Coordinating Council Meeting
February 2, 2015
4:30 pm

The Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, VA

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions – Coordinating Council Chair R. Boyles

2. Public Comment* – R. Boyles

3. Council Consent – R. Boyles
   a) Approval of Agenda (Attachment 1) - **ACTION**
   b) Approval of Proceedings from November 2015 (Attachment 2) - **ACTION**

4. ACCSP Status Report
   Program Update – Program Director M. Cahall
   APAIS Update – Program Director M. Cahall
   Committee Updates – Operations Committee Chair P. Campfield
   Independent Program Review (IPR) Update – Program Director M. Cahall

5. Other Business

6. Adjourn – C. Patterson

*See Public Comment Guidelines:
http://www.accsp.org/documents/ACCSP_PublicCommentPolicyOct2013.pdf

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

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Executive Committee
In-person Meeting
November 2, 2015 | 4:00 pm
World Golf Village Renaissance St. Augustine Resort 500 South Legacy Trail St. Augustine, Florida
https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=552:15:::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1632

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Name	Partner	Phone	Email
Mark Alexander	CT DEEP	(860) 434-6043	mark.alexander@ct.gov
Tom Baum	NJ DFW	(609) 748-2020	tom.baum@dep.nj.gov
Robert Beal	ASMFC	(703) 842-0740	rbeal@asmfc.org
Lynn Fegley (Proxy)	MD DNR	(410) 260-8285	lynn.fegley@maryland.gov
Robert Boyles (Vice-chair)	SC DNR	(843) 953-9304	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov
John Carmichael	SAFMC	(843) 571-4366	john.carmichael@safmc.net
Joe Cimino	VMRC	(757) 247-2237	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
John Clark (Proxy)	DE DFW	(302) 739-4782	john.clark@state.de.us
Gordon Colvin (Proxy)	NOAA	(240) 357-4524	gordon.colvin@noaa.gov
Louis Daniel	NC DMF	(252) 726-7021	louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov
Jim Estes	FL FWCC	(850) 617-9622	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Patrick Geer	GA DNR	(912) 262-3121	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Hannah Goodale	GARFO	(978) 281-9101	hannah.f.goodale@noaa.gov
Lou Goodreau (Proxy)	NEFMC	(978) 465-0492	lgoodreau@nefmc.org
Steve Heins	NYS DEC	(631) 444-0436	steve.heins@dec.ny.gov
Wilson Laney (Proxy)	US FWS	(919) 515-5019	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Jason McNamee	RI DEM	(401) 423-1943	jason.mcnamee@dem.ri.gov
Daniel McKiernan (Proxy)	MA DMF	(617) 626-1531	dan.mckiernan@state.ma.us
Cheri Patterson (Chair, Proxy)	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	cheri.patterson@wildlife.nh.gov
Terry Stockwell (Proxy)	ME DMR	(207) 633-9556	terry.stockwell@maine.gov
Leroy Young	PFBC	(814) 359-5177	leyoung@pa.gov

Committee Members Not in Attendance: M. Gary (PRFC), B. King (DC FWD), C. Moore (MAFMC), Bonnie Ponwith (SEFSC), A. Risenhoover (NOAA)

Others in Attendance:

Name	Title	Partner	Phone	Email
Tom Hoopes	Operations Committee Chair	MA DMF	(978) 282-0308	thomas.hoopes@state.ma.us
Jerry Morgan	Advisory Committee Chair	CT – Rec	(203) 245-8665	B8nTackle@aol.com
Tom Moore	Legislative Proxy for Rep. Mike Vereb	PFBC	(610) 246-0664	jtm314@gmail.com

Welcome and Introductions – C. Patterson
The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Executive Committee of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the St. Augustine Ballroom of the World Golf Village Renaissance, St.

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

Augustine, Florida, November 2, 2015, and was called to order at 4:00 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Cheri Patterson.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: Okay I would like to convene the Coordinating Council meeting please. However, before we start I would like to let everybody know that this is the last time we'll have Joe here. Joe, it has been a pleasure and thank you very much. Welcome, Coordinating Council members.

Public Comment – C. Patterson
I'm Cheri Patterson; the Chair of the Coordinating Council. I would like to move forward with the agenda. Is there any public comment towards this meeting? Seeing none; we'll move on.

Council Consent – C. Patterson
- **Approval of Agenda (Attachment 1)**

Does anybody have any questions or additions to the agenda? Seeing none; let's move on by consent.

- **Approval of Proceedings from August 2014 (Attachment 2)**

Does anybody have any changes to the last meeting's proceedings? Seeing none; we'll move those forward by consent.

Review of Outstanding Action Items from August 2016
One other ancillary request, anybody in Room 936, I have their key here. If you don't want to come up and claim it I can understand, but it will be up here. Okay, we would like to review the outstanding action items from August. There are none, so we can move on very quickly with those. We'll move on to review the recommendations of the submitted proposals for the FY2016. We have Tom Hoopes and Jerry Morgan here from the Operations Committee and Advisors to go through this process.

Review Recommendations of FY2016 Submitted Proposals (Attachment 3) – Operations Committee Chair T. Hoopes and Advisory Committee Chair J. Morgan
MR. TOM HOOPES: All right, thank you, Cheri. As we do every year, we have proposals submitted. They are ranked by both the Operations Committee and the Advisors. As always, the program priorities as stated in the FY16 Request for Proposals (RFP) are catch and effort and landings with the permit information as the top priority, and then biological and bycatch or releases discards third and economic and sociological data last.

This year we received 17 proposals, including the administrative proposal, eight maintenance and eight new. It was a very good slate of proposals; the quality was excellent. This is the seventh year using a 75 percent 25 split as a guiding principal, and it is also the first year that we're using the new long term funding limit on maintenance proposals, where maintenance proposals that are approved will start the clock ticking and get four years of full funding and then a final two years at 66 and 33 percent.

The maintenance proposals that you are going to review; this will be that first year for them. This is the sixth year that we've had sufficient new proposals, so it is a good slate. Quickly looking at this slide, I've thrown this up over the last few years, just because it gives an idea of where the administrative funding has gone over the last 15, 16 years and also the number of staff. It just shows a general increase. You can see there is a decline this year, which is a good thing; a proposed decline, so that's good. If we move to the next slide, you'll see that here is the general representation in terms of the leftover money after the Administration Grant and how it plays out in terms of a 75/25 percent split.

Looking quickly at the slate of proposals, we have these maintenance proposals. I have a number of years there to show you how many years these have been funded and what they would cost if funded, including their administrative or NOAA fee. I think everybody who has reviewed these proposals in the past will be familiar with them.

Some have been submitted 18 years and some have only been submitted 3. If we looked at the new proposals we've got eight as well, and again, I think everybody both in the Operations and Advisory Committees felt there were a lot of very good proposals here; well-conceived and well written. A lot of

good stuff in here and unfortunately there just isn't enough money to fund all of them; especially if we apply the 75/25 split.

Before we get into the details of the proposals, there were two major recommendations that came out, and we can come back to this afterwards. But I just wanted to throw these out so that you could keep these in mind as we look at the proposals. There were three new proposals that had a very similar theme, the eTRIPS proposals, and everybody felt that it was important that at the very least these three groups, if funded, coordinated together.

Again, we can get back to this in a little more detail as we talk about the details of the funding and how much money is available, et cetera. The other two recommendations, themes that came out of the meeting, as I mentioned everybody thought these were great proposals. There was some really good stuff here.

Given that the ranking priorities favor a catch-in-effort proposal, those that come in as biological or bycatch just get less points. They don't rank as high. It is not that they aren't good proposals, it is just they don't get the points. The Operations and Advisory Committees felt that it probably was time, now that we've been going through this process for eight to ten years; it was time next year to revisit the priorities.

An idea might be to give biological proposals the same weight as catch and effort, for instance. I think that is going to come up as a discussion item or already has. But I think that has pretty much already been given the okay from the Executive Committee. If we could go to the spreadsheet at this point, and the handout that you have shows what's up on the screen.

It might be easier for you to read the handout; I know it is pretty small print. One important detail here is that the materials you received a few weeks ago misrepresented the overall average score for the proposals. That was discovered this morning and we have corrected that figure on this sheet and reordered the proposals accordingly.

The result of that is what you see here. If we start with the maintenance proposals, quickly what is laid out on this sheet shows you the cost of the proposal itself, and then what would be the NOAA Administrative Fee, basically at about 5 percent, and the cumulative cost and then scenarios where if the program is funded at 3.35 million, what would happen based on these ranks. Then similarly, if the program is fully funded at 3.5 million, what would happen. In terms of the maintenance proposals you'll see at 3.5 million all of the maintenance proposals get funded; but at 3.35 the last two fall out, or below the line essentially of that 75 percent cutoff. Now the difference between what you saw in your handout and what you see here is that the last ranked proposal in the maintenance group fell from sixth down to eighth.

It was funded before and now it is down below that under the 3.35 scenario. If we move to the new quickly and then we can jump back, you have a similar situation in terms of the breakdown; but obviously there is less money to fund these new proposals. Under the 3.35 million scenario the top three make it, and the fourth is just under that line by $1,800. At 3.5 million, those four proposals get funded but not the fifth. Are there any questions about the ranking and how that is set up?

MR. THOMAS BAUM: Just while they were ranking, I see the last new proposal deals with Jonah crab, and I don't even remember Jonah crab being on the sampling matrix; which is taken into account as far as the ranking goes. Was there any discussion among the Operations Committee with that?

MR. HOOPES: Yes. I think everybody felt this was a very good proposal, but you're right. It is not on the matrix; as far as a priority species. On top of that it is a biological proposal, and so as a result it just doesn't get the points as I mentioned earlier.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other questions for Tom?

MR. ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Thanks for walking through the presentation. On the new projects there, I note three of the top four all have to do with electronic data collection. In your opinion or the opinion of the

Operations Committee, is there some potential synergy that might be gained there by working together to maximize our resources that are available?

MR. HOOPES: Yes. As I may have mentioned or is on that previous slide, yes the recommendation there are these three proposals. If they are funded, these three groups at least work together. There wasn't much discussion in terms of cost savings, but certainly, I think there is an opportunity for that.

MR. BOYLES: Thanks, I'm sorry I missed that earlier.

MR. MICHAEL S. CAHALL: Also, just to bring to everyone's attention that the for-hire projects all had validation methodologies incorporated into them. It is our suggestion that these projects collaborate with an existing MRIP project that is running in South Carolina to develop a standardized validation methodology. That way we would have one that could be an ACCSP standard that we could move through the MRIP approval process.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Go ahead, Louis.

DR. LOUIS B. DANIEL, III: You look like you're scared to call.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: I was just making sure I wrote something down correctly.

DR. DANIEL: Just I guess a comment, a question about the project from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Down at the bottom of the new projects; the sampling strategy evaluation to determine which data and what sample sizes most affect assessment accuracy in the U.S. South Atlantic. That is a pretty broad reaching topic, and really an important one for not just the South Atlantic, for everybody.

It seems to me that that is precisely the kind of thing that ACCSP should be doing. The principal investigator, you know, is one that would cost us a fortune to come in and do something like this. But the potential for it to allow us to focus our data collection programs on those that have the greatest bearing on stock assessments and management approaches are incredible here, the potential.

My understanding is that while it was rated high by the various groups, it couldn't score very high because it didn't fit a specific category. It seems like to me that as the Coordinating Council, we can shift things around. But if there is a general comment that somebody can make about that project, that seems to me like one that we really need to do whatever we have to do in order to fund that $107.000 for the Southeast Center. That is my point on that one, and I just would like to have your comments on that project.

MR. HOOPES: We agree with you. The Operations Committee agrees with you, and there was a lot of discussion at the Operations Committee about what to do, because the project is clearly valuable; but also as you mentioned, doesn't really fit in to some of our criteria. It was very difficult to rank it to reflect the opinion of the committee in terms of its overall value.

It then triggered ongoing discussion amongst the Operations Committee members about potentially making some adjustments to our ranking criteria, so that a project like this one could be given a higher score. I'm not sure how that would bode for this particular go round, but I think you're going to hear a little bit more about that shortly.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other questions? From the Executive Committee point of view, Louis, we have in our minutes, we're going to be instructing the Operations Committee to come back with recommendations in the future on how best to move forward with changing priorities within ACCSP; considering we have primarily catch and effort taken care of amongst all the states. If there is a need to have a change in priorities we should be seeing that recommendation coming from the Operations Committee.

Okay, we have these proposals in front of us to agree or disagree with the following ranking that we see on this paper or up on the screen. **The Executive Committee has agreed with Robert, and if this**

committee would like to move forward with a recommendation to have the top three new projects collaborate; and to see if there is any cost savings that can be realized through their collaboration. Is that okay to come forward with in a letter to those three PIs and the ACCSP? Okay we'll move forward with that. Yes, Gordon.

MR. GORDON COLVIN: Madam Chair, the only think I might add to that is that communication. **I would recommend also suggest conferring or coordinating with MRIP, and see if there is a way we can utilize the products MRIP is in the process of developing to assist those projects and to facilitate the outcome that you're outlining.**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Okay, I'll do that. Thank you.

MR. CAHALL: **Just a point that we've already been in touch with the PIs for these projects and suggested that they discuss their needs with the existing MRIP folks; the project that is ongoing in South Carolina. That has been received universally very well, and in fact, I think we've already got a start on this process.**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: **You're saying that ACCSP will have that coordination; you guys will be coordinating all that.**

MR. CAHALL: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: **You will get a report back on that at the next meeting?**

MR. CAHALL: Of course.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Okay, as for the maintenance projects, I would like to turn to Mark to have – let me go backwards here. In the Executive Committee we discussed how we might be able to fund all of the maintenance projects if we don't receive the 3.5 million dollars, if we just receive the 3.3 million dollars, we have two projects that fall below the line. Those are the Maine project and the New York project.

The ACCSP's five year grant is coming to an end, so all funds must be expended at the end of this fiscal year. If there are any remaining funds, then the Executive Committee has recommended that those two projects be funded with any remaining ACCSP Budget Funds. If the funds are less than or around $25,000 then we are recommending that the Maine project gets funded first. If we get all of the funds then, of course, we'll fund both projects. But we have a motion by Mark.

MR. MARK ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam Chair; I would like to propose this following motion. I think I e-mail it to Elizabeth.

MR. HOOPES: Mark, she doesn't have that e-mail on this machine, could you go ahead and read the motion to her?

MR. ALEXANDER: You ready?

MR. HOOPES: Actually Mark, if you could e-mail it to me really quickly I can just give it to her.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Go ahead, Louis.

DR. DANIEL: While they're chatting, is there any way we can have discussion about elevating that one project? I mean you've got maintenance projects; you've got the new projects. That project is a coast wide positive. It seems like we're making more of an effort to do the maintenance projects that may have enough leftover funding or may be able to take a little bit of money off of some of these maintenance projects in order to fund that one. It seems like that was a very strong project, it just didn't fit in a box. I don't want to beat a dead horse trying to do something, but it would seem like to me that you've got a

couple of projects that are partly funded. If those weren't funded at all and those funds went to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center project, you could just about fund it.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Okay Louis, yes, we can certainly get into that discussion here. Another option to think about if the committee is willing to think about it. If we do get the 3.5 million and ACCSP does have that $100,000, is it the will of this committee to spend those funds that the final ACCSP budget has towards that particular project? I would like to get some discussion going within this committee on that. Let's move forward with Terry on that.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Just a clarification that would be funding a new project on top of funding the maintenance projects that are currently below the bar?

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Yes. If we get the 3.5 million. That is the second column in from the right, we would still have roughly $100,000 to play with. Again, this is projected funds. We're not sure, to play with at the end of ACCSP Budget.

MR. STOCKWELL: We're entering into a whole lot of ifs. I mean, I thought I was going to be able to come to this meeting and for once keep my mouth shut, because the bycatch monitoring program that is cornerstone to a number of our FMPs was going to be funded. It really wasn't any surprise when you flagged me down at noon and said, no, there is a revised and updated ranking proposal.

Maine has worked long and hard to reduce the amount of funds. We're down to just shy of $25,000 to run this program that is much like Louis's program recommendation is important to a large part of the coast. I'm going to continue to scrap for that. Next year, it's going to be the New Hampshire plan.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: I just wanted to clarify that if we get the 3.5 million that the Maine and New York projects will be funded. Beyond that, then there is the possibility if there are extra funds at the end of the ACCSP budget period that can fund that new project.

MR. STOCKWELL: The corner of the world where I come from, we never get our full amount of funding any time it is requested, so I'm not anticipating sitting here today with the rest of the Coordinating Council being able to get everything we're asking for, full funding plus $100,000 surplus. With best of wishes that will come through, but I think we need to be realistic as well.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Yes, we have been fortunate over the last three years to get full funding.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: Do we know what the time line is for knowing when that 3.5 million might – do we know when?

MR. HOOPES: Typically, we're not notified until March or April, and it depends entirely on when NOAA and thus NMFS gets their budget.

MS. FEGLEY: To follow up, would we know about the $100,000 in that same timeframe?

MR. HOOPES: Actually, we'll know about that a good bit sooner. The ACCSP, just as a reminder, ACCSP is a five year grant. With the MRIP implementation we've had some personal cost shift to different funding sources, which is the reason that we're probably sitting on a little bit of a surplus. I don't know exactly what it is yet.

It was identified when we did the spend analysis a couple of weeks ago, and we haven't had time to sit down and do a full up analysis to be reasonably certain what the number is going to be. But there is a surplus and it is approximately 100,000. I don't know exactly how much it is going to be. In fact, with the loss of Anne McElhatton, her salary is going to stop being pulled out of the budget too, so it may actually grow a little bit before we get down to the end of the year.

DR. DANIEL: That is promising. I certainly wasn't trying to ditz Maine, because I know they've been trying hard to scrap and save and get this program. But with you saying that there could be a surplus, then to me, this is a huge priority. If the group agrees that that is how we would spend that $100,000 surplus, that's great.

But if it doesn't come to be, then perhaps a letter from the ACCSP Coordinating Council to National Marine Fisheries Service recommending strongly that they fund that project out of the Southeast Fishery Science Center. It really is, it is only $100,000. The potential there is a huge cost savings on data collection programs that I think we would all be interested in.

MR. COLVIN: I'm thinking that the practical effect of Louis's suggestion would be that in the event, under whatever combination of circumstances added up, additional funding was available for new projects in the amount of about $100,000 or so; that the recommendation is to move the sampling strategy evaluation project up in priority from its current listed position of 7 to 5.

Now I've heard a lot of good things about that project, and I've heard some of them today, but there are two other projects there that I think in fairness we ought to offer an opportunity for some discussion of the effect of moving this up ahead of them, just to make sure that our decision-making record is complete before I would be comfortable nailing that down, Louis. I would hope that somebody here could speak to that or perhaps Tom could summarize what the Operations Committee had to say about it.

MR. CAHALL: You didn't make the point that I was expecting you to make, which is that I was in contact with the PIs on the project, on that specific project, because I knew that they had fallen fairly low on the rankings; and offered to provide some assistance in applying for alternate funds. The FIS funding cycle is still open, and they have funds available through the FIS program.

I know from sitting on FIS that this is the kind of project that they would be likely to fund. I don't know exactly how much money is available and I don't know the dates off the top of my head, but the PIs responded, thank you so much and we'll get back to you, but I haven't heard back from them at this point. I would suggest at least in the short term that they go ahead and apply for the FIS funds anyway, regardless of the decision that we make here.

DR. DANIEL: To Gordon's point. I think the fact that it didn't fit into the ranking criteria, I mean this project came out of the blue and was one that everybody jumped on and gravitated to as good; but it didn't rank high because it didn't fit. It is kind of like you hate to throw the baby out with the bathwater by saying, well you know you didn't get the ranking that you needed so sorry. We should be in a position as the Coordinating Council that we can adjust those rankings if we do see something or we agree with the Operation Committee or the Advisors that something is extraordinarily important outside of the ranking criteria.

That would be my justification, Gordon, for leapfrogging some of those other projects. I don't discount the other projects down there, particularly the Southeast Snapper Grouper Observer Program. But this, I think, actually has better overall benefits to the east coast.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other discussion? Okay let's move forward to Mark's motion, and I presume that we'll be doing an amendment if we want to include one of these new projects moving up also. But I'll need an amended motion on that. Go ahead, Mark.

MR. ALEXANDER: I put together this motion before this discussion we had, and I'm certainly open to amendments with regard to that recent discussion. For the purposes of getting this on the books, I'll read the motion. Move that the ACCSP Coordinating Council adopt the following funding contingency for fiscal year 2016 proposals if the total ACCSP funding from NMFS is less than 3.5 million and the reduction from 3.5 million cannot be compensated for through other funding sources and/or cost savings realized by combining the elements of like projects or other means.

First, the maintenance project proposals be funded in order of the first six projects in the revised ranking spreadsheet, the Maine DMR proposal, which is herring, mackerel, menhaden portside sampling and the New York DEC proposal improving trip level reporting, and the new proposals that the new project proposals be funded according to rank order specified in the revised ranking spreadsheet.

There are two things I wish to point out about moving the Maine proposal in front of New York. It is meant as no slight to New York, but I just wanted to recognize that Maine did this year what we've always asked maintenance project proposal submitters to do, and that is to gradually wean them off of ACCSP.

If you read the proposal you'll see that the state of Maine contributed 1FTE, which resulted in this proposals cost being reduced by about 80 percent down to a very modest $25,000.00 give or take. The second is that the Advisors thought very highly of this proposal and ranked it Number 1. That is my rationale for doing that.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Is there anybody to second that? Robert.

DR. DANIEL: I think I can address my issue by simply amending Number 2 to parenthetically revise the ranking spreadsheet to designate the Eric Williams Southeast Fisheries Science Center Project Number 5; which means if there is money left over with the 3.5 million that that would be the last project funded with any excess funds after the Maine and New York studies. If that is friendly to the maker of the motion and the seconder then we're good.

MR. ALEXANDER: I accept that.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Thank you; let's get it up on the board. Is that good, Louis?

DR. DANIEL: Yes, ma'am, thank you.

MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mark, for making the motion but what this doesn't include for me is any recognition of the Executive Committee's recommendation for the utilization of surplus funding and/or full funding of the grant altogether. Is that implied in your motion or do we need to wordsmith this?

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, if there is other funding or if cost savings can be found; then it's implicit in my recommendation that the rank order is followed and that presumably New York and Maine would be accommodated.

MR. STOCKWELL: Cheri, are you comfortable that the recommendations of the Executive Committee are fully embodied in this motion?

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Yes.

MR. STOCKWELL: Okay, then I can support it.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other questions?

MR. COLVIN: Before we vote, Madam Chair, I want to return to the point that I made earlier. Again, I think there is a great deal of merit in advancing the priority for the Southeast Center's project; I absolutely do. At the same time I recognize there are two other projects now that are being dislocated down, and before we vote I just want to make sure that anybody who wants to advocate for those projects has an opportunity to do so.

I was told that there was quite a discussion earlier today about concerns about black sea bass data. That project moves down the priority list here, and I guess the other project is also a Southeast Science Center project. We're not hearing from anybody about those projects. I'm a little uncomfortable voting on this without that advocacy being at least provided an opportunity to come forward. I'll just leave it at that. I

guess we'll vote on it as it is if nobody does, but this is a last invitation for somebody to speak up for sea bass.

MR. JASON McNAMEE: I was trying not to, as I am actually on that black sea bass proposal so I felt a little funny about speaking up too much on it, not in a monetary way but just as a partner on the project. I guess one of the reasons why I haven't spoken up is we are also attempting alternative funding sources for this project as well, including the highly competitive SK funding source.

It is certainly no guarantee. I'm struggling a little bit to understand; there is a systematic approach that you use here to rank these and we're just kind of jumping that rank. This is my very first meeting, I've not been here long enough to know if that is common or appropriate or not.

It is puzzling the fact that Mr. Colvin brought it up. I have the same question about exactly what are the elements of that project that make it a better fit for ACCSP than say the black sea bass project or the one right below that as well? They're all important projects, I think. Black sea bass is certainly - we saw in the terms of reference from the previous meeting that fishery dependent data sources are one of the elements that are actually in the terms of reference. It certainly has importance for that important stock in the stock assessment that is about to unfold.

I suppose I should speak to the project itself, it is a study fleet project, working collaboratively with the industry. The hope is we could follow the model that this same group used for lobster to help bring forward a source of data generated by the industry that can be used in a more systematic way.

I think it would create a nice model. Will it have relevance right now for this next stock assessment? I don't think so. That is one of the reasons I didn't speak up immediately. A little bit about the project, I think it is important. I don't have a good sense of whether it is not as important as that Southeast project, so if I could hear a little more on that, I would appreciate it.

MR. JERRY MORGAN: Bear with me; I haven't worked one of these before. As the Advisors looked at that proposal, we ranked that up pretty high. We felt that it was important to the Atlantic Coast. We felt that black sea bass straddles the New England and the Mid-Atlantic areas.

With the coastal waters warming, we feel that we're seeing more sea bass gravitating toward the northern waters. As a result, the data that we have, compared to the data that we could be getting, I think, is going to be very important for the future management of this fishery; therefore, we ranked it pretty high in our opinion.

MR. HOOPES: I think as far as the Operations Committee are concerned, it would go back to what Louis talked about. My impression was that all three of these proposals, actually all of the new proposals were very good. It is just that they may not have fit in terms of scoring highly in terms of the ranking process. It was in some ways more the ranking process than the proposals themselves.

MR. COLVIN: Just a point of information. Mike brought up earlier the possibility that we could suggest one or more of these project teams that FIS might be a funding option if they haven't applied. FIS, RFP closed last week on the 30th, so if they haven't applied they're out for this year.

MR. MORGAN: N16 is a data and sampling sizes issue. We felt that it was very important as Advisors, an important proposal; simply because of the ranking protocols. We were constrained on how we ranked it. We have a new Operations and Advisors Committee, I believe, that was formed that we're going to be looking into program protocols; particular interest in redefining ranking procedures.

Certainly, this isn't in the catch and effort and in the bycatch or the biological or social economic end of it, but it is a viable program. It is an important proposal, and it should be funded. That is the way we felt about it. There are funds out there that can be utilized towards this, and I think that is the way we felt it should go.

DR. DANIEL: Well, I'll just make one more comment on this. I am not trying to pick on Rhode Island, certainly, or the other southeast proposal, which is equally important. But again, I see that project Number 7 that in the motion is elevated to Number 5, as a broad reaching impact that could have effects for all the species that we manage, not one data poor species that we manage. That is the decision that the Board has to make, is to which one, and you either leave it alone or you make the change. I propose making the change. I also would ask though if they can do it for $100,000. Their proposal was for $140,000 I think it was.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: It is $107,000.00, Louis.

DR. DANIEL: The project that I'm supporting is $107,000 and I think they could do it for $100,000; because we talked about having maybe $100,000 left over. But the Rhode Island project is $137,000. I don't know if they can do the project for $100,000 if that is the amount of money that's left over. But certainly, Eric's project could be done for $100,000.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other conversation? Go ahead, Jason.

MR. McNAMEE: Yes, I appreciate that last comment, and I will note having worked through the budget with the group. Getting to $137,000.00 was tough. If we're talking about 100,000 that might not be enough in either case, so I'm compelled by that piece; that sort of logistical argument, as well as we're talking about multiple stock assessments and efficiencies that could carry forward. I'm compelled by both of those arguments.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other conversation?

MR STOCKWELL: I'm not opposed to the motion. I'm not taking any offense from being bumped from seventh to eighth. I can certainly understand why that is, and I can see why you have a project that only costs $25,000. I mean that is logical if you have a little bit of money left. But in our defense I want to say that we have worked very hard, and I think we made a lot of improvements, and we have a really solid program right now; and we're trying to maintain that program.

We are scrapping and clawing for every dollar we can get. That is all I'm going to say. I think that we have put our own money into it. We have put our own personnel, we are paying for personnel. We have done, I think, what we're supposed to be doing in trying to wean ourselves off of this type of funding. In fact, we haven't been fully funded recently. That's all I wanted to say about this. I'm a little disappointed but hey, we'll see what happens. Hopefully, we'll be fully funded.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any other comments? I'll read the motion. **The Coordinating Council adopt the following funding contingency for FY2016 proposals if the total ACCSP funding from NMFS is less than 3.5 million and the reduction from 3.5 million cannot be compensated for through other funding sources in our cost savings realized by combining the elements of like projects or other means.**

Number 1, the maintenance project proposals be funded in order of the first six projects in the revised ranking spreadsheet; then the Maine DMR proposal, which encompasses herring, mackerel, menhaden, portside sampling and the New York State DEC proposal improving trip level reporting. Number 2, the new project proposals be funded according to the rank order specified in the revised ranking spreadsheet, with the sampling strategy evaluation being moved to Number 5. Can we have a vote on it please? Everybody with a yes; please raise your hands. Any noes? Abstentions? **Motion passes 17 yes, 1 abstention.** Okay, we'll move on to the next agenda item and have Mike provide us with a status report.

ACCSP Status Report
- **Program Update – Program Director M. Cahall**
MR. CAHALL: We have decided that we're going to combine our presentations together a little bit. Tom and I are going to kind of tag team a little, and then we're going to hand you off to a couple other folks to

do a few more things so that hopefully, we won't put anybody to sleep today. I want to talk a little bit about our electronic trip reporting systems.

We are currently working on eTRIPS mobile, and there is a version of the system that's deployed in Rhode Island, which is being used in a for-hire fishery. We've created enhancements to include location collection in collaboration with the Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC), and I believe George is going to talk a little more about that in a few minutes.

We're working on the GARFO certification. The GARFO Submission Certification is very strict. Our tool, although it does collect all the appropriate data elements, making all of the pieces – it is a little bit like the project proposals, all the pieces have to fit into the right holes in order for them to give us a certification.

We were able to transmit data successfully into their Vessel Trip Report (VTR) system at this point. We're working on some issues with the front end to come into compliance with a couple of their requirements. We are getting ready - we are also talking to Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in fact, we have our proposal from Massachusetts to deploy the tool there.

The very interesting discussions we're having with Connecticut, also talking about some shellfish data collection, which if that comes to fruition we're going to actually cross some disciplines in both Connecticut and potentially Massachusetts to be able to get that shellfish data. We've also written some training videos, which have been very, very well received.

It is interesting when the e-mails across my desk, I get status reports and then the training video and I get things with exclamation points and underlines; everybody seems to really like those. Electronic Dealer Reports (eDR) mobile, most of the progress in that particular tool right now is in the joint development project between Massachusetts and Maine.

We do have beta versions of the tools released for both jurisdictions. We are having a technical issue unfortunately with the Android version in Maine. Maine has a very specific card reader. They have a bunch of them that paid tons of money for, and we can't get them to work in Android and we don't know why.

We're working with the manufacturer to get the right programming interface for it. But they are apparently located in some very far foreign country and run on their own schedule, and so we're having a lot of trouble getting feedback from them. Unfortunately, that has also delayed our deployment in Maine, because they really pretty desperately need those card readers to work.

We are working on Windows versions and iOS versions. Hopefully, we'll have the system available for production in the spring. We are in the very final stages for Massachusetts at this point. We have a beta version we released to them. They sent us some comments. We're putting those into the system, and hopefully, will have a system ready for Massachusetts to deploy pretty much at their leisure. They've indicated that they essentially can roll the system out whenever they're comfortable that it's ready. We're going to have a little demo of that system shortly; Tom is going to show you all how it works. The lobster system, which is the lobster transferability system, has been released and is in production.

They are actively using it at this point and they are working on feeding in the federal data, so that we can accurately keep track of who has what traps where. In terms of data, we're almost finished with our fall load. We had a couple of little delays because we've had some issues with our participant match software, which has always been a little problematic; you know, are you Joe, are you Joseph, are you J.

It has always been a little bit of trouble matching all of the different permits together from the different jurisdictions. We've also introduced some improved Quality Assurance /Quality Control (QA/QC) procedure that allows us to review data a little bit more on the fly. We're also working on a new Data Warehouse query integration. This also goes along with our website roll out.

I don't know how many of you have been to our website, but we rolled out a new version a couple of weeks ago and we're working very hard to make our query interface look like the website; so that we'll be transparent to you and should have the look and feel. In terms of our working to push the data out, which obviously we worked to collect it and warehouse it, and then we try to work to get it used.

We participated in the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop. We worked with the ASMFC Data Workshop for spot and croaker. We process routinely several data requests every week. We've participated in American Fisheries Society (AFS) and Organization of Fish and Wildlife Information Managers (OFWIM) presentations. We also pretty quickly worked up the swipe card standard, which now has been tentatively approved by the Commercial Technical Committee, which should be moved over to the Operations Committee to be approved and put into our data standards.

Standard codes, the committees are working on some code reviews and improved descriptions. We do have to implement some SAFA specific code logic. Different jurisdictions will use different gears or different varieties of gears, and SAFIS needs to have a little bit better ability to do that. Julie has been working very hard on the bycatch matrix fleets.

There have been easily 10 or 12 calls on that; trying to refine that down so that we have good consensus on the fleets and the characteristics of each ones. We're also looking at making some modifications to our data warehouse so that we can attach multiple VTRs to a single dealer report.

Of course, I don't know how many of you participated in the original thinking through of how systems worked, but our original designs all assumed each dealer report would be associated with a single vessel trip. Right now, our design doesn't support the ability to link them together. This is something that has been requested by a couple of different program partners, and we're working on getting that done for them.

- **Access Point Angler Intercept Survey (APAIS) Transition – M. Cahall**
In terms of the APAIS update, I have to say as I said to the Executive Committee; this is going just about as smoothly as we could have possibly hoped. There have been obviously a few issues along the way, but by and large we have the resources either in place or coming into place, and the process is either in place or being built to support the standup of the APAIS interface supported through out of state conduct. The five year cooperative agreement was approved in mid-September. We do have the funding in place for the 2015 transition, and we do have the funding in place for the January to June 2016, the first six months.

We have state agreements with virtually all of the states. We expect all of the transition states; that is those states that are doing this for the first time. Right now we are only waiting for New York, I believe. We are expecting completion of other states in the very near term, but these are folks that are generally more familiar with the process and have been working with it a little bit longer.

We've hired our two regional coordinators; some of your staff may have already met with them. We had a Recreational Technical Committee meeting last week where we did the initial training. Many of the state lead biologists have been hired, and we're looking to see all of them onboard, of course within the next couple of months.

ACCSP has acquired the hardware and software that we need in order to scan all the documents and process the data. We also developed a little bit of software so we can keep track of the assignments and the data that's posted up against it. In the near future we have a couple more lead biologists coming online.

We've got a vacancy out for our scan technician. If you know somebody that likes looking at lots and lots of data and is good with their hands, we're all about it. We're recruiting the state field positions as well. Things that we need to get moving finishing. We're working on the training materials for the interceptors, and also on some of the documents that go with it. We of course have to implement and test our scanning.

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

We did manage to get a lot of the scanning technology and tools from the Gulf States, but we have had to make some modifications. As a consequent we're going to have to make sure it all works correctly. We expect North Carolina to start their data collection in January. We expect the state prep and sampling to start on time in February. We will be doing some regional workshops in January to actually start the staff training for the field interceptors. That is that for that. Next piece, why don't you go ahead?

Review Progress of the Independent Program Review (IPR) Recommendations (Attachment 4)
MR. HOOPES: In terms of the independent program review, we're very nearly finished with it, I'm happy to say. We have a number of different vehicles that we used to implement the various recommendations. The last piece that needs to be finished - there are two - the governance review and decision about any changes to governance in the program is one; and then there are a few entries to the standard operating procedure (SOP) yet to be finished.

Then I can say that we have put the independent program review recommendations and the program response to it to bed. We hope to have it all wrapped up at the February Coordinating Council meeting. Here is a list of the remaining actions; it is all just SOP stuff. All done, okay so where is George with Georgia's slides? George, some place people can hear you.

Tablet Reporting – G. Lapointe
MR. GEORGE D. LAPOINTE: Good afternoon, and thank you for giving us time. I am not Senator Ronnie Cromer; I am George Lapointe, consultant with the Northeast Regional Ocean Council. With me is Fran Karp, who is - you will quickly, when we get into questions if there are any, - realize she is the brains behind the operation. For the Northeast Regional Ocean Council, the council is interested in spatial use of ocean planning. I think of different ocean uses. We've been interested in how the party charter industry uses the ocean. We, working with ACCSP and Harbor Light Software; that is who Fran works for, NROC and SEAPLAN worked with SAFIS and the eTRIPS mobile system to allow location tracking.

The pilot test was to continue work on electronic catch reporting for fisheries management, and to test the location tracking for ocean planning interests, and rock in my case. Then to see what lessons we can learn about outreach with captains, the hardware and the software, the captain's use of eTRIPS mobile, and getting the catch effort and location data.

The technology, and this if you have questions will be Fran's forte, is tablet based, well mobile device based and so it is the tablets or mobile phones mounting the software. It is called eTRIPS mobile. It is free to ACCSP partners. It is available for iOS, Android and Windows, and because it's on those systems, it gets updated continually as it needs to get updated.

SAFIS you know a lot about. The data transmission is by cell phone or web access. There is no ongoing or connection charges or transmission charges as there are with other technologies. We scoured New England and the Mid-Atlantic. We didn't get much interest north of Rhode Island, but we have about, I think, 17 captains, a lot in Rhode Island.

Rick Bellavance is in the back and he has been helping us and working with captains for a number of years now; four in Connecticut and two in New York, and the Atlantic City guy was a New York captain who was fishing out of Atlantic City. The things we learned in terms of participation, getting participation at the project level was you need to coordinate with ACCSP and your state managers. State involvement is critical to successful implementation.

The amount of communication between ACCSP staff, Fran and Bill Spain with Harbor Light and the captains just working through the nuts and bolts of individual problems was very significant. We recruited captains and got supporting involvement by entering into individual agreements with the captains, giving them the equipment, the tablets.

Going and talking to them about what was involved, Fran and the SEAPLAN folks did most of the training, and then committing with the captains to go back to them later this year with the data before we share it

publicly; the location data, in particular, because of the sensitivities. There was a lot of need for technology training and troubleshooting.

I really want Fran to talk about this in a second, because she thinks like a true pilot. We piloted and stubbed our toes a fair amount of times, and she thinks our toe stubbing days are over; so that is good news. Then participation with the captains is just good for getting feedback and learning. This is data from Rick Bellavance and some of the Rhode Island captains. It's last year's data because we have permission to use it.

We got the landings and effort data that you know well. As Mike has said, the VTR certification is coming soon. Soon has been elusive, but it is coming really soon now, and we've got catch location. This particular slide is both where people are fishing and transiting, but you can separate those things out. The generalization is what tech people call making the data fuzzy. Peter Zaikowski with SEA PLAN has binned the data into one kilometer hexagon, so you get the general use patterns which NROC is interested in, without giving up specific location data that is so important to many captains and so sensitive as well. The project benefits, just the efficiencies of electronic reporting, captains get into shore and they generally used web access, didn't they or both; Wi-Fi, and so you get your data fast.

The data location is really important for industry negotiations with other emerging industries. I mean, when I met Rick this is what he was doing out at Block Island. We had good advances just in terms of collaborative and cooperative data gathering to build trusting relationships with the fishermen, because they have been very good to work with.

Some of the lessons learned, and I'm going to let Fran talk about this is a minute. The project ramp up is significant. When I think about broad scale application of electronic reporting, the outreach with captains is important, the training videos that Mike talked about will be really important, and with big projects, I think, probably learning how to phase them in.

Cooperation among the parties is really important, and then the programming; and again, this is Fran's end of things - just learning how to make the hardware and software talk in a way that people understand. Support to fishermen is important, because it did take ramp up time and education time that was both temporally a lot of time, and there was a big staff investment.

It had to be at this stage individually targeted, because people have different abilities with different types of technology. I was talking to Mike Waine and he said, well, in 20 years everybody will know how to do this. I said, "Well, that's great, but we aren't at 20 years, we're talking about next year." As younger people come along, I think this will be easier. I think as we get more people it will be easier. Once it is operational, obviously, you're going to have better catch and effort and location information that is timely.

The application of this thing, I'm becoming an evangelist. I'm following behind Rick Bellavance just saying, if we need both the location data, understanding how sensitive that is and good catch and effort data, this is just a good way to get it. I don't remember what funding for development and implementation was for. Do you want to take this part, because you know this better or should I keep going?

MS. FRAN KARP: You can keep going.

MR. LAPOINTE: This was for the location tracking, and they took the individual data points, which were taken a number of points per minute, and they're converted to track lines for visualization. The time stamps allowed ordering and speed calculation. The speeds were broken into transit trolling and still fishing or drift fishing. The catch locations, the confidence in location are estimated through the distance to fishing tracking points from the same trip; breaking it out and getting captains.

Depending on how the captain put data in, when they entered the catch along the trip you got some great information about where catch for different species was occurring. That looks redundant from before. The generalized maps were based on hexagonal grid of one kilometer to get past pointing out the exact location because of the sensitivity.

The tracking points were integrated into the grid to act as a proxy for effort or intensity of use; the time spent in an area, so it is not perfect, but it is way better than we've had. Fishing use and intensity and transit use products were available, so you can see where people are fishing; either trolling or drifting or they're doing transit. The catch records with locational data, you can associate the catch records with locational data and some of the problem with that is training people to enter the data when the fish is caught as opposed to entering the data when they get back to the dock.

You can, because of the locational data get spatially explicit catch per unit effort data. I'm going to skip through this one to give you guys more time. That is the end of our presentation. We are, between now and the end of the year, going to meet with the captains to share the data with them, and I hope I can just share the location data electronically, because I've been working on mapping for the last year, so I think it is pretty snazzy looking.

But it is good information about where people are fishing for different species. I'm going to let Fran talk a little bit about the improvements in the learning process and the programming for fishermen, because she'll convince you that it is going to be a lot better in the future than it was in our pilot.

MS. KARP: This pilot was much more time intensive than we had originally anticipated. We got off to a little bit of a late start in the season and we wanted to ramp up quickly so that we could get the number of trips in that we wanted. We had a little bit of an issue with some of the tablets that we picked.

For some reason they chose not to turn on. They would use them for about one or two weeks and then turn off. I think it was one of the tablets that we picked. Some of the fishermen had never used a tablet before, so it was a little bit intensive for us to sit down with them and show them the basics; not really of the program but on how to use a tablet.

It really didn't matter on age. Some people thing that the older fishermen might have a little bit more of a problem. We didn't see that. It truly was whether or not they had a grasp of how the tablet worked. In the middle of doing this project, we were also making some pretty significant changes to the way the interface looked in the back end of it in SAFIS eTRIPS.

That complicated things. We didn't have the testing time that we really wanted to for deployment, so some of those back end things had to be fixed with the ACCSP, and it kind of kept us on our toes. We did not have any training classes. One of the things that we are going to be doing in the future is having more training classes where people can come in and maybe sit in small groups.

I think small groups is best for these fishermen if they can sit in on classes and go through doing a trip, maybe four, five, ten times until they get it. There were no training videos. One of the things that we learned is it is much easier to point somebody in the direction of a training video if they want to know how to sell their catch, instead of driving out to their location and showing them how to push the buttons.

Those are the things that we can improve on in the future. The application continues to improve. We've been finding that there are two types of fishermen, those that will take the tablet and enter in their catch as they're catching it. Most of those captains have mates. They are able to kind of sit up on their bridge and put in the data as they're going along. Then there is the fisherman who doesn't have a mate and what they tend to do is for the tracking project, start the tracking of the trip, come back and when they're back at the dock they will enter in their catch. We may get the trip data, but their catch data is back at the dock. It really depends on the captains themselves, and then as they get more adept at using it, they tend to really not want to go out without it.

The guys from Rhode Island have been using it for about three seasons now, so they're really good. They can go out there. They use it. It is one of the tools that they pull out every day. The other captains, because it was new this year, they kind of had to take some time to play with it and get to use it and understand it.

Again, the future of it is improving it but based on what the captains give us for feedback. We really want to take what the captains give us and try to implement that into newer versions. We look at it as it is their tool. If we don't make it so it's really easy for them to use, they are not going to be inclined to take it out with them every day.

That is really what we gear our development towards, is to get that feedback from them. Expanding this into different states was also quite interesting, because there are different things that come into play on the back end on the licensing and the vessels; which we've actually sat down and gone through pretty in depth.

We feel that we have a lot of those standards ironed out, and as we go through this we're learning more and more from the feedback we're getting from the captains. I think when we do this again next year; all of the captains have told us that they want to do it again next year. They want to be part of it.

I think next year especially for next fishing season, we'll get a lot of these changes that are being made in SAFIS done and implemented, and next year I think the roll out will be much easier. We've had a couple captains come up to us and ask us to be involved, so I think that next year the project will actually grow from what it is now.

MR. LAPOINTE: Just my final note, thanks to ACCSP staff, because we got a bucket load of help from Mike and Karen and Nico and Elizabeth, and I'm probably forgetting a few other people, but their help was great.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Thank you for the update. We were going to have Tom do a presentation on it, but we're running a little short on time, so anybody who would like to see the presentation after the meeting, come on up and see Tom. If we can move on to electing a Chair and a Vice-Chair. For those new people, oh I'm sorry, Jerry.

MR. MORGAN: Just to follow up a little bit on what Fran said. We did something a little unusual when we had our Advisors meeting. I do a radio show; I'm not here to plug that. But we started it off having some of our Advisors along the Atlantic Coast and all the ACCSP members talk about what they do, what ACCSP does, what happens throughout the year, how we get from point A to Point B and also getting involved in the media and what is happening in today's world.

Surprisingly, and this happened several weeks ago, the feedback that we're getting from the listeners is unreal. First, it is amazing the amount of interest they have in the work that everybody here does, both on the Atlantic and the State level. They are still talking about it to this day, and they were very interested on what it takes to get from Point A to Point B. All they know is, for example, with Mark or Craig or Dave.

We've got numbers that we have to live by, and I don't know if we like them or not but why. Now they're starting to understand and they start to believe that wait a minute, there is more to the game then just coming up with numbers. They were very, very interested in how it is being done, and just to extend their appreciation; because I've been hearing that a lot.

Elect Chair and Vice-Chair
CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: For those that are new to the committee, we have a Vice-Chair, Robert Boyles, but we need to move forward with a motion to elect both a Chair and a Vice-Chair. Would anybody like to make a motion for the Chair?

MR. ALEXANDER: **I move that we nominate Robert Boyles for Chairman.**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Terry seconds. All in favor for Robert Boyles to become Chair, please raise your hand. Any abstentions? Any noes? Oh, Robert, you can put your hand down. Robert is our new Chair with a vote of 14. If we could move forward with a nomination for Vice-Chair, please. Mark.

MR. ALEANDER: Thank you, Madam Chair. **I nominate Lynn Fegley, from Maryland as Vice-Chair.**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Second by Tom Baum. Any discussion? Vote on Lynn being Vice-Chair, please raise your hand for yes. Lynn, you are now Vice-Chair with a vote of 15. Is there any other business people would like to discuss?

MR. CAHALL: Madam Chairman?

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Yes, Mike.

MR. CAHALL: You're not getting away without the going away gift and all of that stuff. On behalf of the ACCSP staff, I want to extend my deepest appreciation for the level of dedication and the phenomenal amount of work that you have put in to guiding this program over the last couple of years. Of course, you receive a plaque. If you haven't signed this plaque, please do so. Secondly, you have a card and we've gotten you a gift certificate to the Flag Hill Winery, so that you'll have something accompanying you and –

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Can everybody join me at the Flag Hill?

MR. CAHALL: And for posterity, we've now created a perpetual plaque for all past Chairs. There are a few of you here, a few of you that are on this. We did our best to figure out what years went with whom, but you are the first new entry on this since we've created it. Again, thank you so much for all that you've done for us.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, you've all made it very easy for me and I appreciate working with everybody. Thanks. If there is no other business, I would like to adjourn the meeting.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m., November 2, 2015.)

— — —

Action Items
1. Once funding has been distributed C. Patterson will write a letter to the ACCSP and the PI's to the top three ranked new projects to collaborate and to explore any cost saving measures.
2. The ACCSP will report back to the committee in February about the coordination of the PI's of the three top ranked new proposals and the MRIP project in South Carolina.
3. MOTION: The Coordinating Council adopt the following funding contingency for FY2016 proposals if the total ACCSP funding from NMFS is less than 3.5 million and the reduction from 3.5 million cannot be compensated for through other funding sources in our cost savings realized by combining the elements of like projects or other means.
    a. Number 1, the maintenance project proposals be funded in order of the first six projects in the revised ranking spreadsheet; then the Maine DMR proposal, which encompasses herring, mackerel, menhaden, portside sampling and the New York State DEC proposal improving trip level reporting.
    b. Number 2, the new project proposals be funded according to the rank order specified in the revised ranking spreadsheet, with the sampling strategy evaluation being moved to Number 5.
    Motion by Mark Alexander. Seconded by Robert Boyles. Motion passes 17 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.
4. MOTION: Nominate Robert Boyles as Vice-chair. Motion by Mark Alexander. Seconded by Terry Stockwell. Motion passes 14 yes, 0 no.
5. MOTION: Nominate Lynn Fegley from Maryland as Vice-chair. Motion by Mark Alexander. Seconded by Tom Baum. Motion passes 15 yes, 0 no.

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