

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

*February 3, 2021
11:15 am - 12:15 pm
Web Conference*

Draft Agenda

The times listed are approximate; the order in which these items will be taken is subject to change; other items may be added as necessary.

1. Welcome/Call to Order (*J. Carmichael*)
2. Council Consent
 - Approval of Agenda
 - Approval of Minutes from October 2020
3. Public Comment
4. Review Program and Project Funding - **ACTION** (*G. White*)
5. Other Business/Adjourn

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
ATLANTIC COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM
COORDINATING COUNCIL**

**Via Webinar
October 22, 2020**

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Introduction of New Members 1

Call to Order, Chair Lynn Fegley..... 1

Approval of Agenda 1

Approval of Minutes from August 3, 2020 1

Election of Council Chair and Vice-Chair..... 1

Consider Recommendations for FY2021 Submitted Proposals 2
 Recommendations from the Operations and Advisory Committee..... 6

Committee and Program Updates 15

Adjournment..... 18

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1)
2. **Approval of Proceedings from August 3, 2020** by consent (Page 1)
3. **Move to elect John Carmichael as Coordinating Council Chair** (Page 2). Motion by Lynn Fegley; second by Dee Lupton. Motion carried (Page 2)
4. **Move to elect Dr. Jason McNamee as Coordinating Council Vice-Chair** (Page 2). Motion by Cheri Patterson; second by Megan Ware. Motion carried (Page 2).
5. **Move to fund the submitted ACCSP proposals as ranked in Average Ranking table of proposals with the exception of the Administrative Grant proposal. That the Leadership Team evaluate a detailed ACCSP Administrative Grant before approving the Administrative Grant. That the funds from savings be brought to the Leadership Team for tanking of priority then back to the Coordinating Council** (Page 12). Motion by Cheri Patterson; second by Mel Bell. Motion carried (Page 15).
6. **Move to adjourn** by consent (Page 18)

ATTENDANCE

Council Members

Bob Beal, ASMFC
Megan Ware, ME, proxy for P. Keliher
Cheri Patterson, NH
Dan McKiernan, MA
Jason McNamee, RI
Greg Wojcik, CT, proxy for J. Davis
Maureen Davidson, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore
Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)
Kris Kuhn, PA
John Clark, DE
Lynn Fegley, MD, proxy for B. Anderson (Chair)

Pat Geer, VA
Dee Lupton, NC, proxy for S. Murphey
Mel Bell, SC, proxy for P. Maier
Doug Haymans, GA
Derek Orner, NOAA
Marty Gary, PRFC
John Carmichael, SAFMC, Vice-Chair
Brandon Muffley, MAFMC
Sherry White, USFWS
Richard Cody, NOAA

Staff

Toni Kerns
Kristen Anstead
Max Appelman
Lindsey Aubart
Heather Konell
Savannah Lewis
Sarah Murray
Joe Myers

Jennifer Ni
Marisa Powell
Mike Rinaldi
Julie Defilippi Simpson
Caitlin Starks
Deke Tompkins
Geoff White

Guests

Joey Ballenger, SC DENR
Alan Bianchi, NC DENR
Jeff Brust, NJ DEP
Barry Clifford, NOAA
Heather Corbett, NJ DEP
Nicole Lengyel Costa, RI DEM
Jessica Daher, NJ Dep
Monty Diehl
Russell Dize
Peter Fallon, Maine Stripers
Dawn Franco, GA DNR
Rick Frenzel, Black Tree Inc
Lewis Gillingham, VMRC
Angela Giuliano, MD DNR
Matthew Heyl, NJ DEP

Raymond Kane, MA (GA)
Phil Langley, Dameron, MD
John Maniscalco, NYS DEC
Stephanie McInerny, NC DENR
Allison Murphy, NOAA
Brian Neilan, NJ DEP
Gerry O'Neill, CapeSeafoods
Chris Piatek
Chad Power, NJ DEP
Story Reed, MA DMF
Helen Takade-Heumacher, EDF
Laura Versaggi, NJ DEP
Beth Versak, MD DNR
Chris Wright, NOAA
Renee Zobel, NH F&G

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened via webinar; Thursday, October 22, 2020, and was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Geoff White, followed by Chair Lynn Fegley.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

MR. GEOFF WHITE: Welcome everybody this morning. I also wanted to welcome two new members. For Connecticut we now have Greg Wojcik on the Coordinating Council. Welcome, Greg. For NOAA we have Richard Cody, so welcome, Richard more officially to the Coordinating Council.

He's been with us many times before as a proxy, so thanks for being here. With that, I think we will turn this over to Lynn to get us started. I hope that in the updated materials you guys saw the revision to the agenda that we have of Chair and Vice-Chair a little bit higher, but Lynn, take it away.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR LYNN FEGLEY: Thanks, Geoff, good morning everybody! Welcome to the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council meeting, really appreciate you all being here today.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR FEGLEY: We have a pretty full agenda. Today is the day that we're going to go through the proposals, and try to get those approved and out. But before we do that, I want to just ask if there is any opposition to a change to the agenda, which would put the election of Chair and Vice-Chair earlier in the agenda.

Do I have any opposition to that change? All right, I'm going to take that silence as none.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIR FEGLEY: Then, the next order of business would be for us to approve the meeting minutes that are in your packet from the last meeting. Does anybody have any changes, additions, or edits to those minutes? If you do, raise your hand. Okay, and I just have to ask here. I'm assuming that somebody is looking at hand raised, and will tell me if there are hands raised.

MR. WHITE: Yes, Julie and I are watching that.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Okay, perfect, thank you. With my internet connection this morning, I just am not taking silence for granted. Okay, seeing no opposition to the minutes, we will consider those approved. That brings us to.

MR. WHITE: Excuse me, Lynn. Julie, can you move down into the slide presentation, please? We were still at the intro slide. There we go, perfect. Go ahead, Lynn.

MS. JULIE DEFILIPPI-SIMPSON: Sorry, I didn't do my job.

CHAIR FEGLEY: No, I think we're good. I think we have now successfully approved the meeting minutes and so the next item, we are going to do things a little bit differently this morning. I have actually had the pleasure of serving an extra year as your Chair. It's been just an amazing learning experience for me. I've really enjoyed working closely with Geoff and Julie and the ACCSP crew.

ELECTION OF COUNCIL CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

CHAIR FEGLEY: But given it's the annual meeting, we thought we would go ahead and pass the torch during this meeting, and I will step away from the Chair for the remainder of today. But before we do that, we need to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair, and I think John Carmichael from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council has been working as an excellent Vice-Chair. **I would**

actually like to kick off this part of the agenda by making a motion to formally elect him as our Chair. I suppose I need a second for that.

MS. DEE LUPTON: I'll second, this is Dee.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, Dee. Is there any opposition to electing John Carmichael as the Coordinating Council Chair? **Okay, well seeing none or hearing none, congratulations, John.** John is going to do an excellent job, and it's going to be, I think really beneficial to have his insight from all of the many happenings down in the South Atlantic brought to this Board. Then that with the next order of business, we need to elect a Vice-Chair, and at this point I would entertain a motion for Vice-Chair.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: Lynn, this is Cheri. I would like to place a motion.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Please, go ahead.

MS. PATTERSON: I would like to move to elect Jay McNamee as Vice-Chair for the Coordinating Council.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Excellent, do we have a second?

MS. MEGAN WARE: This is Megan Ware, I'll second.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, Megan. **Is there any opposition to electing Jason McNamee as Vice-Chair of the Coordinating Council? I see no hands, awesome.** Okay, congratulations, Jay, that's awesome, thank you. I think we actually had a little breach of process. I think that was probably officially John's job to run that motion. But with that, John, are you there?

CHAIR JOHN CARMICHAEL: Yes, Lynn, I'm here. That's fine. I was really looking forward to taking over from you on this, and say for everyone, thanks for your leadership during what has been a really, I think pivotal period in ACCSP, seeing us through major changes in governance, and staff

leadership. Not to mention of course, putting in an extended term as our esteemed Chair. I really appreciate that. Jason, welcome aboard, and looking forward to working with you, and leading this Committee along through the next few years.

MS. FEGLEY: Thank you so much.

MR. WHITE: This is Geoff, I also wanted to pass on an appreciation, Lynn. You did a great job in not just the three years of service to ACCSP, and helping us grow personally as part of the Selection Committee was gone last year, your focus and attention to the issues and the needs of the program, and to provide guidance to myself, as picking up the Director, and Julie as Deputy Director.

I very, very much appreciate it. We have gotten a little more timely with updating the plaque that sits in the office, which we rarely visit at the moment. But we hope to see it more often. But with the deepest appreciation from the program partners of the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program, you are officially on the past Chair's board, so thank you and welcome, John.

MS. FEGLEY: Thank you so much.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Jeff and Julie, are we ready to then move on into our proposals?

CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2021 SUBMITTED PROPOSALS

MR. WHITE: We are. Julie has Ops and Advisors Submitted Proposals summary for us. She'll go to that and we'll get to some points about the Admin Grant that I will talk about and ask for merits from both sides. Go ahead, Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Geoff. Okay, so I'm going to start out with the average ranking of the maintenance proposals. In your materials we provided the advisor ranking, the operations ranking, and then the average ranking. Today I'm just going to be presenting the average ranking

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

for the proposals. The columns that I have here are project name, and I just shortened the names a little bit, so that the slide is a little bit easier to read. But hopefully they'll demonstrate their appropriate projects. We have the partner in the next column, and then the cost of that project in the next column. The cumulative cost is just adding up as we go, to show us how much the maintenance project will cost, or the new projects on the next slide.

Then the amount remaining is from the 3.5 million option or the 3.35 million option. These are just the two sort of landmarks that we've been using in the past few years, to see approximately how much funding we will have left. I do want to note a couple of things about this slide. The first one is that in the past we've had discussions of a somewhat unknown NMFS fee. The NMFS fee is no longer unknown, it is a flat rate.

I think Bob may possibly have more details about how that came about. But it's a flat rate of approximately \$44,000.00 to the Northeast region, and there is no NMFS fee in the Southeast region. That is added into the Admin Grant, and it's taken off the top. The NMFS fee is already taken into account on this slide.

The other thing that I did want to note on this slide is that the New Jersey proposal is listed here at \$54,601, which is different than the \$63,146 that they have requested, which is part of the recommendations from operations that we'll get into later. As you can see there is no red here, so that means that all of the maintenance proposals can be funded. The maintenance carryover, what's left of the 75 percent for maintenance is brought down into the new proposals. These are the new proposals. As you can see, as we get into the line for PRFC, we do start to fall sort of funding. There are the whelk project and the economic fluke, black sea bass projects are not funded with the rankings as they stand at this time.

There are a couple of things that we wanted to point out about the ACCSP Admin Proposal. The first one is that there are two options, and Option 1 was recommended by the Operations and Advisory Committee. A couple of things about this is that this backfills the Data Team lead position. It also adds one software staff, which would reduce the contract support that is needed moving forward.

That is also, by adding the software staff increases the in-house ability to test and maintain mobile applications. Sort of the future outlook is that if approved, the staffing levels are expected to be stable moving into the future. We've had a current pulse where we've had a growth in our staff, and also the coastal data collection support.

That appears to be leveling off, so that we don't expect to have increases at this level in the future. We also do want to point out that we have been attempting to obtain external funds to help support some of the coastwide initiatives, so that we are not relying solely on the Admin Grant.

We're also trying to potentially separate some of the aspects of the ACCSP proposals for ranking, so that as opposed to being supported just by the Admin Grant, the initiative would be separated out as a separate proposal, and allowed to be approved that way. Before I move on to the recommendations from the Operations and Advisors, I'm going to pause. Geoff, did you have anything that you wanted to add to the Admin proposal slide at this point, before I move on?

MR. WHITE: Yes, thank you Julie, thanks for covering that. As Julie mentioned on this slide, it really backfills the Data Team's lead position, which Julie has been doing, well double dipping shall we say, since last summer. One of those staffing increases was a decision of the Selection Committee last year, to add a Deputy Director, which has been extremely helpful.

We were learning how that went, as to when to backfill the Data Team lead position. That is one

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

aspect of the increase in the Admin proposal. The Data Team is now five people, six including Julie, so that is a big group to keep moving forward. But we have been able to move forward on a lot of initiatives there.

The balance point on software is really, the Option 1 and Option 2 we hadn't put forth before, and it was really to allow better transparency to the Coordinating Council and Operations and everyone about how much money is going out for contracts, and how much do we gain in-house ability to cross different projects to maintain mobile application listings move that way.

We've always taken on items like database management design, the API parts, all of that is in-house, the in-house activities for the online versions of eTRIPS and VTR, again primarily in-house, but the mobile apps are the pieces that we do rely on some external support for the development side, but we own that tote, and are able to distribute that to partners and the fishermen and the dealers with no additional cost. That helps steer the explanation of why this has gone up. I do see the trend and hear the concerns of how much the Admin Grant is going up.

We're working very hard to balance the overall workload and external commitments to the ability for staff to meet those timelines. This pulse of growth, it goes with increased electronic trip reporting in Mid-Atlantic, New England, South Atlantic and even the Gulf of Mexico effort is where we see a lot of them.

We've learned over the last year and a half a lot more about how much help that is providing a benefit to all partners across that, so we've been trying to find ways to get around it. I'll stop there and open to questions at this point. If we can move to the recommendations and open it up for questions a little later.

MS. SIMPSON: Geoff, we have Dee Lupton.

MS. LUPTON: I have a couple questions that goes back to what was just talked about, about the NMFS fee, the flat fee of \$44,000.00. Is that already baked into this proposal, or is that on top of it? Is it like Option 1, is it 2.2? Does that include the \$44,000.00, or is it 2.2 million plus the \$44,000.00?

MR. WHITE: That is plus the \$44,000.00, I believe is how the spreadsheet works out.

MS. LUPTON: Okay.

MR. WHITE: It was subtracted out of the slide that Julie showed with the total funding availability.

MS. LUPTON: Okay, I wasn't clear on how that was calculated. Did we have any cost savings from this year from the lack of travel that can be rolled over into the grant for next year, to maybe consider something else between Option 1 and Option 2, to help the ACCSP out with the extra workload, but not the full amount, because there is rollover? Then we can make decisions in the future about where the grant should be. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. WHITE: I do understand, and that's an excellent question. What I want to ask is, Julie, can you go forward two slides, please? I think it's useful to discuss this, even before we get to the recommendations of the Ops and Advisors. I think this may address some other questions as well. Yes, we do have some savings in a five-year grant.

Yes, we are thinking that that will roll forward. What that dollar value is at the moment, what we project forward, staff and contract expenditures through the end of February. We're looking at about \$220,000.00. This is the crux of the transparency in putting things in front of the Coordinating Council, and what to do with that. It could go to the Admin Grant, and we could reduce that, you know for one year, or because we have this one-year buildup, there is the option

to support additional proposals in this particular year, and address the Admin Grant and leave the Admin Grant listed almost the way it is. With that there is a proposal that was approved by the Coordinating Council last is the South Atlantic Council and North Carolina and SAFIS release application. That is running a little behind, and so moving that one forward about \$70,000.00 would be necessary.

The second line is an item about the New Jersey proposal. We have carryover funds to support New Jersey at the full \$63,000 that they requested. The Operations Committee in that approving it at the \$54,000 of the max Year 6 had a nod to the process, and adding it back in here is a nod to supporting partners.

Then the next two items are a little bit unknown today, and that is would the Coordinating Council recommend supporting all of the maintenance in new proposals. This is if we were to assume, we'll know a little bit later, but I think the 3.5 level, is pretty close. At 150K that would support all of the new proposals, so that adds in, I want to name them correctly, so let me look at this real briefly.

The research fleet for channeled whelk in Rhode Island, as well as the Economic Efficiency Assessment, so fluke or black sea bass put in by Rhode Island. That reducing Admin Grant for one-year answers it, or providing the funds to partner project is a different approach. Of course, we have put in a proposal for the SAFIS helpdesk to NFWF, and that decision won't be made for another two weeks.

We've certainly tried to find ways to support the activities important to the partners, both within the Admin Grant and outside of that where we can't. Then the last bullet there is really the need to get direction from the Coordinating Council today, and if there are more detailed budget numbers after today, and after NFWF has been provided feedback, we convene the ACCSP

Leadership Team to work on that together. Answer your question?

MS. LUPTON: Yes, I think it helps. I might have some follow up, once we talk about all the grants together.

MR. WHITE: Okay, thank you. Cheri, I see your hand.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: I'm sorry, did you call my name?

MR. WHITE: I did, I saw your hand up.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I have some questions, thank you. The first one is, did the Leadership Team go over the Admin budget in detail, which is something that we had asked for a couple years ago or last year, I can't remember? You can't present to the Ops Committee and the Advisors Committee a detailed budget, so we had requested that that be conducted with the Leadership Team before it gets put forth for a vote. There is the first question.

MR. WHITE: It was not. At the moment I don't recall that, so I apologize if we missed out on that. The Leadership Team did talk about a grant scrub last annual meeting, and did meet in December and January about how to spend some of that, and provided direction that we followed, in terms of SAFIS helpdesk and some data warehouse changes, which we are in the midst of supporting. The Leadership Team provided guidance to us on how to spend some of that, but I did not pull them together to go over the Admin Grant proposal prior to submitting it.

MS. PATTERSON: Okay, that is something that we had requested in the past.

MR. WHITE: We will bring that forward and make sure it happens now.

MS. PATTERSON: Also, I would like to ask a question of New Jersey, in regards to whether

they would be able to still fulfill their maintenance proposal objectives with \$9,000.00 less if we move forward with this. I presume that the \$9,000.00 less has to do with the reduction in funds over time, and if they exceeded that cap, is that correct?

MR. JOE CIMINO: Well yes, I guess Geoff can correct me if I'm wrong, but right that \$9,000.00 is above our reduction. Cheri, and apologies, Mr. Chair for just jumping in. We've moved all funds towards a staff position, and it would be an awkward situation to not fund this staffing position for the year. Fortunately, the timing of the year runs us into 2022, where we hope to be able to put this on an FTE again. Does that answer your question, Cheri?

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, thank you, Joe. Okay, I'll reserve further questions until later, thanks.

MR. WHITE: Julie, can you go up one slide? I think we're ready for the Ops and Advisors recommendations.

MS. KATHY KNOWLTON: Hey Geoff, can I ask a question first?

MR. WHITE: Oh yes, I'm sorry I didn't see your hand.

MS. KNOWLTON: That's okay, it actually looks like Doug's hand. Can you please explain a little bit more about the extension with the Release Application? I am helping with that project, and I thought we just had an extension for the no cost extension, so I don't understand the 70,000K, thank you, and good morning, by the way.

MR. WHITE: Good morning, Kathy. That project was funded wholly through the ACCSP, so it was that added on to last year's Admin Grant. As a pre-agency proposal, there was a piece for the South Atlantic for some staffing, there was a piece to North Carolina for some staffing. There was a piece that stayed with ACCSP to support meetings and app development through a contract.

Because we haven't been able to hold the meetings yet, and therefore start the application development, that money exists in the current budget, but they are not going to be able to spend that before February of 2021. In effect that piece would be a no cost extension, it will be letting that project run beyond February, to complete using funds that were already approved.

MS. KNOWLTON: Okay, thank you.

MR. WHITE: Other questions before Julie gets to present the recommendations for Ops and Advisors? I see none. Go ahead, Julie.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OPERATIONS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MS. SIMPSON: Okay, so the recommendations from the Operations and Advisory Committee, they are broken down into the maintenance and new proposals. The first one under maintenance was the recommendation that the New Jersey proposal being funded at the \$54,601 instead of the requested \$63,146.

A vote was taken on this and it passed, 22 approved, 1 against, no abstentions. There was also a motion that the Admin Grant was to be recommended to be funded with Option 1. That passed with 22 approvals, 0 against, and 1 abstention. Then there was consensus that all the remaining maintenance funds should be rolled over into the new proposal category.

For the new proposals they recommended that the first three ranked proposals as by consensus be fully funded. They moved that the Potomac River Fisheries Commission proposal be funded fully, to the extent possible with the available funds, and that passed the vote 22 approved, 1 against, and no abstentions.

Then there was a final consensus recommendation that any additional remaining funds be utilized according to the average

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

rankings for new proposals. I also believe that Nicole Lengyel is on the line, and she is the Chair of the Operations Committee. If there are any questions, she is also available to answer them. Okay, Mr. Chair, I'm not seeing any hands. I was just going to tell Mr. Chair that Bob has raised his hand.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay, go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: All right thanks, John. John, I don't know if this is the right time or not. But I just wanted to sort of bring up some thoughts on sort of funding overall for ACCSP. It's not really relative to these specific proposals or the Admin Grant or everything, just kind of across the board thoughts and observations. I don't know if now is a good time to do that, or if you want to have some discussion about the specific proposals first. It's up to you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I think that given there has been some concerns raised about funding and the Admin component in particular. I think if folks think they would benefit from this, it might be helpful, Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: Okay, well I'll start going. If I talk too much let me know. Like I said, I just have some general overall concerns about budgets and funding within ACCSP, and not being critical of anyone or anything. It's just the program is growing, the funding has been relatively fixed at 3.5 million for, I don't even know how long, 10, 15 years.

Everything we do is kind of a zero-sum game, so everything is sort of tradeoffs, and if we put money in this area it comes out of that area type thing. You know we've got a number of potentially high cost items on the horizon, and some big coastwide initiatives that Geoff's talked about. You know I just worry about; you know when we look at the big sort of holistic picture, can we afford everything? What does a budget look like in the out years in particular? As Geoff said, we'll be able to cover a lot of things this

year, due to the \$220,000 rollover that was unspent from earlier in the five-year grant. But as Geoff noted, you know the Admin Grant is going up this year, it's proposed to go up this year by about \$200,000 with two new staffers. It went up last year about \$200,000 also.

In the last two years, and I think they've picked up a couple staffers, and so that grant has gone up about \$400K essentially, you know if approved now, in the last two years, which is a big jump. I'm not saying they don't need the staff. ACCSP can definitely use the staff and keep people busy, so it's not critical of that, there is just a lot of work that needs to be done.

We can afford things this year because Maine withdrew their \$300,000 plus valid proposal. If that was in the mix right now this would be a much more difficult conversation today, trying to figure out priorities and how we move things around. Looking at coastwide initiatives that ACCSP has absorbed a lot of the work for.

In GARFO in the Mid-Atlantic and northeast, the commercial trips are coming online, and that's a few thousand boats. We've got the SEAFIRE For-hire vessels in the southeast that are coming online, I think January 4, and that is going to be another few thousand vessels. You know we've got; I don't know 6,000 or so federal permit holders that are coming online, and ACCSP is sort of absorbing that.

Those are initiatives which are completely consistent with the direction of ACCSP and the priorities of ACCSP, but they came out of a couple of the partners, and they are putting a big burden on the system. You know as Geoff noted, we need about \$280,000 for the SAFIS helpdesk to have someone available to help all these thousands of new permit holders, kind of know how to navigate all the apps and get up to speed.

That sort of, you know I think those are kind of the holistic discussions and visions we need to have, sort of as different programs come online

they are kind of almost unfunded mandates. How do we continue to absorb those type of changes? Can we do that? Skipping ahead a few slides, not to be the spoiler alert here, but the Ops Committee recommended potentially extending the maintenance funding for another year.

I think six projects are 2021 would be their last year of funding for maintenance projects with the current sort of downward trajectory they are funding, and the Ops Committee saying, well due to COVID and a number of other things, should we extend those moving forward? Again, these are all important projects, but I think kind of a holistic look at this is probably worthwhile.

I get worried that to ACCSPs credit, I think, you know they are trying to be everything to everybody, and that is a really hard thing to do. The program has grown and there are all these different super complex data programs that are online, and all the different partners have sort of unique needs and wants, and customization of a lot of different things, and it's pretty hard.

You know again, we can afford everything this year, but I get really nervous in the out years with some of these commitments. I don't want to commit money to hiring staff, if down the road we don't have money to keep them on. That is kind of the worst-case scenario. If Maine comes after the big proposal, we've got potentially the maintenance rollovers, we've got different additional staffers online, we've got a number of these coastwide initiatives that are online. The 3.5 million gets spread really thin really quick.

Do we need to help out the ACCSP staff by prioritizing some of the projects that they have, and being realistic about what we can get done on the timeline that we can get it done? The other big thing that is sort of hanging over all of us, I think, is no one knows what the federal budget and all the individual state budgets and partner budgets are going to look like in the future.

You know we have more money going to Admin projects. That's less money that is available for new projects or maintenance projects at the state level. That is that zero-sum game thing. It's a really difficult decision. Is it better to put more staff on to help out all the partners, because staff can be obviously spread out to help all 23 of us?

That comes at the expense of less dollars available for individual projects and state priorities, and partner priorities through new projects and maintenance projects. Again, John, it's kind of a rambling point. But I just get nervous about future funding, and if we're going to be fixed at 3.5 million generally, what is the best way to prioritize and make sure the staff is staying generally sane, and we're not running down into the ground.

But we're meeting as many high priority partner-needs as possible. Hopefully I made sense, but I just get a little bit nervous about out-year funding for this program. This year we can afford it, but even with the, or if we didn't have that 220K, we would be really tight right now. We would only be funding, I think it's four new projects this year, because a lot of money is going towards the maintenance projects and staffing and that sort, or Admin Grant, which isn't just staffing. That's it, John, happy to answer questions, but just my general nervousness about future funding.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, yes. Thank you, Bob. I think it's good to bring some of those issues to the forefront. I certainly share some of the concerns about the long time, whether it's going to be the impact of COVID on budgets. We know that fixed expenses of salaries and travel and all that tend to continue to increase due to inflation, which we all experience when we're dealing with this zero-sum budget, as you mentioned.

I also think it's good you point out the issue of Maine essentially it was a bi-year, they are still in idle to X number of years of funding under our current program, which could have an impact on

what we have in abilities to meet the future maintenance program. I thought for a while that the next stage of this funding change.

You know now that we've slowly weaned away some of the longstanding projects, and we've put in these new time limits, is to look at that and think about what it means long term, as you're bringing in potentially 25 percent new a year, and trying to maintain a suite of other programs over a period of years.

You know, just to make sure that the numbers and the math works out, so that it's a compatible system, and we will have the money that we think. I think once projects get funded and have been funded a couple years and they're performing, and they sort of have an expectation. We've laid out what they can expect to receive in funding, and if they have some long-term plans, they are probably going to take advantage of that, and actually set their plans up to meet the funding they anticipate.

If I recall, we potentially have, I know there have been various funding committees and stuff. But I think maybe we're at a point of needing to have perhaps the leadership team, and meet with this funding committee, and just take a bit of a longer-term view of the funding, particularly under a likely fixed-grant scenario, and think about what it does look like down the road. Perhaps come up with some ways of dealing with things as mentioned, the helpdesk scenario and the unfunded mandate.

You know knowing that is coming from the South Atlantic region, but I don't think that is something that necessarily, if there is no funding coming from NMFS to help support that, and no outside funding becomes available. You know I agree, it's a real challenge to put that on the overall coastwide program. I think things like that have to be factored in, and we do need a long-term view. With that I'll go, I see there are a number of hands raised, so I'll just go down the list and Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: You know I share Bob's concerns, which is the whole reason why I asked whether the ACCSP budget was put forward to the Leadership Team first, because they need to be the team to be able to do a deeper dive with information that is confidential outside of that forum.

While it may look like there is money to do the sort of funding this year, as Bob kind of intimated. I feel that we need to be conservative. I'm not so much a conservative person, but when it comes to ACCSP and the funding needs, I have a tendency to lean towards more conservatism, and not necessarily bringing staff on, but having contracts, so that things can be addressed through a contract.

Then when it is no longer needed, it as Bob said, you don't have to get rid of somebody. I think also that if there are these unfunded mandates, like the SAFIS helpdesk and such. When Councils or NOAA Fisheries, states do present these sorts of mandates to the industry, that they need to be thinking about the support system that is needed, and that those need to be presented as proposals, to help ACCSP with these sorts of mandates. When you're ready I can start out with a motion, but I presume that you're going to have other people to have questions. Thanks.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, Cheri, thanks. Yes, there are few more hands, so let's go through those, and then I'll come back to you for that. Jay.

DR. JASON McNAMEE: Thinking about what Bob said and then what Cheri just said. Jumping back to Bob. That is fairly terrifying. I definitely understand everything Bob said. I care about those things. For me, though it feels a bit abstract, like they don't know exactly what we mean. I don't know what the tradeoffs are. I guess what I was wondering is, if there is a way to kind of think through these tradeoffs, like what happens if we invest in the helpdesk, which seems like critical infrastructure at this point?

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

What do we lose? Is it from the proposal funding? Can it be made up somewhere else? I guess, I think this is a really important discussion. I just feel like I need a little bit more to be able to make some positive decisions on it. I'm not sure how that happens, if it's at a follow up meeting or whatever, but I would be interested in looking at that and thinking through these types of tradeoffs, looking forward into the future a bit, seeing what's coming down the pike, and what that would likely cost.

Then thinking about what's in front of us, and accounting for it. The pie is only so big. I totally appreciate that. Then I guess, just because it's come up a couple times, or actually no, I think it's going to come up later in the meeting, so I will just park that thought, Mr. Chair and leave my comments where they are.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right thanks, and next up is Megan.

MS. WARE: Good morning everyone. I think like Jay, what I'm hearing is that we have some both short term and long-term tradeoffs here that we need to be thinking about. I guess I'm kind of struggling just to figure out what those tradeoffs are. It sounds like it's an increase in the Admin Proposal versus maybe other priorities, or proposals from the other states.

I think my question is, is there time to kind of take a pause on the vote? I assume there was supposed to be a vote today for the Admin Grant, and kind of spend some time going through this more thoroughly, with maybe a more holistic and long-term view in mind? I know Cheri has brought up the ACCSP Leadership Team which could do this.

I also think the Commission's Executive Committee does this type of work. I think there are some existing bodies that maybe could bring this back in February, if there is time to do that and if that is appropriate. Although it's been mentioned a couple times about Maine's proposal

and how we paused it for the harvester reporting, and we did this really as a direct result of COVID.

You know as a department we're now looking at pretty significant budget reductions, instead of being able to go to the legislature, like we had hoped to get additional funding for that 100 percent harvester reporting. You know we couldn't really in good conscience ask for that ACCSP money.

When we think we're probably looking at a one-year delay for implementation of that hundred percent harvester reporting, if that is any indication of what other states and other agencies are going to be facing in the future because of COVID. I think that's something we need to be thinking about as we think more holistically and long term about the ACCSP priorities.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you, Megan, then Geoff is up next, and I think Geoff it may be good if you do clarify some sort of the time concerns and what we need to do now. My expectation is, we do need to approve the overall budget situation. We may have some clarification we'll need to do down the road on the Admin component.

But I think to keep project funding on track we need to deal with at least the big picture budget. Perhaps we can approve it with some allowance for potentially further evaluation and clarification of the Admin component, as well as you know starting to take this longer-term view, and respect what Cheri said about being conservative. Knowing that some things are going to come back on next year, such as the Maine proposal, which were delayed due to COVID, but that was a highly ranked proposal, and there are additional years of funding available to that. I see Geoff you put your hand down, maybe you'll wrap it up at the end. But next up is Lynn.

MR. WHITE: Actually, I think Julie just got ahead of lowering my hand, because I was ready to talk.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, well go ahead, Geoff.

MR. WHITE: Thank you for the lead in. I agree, John, and everyone that movement on the overall proposals is strictly necessary today. Waiting until December or February, doesn't leave enough time for us to inform NOAA how to direct those funds directly out to partners, and actually with an intended start date of March 1.

Movement on the maintenance and as many new projects can be funded today would be preferred. She will address a couple of things about the tradeoffs. Really big picture there are kind of two that come to mind. One is the difference between ranked partner projects and kind of the Admin Grant central support.

The more Admin goes up the less is available to partners overall. No big, bright new idea there. The other is of course what Cheri and Bob and others have raised is this balance between staff and contracts. We've utilized contractors really well for pulses of activity, and tried to bring on staff where we needed long-term support and in-house ownership of skills and process.

That can be teased out a little further. The helpdesk in a lot of the discussion today, was kind of the unfunded mandate, and I want to at least clarify that that was historically offered as a, we have a helpdesk, it's free to partners, and it's 24/7. We got no positive feedback for that, but myself and others have I think tried to absorb that within what the Admin Grant can do.

That is why it was presented as a potential split out as a different ranked proposal, because it really benefits everyone, it's not just an internal item. It also comes in waves, so 2021, 6000 new fishermen as Bob raised already, and we've been tracking. It is a pulse of a learning curve, that's why we think that is going to be a higher dollar value in 2021 than in other years.

Those are some of the tradeoffs in the balances. I think overall there is enough in the ACCSP 3.5 approach to take a guiding direction on the maintenance, and at least the ranking new proposals. I would certainly like to work with the leadership team in November or the first week of December, to pull together and delve into how much the Admin Grant actually is and should be, and how much of the additional proposals might be the best way to go for 2021.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thanks, Geoff. Lynn.

MS. FEGLEY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Just really quick in the interest of time. I think Geoff did a good job of really identifying those tradeoffs, the two being the partner projects versus the Admin Grant, and the staff versus contract. The third one, which is harder, I think is the cost of a project, whether it be from a state or from the Admin Grant versus the long-term gain, in terms of data quality and robustness. I think that is one of the places where maybe a little more attention in the long view could be paid. I'm just going to leave it right there.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I think that is a good point. I think we've heard a number of things here that point us toward needing to take stock of where some of this is going in the long term, and I think everyone recognizes that increased Admin means less available to more projects, and we all recognize the strength of those projects to all the partners, and to the program.

That is a big part that I believe has made ACCSP so successful. I appreciate everyone's concern, and I think it is because everyone does feel strongly about this program, and keeping it viable and doing the best it can with what have been fixed and very limited resources overall, for a number of years. Cheri, you mentioned potentially a motion, so I'll go back to you and see if you are ready to suggest something.

MS. PATTERSON: Sure, I'll start out the gate. **I would like to make the motion to fund the submitted ACCSP proposals as ranked in the Average Ranking table of proposals, with the exception of the Administrative Grant proposal. That the Leadership Team evaluate a detailed ACCSP Admin Grant before approving the Admin Grant, and that the funds from savings be brought to the Leadership Team for ranking of priority, then back to the Coordinating Council.**

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I'll give staff a minute. I presume we'll put this up on the screen, and they're coming.

MR. WHITE: That was prepared earlier, and so Julie is going to edit that in.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I'm sending it to Julie by e-mail too.

MR. WHITE: Perfect, thank you.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you Cheri, that was a long one.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: This is a pretty important motion, so I think it's worth taking a moment and getting the wording up there so we can be sure that it is what Cheri intended, and then we'll ask for a second.

MS. SIMPSON: Cheri, does that look good?

MS. PATTERSON: Second to the last line, instead of Admin, if you could just put Administrative Grant. Then with the exception of the very first sentence, that should be Administrative Grant instead of Administration Grant. Yes, that is good for now. Thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay Cheri, and so then as I read this the Leadership Team would be empowered by the group to sign off on the Administrative Grant, and then we would be reporting back about what funds there are additionally, and rank them for being used to

apply to the various other needs. That would come back to the Coordinating Council, I assume at the next meeting.

MS. PATTERSON: Correct.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, well thank you very much. Is there a second?

MR. MEL BELL: Second.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel, Mr. Bell. Any discussion on the motion? All right we have a few hands going up, so let me start with Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: Yes, I support the motion. I think you know part of the Leadership Team's job also I would think, and we don't need to put it in a motion, is sort of the longer-term view of is there a financial bottleneck coming for ACCSP, and how big of a deal is it? Some of it is unpredictable, with state budgets and federal budgets.

But just kind of what we know is in the pipeline right now, how worried do we need to be about the future, I guess is the question. You guys, I've made it clear I'm a bit concerned. I think it is worth sort of mapping out the next two years, three years, five years, whatever it may be, just kind of thinking through the funding here. Then mechanically, you know we may, I'll need to work with Laura and Geoff, but we may need to go ahead and sort of seek all the money due to the Administrative Grant.

Some of that kind of comes to ASMFC and gets parked here, and then it's not spent really until the Leadership Team signs off on it. Money may be moved a little bit differently, but the intent is Leadership Team will call the shots on the Admin Grant, and we'll bring that back to the Coordinating Council for an update in the future, if that works for everybody.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, Bob, thanks, and I do believe I agree it would be good to park it over at

the ACCSP account, and then that gives us flexibility for how we deal with it. Jay, you're up next.

DR. McNAMEE: I think Bob just helped me out a little bit there. I just wanted to clarify. I think generally the second half of the motion. Mechanically the way this would work is we have a ranking; you know the assumed funding levels. You know it looks like a couple of the proposals won't get funded.

Then we're going to look at the Admin Grant, and if there is any remainder does it automatically go back to that ranking, or does that become now just a new discussion? I guess I'm wondering what happens to the new proposals that fell below the line in this procedurally?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: My read on it is it would be a new ranking, you know in terms of not just those proposals, but are there other things of some of the other things that had been discussed about being funded. I would presume that if the money goes toward the new proposals, the group would have to consider is there enough to fully fund, say the next new proposal on the list? But I presume we would look at that in terms of the ranking order, as they have been provided.

DR. McNAMEE: Okay, thank you Mr. Chair, that helped.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Megan, you're next.

MS. WARE: I'm sorry I don't know this, but I was wondering who or what is the Leadership Team, and what is that comprised of? I'm familiar with the Commission's Executive Committee, but not the ACCSP Leadership Team.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Geoff, do you know? I know it's a combination of Chair, Vice-Chair, past Chairs. I think Bob. Geoff, can you flush that out for us, please?

MR. WHITE: You pretty much nailed it. The Leadership Team is the old ACCSP Executive Committee, and so there is an analog of the Commission's Executive Committee, there are six a bit more focused. Do you want the current membership names? I would have to actually look it up, to make sure I didn't miss anyone.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Is that good, Megan?

MS. WARE: Yes, I mean I don't need specific names, but it sounds like it would be like state agency representatives, I don't know if Bob Beal is on there.

MR. WHITE: Bob is there, it's about six or seven people.

MS. WARE: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Brandon.

MR. BRANDON MUFFLEY: I think my questions were answered, they were similar to Jay's. I support everything up to the last sentence. The last sentence still isn't a hundred percent clear to me, because in terms of the potential savings, depending upon what the Leadership finds, in terms of how to handle the Administrative Grant.

It's not 100 percent clear to me what happens then, because it was my understanding that states needed to be notified, NMFS needed to be notified, like soon. Essentially, in regards to how those funds were going to be allocated, and if there are additional funds and we're going to fund other projects that are on the list, and not approve that until February through the Coordinating Council.

Something seems off, unless I'm missing, or if we're just trying to understand what savings we could potentially find, keep that as part of the sort of rollover or \$220,000.00 that are currently available, and figure out sort of a longer-term strategy with additional savings. Some additional clarity would be helpful to me, in terms of what

that last sentence really means, in terms of how we're going to deal with savings that may be found.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Brandon, and I'll sort of try to give my perspective, and then make sure Cheri agrees with that. What I think is the possibility that if there are some funds available in the Administrative Grant. If the team either goes with what's been proposed, or one of the other alternatives, there may be some funds that are available from the Administrative Grant total, and then those would be directed back towards projects.

It potentially affects projects which aren't funded now, which don't make the cut under the full Administrative Grant as it is penciled in. You consider that a starting point. All of those other projects and the maintenance projects and others, this allows them to proceed and receive their funding as planned on the regular schedule.

The question would be then for any of those new projects that are on the list. Depending on how much time it takes us to work through this, they may have a delay in their funding. I guess I'm optimistic, based on what Bob said, as long as the funding gets transferred from NMFS over to ASMFC and ACCSP.

Then I would think the transfer out to one of those projects could likely happen, you know in March as more or less planned, assuming we resolve all of this at our next meeting in February. I guess either Bob or Cheri, if you want to jump in. If Maureen will indulge us to at least clarify this point.

MS. MAUREEN DAVIS: Yes, go ahead.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I could jump in. You know the last sentence not only just referred to the Admin Grant, if there is any savings to be realized there. Typically, that gets rolled right into the proposed projects. But there is also \$220,000.00 of savings from the COVID scenario, and there

was a list that was presented to us in one of those slides as to how those funds could be used.

One of them for example, being to help make up for the \$9,000.00 for New Jersey's proposal, until they can get their feet on the ground for the next fiscal year and such. Yes, thank you for bringing those up. These are the sort of support options that would be considered under those additional savings.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I think we're saying savings means in this case any potential Admin Grant adjustments, as well as the carryover pot.

MS. PATTERSON: Correct.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chair, this is Geoff, just a very slight clarification about New Jersey. That is a staff member hired through ASMFC, and so those funds actually stay at ASMFC, and it's not a transfer to New Jersey. Those funds functionally are a little easier to support their staff member.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Maureen, thank you for your patience.

MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you. Actually, Brandon's question was very close to what I had wanted to ask. Everything that's in the motion, the funding, the maintenance and new projects, and then having the Leadership look at any remaining funds. I was going to ask, was all that going to take place before the projects would be funded in the spring of next year? By then I understand that there might be some projects that might receive funding later, because we had to evaluate any of the remaining money after stuff is funded initially. Did I read that correctly?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, that's the way I read it, yes.

MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Cheri, more to add?

MS. PATTERSON: No, I think I'm fine.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Joe.

MR. CIMINO: Was that Joe, Mr. Chair, sorry? Between Cheri and Geoff, they took care of everything I had to ask or put in. Thank you so much.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I see no further hands, and I think we have clarified a few points about what savings mean, and the timing this allows the majority of the grants that have been identified as being able to be funded, and as they're ranked by the group, to go forward and keep most everything on track, and then take a closer look at potential additional funding, either from Admin or the carryover.

Then we would try to do this Leadership Team meeting quickly, as Geoff mentioned, November/December, and have something for the Council in February. Seeing no further hands, I think we are ready to call the question. Geoff or Julie, do you want to say have everybody raise their hands and vote on this? You know we'll call the Ayes and call the Nays, and let you call them out, so we make sure all the votes are clear?

MR. WHITE: Yes, the intention, the way the rest of the week has gone is to have folks just raise their hands and we'll count the hands. I think that will be quicker, and it's certainly useful, instead of going with a typical roll call vote.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, so all of those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

MS. SIMPSON: Okay, I have Cheri, Joe Cimino, John Carmichael, John Clark, Chris Coons, Bob Beal, Dan McKiernan, Dee Lupton, Derek Orner, Jason McNamee, Lynn Fegley, Martin Gary, Megan Ware, Mel Bell, Sherry White, Brandon Muffley, Doug Haymans, Greg Wojcik, Lewis Gillingham, Maureen Davidson. Is there anyone that I've missed?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Hearing none, so Julie, you go ahead and let me know when your hands are lowered, and we'll call those opposed.

MR. WHITE: I believe that was 18 for.

MS. SIMPSON: That's what I got. All hands are down.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Those opposed, please signify by raising your hand.

MS. SIMPSON: I see no hands.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay, thank you. Any abstentions, please signify by raising your hand.

MS. SIMPSON: I see no hands.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: **All right, thank you, so the motion carries.** We are at the limit of our time. I guess I'll turn to Geoff or Bob. This gets us through some of the most important business we really needed to take care of today. Are we okay to go a little over, or should we allow the Committee and Program Updates to stand as submitted, and let people review them on their own time, or can we maybe take a few minutes and let Geoff note any highlights that are really critical?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: You know if Geoff wants to go over it and Julie, hit the highlights. I think it's okay to go a little bit long. You know the Business Session doesn't actually start until 10:00, so we've got a little bit of cushion built in.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay, thanks Bob, that sounds great. Geoff and Julie, if you want to try to forge on through the highlights in the next say ten minutes, so everybody has a few minutes to transfer, that would be great.

COMMITTEE AND PROGRAM UPDATES

MR. WHITE: No problem, I think we can absolutely get this done in five to seven minutes

here. We did rely on the written package for most things. Some of the meaningful items we did cull out here, and we've included some staff as a connection for the work product that they've been able to take care of so far. Julie will cover our Committee highlights?

MS. SIMPSON: Absolutely, thank you, Geoff. For the first Committee highlight is we have the biological resilience project, which has been going on for over six years. It was initially headed up by Richard Cody, and then when he switched positions, it was revitalized by Michael Errigo from the South Atlantic Council. Heather Konell is our staff member for this Committee, so here picture as well as Mike's are up there, because they've invested a huge amount of time in this.

The goal for this project was to provide a quantitative method for scoring resilience on the matrix, as opposed to the qualitative methods that had previously been used. The spreadsheets that Mike ended up sort of massaging after Richard left is the Resilience Factor Spread Sheet, and what it does is it takes productivity and susceptibility attributes.

Those are scored, and then that provides an overall vulnerability score, and that vulnerability score is translated into the scale that is used for the resilience score on the matrix. The reason that this is such a huge project is one, it moves the matrix into a more quantitative state. It also has been a project that the Committee believed in, and put in a lot of time. While Mike and Heather garner the most recognition, all of the Committee members really put in a lot of time on this. There were 15 small group meetings, and 8 full Committee meetings that the group had to finalize this.

These new quantitative resiliency scores will be used in the matrix that is created in January 2021, and will be in the FY2022 and 2023 RFP. The other Committee highlight was the remaining recommendation from Ops and Advisors. This recommendation was alluded to by Bob earlier,

and this is a recommendation that the Coordinating Council discussed, maybe not today, maybe that may not work.

But, also provide guidance for direction to the Funding Subcommittee on budgetary issues that partner to just consider the budgetary issues due to COVID at the partner agencies. These are the list of the seven projects that would no longer be eligible this year for maintenance funding. The at-sea head boat sampling, I just want to note is no longer been proposed. They did not propose this year.

There are six proposals from this year's maintenance that are set to expire and not be eligible for next year, and the Ops and Advisors wanted to consider that the Funding Committee potentially offer a one-year extension to that. That concludes my committee highlights, so if there is any discussion or questions, we can entertain those now.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you, Julie.

MR. WHITE: I think this can be handled either at the next meeting, so if we don't mind moving forward to report on our activity status. The first slide there is again another point on the budget. This is identified in the written one, so let's move forward to the next slide. I did want to highlight that two external projects were funded, and the NFWF one is in review, so again we can move forward from this one.

I will take a moment and pause on the external coordination. We have been having monthly meetings with GARFO that really has been fantastic in the technical improvements, the alignment on data sharing initiatives. Really the One Stop Reporting we're getting GARFO and SERO and Southeast Fisheries Science Center and ACCSP and HMS on this on occasion, and aligning those tools.

Last time I had left HMS out of this, and intended to have them on. We do a lot of work with HMS,

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

both in these other meetings and directly, to support their dealer and fishermen reporting tools. We very much appreciate the fiscal, as well as direct show of support from HMS as we go forward.

The other one that had a lot of activity in between last Coordinating Council meeting and now is kind of weekly meetings on the lobster reporting requirements, again, here highlighted this during the Lobster Board meeting, and that has been a lot of work for Julie, and a lot of the state partners to align those data needs with upcoming tools for data collection for 2021. Very excited about how that process has been going. The data warehouse, these really were not in the list. The Data Team are identified below, which is from left to right, Jennifer Ni, Joe Myers, Heather Konell, Mike Rinaldi, and our newest member, Lindsey Aubart. They got the full data load out on time.

Lindsey is really bringing some staff time focus to the biological module development, being able to not just update the technical part, but prepare for next year's populating that biological module further, and getting that out of the website for the query. Mike has been really helping out with some spatial work.

The beauty of that spatial work and the trends is really that by pointing a finger and saying, yes, I was about in this area, it may be able to innovate a collection tool suffice for five or six different questions. That kind of data entry efficiency and tools, not just the presentation, but for data entry are really amazing to be able to approve the applications in the field and the efficiency out that way.

Again, with all the data warehouse redesign, all the transformation of work being done in SAFIS, it becomes something that kind of needs to pass on to the separate data warehouse, and find user friendly ways to access it. That's why there was FIS money approved, to improve that next year. As is kind of normal in IT, it takes a fair amount of complexity behind the scenes, to make it look and

function simply to end users, so thank you to the Data Team.

When it comes to FISMA we've completed the technical things. We completed the authority to connect, we've completed our first quarterly report, and really coordinating some neat data paths to federal partners. Ed is our IT Manager, and has led that charge, and really an appreciation for all the federal partners, as we have been able to move this forward.

On the recreational side, we've been presenting and participating in the National Academy of Science reviews on the MRIP freeze with recreational fisheries with ACLs. We've been working with the states and MRIP on the increased funding for APAIS sampling, and of course getting ready for 2021.

On the outreach front, Marisa has been doing a fantastic job integrating our communications with strategy with that of ASMFC, and making changes to the website. There were technical challenges to the website to do the Calendar and the Projects, and catching up on some areas where we had been behind in updating the content and functionality of the website, so thank you, Marisa.

Moving on to SAFIS. The schedule is written of new releases is posted in the materials, but really the integration of HMS questions is reducing the burden on fishermen to report. The eTRIPS online redesign is a coordinated effort with enough lead time to get some partner feedback, and put that out in the field.

We are adjusting electronic dealer reporting mobile app that is in process as kind of a request from GARFO, to allow federal dealers to use the more flexible data entry when they are out on the docks and bringing it inside. Again, the planning part of this is we've done a lot of work on these eTRIPS side in 2020, and the redesign of the tools to the end users is really shifting to a 2021 activity in what we're planning. With that, we can go to the next slide. The Action Plan, we have been

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

working on Goal 3 of course. That is going to be reviewed during the Business Meeting, which is next.

Thank you for your time, thank you for your attention, and the direction on the budget and the future direction. That kind of transparency and feedback is exactly the direction we've been looking for and going, so I look forward to working with the Leadership Team in the next months to take action. John, back to you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you, Geoff. Any questions? I'll pause a moment and see. Julie, let me know if any hands go up.

MS. SIMPSON: I have Jason McNamee.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, Jason.

DR. McNAMEE: I just, Geoff kind of flipped by it quick, and it's something we talked about earlier. It's this notion, the recommendation that came out of the Ops Committee on, I don't know we'll call it a bi-year for some of the maintenance proposals. Did you say, Geoff, that we can address that at a subsequent meeting, and it will still be timely enough?

MR. WHITE: Yes, the funding process, the idea there is to have the Funding Subcommittee and potentially the Coordinating Council discuss it before the May meeting, when the funding process is actually approved and the RFD goes out. We have time between now and either a February meeting to address that item.

DR. McNAMEE: Excellent, thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thanks Geoff, and Kathy.

MR. WHITE: I also see a hand up by Lewis.

MS. SIMPSON: Lewis is Kathy.

MR. LEWIS GILLINGHAM: You're telling me I've been transformed as Kathy?

MS. SIMPSON: I'm so sorry.

MR. GILLINGHAM: I was hoping to get the last comment, because it's really a comment. I just wanted to thank the Ops Committee and the Advisory Committee. They are able to wade through a couple hundred pages of these project proposals, and distill it down into three easy to digest slides, and on top of that when they vote, you see a near consensus of 22 to 1 that it gives me a comfortable feeling that we're doing the best we can with the funds that are available. Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Lewis. We are out of time, but I will note the need for more Advisors, and we'll bring that up in a future meeting.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you, Geoff, and I like that Lewis, those guys do a great job. Having been there and done that, it is a big lift when you get into those things. It looks like we are out of time. We'll try to catch up with Kathy offline perhaps. But I do thank everyone for getting us through this.

ADJOURNMENT

Then we had a few challenging issues to deal with, so thanks for everyone's discussion, and putting viable alternative on the table. Again, a big hand to Lynn for your leadership the last three years. Thank you very much, and thanks to Geoff and Julie for another great job of preparing for the Committee. With that we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.
on October 22, 2020.)

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council
February 3, 2021

Program and Project Funding

The ACCSP Leadership Team was reconstituted in November 2020 filling the roles identified in the ACCSP Governance Transition plan (2016). The Leadership Team met via webinar on 17 November and 17 December 2021 to discuss the use of carryover funds, revise the 2021 ACCSP Administrative Grant, and discuss 2021 ranked project proposals.

ACCSP Leadership Team Membership:

- John Carmichael as CC chair and Council representation
- Jason McNamee as CC vice-chair and North Atlantic State
- Lynn Fegley as ex-officio and Mid-Atlantic state
- Richard Cody for NMFS S&T
- Dee Lupton for South Atlantic state
- Sherri White for USFWS
- Bob Beal for ASMFC

October 2020 Coordinating Council Motion

Move to fund the submitted ACCSP proposals as ranked in Average Ranking table of proposals with the exception of the Administrative Grant proposal. That the Leadership Team evaluate a detailed ACCSP Administrative Grant before approving the Administrative Grant. That the funds from savings be brought to the Leadership Team for tasking of priority then back to the Coordinating Council.

Motion by Cheri Patterson; second by Mel Bell. Motion carried

Completion of 2016-2020 Grant

The Leadership Team was tasked by the Coordinating Council in October 2020 to review program funding options for extension / carryover funds and direct the Program appropriately. The primary components of those decisions were 1) NFWF proposal response for SAFIS Helpdesk support, 2) Forecast completion dates and costs of previously approved projects, and 3) clarity on the amount of carryover funds available after 1 March 2021.

In November, the ACCSP proposal to NFWF was **not** selected for funding. Reviewers felt that the proposed work was well described, demonstrated funding need, was cost effective, and included monitoring to evaluate success. However, the review committee felt that this proposed Scope of Work was closely enough tied to Federal data collection efforts that there was likely a more appropriate funding source than EMR, especially considering the needs of other projects.

After discussion of the existing commitments, the ACCSP Leadership team supported the following items to complete the 2016-2021 Administrative Grant:

- \$220K to support the SAFIS Helpdesk from 1Jan2021 through 28Feb2022
- \$95K to complete the 2019 ranked proposal SAFIS Release app development (SAFMC-NC, year 1)
- \$9k to support New Jersey Commercial / Biological staff (March-April 2021)

ACCSP Administrative Proposal 2021 Review (1Mar2021 through 28Feb2022)

The Leadership Team discussed proposed funding options 1 (\$2,208,056) and 2 (\$2,170,067) with the tradeoffs of staff growth and contractor support in balance with a 3 year projection of ACCSP Activities. The choice was made to delay the hiring of a software team member in 2021 and continue ongoing evaluations of ACCSP priorities and partner needs. The Admin Grant Proposal was further reduced by removing some SAFIS Helpdesk costs, reducing staff travel, and reducing data connectivity costs. The Leadership Team supported these changes resulting in a 2021 admin grant budget of \$2,122,916.

Ranked Proposal funding Recommendation for 2021

Several factors combined to allow the Leadership Team to support funding all maintenance and new proposals for 2021. These included the final determination of utilizing the 2016-2021 grant funds, the reduced the ACCSP administrative proposal, and a return of unused ACCSP funds from the Florida Headboat sampling project. Florida staff were unable to sample headboats in 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions, and on a positive note secured in-state funding for future sampling. The revised table of ranked projects is attached for reference and discussion. Projects with blue values are indicated as a redirection of funds through SERO. The RI Economic Efficiency Study has indicated they can adjust project tasks to be successful at a slightly reduced funding amount.



FY2021 Proposal Rankings (Average)

	Admin Grant	2,122,916	\$44,423	2,167,339
3.41M LEVEL	Maint @ 75%	931,996	New @ 25%	310,665
3.56M W/FL	Maint @ 75%	1,044,496	New @ 25%	348,165

Project Name	Partner	Score	Cost	Cumulative Cost	3.56M Amt Remaining	3.41M Amt Remaining
RI Data Feed	RI DEM	9.136	\$ 27,521	\$ 27,521	\$ 1,016,975	\$ 904,475
SC Commercial Reporting	SC DNR	8.909	\$ 56,923	\$ 84,444	\$ 960,052	\$ 847,552
ME Dealer Reporting	ME DMR	8.727	\$ 61,263	\$ 145,707	\$ 898,789	\$ 786,289
ME Portside Sampling	ME DMR	8.091	\$ 25,896	\$ 171,603	\$ 872,893	\$ 760,393
RI Black Sea Bass	RI DEM	8.000	\$ 132,064	\$ 303,667	\$ 740,829	\$ 628,329
SEFSC Ageing / Bio	SEFSC	7.952	\$ 88,931	\$ 392,598	\$ 651,898	\$ 539,398
SAFIS Customizable Citizen Science Application	SAFMC	7.917	\$ 114,792	\$ 507,390	\$ 537,106	\$ 424,606
NJ Commercial / Biological Data	NJ DFW	7.364	\$ 54,601	\$ 561,991	\$ 482,505	\$ 370,005

includes carryover from maintenance projects

COMTECH Conversion Factors	ACCSP CommTech	51.591	\$ 142,056	\$ 142,056	\$ 688,614	\$ 538,614
NC biological database enhancements	NC DMF	48.886	\$ 153,600	\$ 295,656	\$ 535,014	\$ 385,014
Genetic Stock ID striped bass	MA DMF	48.523	\$ 99,820	\$ 395,476	\$ 435,194	\$ 285,194
PRFC Electronic Trip Reporting	PRFC	40.500	\$ 263,712	\$ 659,188	\$ 171,482	\$ 21,482
RI Research Fleet approach for Whelk	RI DEM/CFRF	39.545	\$ 115,149	\$ 774,337	\$ 56,333	\$ (93,667)
RI Economic Efficiency Assessment of the Fluke and BSB Aggregate Management	RI DEM	34.114	\$ 61,384	\$ 835,721	\$ (5,050)	\$ (155,050)

Funding Proposal
FY21 ACCSP Administrative Budget

Applicant Name: Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Project Title: Administrative Support to the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

Principal Investigator: Geoff White, Director, ACCSP

Requested Award Amount: \$2,122,916 (Leadership Option 3)

Request Type: Maintenance/Administrative

Requested Award Period: March 1, 2021 through February 28, 2022

A. Goals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) is a state-federal cooperative partnership between 23 entities responsible for fisheries management, and fisheries data collection on the Atlantic Coast: the 15 Atlantic coast states and the District of Columbia, two federal fisheries agencies (Commerce's NOAA Fisheries and Interior's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), three regional fisheries management councils (New England, Mid-Atlantic, and South Atlantic), the Potomac River Fisheries Commission, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). Partner agencies are listed in the original [ACCSP Memorandum of Understanding](#).

The Program was established in 1995 to design, implement, and conduct marine fisheries statistics data collection programs and to integrate those data into a single data management system that will meet the needs of fishery managers, scientists, and the general public.

By establishing and maintaining data collection standards and providing a data management system that incorporates state and federal data, ACCSP will ensure that the best available statistics can be used for fisheries management.

B. Objectives

1. Manage and expand a fully integrated data set that represents the best available fisheries-dependent data;
2. Continue working with the program partners to improve fisheries data collection and management in accordance with the evolving ACCSP standards within the confines of limited funds;

3. Explore the allocation of existing Program funds and work with partners to pursue additional funding;
4. Maintain strong executive leadership and collaborative involvement among partners at all committee levels;
5. Monitor and improve the usefulness of products and services provided by the ACCSP;
6. Collaborate with program partners in their funding processes by providing outreach materials and other support to demonstrate the value of ACCSP products and the importance of maintaining base support for fishery-dependent data collection programs to state partners and their executive and legislative branches as well as to all other partner agencies; and,
7. Support nationwide systems as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA).

C. Need

Various state and federal fishery management agencies on the Atlantic coast collect data on the status and trends of specific fish populations and the fisheries that utilize these resources; however, it is often difficult to develop sound recommendations to fisheries managers due to inconsistencies in the way data are collected and managed. The various data sets often cannot be integrated to provide accurate information at the state, regional, or coast-wide level. In addition, the disparate manner in which these data are collected and managed places duplicative burdens on fishermen and dealers reporting to multiple state and federal agencies and regions. Due to rapidly changing stock conditions, within-season regulatory changes and catch quotas have become common fishery management strategies. Timely and accurate harvest information for both recreational and commercial fisheries is required to determine the need for and effects of these management measures.

The [Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act of 1993](#) mandated a cooperative state-federal program for the conservation of Atlantic coastal fisheries. Section 804 of the Act requires the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior to develop a program to support state fisheries programs and those of the ASMFC, including improvements in statistics programs. Since the mid-1990s, the ASMFC has provided administrative support for this coordinated effort to improve data collection and management activities.

In 1995 the states, the ASMFC, and the federal fishery management agencies on the Atlantic coast entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to develop and implement a cooperative state-federal statistics program that would meet the management needs of all participating agencies. All program partners signed the MOU for the ACCSP at the Commission's 54th Annual Meeting in Charleston, SC. Following signing, an Operations Plan was developed to outline the specific tasks and timetables required to develop and initiate implementation of this program. In October of 2016, an [updated MOU](#) was approved that made the ACCSP a program of the ASMFC. This governance change integrates the long-term and annual planning processes with those already in existence for the ASMFC and conform to policy as set by the ACCSP Coordinating Council.

D. Results and Benefits

The ACCSP developed and adopted 1999, 2004 and 2012 versions of the Program Design (now renamed [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](#)), which document the standards and protocols for collection and management of commercial, recreational, and for-hire fisheries statistics. Program partners developed and approved minimum data elements for collection of catch, effort, biological, social, and economic statistics. The ACCSP also developed standard codes and formats to ensure consistency of all data collected under the Program. These standards require periodic review and revision as the needs of fisheries managers and the state of the art of fisheries science change.

In 2000, the first version of the [Data Warehouse](#) was made available to the program partners. Since then, it has grown to encompass almost a 70 year time series of fisheries-dependent catch and effort data. Loading of biological data has begun. These data are constantly reviewed and updated as needed.

In 2004, the first version of the [Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System \(SAFIS\)](#) Electronic Dealer Reports (eDR) was deployed, followed in 2008, by Electronic Trip Reports (eTRIPS). This system is used to collect Program-compliant data from commercial and recreational fishermen and dealers and is now deployed from Maine to Georgia. SAFIS is an ongoing and evolving system, requiring support, review and revision.

The ACCSP will continue to reduce duplication of effort by dealers and fishermen, make more efficient use of limited funds, promote education of resource users, and provide a more complete information base for formulating management policies, strategies, and tactics for shared resources. An integrated multi-agency program using standard protocols for reporting compatible information will lead to more efficient and cost-effective use of current federally and state funded data collection and management programs. The ACCSP will reduce the burden on the fishing industry to provide information in multiple formats to multiple agencies, and will provide more accurate and timely information to achieve optimum public benefits from the use of fishery resources along the Atlantic coast. The ACCSP will ensure the timely dissemination of accurate data on commercial and recreational fisheries for use in stock assessments and fisheries management through a comprehensive and easily accessible data management system.

E. Approach

The ACCSP is managed collaboratively by committee: the Coordinating Council, composed of high level fisheries policy makers from all the program partners, is the governing body; the Operations Committee provides guidance in standards setting and funding priorities. An Advisory Committee provides industry input into the process. A number of other technical committees provide input into various aspects of the process.

Program planning builds on basic principles related to the goals stated in the ACCSP MOU:

- Development of data collection standards and the implementation of data collection programs will be done cooperatively, across jurisdictional lines;
- Consistent coast-wide data collection standards will be implemented by all program partners that include data on all fishing activities -- commercial, recreational and for-hire fisheries;
- Once achieved, data collection improvements will be maintained;
- These data will be loaded and maintained in a central data repository and provided to data users through a user-friendly query system;
- Program planning will be done collaboratively, by consensus;
- The program will be responsive and accountable to partner and end-user needs; and
- Focus on activities that yield maximum benefit.

Goal 3 of the ASMFC Strategic Plan (Attachment I) details activities to be conducted by ACCSP staff and committees under the FY21 Administrative Budget. Note that program activities and staff in support of the Marine Recreational Information Program are separately funded and therefore not included in this plan.

The ACCSP initially developed common standards collaboratively, by consensus, then began to work with program partners to implement the standards, according to a commonly agreed upon priority. All ACCSP technical committees, except for the Advisory Committee which is composed of industry and recreational representatives, are comprised of managers and staff of the partner agencies and set policy by consensus. Only the Coordinating Council votes directly on motions.

The standards, known as the [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](#), for data collection and management are developed and maintained by ACCSP Technical Committees, with review and oversight by the Operations Committee, and advice from the Advisory Committee. The ACCSP Coordinating Council makes policy level decisions to adopt the program standards. The full-time ACCSP staff coordinates all activities conducted by the ACCSP.

The [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](#) documents all completed standards and provides the basic framework for full implementation of the ACCSP by all program partners. Administrative support of ACCSP activities is provided by the ASMFC and funded through overhead charges. The ACCSP is continuously evolving as technology and the needs of management and science change over time. Therefore the *Standards* and supporting systems are still in development. Support for the implementation of ACCSP modules is provided by staff in various jurisdictions. To this end, funding is required to provide for full-time staff for all ACCSP activities, as well as for travel and meeting expenses.

The ACCSP Director, reporting to the Executive Director of the ASMFC, provides leadership for the Program, overall programmatic management and guidance, and is responsible for the day-to-day operations. The ACCSP Deputy Director supports the ACCSP Director on operation and development of the Program and is responsible for managing the competitive ACCSP funding process, coordinating cross-team project management, and providing support for a wide range of Program activities. The ACCSP Program Assistant provides assistance to the ACCSP Director and ACCSP Deputy Director, provides staff support for program and technical committees by drafting, maintaining and coordinating program documents, and publicizes the availability and benefits of the Program. The Software Team Leader coordinates the development and management of ACCSP data collection systems. The ACCSP IT Manager manages the information systems infrastructure and security. The Data Team Leader provides guidance for data compilation and dissemination related activities. The Recreational Team Lead coordinates MRIP survey implementation and recreational and for-hire data standards. The Data Coordinators and Developers provide programming services and system support required to develop and fine-tune the data management systems, assist users as they access the system and provide quality management and control. The Data Coordinators also complete custom data requests, QAQC existing data, maintain data feeds, and directly participate in data intensive activities such as a stock assessment data workshops. The Software Team staff provides expert consultation to partners as they implement new reporting, and licensing/permitting systems. The Software Team will continue to support development of SAFIS.

ACCSP staff will follow Goal 3 of the ASMFC 2019 Strategic Plan during FY21, in consultation with all partners. Specific tasks to be accomplished during the period include initiation and maintenance of Partner data feeds from the commercial, recreational, and biological modules; implement dealer reporting component of SAFIS redesign maintenance of Federal Information Security Management Act procedures;; and support of other partner projects by providing technical expertise as necessary.

The ASMFC has basic responsibility for the logistics of all committee meetings which support the development of the ACCSP, including: the ACCSP Coordinating Council, the ACCSP Operations Committee, the Advisory Committee, the Recreational Technical Committee, the Commercial Technical Committee, the Information Systems Committee, the Biological Review Panel, the Bycatch Prioritization Committee, the Standard Codes Committee. Full-time ACCSP personnel staff these committees for planning of work, providing minutes and other documents, and other follow-up.

The ACCSP has helped foster an improved atmosphere of cooperation among its partners. The Program has succeeded in establishing coast-wide fisheries data standards that all program partners have agreed to adopt. Data collection and management systems will be developed and deployed and maintained as the standards and Partner needs evolve. Program partners remain engaged in the process, and the program has made substantial progress towards its goals.

1. Geographic Location: Atlantic Coast (Maine through Florida); systems are being developed for coordination with Gulf of Mexico

2. Milestone Schedule: See Goal 3 of the ASMFC 2019 Strategic Plan (Attachment I)

This is a continuation from previous projects. Table 1 contains the base administrative budget amounts by year since implementation began in 1999.

Table 1. Administrative funding for ACCSP from 1999-2020

Year	Funding	Number of Staff
1999	\$907,902	3
2000	\$681,451	3
2001	\$1,054,466	5
2002	\$1,178,677	6
2003	\$1,302,768	7
2004	\$1,298,319	8
2005	\$1,409,545	8
2006	\$1,380,598	8
2007	\$1,489,189	8
2008	\$1,447,620	9
2009	\$1,527,996	9
2010	\$1,509,899	9
2011	\$1,530,699	9
2012	\$1,509,555	9
2013	\$1,582,780	9
2014	\$1,718,447	9.5
2015	\$1,731,666	9.5
2016	\$1,623,360	9.5
2017	\$1,855,113	9.5
2018	\$1,854,249	9.5
2019	\$1,816,503	9.5
2020	\$2,012,744	11

3. Cost Summary: The ACCSP requests \$1,818,967 (Leadership Option 3) for administrative support, committee travel and systems operations during FY21. The addition of the 16.71% overhead rate raises the request to \$2,122,916.

The funds used for the ACCSP shall be accounted for separately from all other ASMFC funds.

4. Personnel

Program personnel funded through this grant, except the Recreational Team Lead, are dedicated 100% to the ACCSP and are full-time employees of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Note that personnel associated with the MRIP state conduct and 85% of the

Recreational Team Leader are funded under separate authority and not accounted for in this document. Fringe benefits which include health care, vision, dental, annual and sick leave are calculated at 27%. ASMFC salaries are kept confidential, thus only totals are displayed. Additionally, an agreement has been put in place with NMFS Highly Migratory Species (HMS) to partially fund the Information Systems Specialist responsible for maintaining HMS data feeds. The addition of a software development position would transition some contract support for mobile software maintenance to staff role.

- ACCSP Director - Geoff White
- ACCSP Deputy Director – Julie Defilippi Simpson
- Program Assistant – Marisa Powell
- ACCSP IT Manager and Software Developer – Edward Martino
- Recreational Team Lead (15%) – Alex DiJohnson
- Software Team Lead - Karen Holmes
- Senior Software Developer – Nicolas Mwai
- Software Developer – VACANT (**OPTION 1 ONLY**) - Delayed
- Data Team Lead – Julie Defilippi Simpson (To be backfilled in 2021)
- Data Analyst - Jennifer Ni
- Senior Data Coordinator – Joseph Myers
- Senior Data Coordinator – Heather Konell
- Data Coordinator – Michael Rinaldi
- Data Coordinator – Lindsey Aubart

Salaries and Wages	Option 1	Option 2	Leadership Option 3
Total Salary	\$1,229,993	\$1,164,993	1,164,993
Benefits @27%	\$332,098	\$314,548	\$314,548
Total Costs	\$1,562,091	\$1,479,541	\$1,479,541

5. Travel

Travel is broken down into two general categories; committee meetings and staff travel. The bulk of travel is in support of committee meetings. While significant savings have been achieved by using remote meeting technologies (such as online meetings), face-to-face meetings are often required to complete the tasks assigned. In general, each committee will have at least one face-to-face meeting during the year. In addition to staff travel to support committee meetings, staff travel is needed for implementation planning, data collection activities, outreach efforts, and information system development meetings with partners.

The Program funds fares to and from the meeting site, per diem according to Office of Personnel and Management guidelines and facilities costs for the meeting itself. (The daily rate per meeting

includes cost of airfare or mileage, lodging, meals and other travel related expenses.) Reimbursable participants include state fisheries directors and biologists, state and university scientists, law enforcement personnel and citizen advisors from Maine through Florida. Meetings will be held in various locations on the Eastern Seaboard, including but not limited to: Annapolis, MD; Norfolk, VA; Charleston, SC; Philadelphia, PA; Alexandria, VA; Providence, RI; Jacksonville, FL; Washington, D.C.

The travel budget is based on an ASMFC average estimated \$275 per day multiplied by meetings multiplied by days multiplied by non-federal membership plus staff.

Committee Travel	Meetings	Days	Membership	Total	Staff	Total	Grand Total
Biological Review panel	1	1.5	15	\$6,188	1	\$413	\$6,600
Bycatch Prioritization	1	1	15	\$4,125	1	\$275	\$4,400
Commercial Technical Committee	1	2	15	\$8,250	1	\$550	\$8,800
Coordinating Council (with ASMFC)	3	0.5	12	\$4,950	2	\$825	\$5,775
Operations and Advisory Committees	2	2	20	\$22,000	2	\$2,200	\$24,200
Recreational Technical	1	2	15	\$8,250	1	\$550	\$8,800
Information Systems Committee	1	1	15	\$4,125	1	\$275	\$4,400
Total Committees				\$57,888		\$5,088	\$62,975
Staff Travel							
Partner Coordination	5	2	2	\$5,500			
Data Support (Stock Assessment etc.)	1	5	2	\$2,750			
IT Support	3	1	1	\$825			
Outreach	2	2	1	\$1,100			
GulfFIN Coordination	2	1.5	1	\$825			
SAFIS Support/Training	4	1	4	0			
Total Staff Travel				\$15,400			
Grand Total							\$73,975

Attachment II provides the FY20 schedule of the funding cycle and calendar of meetings, which serves as a tentative schedule for FY21.

6. Supplies

Supply costs include supplies not covered by the ASMFC overhead. This includes ACCSP specific materials for outreach, smaller information systems items such as network switches and cables.

Supplies	
Misc Hardware (cables, network hubs etc)	\$4,651
Backup Tapes	\$1,000
Total	\$5,651

7. Equipment

ACCSP maintains several large server systems and related hardware in support of the Data Warehouse, website, SAFIS and administrative functions. These systems typically have a 5 year life cycle after which they require upgrade or replacement. In cases of the larger items, lease options have been explored, but it appears that, in part due to current staffing, it is more cost effective to own and maintain the equipment internally.

Included are the costs are normal life cycle replacements of laptop and desktop systems, assuming replacement of 3 systems annually. Costs are based upon current market surveys and an estimate of our needs. We assume the replacement of one major infrastructure component (server, router, firewall, etc.) yearly.

Equipment	
Infrastructure Replacements (servers, UPS systems, etc.)	\$18,000
Desktop/Laptop Systems	\$4,500
Total	\$22,500

8. Other Costs

Hardware and software support are supplied by a number of different vendors and includes costs associated with licensing and maintenance fees (such as *Oracle* licensing).

The Program maintains two high speed internet connections and associated infrastructure in support of the server systems. The primary internet connection is covered by ASMFC. The first ACCSP funded connection is a dedicated line to the NOAA Fisheries Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO). This second line provides full time secure connectivity requested by the Region. The third connection, using an entirely different technology and provider provides redundancy to the primary connection in case of failure. The system is configured to automatically fail over in the event of a failure of the primary internet connection.

Outside vendors include Hewlett Packard for systems hardware and software support; Oracle for database management systems support; DLT Solutions and Trident Solutions for hardware support. All pricing is based on the GSA schedule.

Communications supports high-speed internet connectivity for ACCSP and related systems and a direct secure connection to the GARFO Data Center in Gloucester, MA. Costs are based upon negotiated contracts with Cogent Communications, Level 3 Communications and Verizon.

Software maintenance and development workload at times exceeds staff’s resources. Contract services will be utilized to provide services that staff may be unable to perform.

E-Reporting Support

Funds are requested for electronic reporting outreach and support activities. Interest among state Partners and harvesters has been steadily rising and a steady stream of new users are adopting the system where agencies will accept electronic reports though SAFIS. In addition, recent and pending management actions mandate electronic reporting. SAFIS eTrips in both the mobile and on-line versions are likely to be used by the majority of harvesters as the reporting tool. In addition, the majority of trips will be reported to the SAFIS system regardless of the tool selected.

Funds requested include both costs associated with the initial deployment and ongoing support. Initial startup costs include but are not limited to in-person training workshops for harvesters and Partner Agency personnel and published training guides and videos that will be available via the ACCSP website. ACCSP continues to contract for help desk support for SAFIS which includes 24/7 helpdesk support, a toll free number to contact support personnel and a helpdesk ticketing program designed to keep track of all requests and provide feedback to the Program. With increases to mandatory electronic federal reporting in 2021 additional helpdesk support is anticipated.

Other Expenses	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Software License Support	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
Hardware Support	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500
Communications/ Internet Connectivity	\$22,700	\$22,700	\$16,700
Printing (outreach)	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500
Software Development	\$75,000	\$125,000	\$125,000
Help Desk Support	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
Total	\$227,700	\$277,700	\$241,700

Budget Summary

	2021 (Option 1)	2021 (Option 2)	2021 (Option 3)
Personnel	\$1,229,993	\$1,164,993	\$1,164,993
Fringe Benefits	\$332,098	\$314,548	\$314,548
Travel	\$78,375	\$78,375	\$69,575
Equipment	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500
Supplies	\$5,651	\$5,651	\$5,651
Other	\$227,700	\$277,700	\$241,700
Total Program	\$1,896,317	\$1,863,767	\$1,818,967
ASMFC Overhead 16.71%	\$316,874	\$311,435	\$303,949
Total Proposal	\$2,213,191	\$2,175,202	\$2,122,916

Resources actively sought to support full range of ACCSP activities in addition to the ADMIN Grant

2021 Support	Coverage	Funding Expected
GARFO (for FISMA)	Partial IT Manager & Contracts for ongoing monitoring and reviews	\$ 125,000
HMS	Partial Data Analyst	\$ 40,000
FIS Quality Management FY21 Proposal	Atlantic Coast Project Scoping for Implementation of Automated Data Auditing Validation for Electronic Logbooks	\$ 77,000
FIS FIN Development FY21 Proposal	Continued Development and Enhancement to the ACCSP Online Data Query Tool and the ACCSP Assignment Tracking Application	\$ 181,500
MRIP	State Conduct of MRIP APAIS, FHTS ME-GA, and additional surveys in some states (LPIS in ME, Catch Cards in MD & NC, and LPBS in NC). Includes Recreational Team Staff (4).	\$ 5,781,554 * Majority of funds passed on to States



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

This list includes dates for fiscal year 2021, including ACCSP committee meetings, relevant dates of the funding cycle, as well as meetings or conferences ACCSP typically attends or which may be of interest to our partners. Due to the restrictions from COVID-19, some in-person meetings may be held virtually. If you have any questions or comments on this calendar please do not hesitate to contact the ACCSP staff at info@accsp.org.

Jan 20-21:	APAIS South Atlantic Training – Webinar
Jan 26-27:	APAIS Mid-Atlantic Training – Webinar
Jan 26-28:	NEFMC Meeting – Webinar
Feb 1-4:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Webinar
Feb 9-10:	APAIS North Atlantic Training - Webinar
Feb 17:	Biological Review Panel Annual Meeting – Webinar
Feb 18:	Bycatch Prioritization Committee Annual Meeting –Webinar
Feb 10-11:	MAFMC Meeting – Webinar
Mar 1:	Start of ACCSP FY21
Mar 1-5:	SAFMC Meeting – Webinar
Week of Mar 23:	Commercial Technical Committee Annual Meeting – Webinar*
Week of Mar 23:	Information Systems Committee Annual Meeting – Webinar*
Apr 6-8:	MAFMC Meeting – Galloway, NJ
Week of April 13:	Operations and Advisory Committees Spring Meeting – Webinar*
Week of Apr 13:	Recreational Technical Committee – Webinar *
Apr 13-15:	NEFMC Meeting – Mystic, CT
May 3-6:	ASMFC/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
May 11:	ACCSP issues request for proposals
Late May:	APAIS Wave 2 Meeting - Webinar
Jun 8-10:	MAFMC Meeting – Virginia Beach, VA
Jun 14-18:	SAFMC Meeting – Ponte Vedra Beach, FL
Jun 12:	Initial proposals are due
Jun 19:	Initial proposals are distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees
Jun 22-24:	NEFMC Meeting – Portland, ME
July 6:	Any initial written comments on proposals due
Week of Jul 13:	Review of initial proposals by Operations and Advisory Committees – Webinar
July 20:	If applicable, any revised written comments due
Week of Jul 27:	Feedback submitted to principal investigators
Late July:	APAIS Wave 3 Meeting – Webinar
Aug 3-5:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
Aug 9-12:	MAFMC Meeting – Philadelphia, PA
Aug 14:	Revised proposals due

Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.

Aug 21:	Revised proposals distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of Sep 7:	Preliminary ranking exercise for Advisors and Operations Members – Webinar
Sep 13-17:	SAFMC Meeting – Charleston, SC
Week of Sep 21:	Annual Advisors/Operations Committee Joint Meeting (TBD)
Sep 28-30	NEFMC Meeting – Plymouth, MA
Late September:	APAIS Wave 4 Meeting – Webinar
Oct 5-7:	MAFMC Meeting – New York, NY
Oct 19-21:	ASMFC Annual Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Long Branch, NJ
Nov 6-10:	AFS 151 st Annual Meeting – Baltimore, MD
Dec 6-10:	SAFMC Meeting – Beaufort, NC
Dec 7-9:	NEFMC Meeting – Newport, RI
Dec 13-16:	MAFMC Meeting – Annapolis, MD

** Indicates meetings not yet scheduled.*