



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

Coordinating Council Meeting

August 5, 2015

10:45 am – 12:15 pm

The Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, VA

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions – Coordinating Council Chair C. Patterson
2. Public Comment* - C. Patterson
3. Council Consent – C. Patterson
 - a. Approval of Agenda (Attachment 1) – **ACTION**
 - b. Approval of Proceedings from May 2015 (Attachment 2) – **ACTION**
4. ACCSP Status Report
 - a. Program Update – Program Director M. Cahall
 - b. Committee Updates
5. Conflict of Interest with voting partners/Advisor's Recommendation (Attachment 3) – C. Patterson
6. Independent Program Review Progress
7. Executive Committee Membership Standard Operating Procedure
8. Other Business
9. Adjourn – C. Patterson

*See Public Comment Guidelines:

http://www.accsp.org/documents/ACCSP_PublicCommentPolicyOct2013.pdf

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



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

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

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

In-person Meeting

May 6th, 2015 | 3:45 – 5:15pm

The Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, VA 22314

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=550:15:0::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1586

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Name	Partner	Phone	Email
Mark Alexander	CT DEEP	(860) 434-6043	mark.alexander@ct.gov
Bob Beal	ASMFC	(703) 842-0740	rbeal@asmfc.org
Robert Boyles (Vice-chair)	SC DNR	(843) 953-9304	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov
John Carmichael	SAFMC	(843) 571-4366	john.carmichael@safmc.net
Joe Cimino	VMRC	(757) 247-8068	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
John Clark (Proxy)	DE DFW	(302) 739-4782	john.clark@state.de.us
Jessica Coakley (Proxy)	MAFMC	(302) 674-2331	jcoakley@mafmc.org
Gordon Colvin (Proxy)	NOAA	(240) 357-4524	gordon.colvin@noaa.gov
Louis Daniel	NC DMF	(252) 726-7021	louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov
Jim Estes (Proxy)	FL FWCC	(850) 617-9622	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Lynn Fegley (Proxy)	MD DNR	(410) 260-8285	lynn.fegley@maryland.gov
Martin Gary	PRFC	(804) 224-7148	martingary.prfc@verizon.net
Mark Gibson	RI DFW	(401) 423-1935	mark.gibson@dem.ri.gov
Patrick Geer	GA DNR	(912) 262-3121	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Lou Goodreau (Proxy)	NEFMC	(978) 465-0492	lgoodreau@nefmc.org
Steve Heins (Proxy)	NYS DEC	(631) 444-0436	steve.heins@dec.ny.gov
Wilson Laney (Proxy)	US FWS	(919) 515-5019	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Dan McKiernan (Proxy)	MA DMF	(617) 626-1531	dan.mckiernan@state.ma.us
Brandon Muffley (Proxy)	NJ DFW	(609) 748-4343	brandon.muffley@dep.nj.gov
Steve Myers (Proxy)	NOAA	(301) 713-2347	steve.meiers@noaa.gov
Cheri Patterson (Chair; Proxy)	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	cheri.patterson@wildlife.nh.gov
Terry Stockwell (Proxy)	ME DMR	(207) 633-9556	terry.stockwell@maine.gov

Committee Members Not in Attendance: B. Ponwith (SEFSC), B. King (DC FWD), L. Young (PFBC)

Others in Attendance

Name	Title	Partner	Phone	Email
Emerson Hasbrouck	Governor Appointee	NYS DEC	(631) 727-7850	ech12@cornell.edu
Tom Hoopes	ACCSP Operations Committee Chair	MA DMF	(978) 282-0308	thomas.hoopes@state.ma.us
Craig Pugh	Proxy for Legislative Appointee Rep. William Carson	DE DFW	(302) 222-4026	crabman31@aol.com

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

Eric Reid	Proxy for Legislative Appointee Sen. Susan Sosnowski	RI DFW	(401) 440-1885	eric@seafreezeltd.com
Lance Stewart	Governor Appointee	CT DEEP	(860) 822-3953	lance.stewart@uconn.edu

Staff Members in Attendance: M. Cahall (Program Director), J. Defilippi (Data Team Leader), A. McElhatton (Program Manager), G. White (Recreational Fisheries Manager), E. Wyatt (Program Assistant)

Welcome/Introductions – Chair C. Patterson

The Coordinating Council of the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, May 6, 2015, and was called to order at 3:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Cheri Patterson.

CHAIRMAN CHERI PATTERSON: Welcome, Coordinating Council Members. I'm Cheri Patterson, the Coordination Council Chair. Let's move forward with the agenda, please.

Public Comment – C. Patterson

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Is there any public comment pertaining to this meeting and agenda? Seeing none; we'll move on.

Council Consent – C. Patterson

- **Approval of Agenda (Attachment 1)**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Does anyone have any questions or additions with the agenda? Seeing none; it is approved by consent.

- **Approval of Proceedings from February 2015 (Attachment 2)**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Does anybody have any changes or concerns with the February proceedings? We will move those forward as approved by consent.

ACCSP Status Report

- **Program Update – M. Cahall**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: We will have Mike Cahall start with the program update of the ACCSP.

MR. MIKE CAHALL: Suffice it to say we've been pretty busy. Many of the efforts that I've briefed you on at the last meeting are ongoing. I think that some of the more important of those is the continued work in electronic trip reporting tools that we're developing. As most of you probably are aware, our deployment in North Carolina hit a little snag with some regulatory issues, but the tool is complete and ready to be deployed there.

Also the same is true in Rhode Island. We are working with a Non-Government Organization (NGO) in New England to deploy a version of it that will actually manage vessel tracking. It will be a little bit like Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Light; and that tool is also favored prominently in a number of different National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) proposals that just were pushed out.

I would expect that at least one or two of those would probably be awarded; so we will continue with software development in electronic trip reporting. We're also, of course, continuing our work with GARFO to get our tool approved as a data-input tool. I don't foresee any issues with that. GARFO just pushed out a minor modification to their standard, and we're reviewing that at this point and getting ready to make some modifications to our software to be able to comply with that.

Suffice to say that there is a lot of forward momentum for electronic trip reporting, as many of you are aware, and we're going to continue to be working on that tool. Our concept continues to be a single tool that is designed to be flexible enough to know what kind of reports you're providing. Whether or not it is a commercial or a recreational trip report and also which jurisdiction you are provided this report to, the system is able to make minor adjustments as you go along, either turning various fields off and on, restricting lists, for example, of fishing areas to the appropriate jurisdictions.

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

In addition, I also attended a joint meeting just last week with the folks from both GARFO and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center to discuss the Northeast Data Visioning Project. In your meeting materials, I think we did send out the summary of their recommendations from that. It should be noted that they very much want to do more tight integration with ACCSP and to collaborate more with us.

Specifically they're looking at having us work with them to manage a lot of their vessel reporting and in addition doing additional data warehousing for them. Just to give you an overview of where we are right now with GARFO, we provide them with virtually all of their dealer reports. Also they are bridging access to our data warehouse, which allows them to pull the comprehensive landings that they use for stock assessments, et cetera.

They also do overnight data pulls from the Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information Service (SAFIS) in order to provide with a backup, which is very convenient, and in addition to provide them with a real-time feed for the SAFIS landings. At present we are not collecting any federal vessel reports; but I expect that to commence in the fairly near future.

As soon as our tool is certified, there is quite a lot of interest in being able to report the data electronically. I expect that as we begin to work through the issues with GARFO and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center on how this more tight integration is going to look; that there will be additional integration in terms of the data reporting.

I would also look forward to re-visioning our reporting tools. That is one of the things that we're looking forward to working on. There is a concept of integrated reporting which, for those of you who aren't familiar, essentially assigns a single universal identifier to a group of transactions that are based on the same vessel trip.

For example, the observer trip report would have the same universal identifier that the vessel trip report would have – that would have the same vessel universal identifier that any associated dealer reports or dock samples would have; so it would be easy to integrate all these together to get a comprehensive view of all of the different transactions that are associated with a particular trip.

What needs to be defined, of course, is the business rules that we use to associate those together and the processes of how it might work. GARFO is very eager to get going on this. They have a very ambitious timeline of mid-2017; and we're very much looking forward to working with them on that particular initiative.

I also recently attended the annual meeting of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. I sit on their Fisheries Information Network (FIN) Committee, which is the committee that they have that is analogous to our Operations Committee. They are also looking at doing some systems' redesign; and they intend to collaborate with us so that our systems remain compatible and we're easily able to continue to do data transfers back and forth between the systems.

For example, the data that we have that we process for Highly Migratory Species (HMS) actually is provided to us through their data servers. They collect through their own software the various dealer reports, which we pull from them overnight and process and provide to HMS and also to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

I think a lot of things are coming together all at once. I'll give you an update in a few minutes on the Independent Program Review. A lot of good things are coming out of that as a consequence. Also, briefly, we were a little bit concerned that we weren't going to be able to fund the projects which were approved, and the money apparently has come through for that; so we don't have to make any adjustments, which is a good thing.

I think that we have a lot of forward momentum. There is a lot of work going on moving forward. A lot of work is being put into the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey (APAIS) transition. You're going to get a little bit of a briefing on that a little bit later. It sounds like I'm going to do that; so a quick overview on where with the APAIS transition.

We have completed the basic outline for the start-up funding and start-up process. We have a plan for the initial hires that will be done out in the states that require earlier folks on the ground. And also for our program manager; I extend my congratulations to Geoff White, who is sitting over here. He has certainly earned that, done a great deal of work in pulling of this together.

Basically the first phase, which is sort of the pre-implementation phase. We have plans in place and we have the funding mechanisms in place to handle that. We are still working with both the Commission and with NOAA Fisheries on the details of the first-year implementation and the funding that relates to that.

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

I can report that with a great deal of work back and forth on everybody's part we're pretty close. I expect that we'll have the final pieces in place in the very near future. We are on track to be able to submit the requests for the Cooperative Agreement in the next several weeks. There are still some details that have to be worked through as in anything that has this level of complexity, but I'm reasonably confident that an agreement is going to be made between the Commission and NOAA Fisheries and that we'll be able to get that put in place well in advance of needing the funds and making them available to our state partners and also to the Commission.

Again, I want to emphasize the incredible amount of work on the part of all of our state partners who are participating; many of them for the first time having to look at these particular areas and detail and doing the kinds of work and analysis that is necessary in order to provide reasonable estimates of the costs and the level of effort.

Also my thanks to Laura Leach who has done great work pulling together what I can say is one of the most complex spreadsheets I've ever seen and also to Geoff White, who has been at the core of all of this, working as the go-between between all the various folks who are involved in this fairly complex planning and executing of this operation. I am reasonably confident, again, that we're going to be able to hit our timelines; and I think it is going forward very well at this point. That is what I have for the program update. Do you have any particular questions?

MR. JOHN CLARK: Mike, at the winter meeting I believe you said that NMFS was supposed to be releasing the money by June. Are we still on for that and will the amount of money that is coming from NMFS line up pretty well with what the states are asking for their Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) proposals?

MR. CAHALL: I don't think NMFS knows exactly how much money they have at this minute; but we are on track to be able to provide the funding by June. I can tell you that on the overall budget, we are apart by a few percentage points at this point; so it is pretty close. The short answer is, yes, I think money should be available in June. Although I can't speak for what all the final numbers are going to look like, we're pretty close.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any questions for Mike?

- **Committee Updates – T. Hoopes**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: We'll have committee updates with Tom Hoopes, the Chair of the Operations Committee.

MR. TOM HOOPES: Good afternoon, everyone. As usual, I'm going to run through a number of slides and please feel free to stop me along the way if you have questions. You can see that all of the committees I think have been busy. Since our last meeting, there have been nine total meetings. For some of the committees, this is really almost the busiest time of the year, particularly getting ready for packaging up the Request For Proposals (RFP) for the new fiscal year proposals.

If we move on to the Operations Committee, you will see we have a new vice-chair. We welcome Pat Campfield. Andy Strelcheck was promoted to Deputy Regional Director position down at the Southeast Regional Office; so Pat has graciously accepted the vice-chair position and was voted in successfully. You will be seeing him sitting here at the end of the year.

We met in April and we worked through some small changes to the RFP, which we'll talk about in a little while. We also worked through the details of the long-term funding strategy, which we'll also talk about in a few minutes. We approved the criteria for an annual award in excellence, and Ann McElhatton might talk about that in a bit.

We also reviewed the new projects that are part of this year's funding cycle, the four of those. This slide talks about one of those new projects. I'm sure you can't see all the details of this, but it basically presents a timeframe or timeline of two proposals or two partners merging together from different funding cycles and the pitfalls that can arise from that given the fact that the first proposal has already started when the second partner or proposal joins the project.

In this case it set us back by about three or four months. What I'm trying to illustrate here is the fact that I don't think this has happened before – maybe it has, but this might be the first situation in the history of the program and it may not happen again; but just to remember that merging projects may not be as simple as it may seem particularly when they come from multiple funding cycles. That is really the point of that slide.

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

If we move on to the Advisors Committee, you will see there that the advisors vice-chair position is vacant right now; and I believe they're going to fill that soon. I'll just make a plug to all of you if you have ideas about proposing new advisors, please do so. They can always use new members; and if you have some people in mind, maybe go through your Operations Committee member.

As you know, Rick Bellavance stepped down recently. The advisors basically have done the same thing that Operations Committee did. Besides the fact that they participated in an MRIP listening session, they reviewed the new projects and the RFP and the criteria on annual excellence; so a very similar agenda there.

If we move on to the Biological Review Panel; that committee has been working hard and they are very involved with implementation of the Biological Module. That will be their primary focus this year. They also put together the new Biological Priority Matrix, which is part of the RFP. Year after year they put together sampling targets and they're starting to wonder whether there is a utility to that. There is a lot of work that goes into that, and they're not sure whether partners are using that sampling target index appropriately or at all. That is something that we're going to take a closer look at over the course of this year.

On the next slide you'll see that they have accomplished a number of steps in furthering the Biological Module. They've successfully translated New Jersey and South Carolina data. They've identified some queries and designed those.

There is a new table structure and basically they're on track. They're also looking at some of the standards in terms of how data will fit into this module; and they've got to look at tightening those up. There is a fair amount of work involved in the implementation of that module.

Moving over to the Bycatch Prioritization Committee; they have been working on their priority matrix. That has been a little harder than expected, and they're not quite done with that. They're going to meet in May and finalize that. The RFP, as it stands, includes the previous matrix.

Then if we move on to the Commercial Technical Committee, they've been working on fine details, essentially moving the Catch Source field into the warehouse. The conversion factor project is almost finalized. There is a final report that is being analyzed; redesigning the Discover Web-Based Query Tool; improving participant data for the Bluefin application; reviewing codes and standardizing codes for gear type and species.

The last one that is near and dear to me, we've been able to add a few new data elements to the standard that really apply for public health purposes; and it is a great combination of effort essentially so that shellfish dealers in Massachusetts, if they use this swipe card application, won't have to report both to us and to public health. They might actually be able to report once and cover both of those requirements. We're very excited about that. It will be a huge improvement in efficiency.

If move on to the Information Systems Committee, they've been reviewing different projects and prioritizing those. They're almost done with change management module. We basically have agreed to split that into three levels; and it is the third level, the large project management level that is still not quite complete. And also looking at possibly using e-mail for communication and collaboration, et cetera, more so in the future.

If we move on to Outreach; several outreach committees; there is a new SAFIS logo. I think a lot of you have seen it; there it is. Then there is a SAFIS Outreach Group that is working on getting feedback from stakeholders on the redesign of SAFIS. There is also a Warehouse Outreach Group, which is looking at the redesign or components of the redesign for the query tool.

There is a new newsletter; so if you haven't seen the new newsletter, it is a weekly newsletter, you can certainly sign up for that. It is great and there is a lot of great information. I assume a lot of people have seen the 20-year report that came out yesterday. It is a great report. If you haven't see it; take a look at it. Lastly, there is the Award of Excellence. I don't know, Ann, if you wanted to touch on that quickly.

MS. ANN McELHATTON: Absolutely! It is something that we had talked about in response to the Independent Program Review to increase partner programs' knowledge of the value of ACCSP. Laura Leach, Alan Mather with NOAA Fisheries and Eleanor Bochenek, one of our advisors; we had come up with a criteria and we will be putting a call for nominations for people that have implemented successful fisheries' data projects.

We will be explaining a little bit more about what a successful project is in the nominations, but it will be something that has a regional or significant impact for the coast as well as hitting on catch and effort and/or

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

biological and bycatch data or socio-economic data, as well as it will exhibit improvements on data quality and quantity and timeliness. That is a little bit more on that.

We also have decided the nomination committee will be or they had suggested the Operations and Advisory Committee. There will be one member from the Coordinating Council, Operations and Advisory Committee. That final detail has not been really agreed upon; so if anyone would like to sit on that, please let me know. Thank you.

MR. HOOPES: The last committee would be recreational technical, last but not least. As Mike alluded to, there has been a lot of work on the APAIS transition. The committee developed a list of priorities for the RFP, which is in your packet. The last bit was to put together proposals for the upcoming funding cycle. That is it; any questions?

Independent Program Review (IPR) Progress (Attachment 3)

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Next up is the Independent Program Review Progress, and Mike will lead us through that.

MR. CAHALL: This is an update of the slide that we gave you the last time; and I'm pleased to report that we've hit a hundred percent on the midterm recommendations. We're at 88 percent on short term, which were to be dealt with in roughly a year; and then the midterm recommendations, which are out to three years, are 74 percent complete.

This shows the incremental progress that we've been making. As you can see with every quarter – well, actually in this particular it is six months – we're picking them up slowly. I expect that we're actually going to be able to get through these recommendations by the end of the calendar year. There are a number of them right now that are hanging and waiting for us to complete; an Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) document.

Once they're done, I expect that a number of these will close out. Also, to some degree, some circumstances, they're catching up with us. The work that we're doing with GARFO and Science Center, we'll close out a couple of the recommendations. As I said before, I think we're going to be through it by the end of the calendar year.

We have just a few more next steps. The office has got a couple of midterm ones that we need to deal with. There are a few that the Executive Committee has as well. We're continuing to work with the Governance Subcommittee. The Governance Review is part of the IPR; and one of the items that we have to check off is it has to be completed. We're also working to implement the strategies in the Outreach Plan. Again, I expect the whole thing to be wrapped up by the beginning of next year.

Review and Consider Approval of 2015 Request for Proposals (Attachment 4)

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any questions? We will move on to our annual approval of the RFP by reviewing and considering any changes or concerns of the RFP in your packet. Are there any questions, any concerns? Okay, Tom is going to review what has changed.

MR. HOOPES: Which isn't much at all, but there is one small change to the language in Section 3 on Page 20, which basically is aimed at any project that falls outside of the standards, which is what happened last year; so it is just some stronger language there to basically reject a proposal if it does outside those standards. Then the other pieces are the new Biological Review Panel Matrix or priority matrix and the revised recreational technical funding prioritization piece. That is it; it is pretty much the same document other than those three things.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Any questions? **We will move forward with approving the RFP. Is there any dissent? Not seeing any; then we will approve it by consent.** Thank you.

• Long-Term Funding Decision Document (Attachment 5)

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Next we will move on to the long-term funding decision document; and Bob Beal will be presenting this. He is the Chair of the Workgroup.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: A little over a year ago, I guess, there was a long-term funding subcommittee formed. I was asked to chair that. The members of the committee are up on the screen. It is me; Tom Baum; Mike Cahall; Paul Diodati, who is retired; Mark Gibson; Tom Hoopes; Kathy Knowlton; Scott Newlin; Cheri Patterson; and Terry Stockwell.

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

You can see it was a cross-section of the coast and a cross-section of the committees from ACCSP. It was a good group. We had a number of conference calls, four calls, over about a year. I think we came up with a reasonable work product. There is a document in your background materials titled "Proposal for Long-Term Funding". It is 17 pages or so and then a number of appendices.

The document begins with the problem statement. I won't read the entire problem statement, but essentially the issue that was being addressed by the subcommittee is that a number of programs have become dependent on ACCSP funding for their long-term Maintenance of those programs; and this really wasn't the original, anyway, of ACCSP.

These programs that have been on long-term multiyear – a number of them have been funded for more than decade now. This isn't consistent and this long-term funding prevents other New and Innovative projects from being funded, which is more in line with the intent of ACCSP's general concept. The ACCSP still is working on the top two – or is still the top priority, right, Mike and Cheri – so if more funding became available, would they be able to move farther down on their priority list and fund additional projects on other projects such as biological sampling.

With that, the Independent Peer Review came up with a number of issues that this paper also captures. The IPR focused on funding levels and the need to review some of the funding strategies and approaches within ACCSP; and one of those is funding of long-term Maintenance projects versus this New and Innovative projects.

The background of the issue is that currently there is a 75/25 split in ACCSP funding; so 75 percent of the funding goes towards Maintenance projects and the remaining 25 percent goes to New and Innovative projects. This ratio has been place for I think five or six years now if not longer. It is really a guideline for the Coordinating Council. The Coordinating Council can modify this ratio if they choose to do so, but it has been pretty close to the final outcome over the last number of years.

As the program continues to mature, is this 75/25 ratio the right thing for ACCSP. That is really what this group was trying to get at. As you go through the document, it lists the number of projects that really were not funded because of the large proportion of money going to the Maintenance projects. There is a list of things that could have been funded if more money was available. Some of them are only partially funded rather than fully funded.

The paper continues to go on in Section D and lists projects that were funded for Maintenance and have been in the past and are ongoing. You can see sort of the tenure of that funding; some of it is 10, 12 years, if not longer. There are a number of projects right now – I think there are five projects that are ongoing that are on maintenance funding.

I will go through those in a minute, but the paper tries to give a sense of what exactly are we talking about, what is not funded, what has been funded for the long term. We also asked the states that have these long-term maintenance projects to kind of give us a risk analysis. If this money goes away, what does it mean?

The states really said if this money goes away, we're going to have to find another funding source and we don't know exactly what that funding source is at this time. There is concern by a number of the partners that have these long-term projects about back-sliding; but we can talk about that in a minute as well.

The five projects that are ongoing is the Maine Department of Natural Resources, their dealer reporting; Maine DMR, portside bycatch. Rhode Island Division of Fish and Wildlife Service, New Jersey and South Carolina all have projects. Project Number 2 on the slide, the Maine Portside Monitoring for Bycatch is a little bit unique in that it is not solely a Maine project.

It is a data collection project on river herring and sea herring; and samples are collected from Maine all the way down through New Jersey. There was discussion on the working group as that one is a little bit unique and maybe some different consideration along the way. I think through the Northeast Regional Coordinating Council and some other venues, which may be an appropriate place to try to find longer-term funding.

It didn't seem appropriate to some of the folks on the working group to sort of saddle Maine with the responsibility of finding funds to fully fund the survey since it benefits half the coast, essentially, from Maine down to New Jersey and it does provide information that feeds into the council and commission processes for a number of species. That one is a little bit unique, but it is the same idea. It has been long-term funded through ACCSP.

The paper also goes into a number of things that were talked about and thought about but were not recommended for moving forward. One is a formulaic approach, similar to how Atlantic Coastal Act funds are

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

distributed to the states now. We could come up with a weighting scenario where each state gets a proportion of the money that is available.

Everybody would receive some money, but a lot of states would not receive enough money to fully fund these Maintenance projects. That was not moved forward just because it felt that there were different needs up and down the coast. The group also felt that the competitive nature of applying for ACCSP money, having a review and having this group ultimately decide which high-priority projects were funded lent a lot of credibility to the program; and, frankly, that competition and getting money raised the quality of all the projects that are going on up and down the coast.

That is why the group sort of steered away from the formulaic approach. In Section F there is a number of scenarios that are talked about. How long do you maintain current levels of funding and should we phase out funding; what is base-level funding, all these issues were talked by the group quite a bit.

Ultimately the funding subcommittee moved two different viable ideas forward to the Operations Committee. Those two ideas were we'd take the last two years of funding for those five Maintenance projects, take the average of the value of those last two years, and that level would continue for the next four years.

If this is implemented and approved by the Coordinating Council today, it would be 2016, '17, '18 and '19 those five projects would receive level funding. That would be the maximum that they could receive from ACCSP. They could receive less if they didn't need quite as much. Then in Year 5 there is two different scenarios.

Under the first scenario, funding would just be cut off and that is the end of it. The states got four years level funded and that is it. Under the second scenario, in Year 5 the state would receive 66 percent; in Year 6 they would receive 33 percent; Year 7, then they're cut off; so over seven years they would be phased out ultimately under the second scenario.

There is sort of infinite scenarios on how this could happen and what the base years are and what sort of the burn rate of the phasing out of that money; but this seemed to be sort of the happy medium of the group. They gave the states plenty of time to plan, but it did ultimately end up in cutting off funding to these long-term funded projects.

One reasonable question is where did four years from? A number of the states said that they have two-year funding cycles and two-year legislative cycles; and it would essentially two of those cycles to try to find funding – there are no guarantees – try to find funding for these projects. The State of Maine in particular indicated that it would take them two two-year cycles to try to find some money, so that is where the four-year number came from.

Those are the recommendations that were brought forward to the Operations Committee. I think Tom is going to talk to where the Operations Committee ended up. Real quick before Tom comments, I think one thing that is important is throughout the deliberations of the subcommittee, one thing that was evident was that they wanted to make a change, but they also felt that these are still guidelines for the Coordinating Council.

This group still decides ultimately how the ACCSP funds are spent on these projects. If we get to the end of this four-year or seven-year process – and pick one of these states – South Carolina really did everything they could but they were unable to find funding and the Coordinating Council still felt it was appropriate to fund South Carolina, they'd still have that latitude.

These are guidelines and this is ultimately – and this is the plan that they'd like to have move forward. This is the intent of the Coordinating Council as it is right now; but if something changed and they needed to override this, they would have that authority to do so. That is my summary and I'm happy to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Tom, did you have any further comment?

MR. HOOPES: We had a great discussion on this issue. We really picked it apart. We looked at some of the real fine details of the issue. For us this has been a big issue for a long time; so there are a lot of differing opinions. We took this down a little bit further. We felt that the second of the two options was the better of the two, easing out in Years 5 and 6.

But also we talked about should the four years or the six years be consecutive or could it be years' total; and we decided that it made more sense to be years' total so that if a partner missed a year for whatever reason, they could still get that four or six years of funding. We took "consecutive" out of our recommendation.

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

There was a lot of discussion about what if, what happens if, and I think we all agreed that this is not a perfect solution. There isn't a perfect solution to this problem, but this was probably the best compromise given all of the different scenarios and issues. Chances are there are going to be some things that we didn't think about; and they're going to come up and we're going to be, okay, well, what do we do now?

For instance, what if we don't have enough projects that fill out the full funding of the program; what do we do with that extra money? There are going to be some things that will crop up a few years down the road; and we're going to have to figure out or the program will have to figure that out.

The other thing that we discussed was, well, what if a partner is getting money through Maintenance funding now, but comes back later on within the same module for, say, catch and effort; can they apply for catch-and-effort money later on or is that it; are they done in that module? We felt that if the scope of work changed, then they can come back and get money from that same module; so that is what the second piece of this is.

We don't want to exclude new innovation within the same module. A perfect example is in Massachusetts where we've received money for dealer and harvester catch-and-effort data, collecting those data. We're not getting money any longer, but now we're getting money for a new innovative way of collecting that information.

We want to encourage that. We feel that is important. Those were really the fine details of it; and there is the recommendation. It is the second of the two; and then to make sure that partners have the ability to apply for money again within the same module or within a module that they've received money from before.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, Bob and Tom. Are there any questions for either Bob or Tom? Branden.

MR. BRANDEN MUFFLEY: Madam Chair, is the assumption then that these five projects are guaranteed to get funding for the next four years or whatever sort of phase-out we try to do? Is it the assumption that they are going to get those funds, though?

MR. CAHALL: No project is guaranteed a second award. They have to compete every year. It is all based on the ranking criteria. For example, if we had less funding and let's just say hypothetically the Maine Project scored the lowest of the Maintenance projects and we didn't have enough funding and the cut off hit there, it wouldn't be funded. It would be subject to exactly the same limitations that it is subject right now. That wouldn't change at all.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: I think the other part that I'm not sure Tom covered was this would apply to New projects as well in a sense. In other words, if a project is coming on line now, after the first two years that becomes their base level and then the next four years would be the funding; and then depending on the outcome, it would be phased out after that. We're not necessarily resetting the clock on any of the new projects, but this would prevent new projects from becoming long term sort of burdens or expenses for ACCSP.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: The council has before it a recommendation up on the screen by the Operations Committee. Is there a motion to follow through with this? I think I saw Mark's hand up first,

MR. MARK ALEXANDER: I really appreciate all the work done by the committee and also the detailed deliberations by the Operations Committee. I think they came up with some very important points, and I like the way that they crafted the recommendation that they've offered to the Coordinating Council today. **In terms of that, I would like to offer a motion that we accept the Operations and Advisory Committees' recommendation on long-term funding.**

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Seconded by Mark Gibson. Is there discussion? Terry.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: I'm comfortable with the Operations and Advisory Council recommendations, mostly. I do want to report out to the council that Maine is currently working with our legislature to transition our dealer reporting to general state funds. It is an ongoing project right now.

I want to follow up on the comments that Bob made and discuss the portside bycatch funding, which I really consider a core Commission project. It has been labeled the Maine Project for the last 12 years; but as Bob said, we monitor herring, shad and river herring and menhaden. The data that we produce feeds into the assessments and to the days-out program and to both the Council and the Commission's Atlantic Herring, Menhaden and Shad and River Herring Boards.

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

I consider that a core project, and I don't feel comfortable about having to compete for it every year. In fact, the Herring Section every year, as long as I've been participating, has come back to the Policy Board and then to the Commission and to this Council and requested that the portside bycatch be brought back up above the bar.

I don't have an answer for it now, but I think as Bob alluded there should be some way to consider on how to full-time fund this project in some manner that is going to benefit the entire Commission. If the State of Maine doesn't get money for this, this program will just cease. Like every other state around here – we probably have less money than all the other states. With that condition, I can support the motion on the board.

MR. MARK GIBSON: I participated in the subcommittee and I think we did the best with the hand we were dealt. I support the motion really with some trepidation because it is entirely possible that upon implementation of this, we could see important state/ACCSP data collection projects start to get dismantled.

That is a real possibility; and I think we have to be thoughtful of that as we go forward with this and continue to pursue, as Terry suggested, alternative funding so as to keep some of this apparatus and infrastructure going in the event that the states can't step up and pick up the pieces if they start to come at us.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Louis, you had your hand up earlier.

DR. LOUIS B. DANIEL, III: I was just going to make motions and second them, Madam Chairman, but you've got me covered.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Are there any other questions or are we ready to vote on the motion?

MR. STOCKWELL: We've heard from Mark and I would like to hear from some of the other council members on what they think about consideration of some core funding and have a game plan before we move this up; because if we don't, I'll vote against it.

MR. ALEXANDER: Terry, I just have a question for you as Chairman of the New England Council. Much like the Scallop Research Set-Aside Program funds some very important surveys for the scallop fishery; has any thought been given to utilizing some of the Herring RSA to support surveys such as the shore-side sampling?

MR. STOCKWELL: The RSA Program is brand new to the herring specifications and the current program is for 2014 and '15. The RSA for 2016, '17 and '18 will be discussed by the committee at the latter part of the summer and the beginning of the fall. There has been some thought put into it but nothing definitive.

MR. JOHN CARMICHAEL: I think he makes a great case about there being many people involved in this. In a way it sounds like some of the projects that come up labeled as the recreational technical that affect many other states; so maybe a way of labeling it different and not solely putting that on Maine particularly with this motion and maybe – I don't know, through the Operations Committee or something but trying to get a subcommittee together of those affected to come up with some way of funding this long term that sets it aside from the consequences of this amendment if everybody is in agreement with that. It certainly would support the process you laid out of collectively dealing with this problem and not leaving it to Maine; and that seems fair.

DR. WILSON LANEY: I certainly don't disagree with Terry's characterization of it as a program that ought to be considered a core Commission program, especially if you consider the plight of river herring and the fact that we have federal fishery management councils trying to deal with the issue of offshore catch.

This is one of the few programs that provides us any data with regard to what the magnitude and distribution of that offshore bycatch is. I certainly would concur with that characterization. We definitely need to find some way to continue funding the program, because I think it is vital.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Are there any other comments or questions? Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: Well, John and I were just side-barring and I don't know if amending the motion – I would be doing it completely on the fly; but I'm sort of a sentiment around the table for support for the consideration of pursuing some alternate funding, whether it is through the Herring RSA or another vehicle. Mike, do you have an idea?

MR. CAHALL: Terry, are you suggesting that we facilitate that process somehow?

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

MR. STOCKWELL: I mean, every year we've come back and I expect again this year that proposal will fall below the bar; and it puts a whole lot of us spinning our wheels putting a whole lot more time into trying to bring a core program back up above the bar. Perhaps a way to amend the motion would be for the council to pursue long-term funding for the Portside Bycatch Program.

That would be fairly open. It would be something, Mike, that the State of Maine would work with you and I can work with the council and we can come up with a plan. I would like to be able to wean us from the long-term funding from ACCSP, but I'm afraid of the short-term implications if we do it too quickly. It would be "find and fund portside bycatch sampling".

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Terry, you're not necessarily just talking about that particular project; you're also talking about just multistate jurisdictional projects; and yours is definitely encased in that.

MR. STOCKWELL: Well, we had some discussion on one of our conference calls about how many of these projects were multi-jurisdictional and have shared benefits for different states and jurisdictions. I think those funding specifics need to be highlighted for the shared benefits it does for the entire Commission.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Okay, let's vote on this motion. Any further discussion on this?

MR. ALEXANDER: Terry, in addition to finding funding, is your intent to defer or exempt this particular project from the recommendation? Not that I have a problem with that; I'm just curious, that's all.

MR. STOCKWELL: I'm not sure, Mark. I'm just trying to sustain the project. I don't want to be a fund hog, but I do want to ensure that we can continue this monitoring well into the future to support our existing programs. I don't think we need to probably hardwire that exemption into the motion; because if it is the will of the council to support this program, we can do much like we've done the last couple of years and be creative when we make our decision at the annual meeting. In the meantime if we're pursuing alternative funding mechanisms and, for instance, the Herring RSA is going to be one of them, that won't play out until 2016.

MR. GORDON C. COLVIN: I think I'm hearing a couple of things here actually as it relates to the motion. Terry pointed out that what he's trying to do is address the need to sustain the program; and I clearly understand and recognize the importance of that. I also heard that there are two different problems involved.

One problem seems to be that the project proposal is consistently scoring at a level at or close to the cut-off line for funding. This motion doesn't address that, and I don't think it can. My sense is – and please correct me if I'm wrong, Mike – the reason for that is that this is predominantly regarded as a bycatch monitoring program, which is not in our highest priority group.

One of the things that we might look to in the future as part of the long-term solution here is this whole question of visiting where we are with our funding priorities. I don't think that's anything we can discuss today, but it is out there and is something that we should be aware of and aware that we need to potentially return to.

The other problem I'm hearing is that if the project as currently constituted is above the funding line consistently, it still would become subject to the provisions of the main motion and would be subject to a four-year funding limit and then a three-year phase-out; and as presently constituted, the burden falls to the State of Maine to address that problem and what Terry is seeking to do – and I think quite correctly – is to find an alternative approach so that burden does not fall solely on the State of Maine.

I think that is appropriate; and so I think we can support the motion from that perspective. I kind of wonder mechanically what happens; how does progress happen towards accomplishing what the amendment seeks to. Somebody has got to pick up the ball; and I don't think we've yet identified that entity.

It sounds to me like the Commission and the two Councils probably need to take a strong role in partnering perhaps with Maine – and I don't know whether the Northeast Science Center should also perhaps have some role in this – in becoming the sponsors for this project and accepting that responsibility subject to the main motion.

MR. STOCKWELL: I think we want to perfect the motion to amend it is not just the bycatch sampling of herring and probably just delete "of herring", and it will cover all the stocks that are covered. Concerning your point, Gordon, the Northeast Regional Coordinating Council (NRCC) is scheduled to meet in a month, and Bob and I will be there and we will add this to the agenda.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Anybody else have a comment on this motion? Go ahead.

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

DR. DANIEL: I hear what Gordon is saying and I agree with a lot of what he said. I'm just trying to make sure that this doesn't compromise the integrity of the Advisory and the Council's proposal; and this doesn't seem to do really anything. I mean, what if we don't; it is still going to be subjected to the same policy that we are voting on, right? If we don't find alternate funding, it goes away like the proposal says. I'm just wondering if it is even necessary.

MR. ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Terry, I understand what you're trying to do and certainly support what you're trying to do. Maybe I misunderstand, but looking at the motion that is before us and where it is with respect to the parliamentary procedure what I read is that we're going to hold the herring bycatch sampling to a different standard and we will treat specially, vis-a-vie the other projects that would be subject to the main motion. I'm a little concerned about that for a variety of reasons; and maybe, Terry, you can assuage my fears.

MR. STOCKWELL: I think you're in fact correct. If it is the sense of the council that we view this as a core project that should be sustained for long-term funding, however it is provided, then we're holding it to a different standard than we are the other projects that are being funded.

MR. BOYLES: In that case, Terry, with respect I will vote against the motion. We do have a priority setting procedure in place that is very well established and very well vetted, I believe, that is reviewed quite rigorously. Again, Terry, I understand where you are and I understand the importance of portside bycatch sampling. I certainly agree that it is a priority, but I think we're getting either in front of ourselves or behind ourselves I think with respect to what I understand the recommendation coming out of Operations. Thank you.

DR. LANEY: I appreciate very much what Louis and Robert are having to say about this having served on the Operations Committee for quite a few years and gone through that prioritization, that painful annual prioritization and review process. On the other hand, I appreciate the spirit and the intent of the motion.

I again agree with their discomfort about the outcome of the motion. I'm putting on my ecosystem hat, though, sitting here and thinking about river herring and thinking about the historic numbers of river herring, thinking about the significant amount of time we spent on Atlantic menhaden earlier in the week and thinking that the conservation efforts undertaken by this Commission could ultimately result in river herring being perhaps as significant a prey base as Atlantic menhaden.

I just feel like it is important for us to somehow creatively come up with an acknowledgment of the fact that this is an extremely important sampling program that ought to be considered a core program of the Commission and find a way to fund it. It may not be through this exact motion, but certainly we ought to be able to find a way to fund it and acknowledge the role of not just river herring but also Atlantic herring as important prey species that at least geographically may be as important as Atlantic menhaden are for many of the Commission-managed species.

DR. DANIEL: I hear you and kind of agree with you to an extent, but that is the kind of discussion that I think we need to have about that project and all the projects. We've been doing this for a long time, and we really haven't taken any action on the results. We know about all this stuff that is going on in this fishery, but we can't even get them in stocks-of-the-fishery.

We haven't done anything with the information that we have, but yet it is critical information to have. I don't think this is the time or the place to discuss the merits of that project right now because we have a request and a recommendation from our group. To pull one project out as being completely – I mean, I might argue that it is not important at all and would certainly like to have a lot more information on what we're doing with that information that we're gathering. I think it is out of order and I would vote against it, and I think it is a big mistake to approve it.

MR. ERIC REID: Excuse me; I'm a little late to the table for this one, but it seems to me that we have to change the recommendations and not the funding of them. We're talking about a multi-state – I've heard the name "core"; I mean, these are projects that benefit across the entire Commission's range.

We're talking about whether or not Rhode Island gets funding and Maine gets funding and this one gets funding and that one gets funding. If we redefine in our recommendations the type of projects that receive funding on a four-year or five-year or seven-year basis, then we would cover the issue that we're talking about. In my opinion, I think we don't need any of this. What we need to do is redefine our recommendations. I don't know what that takes; it probably takes an Act of God, but I think that's where we have to go. Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I kind of took away from this that I thought mainly Terry was asking that Maine not have to go it alone in terms of finding the solution. Maybe it is the language of the motion that is the trouble and

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

what they really want to say is amend the motion maybe so that all partners involved in a multi-partner project work together to find a funding solution. It is just listed as Maine because I think they initiated it and they've kind of organized it and kept it going, but you really just want some help from everyone else and not to necessarily make it an exception in the funding priorities and all of that.

MR. STOCKWELL: Yes; we'll call it the New Hampshire Project next year. But to follow up, I guess my question to Louis and Robert is how would you suggest that we as a Council address an issue like this? This is the first opportunity to address an issue like this, and I certainly understand your concerns about the precedent it will set. At least in the Northeast and the Mid-Atlantic it is a really important deal and whether or not we vote this up or down, it is still an issue.

MR. HOOPES: Keep in mind that when a proposal is ranked or evaluated, it gets credit for multi-jurisdictional content essentially; so this proposal does get that credit. There are provisions in the process to give a credit for that purpose. I think because it funds one position in Maine is why it is a Maine proposal; but even though it scores low, it does get credit for being a multi-jurisdictional project.

MR. CAHALL: I've heard a lot of issues that touch outside the purview of ACCSP specifically. On the other hand, one of the things that we do that we seem to do pretty well is to help facilitate processes and work with folks together. You are the voice of the program, but I personally see no reason we couldn't facilitate this process and help bring everybody together to talk about it and see if there is something that ACCSP could even back up when you're going to look for alternate sources of funding, where we might be able to provide some assistance without this coming up year after year as an exception.

That is really what is going on with this particular project. Not every year does it come up as an exception; it just depends on the level of funding. I wonder if we amended this to basically kind of follow John's line where we will work with the program partners who are involved in this to help identify alternate sources of funding and be supportive of an effort to obtain additional funding.

DR. DANIEL: I wanted to address Terry's question to me. I just, again, think that the motion is out of order just because I'm assuming we're all going to do this; that if you've got a long-term funding project that is important to you, I think the Advisory Committee's recommendation took that into account.

I think everybody recognizes that a lot of these programs have been long-standing funding; and those that have been long-standing funded are important to everybody. I don't think that there is a specific issue with this one. I mean, how important is the Striped Bass Tagging Project to everybody; is that more important?

We're funding that through our recreational license money in North Carolina. We won't do that anymore, but is that an important program; is that something that I should add – amend the motion to add the Striped Bass Tagging Cruise, too. I think this is not the time or the place to have this type of discussion on a specific project and how we're going to come up with funding on the things that drop out.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Terry, are you willing to rescind this motion if Mike will facilitate the process to further this discussion?

MR. STOCKWELL: We've worked this motion now for a half hour and it is kind of the property of the council. If there is not objection, I withdraw. I mean, working with Mike to find another source; I like the Easter Bunny and Santa Claus, too, but there is just no other source.

DR. LANEY: I will just make one other comment. I agree with Louis that we're mixing two different things here. I think one is the importance of the program in terms of providing very important data on river herring. And to that point, Terry noted that it was important to New England and Mid-Atlantic.

I think it is important to the South Atlantic as well because to the best of my recollection the mark/recapture work that my colleague, Roger Rulifson, did at East Carolina for the ASMFC many, many years ago shows that a lot of those Carolina and Georgia and Florida river herring spend a lot of their time up off New England and Mid-Atlantic as well.

I think it is an important program from the standpoint of providing that very much needed biological data. As a citizen of North Carolina and one of Louis' stakeholders, we have a moratorium in place on the species in our state and North Carolina is doing a tremendous amount of work to try and conserve river herring, and I think a lot of the states are.

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

I think it is, again, very important if we're all making conservation efforts in our state jurisdictions and contributing to hopefully increased sustainability of that stock and yet those fish are being encountered and captured offshore and brought to the dock. They're not doing us any good back in our home states where we're expending all that conservation effort.

I would definitely support further discussion as has been noted and hope that we could come to some means of funding it. And just to Louis' point, Louis rightly noted that the striped bass cruise is being funded by North Carolina Coastal Recreational Fishing License funds. Again I'll note for the record that we were challenged to find a match for those funds and we did find a match for the second and third years of that grant with Saltonstall-Kennedy funding.

I just had a very interesting discussion with Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) today about providing funding for future cruises from a different source. We're working hard to try and wean ourselves off North Carolina Coastal Fishing License funds and find other funding for long-term support of that cruise.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Is there a comment down here at the end of the table.

MR. JOE CIMINO: It might be appropriate because I want to start with the comment that I agree with Robert and Louis. I at least have a concern of creating a new category right here at the table, but I had a question about where Gordon was going with the bycatch information. Going back to the original motion; is it possible that if the bycatch rankings change in the future that that could actually bring this project back into the fold?

MR. HOOPES: It would certainly rank higher.

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: But it is still under that four-year, three-year regression. Okay, let's vote on the motion. You didn't withdraw, right? Oh, you did withdraw the motion, okay. That puts us back to the original motion. **The motion is to accept the Operations and Advisory Committees' recommendation for long-term funding strategies. Motion by Mark Alexander and that was seconded by Mark Gibson. Everybody yea, please raise your hand; any noes; abstentions. It passes by 19, one, zero.**

Adjourn – C. Patterson

CHAIRMAN PATTERSON: Is there any other business anybody would like to bring forward? Seeing none; we're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 o'clock p.m., May 6, 2015.)

— — —

Advisory Participation in the Proposal Ranking Process

Based on meeting minutes, it appears that in 1999-2000 the Operations Committee began to accept written project ranking recommendations from the Advisory Committee. In 2001 the Operations Committee included Advisors rankings in a comparison spreadsheet for the first time. This decision was made by consensus without a formal motion. As the process was modified over time to become more objective, the Advisors have continued to participate in the process.

Presently a relatively impartial scoring system, as outlined in the *Funding Decision Document* is used by both the Operations and Advisory Committees to generate funding recommendations to the Coordinating Council as part of the annual funding process. These results are presented to the Council side by side and the Council then makes the decisions on funding. Normally the Council uses the Operations Committee recommendations as a guide. At times, explanations of any differences between the rankings have been provided based on questions from the Council.

Over the years since the Advisors have been directly involved in the ranking process, it appears that there has been only one instance of an Advisor providing direct input into ranking a project that they were involved in. This was a proposal advanced by the Advisory Committee in 2006 entitled 'A pilot study to develop a real-time reporting system for vessel rip reports using a vessel monitoring system for party boats' (attachment 1).

Reading through the Operations Committee comments on the project (attachment 2), there is no question about conflict of interest. All the comments to the Primary Investigators appear to be technical in nature. There also doesn't appear to be any discussion of the potential conflict in the minutes of the Operations Committee meeting that ranked the proposals (attachment 3).

There was a funding process review by a joint Advisors and Operations work group in 2011 that resulted in some revisions to the *Funding Decision Process*. One of the issues considered was the potential conflict of Operations and Advisory Committee members reviewing their own proposals. According to the minutes of the working group call of August 11, 2011 (attachment 4), a single individual state ranking could not significantly affect the outcome of the ranking process. The minutes of the Operations conference call on August 25, 2011 (attachment 5) reflect this conclusion as well as do the minutes from the face to face Operations and Advisory Joint meeting of October 12-13, 2011 (attachment 6) While there were changes made in the ranking process as a consequence of the work group recommendations no recommendation to exclude an individual committee member from ranking their own projects was made.



Haskin Shellfish Research Laboratory

**Institute of Marine and Coastal Sciences – New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey**

Reply to: Eleanor A. Bochenek¹
1636 Delaware Ave.
Cape May, NJ 08204
609-898-0928 ext 12 (fax) 898-8241
Bochenek@hsrl.rutgers.edu

Maury Osborn
Director, ACCSP Program
1444 Eye Street, NW Ste. 410
Washington, D.C. 20005

July 6, 2006

Dear Maury:

I am submitting this proposal on behalf of the ACCSP Advisory Committee to the 2007 ACCSP request for proposals. The proposal is entitled “A pilot study to develop a real-time reporting system for vessel trip reports using a vessel monitoring system for party boats.” If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Eleanor A. Bochenek
Eleanor A. Bochenek, Ph.D

**A Pilot Study To Develop A Real-Time Reporting
System for Vessel Trip Reports Using A Vessel
Monitoring System for Party Boats**

Submitted by the

ACCSP Advisory Committee

July 7, 2006

Principal Investigators
Eleanor Bochenek, Tom Lukegord,
and Michael Bucko

Applicant Name

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Advisory Committee

Project Title

A Pilot Study To Develop A Real-Time Reporting System for Vessel Trip Reports Using A Vessel Monitoring System for Party Boats

Total Project Request

\$80,783

Requested Award Period

January 1, 2007 – December 31, 2007

Objective

To develop a real-time vessel trip reporting and monitoring program for party boats to improve data collection and monitoring.

Introduction

Some commercial fisheries in the Northeast such as the scallop fishery must have vessel monitoring systems (VMS) on their vessels to track where and when scallops are caught to protect closed areas. These vessels can also report their catch in real-time using the VMS. This permits managers to monitor their catches and prevent fishing in closed areas. In the Gulf of Maine, there are closed fishing areas for Atlantic herring. This commercial fishery is also beginning to use VMS.

VMS technology has improved and the cost has declined to purchase and use the device onboard a fishing vessel. Therefore, using VMS onboard party boats is feasible at this time. Party boats fishing in the Gulf of Maine from Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire currently are not required to have a VMS or to report their vessel trip reports in real-time. Vessel trip reports must be submitted monthly. Party boats also fish in closed areas in the Gulf of Maine without a monitoring system and fishing trips to these areas should be monitored.

Methods

The Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program Advisory Committee with some assistance from the National Marine Fisheries Service, NERO, FSO will develop a real-time reporting and monitoring program for party boats to improve data collection and monitoring. The cost of technology and monitoring equipment is decreasing and a vessel monitoring systems (VMS) is now affordable which can capture all the information recorded in the paper Vessel Trip Reports (VTR) and upload the data in real-time. The overall objective of this pilot study is to develop a real-time Reporting system for party boats in New England. This project will provide management with timely data since many northeast party boats fish in closed waters under the jurisdiction of the NEFMC and also fish for Highly Migratory Species (HMS). The VMS will capture in real-time location, effort and catch data.

Collecting real-time location data may be a concern of charter captains. Fishing location information is essentially a trade secret for the vessels involved. These locations would require many years of fishing to acquire these data. The Magnuson-Stevens Act and other statutes concerning the collection of proprietary or confidential fishing data protect the confidentiality of the information that will be collected. This confidentiality is protected under law. All required data are sent to the NMFS who will remove all identifying particulars from the information. NOAA directives or NMFS internal procedures will apply to the collection and maintenance of all statistics whether separated for identifying particular or not so as to ensure their confidentiality. Data are in SAS format in a UNIX operating computer which is not windows friendly. The NMFS will not release to the public any statistics required to be submitted under a fishery management program (FMP) in a form that would identify the submitter except as required by law. The only personnel with access are federal and state personnel with FMP. Persons having access to these data are prohibited from unauthorized use or disclosure and are subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1905, 16 U.S.C. 1857 and NOAA/NMFS internal procedures. These procedures are instituted for NOAA, ACCSP, GULF-FIN and REC-FIN.

This pilot project consists of three components. Component one involves installing VMS on party boats. Component two consists of software development to receive the real-time data and monitoring positions. Component three consist of two QA/QC trips onboard each of the participating party boats. Project initiation will occur in January 2007, in June and July the VMS will be installed on the vessels and captains trained, and from August through December all vessels will be reporting their VTR and fishing locations using the VMS unit.

The Pilot study will consist of 12 VMS placed on 12 different party boats from Rhode Island to New Hampshire (Table 1). A party boat will be defined as a vessel that carries a minimum of 50 anglers for this study. A minimum of two party boats from each state will receive a VMS. These VMS will be placed on vessels that volunteer for this study free of charge and the monitoring fee will also be paid for by this study.

After the pilot study all captains who would prefer to return to the paper VTR can do so but would be required to return the VMS units. The captain that would like to continue to use these units can do so, but would be required to pay the uplink monthly fee which would average 30 to 50 dollars.

NMFS, NERO, FSO will develop software to receive VTR in real-time and record the vessel's position. They will also store the data, and submit the data to the ACCSP data warehouse.

For the QA/QC component of the study, a Rutgers University scientist will board each of the 12 party boats twice during the season on a full-day trip or two half-day trips in August and September and again in October and November to collect catch and effort data. The scientist will follow MRFSS for-hire protocol for these trips. Rutgers University scientists will inform the MRFSS program one week prior to boarding a vessel that they will be collecting data onboard the vessel on that date. The data will be

compared to the VTR logs for the respective vessel. The data will be collected without the captain's knowledge. Data will be submitted to the MRFSS program.

Results and Benefits

The primary goal of the ACCSP is to improve catch and effort data collection and storage of fisheries dependent data from Maine to Florida for commercial, recreational, and for-hire fisheries. NMFS will develop the software and infrastructure necessary to handle real-time reporting and monitoring by the for-hire sector. The twelve party boats will report their VTR trips daily to NMFS. NMFS will also monitor fishing in the closed areas using the VMS technology.

This pilot project will improve data collection from the for-hire sector by providing real-time VTR data and vessel monitoring. The current collection method for the Atlantic Coast FHS Effort estimates for the Head Boat mode would be improved. This pilot project could possibly provide a long-term solution for obtaining timely and accurate effort data from Head boats. This technology can then be applied to the remaining for-hire fleet along the East Coast and permit real-time data reporting and monitoring for an important sector of the fishing industry.

Geographic Location

This project will focus on party boats from ports in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire that fish in the Gulf of Maine and offshore waters (federal waters). See Table 1 for a list of the vessels and their home ports. Federal law governing VTR require mandatory reporting of all fishing trips, therefore even fishing trips in state water will be captured in this pilot study.

Milestone Schedule

January 1, 2007– Initiate Project

January-February 2007- Complete purchase of VMS units

March-May 2007-Complete software at NMFS for real-time reporting of VTRs and monitoring using VMS

June-July 2007–Installation of VMS units on the vessels and conduct site visits to assist with using the VMS systems

August-December 2007 – All vessels will be reporting their VTRs and fishing locations using the VMS unit

August 2007- Complete first QA/QC trips onboard the vessels

October 2007- Complete second QA/QC trips onboard the vessels

February 2008 – Submission of final report

Budget

The overall cost of this project will be \$80,783 with \$12,758 as match.

Budget			
ACCSP Advisory Committee			
GRANTEE			
ACCSP			
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR			DURATION
Eleanor Bochenek			1/1/07=12/31/07
Rutgers University			
		ACCSP	MATCH
<u>A. SALARIES AND WAGES</u>			
<u>1.Senior Personnel</u>	MAN-MONTHS		
a.Principal Investigator Rutgers	E. Bochenek 1.25 mon	10,792	
b.Associates Luke gord 80 hrs@\$20/hr,	Bucko 2 weeks @\$20/hr	2,560	640
	Sub-Total	13,352	
<u>2. Other Personnel</u>			
a.Professionals			
b.Assistant			
c.Technician I Rutgers	65 days @\$210.31/day	13,670	
d.Technician II			
e.Party Boat Owners			
f.Secretarial-clerical Rutgers 2% of Rutgers cost		830	
g.Technical-shop			
	Total Salaries and Wages	27,852	
<u>B. Fringe Benefits</u>	34% for PI, sec, tech		
	Tot Sal, Wage, Benefits (A+B)	27,852	
<u>C. Permanent Equipment</u>			
<u>D. Travel</u>			
1.Domestic		6,500	
<u>E. Other Costs</u>			
1.Telecommunications		500	
2.OfficeSupp,postage,copies,misc. project supplies		300	
3.Facilities/Equip.,Rent,Rep.Maint.			
4. vessel computers 12@\$800/unit		9,600	
5. subcontract-VMS&VTR		29,083	
6. Monthly uplink fees for VMS units 12 vessels for 5 months @\$50/month		3,000	
7. Party boat fees - 24 trips \$75/full day trip		1,800	
8. Rutgers HSRL Lab fee 5% of Rutgers Costs		1,548	
Total Other Costs		45,831	
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A through E)		78,635	
INDIRECT COSTS 15%		0	12,028
TOTAL COSTS		80,183	12,668

Budget Justification

ACCSP Advisory Committee

Salary-Lukegord-48 hours and 32 hours match to assist with working with party boat owners and captains to obtain VMS and use of the system to report VTR data and location in real-time. Bucko-two weeks to assist with the installation of VMS and uses of the system to report VTR data and location in real-time and coordination with NMFS office.

Party boat fees includes fees for a total of 24 full-day trips @\$75/day (two half day trips will count as one full-day trip)

Subcontract-To Skymate for VMS & VTR costs for hardware, software, and installs for 12 vessels for \$29,083. No charge for VTR software.

Rental fee-Fee to uplink the VMS units to submit VTR data in real-time \$50/month/vessel for five months for 12 vessels.

Vessel computers-purchase 12 computers @\$800/unit for each vessel so each vessel can use the software from Skymate.

Rutgers University Subcontract:

Salary-P.I for 1.25 man-months to oversee project, assist with final report preparation, project coordination, and four trips on party boats. Secretarial time for ordering supplies, making copies, etc at 2% of project costs. Technician-Conduct 24 trips on party boats in NH, MA, and RI, training, data entry, and report writing. Fringe rate at 34%.

Travel for PI from Cape May, NJ to Rhode Island and Massachusetts (NMFS Gloucester office) to coordinate project and four QA/QC party boat trips. Technician for four trips from Cape May, NJ to RI, MA, and NH to conduct 24 QA/QC trips on party boats. Each trip from Cape May will consist of 6 full-time party boat trips in New England. Mileage rate@\$0.38/mile plus tolls lodging, and state per diem rate for meals. Lodging is estimated at total of 24 nights.

Telecommunications includes long distance phone calls, faxes, and conference calls.

Project and office supplies such as clip boards, water proof paper, copies, postage, etc.

HSRL Lab fee-Operating fee for lab of 5% of Rutgers direct costs.

Table 1. List of participating party boats by home port. Note that twelve vessels will be selected from this vessel list.

<u>PORT</u>	<u>VESSEL NAME</u>	<u>CAPT NAME</u>
RYE, NH	ALANTIC QUEEN	Captain Cook
HAMPTON BEACH, NH	NORTHERN STAR	Captain Al Gauron
HAMPTON BEACH, NH	STARFISH	Captain Al Gauron
SEABROOK, NH	LADY AUDREY MAE	Captain Eastmans
NEWBURYPORT, MA	YELLOW BIRD	Captain Rick LaPierre
SALISBURY, MA	CHALLENGER	Captain Frank Grady
PLUM ISLAND, MA	CAPTAIN LADY II	Captain Choros
GLOUCESTER, MA	YANKEE CAPTAIN	Captain Greg Mercurio
GLOUCESTER, MA	YANKEE FREEDOM	Captain Greg Mercurio
LYNN, MA	AMERICAN CLASSIC	Captain Jim Walsh
PLYMOUTH, MA	CAPTAIN JOHN	Captain Stan Travis
HYANNIS, MA	HELEN H	Captain Joe Huckermayer
GALILEE, RI	GAIL FRANCES	Captain Frank Blount
GALILEE, RI	LADY FRANCES	Captain Frank Blount

Vitae

ELEANOR ANN BOCHENEK

Rutgers, The State University
Haskin Shellfish Research Laboratory
1636 Delaware Ave.
Cape May, NJ 08204
609-898-0928 ext 12 (w) Fax 609-898-8241

Education

- Ph.D. Marine Science (Fisheries and Marine Resource Management). 1989. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, School of Marine Science, The College of William and Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia
M.S. Biology (Aquatic Ecology). 1981. East Stroudsburg University, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania
B.A. Biology. 1977. Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York

Positions Held

Marine Scientist, Lecturer. Institute of Marine and Coastal Sciences, Haskin Shellfish Research Laboratory, Rutgers University. May 2000-present Work directly with commercial and recreational fishing industries of New Jersey and the Mid-Atlantic region. Key projects include socioeconomic and catch and effort study of fishing tournaments in New Jersey, evaluation of size and bag limits in the recreational summer flounder fishery, fine-scale spawning habitat delineation for winter flounder using telemetry, development of an outreach program to Hispanic community in Newark Bay Complex on consuming contaminated finfish and shellfish, an industry-based Mid-Atlantic supplemental finfish survey, and *Loligo* net testing study to reduce bycatch in the offshore *Loligo* trawl fishery.

Associate Director/Extension Program Director New Jersey Sea Grant College Program. Ft. Hancock, NJ. March 1999 – April 2000.

Adjunct Professor. Cook College, Rutgers University. March 1999 - 2000.

Marine Recreation (Fisheries and Boating) Agent. New Jersey Sea Grant Extension Program/Rutgers Cooperative Extension. Toms River, NJ. October 1990 - February 1999.

Environmental Scientist. Louis Berger & Associates Inc. East Orange, NJ. 1989 - 1990.

Fisheries Technician. New Jersey Division of Freshwater Fisheries. Rosemont, NJ. 1979. Tagging and population estimate of American shad in the Delaware River.

Selected Refereed Journal Articles

Bochenek, E.A., E.N. Powell, A.J. Bonner and S.E. Banta. 2005. Assessment of scup (*Stenotomus chrysops*) and black sea bass (*Centropristis striata*) discards in the directed otter trawl fisheries in the Mid-Atlantic Bight. *Fishery Bulletin* 103:1-14.

Powell, E.N., E.A. Bochenek, J.M. Klinck, and E.E. Hofmann, 2004. Influence of short-term variations in food on survival of *Crassostrea gigas* larvae: A modeling study. *J. Mar. Res.* 62:117-152.

Powell, E.N., A.J. Bonner, B. Muller and E.A. Bochenek. 2004. Assessment of the effectiveness of scup bycatch-reduction regulations in the *Loligo* squid fishery. *J. of Environmental Management* 71:155-167.

Hofmann, E.E., E.N Powell, E.A. Bochenek, and J.M. Klinck. 2004. A modeling study of the influence of environment and food supply on survival of *Crassostrea gigas* larvae. *ICES J. Mar. Sci* 61(4):596-616.

Burger, J., M.H. McDermott, C. Chess, E. Bochenek, M. Perez-Lugo, and K.K. Pflugh. 2003. Evaluating risk communication about fish consumption advisories: a brochure versus classroom efficacy in Spanish and English. *Risk Analysis* 23 (4):791-803.

McDermott, M.H., C Chess, M. Lugo, K. Pflugh, E. Bochenek, and J. Burger. 2003. Communicating a complex message to the population most at risk: an outreach strategy for fish consumption advisories. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication* 2:39-48.

Powell, E.N., E.A. Bochenek, J.M. Klinck and E.E. Hofmann. 2002. Influence of food quality and quantity on the growth and development of *Crassostrea gigas* larvae: a modeling approach. *Aquaculture* 210:89-117.

Zimmerman, S.R. and E.A. Bochenek. 2002. Evaluation of the effectiveness of circle hooks in New Jersey's recreational summer flounder fishery. Extended Abstract. In J.A. Lucy and A.L. Studholme (editors). *Catch and Release in Marine Recreational Fisheries*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 30. Proceedings of the Symposium, National Symposium on Catch and Release in Marine Recreational Fisheries, Virginia Beach, Va. 1999. 106-109p.

Bochenek, E.A., J.M. Klinck, E.N. Powell and E.E. Hofmann. 2001. A biochemically-based model of the growth and development of *Crassostrea gigas* larvae. *J. Shellfish Res.* 20(1):243-265.

Eggleston, D. and E.A. Bochenek. 1990. Stomach contents and parasite infestation of school bluefin tuna, *Thunnus thynnus*, collected from Mid-Atlantic Bight, Virginia. *Fishery Bulletin* 88(2): 389-395p.

Bochenek, E.A. and J.A. Lucy. 1989. A comparison of two sampling methods for analyzing Virginia's recreational marlin/tuna fishery. In Stroud, R. (editor). *Proceedings 2nd International Billfish Symposium*, Kailua-Kona, HI, Part II, *Marine Recreational Fisheries* 13, National Coalition for Marine Conservation Inc., Savannah, Georgia. 179-190p.

Lucy, J.A., E.A. Bochenek and N.J. Chartier. 1989. Socioeconomic and catch trends characterizing Virginia's recreational marlin/tuna fishery. In Stroud, R. (editor). *Proceedings 2nd International Billfish Symposium*, Kailua-Kona, HI, Part II, *Marine Recreational Fisheries* 13, National Coalition for Marine Conservation Inc., Savannah, Georgia. 253-262p.

Selected Publications

Bochenek E.A., E.N. Powell, and H.A. Diviney. 2004. A Pilot Industry-based Monkfish Gillnet Survey Off The Northeast Coast of the United States. Final project report to Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries. 22p.

Powell, E.N., A.J. Bonner, B. Muller, and E.A. Bochenek. 2003. Assessment of the Effectiveness of Scup Bycatch-Reduction Regulations in the *Loligo* Squid Fishery. Report to NMFS for Research Set-Aside Grant. 30p.

Bochenek, E.A. (Editor). February 2002. Recommendations and Issues Concerning The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Proceedings Of A Workshop Sponsored By The New Jersey Fisheries Information and Development Center. 31p.

McCay, B.J., B. Oles, B. Stoffle, E. Bochenek, K. St.Martin, G.Graziosi, T. Johnson, and J. Lamarque. 2002. Social Impact Assessment, Amendment 9, Squid, Atlantic Mackerel, and Butterfish FMP. A Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. The Fisheries Project, Rutgers the State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, June 27, 2002.

McCay, B.J., B. Oles, B. Stoffle, E. Bochenek, K. St.Martin, G.Graziosi, T. Johnson, and J. Lamarque. 2002. Port and Community Profiles, Amendment 9, Squid, Atlantic Mackerel, and Butterfish FMP. A Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. The Fisheries Project, Rutgers the State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, June 27, 2002.

McCay, B.J., D. Wilson, J. Lamarque, E. Bochenek, B. Stoffle, B. Oles, and T. Johnson. 2002. Port and Community Profiles and Social Impact Assessment, Amendment 13 of the Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery Management Plan: Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. February, 2002.

Bochenek, E.A., E.N. Powell, A.J. Bonner and S.E. Banta. 2001. Scup Mesh-Selectivity Study of The Otter Trawl Fishery In the Mid-Atlantic. Final Report. National Fisheries Institute -Scientific Monitoring Committee. 34p.

Thomas W. Lukegard Jr.

10/22/05

121 Wheeler St.
Gloucester, Ma. 01930
978-283-0225 H.
978-235-5411 C.
Lukegard121@aol.com

OBJECTIVE

Looking for an established or up-start construction management company that is aggressive & creative in its market!

This company has or would look to build a strong inspiring group of employees to run a responsible, profitable construction division.

This company would support performance incentives for the right employees

A challenging work environment a must for me while pursuing my professional career!

QUALIFICATIONS

I have been in a position of authority and responsibility since I was seventeen years old. This was accomplished by hard work & maintained by achieving good results!

I have proven to be a successful small business man and have the owner's point of view in getting to the bottom line!

My people skills are excellent and I am a very good team builder. I have clarity in my thoughts while being comfortable in making decisions, standing by them, but not being afraid to take responsibility for my own mistakes.

I have a good understanding in commercial construction management, principles, material & safety, from site work to punch lists a understanding of H.V.A.C., including steam systems, electrical systems in both high & low voltages and a good knowledge of commercial paint systems.

EDUCATION & ACCOMPLISHMENTS & QUALIFICATIONS

***Gloucester High School graduate 1978**

***North Eastern University – Certificate in Construction Management & Technology 1997.**

***North Eastern University – Certificate in Construction Project Management** currently ongoing to finish 6/1/07.

***North Shore Community College 1979 – 1983 Business classes 12 credits.**

***U.S.C.G. “Merchant Marine Officers License” 100 ton vessels. 1979 to present.**

***F.C.C. Radio Telephony license 1979 to present.**

***Co-Founder & Executive Director “Gulf of Maine Recreational Fishing Association” 1998-2003.** Legal non-profit organization that represents 22 passenger boat companies or charter boat associations from Hyannis Ma. to Boothbay harbor Maine!

***Co-Founder & Director “Cape Ann Youth Basketball Association” 1999 – 2004.**

Legal non-profit organization with an annual budget of \$12,000.00 during these years.

***Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries**, state representative for the Atlantic States Fisheries council. A.C.C.S.P. Advisory & Recreational Technical committee members since 1997

***Vice President “Interstate Passenger vessel Association” 1987-1993**

***Drug Free & Enrolled in approved Department of Transportation drug testing programs, from 1994 to present.**

***Mass Div. Marine Fisheries “Skillful Skipper Award” 1997, 98, 99.**

Since awards inception in 1997 for the best for hire captain in the state.

PERSONAL

Married, since 1982.

Three children 23, 19, & 15 years old.

Home owner since 1985

Owner of 34' Charter boat “JILLY”

MICHAEL J BUCKO

155 Brackett Ave, Tiverton, RI 02878, United States

MJBUCKO@mindspring.com • Work 508-674-7900 • Fax 508-674-8021 • Home 401-624-2142

Education

University Mass of Dartmouth, Dartmouth Mass 1978 *B.S., Physics*

Educational Experience

Work lab at Brookhaven High Energy lab in Long Island 1976 - 1978

General Manager, WSMU 91.1 Dartmouth, Ma. 1977- 1978

Experience

Bucko's Parts Service, Fall River, Mass 1978 to Present

Retail Fishing Tackle / Reel Repair Service

I have developed a customer database of high effort fishermen that buy fishing tackle and a good rapport with everyone of them as consumers. I have provided service to over 100's of tackle shop in the New England region.

- I have integrated my operation on computer from repairs to sale all aspect of operation have real time inventory and automatic ordering. I have the ability to write all the programming to facilitate a real time inventory.
- The company of Penn, Shimano, Daiwa, Mitchell and Garcia accredited Bucko's Parts and Tackle as Warranty and Service Center for parts distribution

Affiliations

Member, Mass Stripe Bass Association, Quincy Mass, 1980 to 2006

Chairman of Grant Committee, Rhode Island Saltwater Anglers, Convery, RI, 2000 to 2006. The committee develops vision project in the Marine and recreational fishery then find funding.

Member, Recreational fishing Alliance, New Jersey / Washington DC, 2002 to 2006

Advisor Recreational Rhode Fishermen, Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statically Program, Washington DC, 2003 to 2006.

Honors

Legislative Award, Rhode Island Saltwater Angler Association, 2003 to 2003. Passage of RI Freedom to fish act.

Fisheries Management, Rhode Island Saltwater Angler Association, Rhode Island, 2005 to 2005

Comments for revising ACCSP FY07 Proposals

General Comments for all (or most) proposals:

1. When revised proposals are submitted on or before September 8th, 2006 the Operations Committee wants all changes **highlighted** in the proposal. It would also be helpful to include “Revised Proposal” in the title and the date of the revised proposal.
2. If a proposal is a continuation of any past ACCSP project the Operations Committee wants a brief informative review of what has occurred before (with progression by year) added to the proposal. Items you should include in the review are the dates of past projects, dates of no-cost extensions, the number of years the project has been ongoing and what number year the current proposed work would be, what was accomplished in the past project(s), how the past work ties into the current proposal, what will be different for the proposed project, and a graphical yearly representation of total budget.
3. On all proposals that are continuations of previous ACCSP funded projects the Operations Committee wants a more detailed account of the effort given to secure permanent funding for ongoing operations.
4. The Operations Committee wants all proposals to include a much more detailed account of how (conversions, cleaning up, etc.) and when end product data (**including commercial, recreational, biological, and bycatch**) are going to be submitted/transmitted to ACCSP. This information should also be included in the Milestone Schedule.
5. For all biological sampling projects the Operations Committee would like to see a plan on what will be done for aging the samples (even if it is just archiving the samples at a science center for upcoming stock assessment) included in the proposal.
6. The Operations Committee would like all proposals to include in the Milestone Schedule a reporting schedule for submitting Semi 1, Semi 2, and Final reports to ACCSP and NOAA Grants.
7. If the funding is not going to the submitting partner (i.e. it will be going straight to NMFS or to the ACCSP administrative grant) this should be noted in the budget section of the proposal.

ME DMR - Portside bycatch sampling and commercial catch sampling of the Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*) and Atlantic mackerel fisheries (*Scomber scombrus*) – Year 2

1. The Operations Committee would like the proposal to clarify what year this project actually is (year 2 for all of the project or only part?)
2. A committee member felt that throughout the proposal the language needed to better explain that this is a continuing project. (See general comment about continuing projects)
3. A committee member wanted more detail on what the Project Tech. positions will be doing.
4. This project has been ongoing for a number of years and the proposal needs to address a specific plan for transmitting the data to the ACCSP warehouse. (Also see general comment on submitting end product data)

ME DMR - Implementation of a Mandatory Dealer Reporting System for Maine Commercial Landings According to ACCSP Standards

1. A committee member wanted the proposal to address how and when Maine is going to get to mandatory reporting. The proposal should also address the issue of what ME-DMR will do if Maine never gets to mandatory reporting.
2. A committee member felt the language throughout the proposal needed to be clarified to indicate that the project is a continuing project. (See general comment about continuing projects)
3. A committee member wanted the proposal to show what has been accomplished from the funds ACCSP has given Maine over the past years. (See general comment about continuing projects)
4. A committee member wanted to know why there are three cell phones in the budget when there are only two landings agents.
5. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify the budget information concerning network connections: why are three needed, what are the working locations for the landings agents and data entry specialist?
6. A committee member wondered why information was being entered into a ME-DMR database first when SAFIS is available and wanted the proposal to address this issue. The proposal should also include specific plans for transmitting the data to ACCSP. (See general comment on submitting end product data)

7. A committee member felt the salary for the data entry specialist seemed high (43K on an annual basis) and wanted the proposal to explain/justify the salary.

MA DMF - Trip Level Reporting for Lobster Harvesters in Massachusetts

1. The Operations Committee felt that the proposal was backing away from ACCSP standards and wanted the proposal to address this issue. It should be noted that even if ASMFC adopts different reporting levels that fact does not change ACCSP standards. Other partners handle large volumes of data so why can't Massachusetts?
2. The proposal needs to better explain sampling procedures and explain precision vs. accuracy. For example: how will the sample stratified, how will the sample be tested for "truth", how will sample be tested for being a representative sample, etc.
3. The proposal needs to explain who will do the statistical analysis, what their qualifications are, and what the timeline is for completing the analysis.
4. On page 5, Methods section, the first sentence mentions "regions". The proposal needs to explain what regions it is talking about.
5. A committee member wanted the proposal to include more detail on the person being hired (Biologist I) and the individual's duties.
6. A committee member wanted the proposal to address the percent of fishermen sampled (10%, 20%, etc.) and not just number of trips sampled.
7. A committee member wanted the proposal to explain how mandating electronic reporting is a big mistake (page 4, first full paragraph, third sentence). The language needs to be reconsidered as NMFS Northeast region implementation has not been a mistake.
8. A committee member felt that the proposal might want to include a map of fishing areas and maybe even statistical areas.
9. A committee member mentioned that there could be issues with filling out the gear portion of VTR reports and felt the proposal might want to address this issue.
10. A committee member felt that the proposal might want to include the in-kind costs of printing and mailing logbooks.

RI DFW - Coordination and Development of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP from the State of Rhode Island

1. A committee member wanted the proposal to explain why Rhode Island would build stand-alone software when there needs to be more collaboration with ACCSP and other states, not less. The new eVTR functions in SAFIS should be where this is developed, not in a stand-alone MS Access database.
2. A committee member wanted the proposal to detail how much (not just percent) the Narragansett Cooperative Study funds for the harvester logbook reporting program.
3. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify what the universal logbook format is.
4. It is critical to be able to match trip ticket data with dealer reports. The proposal should address this issue.
5. The proposal should add information on the number of landing permits/volume.
6. Amount requested is missing from page 2.

NY DEC - Continuation and Expansion of the New York State Fishery Dependent Data Collection and Continuation and Expansion of New York State Biological Sampling

1. A committee member felt that the proposal needed more editing to bring the language up to date, as it is a continuation of past projects. (See general comment about continuing projects)
2. A committee member felt the proposal needed clarification on “initiating reporting requirements” in the last two paragraphs on page 3. The member thought reporting was initiated last year and wanted clarification.
3. In the “major benefits” section on the bottom of page 5, a committee member wanted the proposal to indicate what progress has been made on the three bulleted items. (Also see general comments section about continuing projects)
4. A committee member felt the proposal listed a number of things that were also proposed in New York’s previous FY06 proposal and wanted to know what has been initiated/developed from the FY06 project, and if nothing has been developed or initiated since the last proposal, why not. (Also see general comments section about continuing projects)

5. A committee member pointed out that the Milestone Schedule is quite similar to the FY06 proposal and makes it seem that not much has been accomplished with the FY06 funds and wanted the proposal to clarify/explain why this is the case.
6. A committee member wondered why New York isn't proposing to start using SAFIS instead of continuing CODES (VTRs should go directly into SAFIS) and felt the proposal should address this issue as well as collaboration with ACCSP to begin this process. (NMFS would also like this to occur)
7. A committee member felt the proposal needed some clarification on "Objective 2" on page 4, to explain if the sampling done at the Fulton Fish Market is done at a trip level or can be traced back to a specific vessel.
8. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify what the "new state system" is on page 7, second paragraph from the top.
9. When the proposal mentions targets it would be helpful to better define or clarify what the target is.
10. A committee member felt it would be helpful if the proposal listed how many federal and state fishermen New York has, and how many dealers (including how many are primary buyers) the state has somewhere in the body of the proposal to help readers better understand New York's VTR issues.
11. A committee member felt that in the second paragraph in the "Public Outreach" section that "voluntary participation" should be clarified so it is better understood that participation is voluntary for electronic reporting and not just reporting in general.
12. A committee member wondered if New York was ignoring shellfish reporting for now and wondered if it deserved a brief mention in the proposal.
13. A committee member wondered why a survival suit was mentioned in the budget narrative and felt it should be taken out and the supplies and materials funds subsequently decreased or explain why a survival suit is actually needed. Along the same line, the member also felt the proposal budget narrative needed to be much more clear and detailed and needed to explain what supplies and materials are being used by what individuals.

NJ FG - Implementation of Electronic Vessel Trip Reporting, Biological Characterization, and Continuance of the Standard Atlantic Information System Coordination for the State of New Jersey

1. On the 1st page of the proposal the "Requested Amount" should only read \$167,544

2. The Operations Committee wanted the proposal to refine Peter Clarke's salary so it only covers needed portions for the ACCSP fiscal year (March 2007- February 2008). The current FY06 grant covers Peter's salary thru August 2007.
3. On page 3 in the section on "Termination of Paper Based Reports," the Operations Committee wanted to make sure that the September 2006 termination date was correct.
4. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more justification for the Senior Biologist position, such as what the individual's duties and responsibilities are.
5. A committee member felt that the proposal needed more justification for why New Jersey is doing bio-sampling.
6. A committee member felt that the sentence in the proposal mentioning coordinator evaluation (page 4, second paragraph under Approach) needed to be clarified and explained more.
7. A committee member wanted the Approach (Methodology) section to be much more detailed.
8. A committee member felt that "SAFIS Coordinator" section on page 3 needed to be written with language that indicates there is already a Coordinator in the position. (Also see general comment on continuing projects)
9. A committee member felt that the "Blue Crab Data Entry" section on page 3 needed a more detailed explanation on how and when New Jersey is going to move forward from CODES to eVTR.
10. A committee member had a question of whether the proposal (in terms of eVTR and SAFIS issues) covered all or only some of New Jersey's fisheries/species and why? The member also wanted the proposal to address 1) what the plan is to cover all fisheries, 2) if New Jersey collects all species through dealers, 3) if New Jersey is planning to report the totality of the catch or just specific species within the catch, and 4) how New Jersey will implement mandatory reporting for all species.
11. A committee member wondered if New Jersey had received other grants apart from ACCSP funds to supplement operations costs.
12. A committee member wanted the proposal to address duplicate reporting, specifically how New Jersey compares paper reporting vs. SAFIS reporting.
13. A committee member wanted to know if New Jersey uses dealer information for area information.

14. A committee member felt the “EVTR” section on page 4 was confusing in terms of whether there were only three dealers reporting or if there were only three permits available for dealers.
15. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more explanation of the type of travel and training the Coordinator will be expected to do as indicated on the bottom of page 4, second to last paragraph.
16. A committee member wanted the proposal to address how many state-only fishermen are filing and how many dealers are primary dealers somewhere in the body of the proposal.
17. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more clarification of what New Jersey’s requirements are for eVTR and if New Jersey can actually implement these requirements in the time allotted in the Milestone Schedule.
18. A committee member felt that the proposal’s time frame for contacting fishermen to install eVTR and train seems a little short and wanted more explanation of this in the proposal. The time for programming NJ requirements into SAFIS may also be too short and consultation with Mike Cahall on this issue should be addressed.
19. A committee member did not think the center “ACCSP in-kind support” column in the budget spreadsheet was actually needed.
20. A committee member felt the proposal need much more clarification and explanation on the implementation of objectives.
21. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more clarification on the implementation of eVTR with Federal Permits. Discussion of coordination with NMFS-NERO and NMFS port agents should be included.
22. A committee member wanted the proposal to include language that implementation of SAFIS for federal dealers has already been completed.
23. A committee member mentioned that the Final Report Activity in the Milestone Schedule should be changed to three months after the end of the project, as a partner has 90 days from the end of the project to submit their Final Report.
24. A committee member wanted the sections in the proposal concerning biological sampling to be explained in more detail.
25. A committee member felt that the “Cost of Living” increase in the budget spreadsheet should just be rolled into the position salaries. It does not have to be a separate line.

26. A committee member wanted to make sure that New Jersey was aware that the American Lobster Management Board approval of Addendum VIII to Amendment 3 of the Interstate FMP for American Lobster also adds reporting requirements for American Lobster as well as establishing new biological reference points.

NJ FG - A Pilot Program to Develop a Vessel-Based Reporting System for a Small-Boat Fishery, the New Jersey Oyster Fishery

1. This project goes well beyond ACCSP standards and some objectives seem beyond our scope. There is similar work being conducted by the NMFS Cooperative Research Program and the Principal Investigators for this project should consider talking with John Hoey about collaboration on this project. These issues should be discussed in the proposal.
2. The technology (Fortran, SunSystems) mentioned in the proposal is becoming obsolete and SunSystems is expensive compared to more modern systems. The proposal should explain why the technology is being used or consider updating the project technology.
3. A committee member wondered if there were any in-kind costs and if there were they should be listed in the proposal.
4. A committee member wondered if more intelligent data loggers could be built so that they could be more efficient. Data loggers also collect data when vessels are at the dock (which is not very efficient) and the member wanted the proposal to include details of if the data loggers will be programmed so individuals don't have to wade through all the extraneous data points.

MD DNR - Information Technology Support for Maryland Data Collection, Storage, and Transfer in Support of ACCSP Objectives

1. The committee wanted the proposal to explain more about the ACCSP funded position (Is it an IT person or biologist doing the work? Is the person the same as is being used in the FY06 project?) and contain more detail on the position's qualifications and duties.
2. A committee member wanted the proposal to address how Maryland will collaborate with ACCSP to overhaul their systems.
3. A committee member thought that Maryland could learn from other states' overhauls of their license systems and may want to address this in the proposal (including adding phone calls and/or travel to other states, such as VA and GA)
4. A committee member wondered if there were any in-kind costs associated with this project.

5. A committee member thought that the proposal needed to be more specific about previous activities and on the whole it was a little vague about FY07 activities. (See general comment on continuing projects)
6. A committee member wondered if Maryland really only had 8 dealers reporting on-line and felt the proposal should address this issue. In addition, the proposal should explain Maryland's general timeline for implementing electronic reporting.
7. A committee member felt the proposal should contain detailed information on the frequency of uploads (page 3, Results and Benefits section, 3rd paragraph).
8. On page 3, Results and Benefits section, 1st paragraph, the proposal needs to clarify what samples will be loaded and how this is different from the FY06 funded project.
9. A committee member wanted the proposal to contain information on how many vessels/boats are in the COINS system and how many of those are commercial vessels.
10. A committee member wondered if there was any way to lower costs.
11. A committee member felt that the proposal should also address coordination with NMFS-NERO concerning federal dealers.
12. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify what "NMFS system" it is referring to on page 3, second paragraph, second sentence. The SCBI system, if that is what is meant, is also part of SAFIS.

NC DMF - Estuarine Bycatch Assessment in North Carolina Commercial Fisheries

1. The requested amount should read \$161,500 (which is minus the \$4500 in in-kind costs).
2. A committee member wanted clarification/details in the proposal on why in-house funding can not fund the third year of observer coverage. The member felt that the proposal could also be clearer throughout with the fact that it is requesting third year funding for a three year study with two years data already collected.
3. A committee member wanted more explanation on why the group of vessels chosen for observer coverage were chosen.
4. The proposal should clarify under the "Results and Benefits" section that the federal management aspect is due to sea turtle interactions, as the species mentioned are managed under ACFCMA.

5. The cost summary on page 4 is hard to understand and needs more explanation.
6. A committee member felt that Geographic Location explanation on page 3 does not match well with the map on page 3 (figure 1). The map only shows a portion of coastal North Carolina where the explanation describes the entire coast.

NC Conduct of Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey Random Digit Dialing, For-Hire Telephone Calls, and Dockside Sampling in North Carolina During Wave 1

- No Comments

SC DNR - Continuation of Sampling for Hard Part/Aging from the Commercial Fishery for Snapper/Grouper Complex in South Carolina

1. In Results/Benefits section briefly explain why the suite of species is identified as high priority by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.
2. A committee member commented that as the project moves forward South Carolina might want to work with NMFS (Beaufort or Miami) to discuss sample sizes and may want to include this in the proposal.

NMFS NERO - Travel Support for Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program Committees and Projects by the National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Region and Center

1. The “Recreational Technical Committee” should be included on page 2 where ACCSP committees are listed.
2. On the top of page 1 the requested amount should be listed somewhere and also the words “for FY07” should be inserted at the end of the title.

NMFS NERO w/ NY DEC - Development and Deployment of a Prototype Reporting Compliance and Quota Monitoring Toolbox

1. The committee wanted the proposal to state which partner was the primary lead on the project. (During the meeting G. Power stated that NMFS-NERO would be the primary lead)
2. A committee member felt the proposal should address why this Toolbox is being built outside of the SAFIS umbrella and/or how it works with SAFIS. The member also wondered why Oracle Discoverer is not being utilized.

3. A committee member wanted the proposal to address where the Toolbox will reside (NMFS-NERO, New York, elsewhere) and what databases it will run off of.
4. A committee member wondered if six trips to NY by ICF and NER Principal Investigators (to establish requirements, coordinate development, train staff and deploy system) are really necessary.
5. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify the need for this Toolbox in the whole scheme of the Atlantic coast.
6. A committee member felt the milestone schedule should be clarified, as this is a one year grant and the schedule only shows 8 months.
7. A committee member wanted that proposal to clarify what the end product is and how, when, and where it is to be used.
8. A committee member wanted the proposal to address how other states will be able to use the Toolbox, if they can even use it.

NMFS NEFSC - Characterization of the seasonal maturation and growth rates of a sub-annual squid species, *Illex illecebrosus*, for use in the Illex in-season stock assessment model

1. Has this project been conducted previously? If so, what were the results and how was it funded?
2. This project goes beyond the ACCSP scope in terms of specificity and resolution and the proposal should address this issue.
3. A committee member wanted more detail on why *Illex illecebrosus* is an important species/fishery included in the proposal. What is the value of the fishery? What is the status of the stocks?
4. A committee member wanted the proposal to justify or address the large amount of sampling intensity and how they determined the number of samples.

ACCSP Advisory Committee A Pilot Study To Develop A Real-Time Reporting System for Vessel Trip Reports Using A Vessel Monitoring System for Party Boats

1. This project is very similar to work being done by the NMFS Cooperative Research Program. The Principal Investigators on this project should talk with John Hoey about collaboration and address this in the proposal.

2. There seems to be more justification for this project based on enforcement of closed areas rather than needing the data for stock assessments. The proposal needs to clearly and accurately state the benefits for stock assessment and management. The closed areas don't even seem to relate to species typically harvested by headboats (do headboats fish for herring?), thus enforcement is not really an issue here. More information needs to be included in the proposal on why VMS is needed (particularly in the Gulf of Maine).
3. A committee member wanted the proposal to clarify what closed areas (particularly in the Gulf of Maine) are fished and what species are targeted in those closed areas.
4. A committee member wondered if using eVTRs were considered instead and wanted the proposal to address this issue.
5. On page 3, third paragraph, a committee member wondered why the proposal uses the definition that a party boat is a vessel that carries a minimum of 50 anglers. The member wondered where this definition comes from and feels that the ACCSP party boat standard should apply. If the PIs only intend to include those boats in the frame it should be stated that way, rather than setting up a different definition. The sentence could possibly read: "the sample frame will include boats that have 50 or more people", and does not even have to mention a definition.
6. On page 3 (last paragraph) a committee member wondered why a Rutgers University scientist needs to board and observe trips when this is already done in performing the For-Hire Survey. How will the project handle coordination with the NMFS FHS? Who gets priority when both a NMFS individual and Rutgers scientist both pick the same boat to sample? Why are there 65 days budgeted for a technician when that person is only doing 24 trips?
7. On the very top of page 4, the proposal mentions "data will be collected without the captain's knowledge." The Operations Committee wonders why this is stated this way in the proposal, doubts it could be done, and cautions against going about data collection this way.
8. A committee member felt that the proposal needed more clarification in the "Results and Benefits" section to gain a clearer understanding of exactly what "fleet" would benefit (just headboat fleet or the entire For-Hire fleet). This goes beyond ACCSP standards and may be premature to the For-Hire Survey evaluation.
9. A committee member wondered if the vessels mentioned in the proposal have already agreed to participate, and if so, then that should be mentioned.

10. A committee member felt the proposal should address what is being sampled on board boats.
11. A committee member wondered about the project stalling if the technology is not developed in time and thought the proposal should address this issue.
12. A committee member wanted the proposal to address who would take over the programming work if NMFS is unable to help or does not feel they have the time to do this work.
13. A committee member wanted the proposal to address the handling of confidential data in more detail and wondered if the rule of three would be in use. The member also mentioned that location data cannot be shared with states' management agencies (except law enforcement) and wanted the proposal to clarify this in terms of how confidential data is going to be handled.
14. A committee member wanted the proposal to address a contingency plan if boats start dropping out of the study.
15. A committee member wondered about compliance issues (such as getting the data) considering the voluntary nature of the study and felt the proposal should address this issue. The member also wanted the proposal to address reporting compliance and coordination with NMFS.
16. A committee member wondered about the use of Skymate vs. Boatracks. Skymate has not yet been tested where Boatracks has been tested and felt the proposal should address this issue. In addition, the member felt the approximately \$2,500 per vessel for putting Skymate on boats seemed a little expensive. How much does Boatracks charge?
17. A committee member was worried about the time-line of the project. It should be examined more closely to make sure everything can be accomplished in the time allotted. The project starts early in the year but reporting doesn't begin until August, which misses much of the fishing season.
18. A committee member wanted the proposal to address and define the study's QA/QC protocols.
19. A committee member wondered who would actually retain ownership of the VMS units and the computers if they were returned and wanted the proposal to address this issue. The member felt that the VMS units and computers would technically be ACCSP's since they were bought with ACCSP funds, but ACCSP would not have any use for the VMS units. In addition, if the VMS units and computers were kept by the boat captains how would that be handled? As it stands now there are no ACCSP standards for these scenarios but the proposal should address these issues.

20. A committee member felt that the “Results and Benefits” section of the proposal was making assumptions about ACCSP standards and wanted to caution against making these assumptions in the proposal.

21. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more clarification on how Rutgers University scientist days will be matched up with VTR logs.

22. The proposal’s Milestone Schedule needs to be put in chart form (Month 1, 2, 3, etc.).

23. A committee member wanted the proposal to justify the higher level of sampling taking place (increased sample size).

ACCSP Recreational Technical Committee - Increase Intercept Sampling Levels for the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), For-Hire Methodology of the Charter Boat and Headboat Fishery on the Atlantic Coast (Maine through Florida)

- No Comments

ACCSP Recreational Technical Committee - Independent Evaluation of Headboat Sampling Benchmark Study by the For-Hire Subcommittee

1. A committee member wondered who was going to do the logistical work for the evaluation (ACCSP Administrative Grant has a 30% overhead while NMFS has no overhead) and thought the proposal might need to address this.
2. A committee member wanted the proposal to have more clarification of the people in the subcommittee and their duties.

ACCSP Recreational Technical Committee - Reducing Catch and Effort Variances for Important Managed Recreational Fisheries on the Atlantic Coast (Maine through Georgia)

- No Comments

ACCSP Recreational Technical Committee - An Inventory of Tournament Activity Along the Atlantic Coast

- This proposal will be removed from consideration

ACCSP Administrative Grant

1. A committee member found a mistake in the budget figures in Table 1 and asked that all figures be checked throughout the proposal.

2. In Table 2 (travel costs) the two Biological Review Panel meetings should be split into one subcommittee meeting and one full committee meeting.
3. A committee member was wondering if it was possible to piggy back the Commercial Technical Committee meeting with the Information Systems Committee meeting to try and save money since most of the people on both committees are the same.
4. The Operations Committee felt that the outreach figure in Table 1 should be decreased by half to \$5000.
5. The Operations Committee wanted more detail about the \$80,000 under contracts in Table 1.
6. A committee member pointed out that formats for numbers should be consistent throughout the proposal (for example: WAN Support in Table 3)
7. The Operations Committee asked that the Resources section for Sub-task 2c in the FY07 Operations Plan read: Budgeted funds for meetings (remove fall).
8. The Operations Committee asked that Sub-task 15d in the FY07 Operations Plan read: Develop proposal for FY08 For-Hire Survey using current standards.

ACCSP OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
DoubleTree Hotel, 210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, MD
October 4-5, 2006

FINAL MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, October 4

- 10:00 AM Welcome – Chair Patterson
- 10:05 AM Approval of Agenda
Action Required – Attachment I
- 10:10 AM Approval of Draft August 2006 Meeting Minutes
Action Required – Attachment II
- 10:15 AM Public Comment
- 10:20 AM Information Session on NOAA Grants process & ACCSP grants process
(NOAA Grants employee)
- 11:30 AM Discussion of InPort and States’ Metadata (Osborn)
Attachment III
- 12:00 PM Lunch
- 1:00 PM Update on ACCSP Activities (Osborn) – **Moved to Thursday**
Attachments IV & V
- 2:00 PM Report on External Peer Review Results (Osborn)
Attachment VI
- 2:45 PM Break
- 3:00 PM Discussion and Recommendations for FY07 Funding Proposals

Thursday, October 5

- 9:00 AM Continue Discussion and Recommendations for FY07 Funding Proposals
- 10:30 AM Break
- 10:45 AM Overview of Advisory Committee Recommendations on FY07 Funding
Proposals & Ranking of FY07 Funding Proposals -- Action Required --
Attachment VII

- 12:00 PM Lunch
- 1:00 PM Demonstration of Discoverer Query applications (Commercial and Recreational) (IT Staff)
- 2:00 PM Other Business
-- Approve Funding Decision Document changes – C. Patterson Attachment VIII
-- Compensation for Advisory Committee members (brought up at May and Sept. Advisory meetings) Attachment IX
-- Update on NMFS response to NRC study
- 2:30 PM Adjourn

ATTACHMENTS

- I Draft Agenda
- II Draft Meeting Minutes, August 2006
- III ACCSP InPort Hierarchy (supplied at meeting)
- IV FY 06 Operations Plan – Updated
- V FY07 Draft Operations Plan
- VI External Peer Review Final Report
- VII Advisory Committee comments on FY07 Funding Proposals
- VIII Funding Decision Document with changes highlighted
- IX Memo to Operations Committee regarding Advisory Committee Member Compensation (supplied at meeting)

ACCSP OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
Annapolis, MD
October 4-5, 2006

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Attendees:

John Lake	RI DFW	401-423-1942	john.lake@accsp.org
Tom Hoopes	MA DMF	978-282-0308	thomas.hoopes@state.ma.us
Carrie Kennedy	MD DNR	410-260-8293	ckennedy@dnr.state.md.us
Dave VanVoorhees	NMFS HQ	301-713-2328	dave.van.voorhees@noaa.gov
Tom Baum	NJ DFW	609-748-2020	tom.baum@dep.state.nj.us
Rick DeVictor	SAFMC	843-571-4366	richard.devictor@safmc.net
Dee Lupton	NC DMF	252-726-7021	dee.lupton@ncmail.net
Cheri Patterson	NH F&G	603-868-1095	cpatterson@nhfgd.org
Nan Jenkins	SC DNR		jenkinsn@dnr.sc.gov
Bruce Joule	ME DMR	207-633-9500	bruce.joule@maine.gov
Kathy Knowlton	GA DNR	912-262-3122	kathy.knowlton@dnr.state.ga.us
Steve Turner	NOAA SEFSC	305-361-4482	steve.turner@noaa.gov
Greg Power	NOAA NERO	978-281-9304	greg.power@noaa.gov
Mark Alexander	CT DEP	860-447-4322	mark.alexander@po.state.ct.us
Stephanie Iverson	VMRC	757-247-2061	stephanie.iverson@mre.virginia.gov
Megan Caldwell	ASMFC	202-289-6400	mcaldwell@asmfc.org
Robert Wiggers	SC DNR	843-953-9363	wiggersr@dnr.sc.gov
Eleanor Bochenek	Rutgers U	609-898-0928	bochenek@hsrl.rutgers.edu
Vic Vecchio	NY DEC	631-444-0476	vjvecchi@gov.dec.state.ny.us

Committee members not in attendance: Lou Goodreau (NEFMC), Wilson Laney (U.S. FWS), Member from DE DFW, Joe O'Hop (FL FWCC)

Staff: Maury Osborn, Benjamin Baron-Taltre, Mike Cahall, Kate Fleming, Ellen Lovelidge (Wed. morning only)

Wednesday, October 4, 2006

Chair Patterson opened the meeting at 10:00AM with a welcome and introductions.

The first order of business was the approval of the current meeting agenda and past minutes from the August 2006 Operations Committee meeting. The agenda was approved with minor changes: M. Cahall, instead of M. Osborn, will cover the discussion of InPort and state metadata and the ACCSP update was moved to Thursday. The past meeting minutes were approved without any additions or corrections.

The August 2006 meeting minutes will be made final and posted to the ACCSP website by staff. (Done)

There was no public comment.

Information Session on NOAA Grants process and ACCSP grants process

Rimas Liogys and Susan Olsen from NOAA Grants attended the meeting to hold an information session on the NOAA Grants process and how it relates to ACCSP grants.

Rimas Liogys began by mentioning that due to Business Process Reengineering, NOAA Grants has instituted a new system for the grant process. He then gave a presentation on the overall NOAA Grants process, discussing such details as the planning process, the pre-award process, the award process, executing and monitoring awards, closing-out awards, auditing awards, and performance goals. **Staff will post R. Liogys's presentation to the ACCSP website. (Done)** The website URL is <http://www.accsp.org/opercommitteeoct06presentations.htm>

Susan Olson began her discussion by handing out a FY07 Grants Timeline spreadsheet comparing the ACCSP proposal timeline with the NOAA Grants processing timeline. The primary issue was how to decrease the time from when the proposals are selected for funding to when those proposals actually receive funds. The biggest hurdle is that money is not usually available until May or June because the federal budget is not typically passed until November or December the year before.

With the new Business Process Reengineering initiative the goal is to find projects that can be submitted early to help speed things along. Along those lines S. Olsen wanted the Operations Committee to think about multi-year proposals, since those would work better with the NOAA grants timeline. Multi-year awards do not require new applications (they just have to be up-to-date on performance and financial reporting) to receive money, which they can get in approximately 15 days instead of 60 or more with new applications. The ACCSP Administrative Grant was designated a multi-year grant a year ago based on the fact that for other projects to receive money, the Administrative Grant has to be funded. This designation has saved time in the NOAA grants process. Multi-year projects can also save on reporting requirements (a two-year project has four semis and a completion report while two single year projects have four semis and two completion reports). Projects that need to start early (January/February) do face the problem getting funds earlier than NOAA grants can process them. NOAA grants will work individually with those states/projects that need to start early to get them the money as soon as possible.

M. Osborn wondered if it would help if ACCSP could tell NOAA Grants which projects were continuations from the previous year. S. Olsen said that before the Business Process Reengineering initiative, NOAA Grants could normally only spend as much money as was spent the previous year and awards were never approved in the first quarter. However, under the new initiative plan projects could be funded in the first

quarter (as long as the federal budget has been passed early enough) and NOAA Grants would identify which proposals needed to be funded in these early months.

While multi-year projects are processed faster, a multi-year proposal does need to include all the planning and budget estimation for each year of the project. A few Operations Committee members wondered if ACCSP approved multi-year projects would ACCSP be obligated to multiple years of funding. S. Olsen said that just because the project is a multi-year project there is no guarantee it will be funded each year. D. Lupton thought that this would be a policy change and going down this road needed to be discussed further. S. Iverson thought the change to multi-year proposals was basically just a paper change and not a policy change. Since projects are not guaranteed funding each year, doing the paperwork up front saves time in subsequent years if the project is funded again. The primary issue with multi-year projects is that ACCSP's policy was to fund one-year implementation projects and not maintain a partner's project over many years.

The bottom line is that the more expedient the new ACCSP project information gets to NOAA Grants the sooner the process speeds along, as it helps spread the workload throughout the year. However, S. Olsen mentioned that they could only speed up the process to a certain point. Currently, once selected:

1. Project partners are notified,
2. Recipients then submit their applications through grants online,
3. Which will then sit in the grants office until the release of funds occurs.

ACCSP will get the list of projects to NOAA Grants as soon as possible this year, and since they will be ranked, NOAA Grants can go ahead to start the process of notifying the partner. Those projects that might be affected by a rescission will be contacted when the federal budget is finalized. M. Osborn mentioned the Coordinating Council would be meeting the third week in October this year, so ACCSP will be able to get a finalized ranking list out to NOAA Grants immediately after that meeting. She also mentioned that she would also be talking with the Coordinating Council to see if ACCSP could provide the grants office a draft ranking list before the Coordinating Council finalizes it during years when they meet later in November.

S. Olsen updated the Operations Committee on performance reporting.

- Northeast Region: 2 progress (semi) reports and 1 completion (final) report for a one-year project.
- Southeast Region (which had been different from the Northeast) is now also requiring: 2 progress (semi) reports and 1 completion (final) report for a one-year project.
- Progress reporting is semi-annual based on the project start date.
- Financial reporting is semi-annual based on the federal fiscal year (Oct. – March and April – Sept.).

D. Lupton from North Carolina mentioned that she was submitting a 3-month report. S. Olsen said that sometimes new, high visibility, or high risk projects sometimes have more frequent reporting requirements. The standard, however, is semi-annuals or annuals.

Based on the information S. Olsen gave about performance reporting the Operations Committee decided to change ACCSP's reporting timeframe, which was based on receipt of funds, to the NOAA Grants reporting time frame (based on project start date).

Staff will work with all partners to bring them into synchronicity on their performance reporting so ACCSP semi and final report due dates are the same as NOAA Grants due dates. (Done) NOAA Grants will need to contact ACCSP staff every year concerning start dates for new projects.

Due to the changes in reporting, the ACCSP Funding Decision Document will need to be updated to reflect the changes. **M. Osborn will convene a conference call of the Funding Decision Document Subcommittee to begin the process of making changes to the document regarding performance reporting. (In Progress)**

The NOAA Grants information session ended with S. Olsen giving a presentation on the monitoring of grants. **Staff will post S. Olsen's presentation to the ACCSP website. (Done)** The website URL is <http://www.accsp.org/opercommitteect06presentations.htm>

Discussion of InPort and State Metadata

M. Cahall mentioned that ACCSP has been working on the InPort metadata project for the last five months. Almost all ACCSP metadata has been put into the InPort System (a metadata repository), however, it is not currently designed to provide other types of metadata in the way fisheries managers understand or would like a metadata application to work. The InPort application is designed to document existing programs and their functions as opposed to statutory, regulatory, and missing data information. For example, it can show that Rhode Island has a VTR system that collects x,y,z, but not that Rhode Island has closed fishing seasons reflecting why fish weren't caught in certain months. M. Cahall stated that InPort only has broad categories and subcategories and showed a handout of how ACCSP divided itself within these categories and subcategories.

M. Cahall said that the InPort application is hard to work with and is still a work in progress. It takes a lot of up-front planning to organize the data into sections that make sense. It also will not do a hierarchical display or printing of everything in the application. Due to that fact, ACCSP is best served completing the rest of the project (state metadata) on its own. The current contractor adds more complexity to the process than is needed since the contractor does not have a background in fisheries. The final end product will be high-level documentation of all fisheries dependent data collection programs on the Atlantic coast. What it cannot do and will not be able to do in the short/mid term is associate events (regulatory, historical, etc.) with the data.

M. Osborn mentioned that she is currently writing a statutory/regulatory history proposal. D. Van Voorhees said the first step for any statutory/regulatory database would be the design of the tool. M. Cahall said he did not think it would be too difficult to build that type of metadata system tool, but the time consuming part would be actually getting the data in the system. However, to get this accomplished some other ACCSP project would need to be dropped or delayed, staff size would need to increase, or ACCSP would need to reprioritize its activities. It is up to the Coordinating Council, Operations Committee,

and Advisory Committee to decide what to do. This should hopefully occur during the next strategic planning session.

M. Alexander wondered if ACCSP's InPort metadata is available to see. M. Cahall said the data would need to be published for that to occur and there are some limitations to what InPort can do. S. Turner thought it would be a good idea if Operations Committee members and others could see the ACCSP data currently in InPort.

Report on External Peer Review Results

M. Osborn and C. Patterson gave a presentation on the results of the External Peer Review of ACCSP that occurred on September 19-21, 2006. The final report of the External Peer Review is located on the ACCSP website at <http://www.accsp.org/accspeerreview2006.htm>

There were a number of discussion points that came up during the presentation, including:

- The need to improve communication between the Advisory and Operations Committees.
- The need for the Executive Subcommittee of the Coordinating Council to conduct the performance evaluation of the Director.
- The need to work with industry to assure confidence in data collection and the ACCSP process.
- The Coordinating Council and Subcommittees aren't as engaged as they should be. Lobbying efforts have not been done for the Atlantic coast like they have been for the Gulf, primarily due to the lack of engagement of the Finance Subcommittee.
- Moving the ACCSP forward in a more directed approach, and focus on finishing one module at a time.
- Should the Operations Committee draft a letter indicating what they want the Coordinating Council to start thinking about or should each Operations Committee member contact their own Coordinating Council member and let them know how the Operations Committee is thinking? It might be presumptive to tell Coordinating Council members what the Operations Committee wants them to do before they hear the peer review results themselves.
- Start building proposals (with ACCSP staff assistance) that will get the entire Atlantic coast to a particular target/goal with one module.
- Highlight parts of the peer report that the Operations Committee feels is important for the Coordinating Council to address.
- Some Coordinating Council members are just not engaged (and may never be). A communications plan (Outreach Committee?) is an important step to try to change this.
- Add a section to the peer review presentation that will be given to the Coordinating Council with the Operations Committee's Comments from this meeting, making sure the opinions of the Operations Committee members are not confused with the peer reviewers' comments.

- Concerns that the upcoming elections will have a significant effect on the structure of Coordinating Council. Anything presented to Coordinating Council in October might fall on deaf ears since some council members might change.
- User expectations are not being met. It must be shown that ACCSP is the best place to access fisheries dependent data. This may mean moving up some priorities.

Discussion and Recommendations for FY07 Funding Proposals

Before discussing the proposals there was a discussion about the process. The Advisory Committee had submitted a request that both their comments and ranking be made available before the Operations Committee started their discussion and ranking of the proposals. In the past only their comments were made available before the discussion and ranking process. The Advisory Committee felt that without also seeing their ranking the Operations Committee is not getting the Advisory Committee's complete input. The Advisory Committee spends a lot of time looking at proposals and they would like to see that the Operations Committee is taking note of all their advice, as they are industry advisors to the ACCSP.

After some discussion between Operation Committee members it was clear there were some members in favor of the seeing both the comments and ranking and there were some members only in favor of seeing the comments. A subsequent vote showed the majority of members favored only seeing the Advisory Committee's comments before the Operations Committee made their ranking. Only after the Operations Committee had their ranking would they view both committees' proposal rankings and then make any adjustments from that point if they choose to do so.

The Operations Committee was glad to see the issue come up and would like to get the Coordinating Council's opinion on the matter. **M. Osborn will draft a memo to the Executive Subcommittee of the Coordinating Council concerning the issue of making available both the Advisory Committee's proposal comments and ranking before the Operations Committee makes their ranking. (In Progress)** The Operations Committee would like to revisit the issue next year.

The Operations Committee then started their merit discussion of the FY07 Funding Proposals. Advisory Committee comments were provided for each project as that project was being discussed by the Operations Committee.

1. ACCSP Administrative Grant

D. Lupton wondered about the strategic plan update and if the Operations Committee would be doing that at a regular meeting or would it be separate? M. Osborn said there wasn't a special meeting budgeted and that it was up to the Operations Committee to decide how to do the new planning (possibly it could be folded into an existing meeting or a joint meeting with the Advisory Committee).

2. ACCSP Legacy Data Population Into the Data Warehouse

E. Bochenek mentioned there were mixed feelings about this issue at the Advisory Committee meeting. A few of the advisors were concerned about putting “incorrect” data into the Data Warehouse. At their meeting, M. Osborn explained that the data is already being used for stock assessments, but a few advisors still felt strongly that it shouldn’t be populated into ACCSP’s Data Warehouse. There was also the concern that the data currently going into the warehouse is “incorrect.” It is clear there is a communication issue with the Advisory committee and ACCSP does not have total industry buy-in.

The primary issue is not that ACCSP cannot get the data into the system, but what ACCSP is going to do with it once it has it. The data needs to be reconciled, monitored for quality control, etc., and right now ACCSP does not have the time and resources to do that without some help. That will be part of the push in the next year to get the legacy data in the warehouse.

Not putting the legacy data into the warehouse is not an option, as that is part of its primary mission. The ASMFC wants to use ACCSP data for the red drum assessment and ACCSP wants to make sure it has the data when requests come and ask for it. Part of ACCSP’s fundamental mission is to pull in legacy data and have stock assessment scientists use the Data Warehouse. If ACCSP is not pleasing the end user, why is it here? Part of the Advisor’s concern was they don’t want the data used without knowing what condition the data is in. Of course part of getting the data in ACCSP systems would include ensuring that ACCSP document the condition of the data.

Possibly a good place to start with the Advisory Committee would be to gauge their level of knowledge of how stock assessments are done (show an example of a recent one to make it tangible). Not many fishermen have been to a stock assessment. Maybe the Advisors need a better explanation of stock assessments and then they could educate other fishermen.

The Operations Committee will rank legacy data project separately just as the Advisory Committee did.

3. ACCSP Annual Meeting (an idea from the Advisory Committee meeting in September 2006)

Many Operations Committee members understood the merit of the meeting, especially since it would combine nicely with updating the strategic plan, but felt that introducing a new proposal is inappropriate. The proposal is worth looking into for the future and could be submitted next year.

ACCSP could have a hard time getting that many people together at once and the Operations Committee questions the productivity of such a large meeting. For the amount of money being spent on the meeting ACCSP could fund an additional project.

The overall consensus of the Operations Committee was that they were going to remove the Annual Meeting proposal from consideration and not vote on it. M. Osborn said that ACCSP can arrange for a joint meeting of the Advisory and Operations Committees in the spring or fall and that will already be covered under the Administrative Grant. ACCSP may consider holding a joint meeting in the fall where each group would meet independently to rank the projects, and then come together to see each other's rankings and discuss the recommendations.

4. NMFS – NERO: Travel support

The Northeast Regional Office of the National Marine Fisheries Service has submitted all past reports and is no longer delinquent in reporting. The requested funds increased by \$2,000 from the original proposal.

The Advisory Committee commented that we must be sure past reports have been submitted.

5. NMFS – NEFSC: Characterization of seasonal maturation and growth rates of *Illex illecebrosus*

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee was pleased that the proposal writers heeded the advice of the Operations Committee members.

6. SC DNR: Continuation of Sampling for Hard Part/Aging from Snapper/Grouper Complex

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee would like to make sure this project keeps up with reporting and believes it is good that they are doing biological sampling.

7. NC DMF: Estuarine Bycatch Assessment in North Carolina Commercial Fisheries

If the project is not funded by ACCSP, it is very likely that it will not receive funding from any other source. Consequently, North Carolina would miss out on having third year data in this three-year project.

The project was not designed originally as an ACCSP project, but it does address ACCSP standards.

8. ME DMR: Portside bycatch sampling and commercial catch sampling of the Atlantic herring and Atlantic mackerel fisheries

There were no Operations Committee comments.

The Advisory Committee was concerned about continual/maintenance projects and felt strongly that partners and regions should take over the funding and allow ACCSP funding to be used for start-up projects.

9. MD DNR: IT Support for Maryland Data Collection, Storage, and Transfer in Support of ACCSP Objectives

The primary discussion about the project was if Maryland actually needed the money this year or should Maryland wait until next year, as the proposal immediately mentions that Maryland would file for a no-cost extension if the proposal were funded.

Maryland is still working to hire someone for their F06 project (Maryland is now working with ACCSP to hire a contractor under the Administrative Grant) so maybe they could have the person start in March 2007, instead of January or February 2007, that way they would not need FY07 funding.

The Maryland Operations Committee member spoke to her supervisors to see if they wanted to pull the proposal for the FY07 funding cycle. Their response was that they would be willing to withdraw the proposal this year and turn in for next year if there was a guarantee it would get funded next year. The Operations Committee said they could not guarantee funding, but they felt it had a good chance of being funded next year. Maryland does not want to hire a person and then not be able to keep them so it was decided that the Maryland proposal would stay in for consideration.

10. NJ DEP: A Pilot Program to Develop a Vessel-Based Reporting System for the New Jersey Oyster Fishery

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee felt it was an innovative proposal.

11. RI RFW: Coordination and Development of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP

Rhode Island is going through its own peer review process at the moment and it is trying to find money to support its ACCSP projects instead of having to submit proposals to ACCSP every year.

12. ME DMR: Implementation of a Mandatory Dealer Reporting System for Maine

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee was pleased with the rewrite of the proposal and felt a significant amount of information was added.

13. NMFS – NERO collaboration with NY DEC: Development and Deployment of a Prototype Reporting Compliance and Quota Monitoring Toolbox

Operations Committee members wondered if the Toolbox was going to be integrated with SAFIS and wanted the project PIs to work with ACCSP and M. Cahall to make it a collaborative effort.

The Operations Committee member from NMFS-NERO said working with ACCSP on the project was always the plan.

The Operations Committee liked the project and said it would be beneficial to many partners, but only if it were a collaborative effort with ACCSP.

14. NJ DEP: Implementation of Electronic Vessel Trip Reporting, Biological Characterization, and Continuance of SAFIS Coordination for the State of NJ

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee believed the rewrite of this proposal made it better.

15. NY DEC: Continuation and Expansion of the New York State Fishery Dependent Data Collection and Continuation and Expansion of New York State Biological Sampling

There were no comments on this proposal from the Ops or Advisory Committees, other than NY needs to get caught up with reporting requirements.

16. ACCSP Advisory Committee: A Pilot Study To Develop A Real-Time Reporting System for Vessel Trip Reports Using A Vessel Monitoring System for Party Boats

The Advisory Committee is very supportive of the project. It would provide real time data reporting and get rid of paper reporting.

The proposal added ACCSP as the administrative contractor since NMFS couldn't partner in the first year, but M. Osborn said no one spoke to her about this.

The proposal was unclear about what would happen if the project received year 1 funding, but did not receive year 2 funding.

The proposal was unclear how real time data fits with ACCSP goals. Currently, VTRs are not an ACCSP standard.

17. ACCSP Rec. Tech. Comm: Increase Intercept Sampling Levels for the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), For-Hire Methodology of the Charter Boat and Headboat Fishery on the Atlantic Coast (Maine through Florida)

Past Recreational Technical Committee reports are in the process of being submitted to ACCSP. As the projects concern multiple states, the Recreational Technical Committee Chair would like the Recreational Technical Committee to see the reports before they are submitted to ACCSP.

The Advisory Committee was concerned about the continual submission of the proposal every year and the amount of money it requests. It was mentioned, however, that the project covers recreational data collection for up to 18 partners. It just happens that all the partners are included on one proposal instead of submitting 18 individual proposals. The amount of funding that has been given to the Recreational Technical Committee for recreational fisheries data collection is on par with the amount of funding that has been given to commercial fisheries data collection projects.

18. ACCSP Rec. Tech. Comm: Independent Evaluation of Headboat Sampling Benchmark Study By the For-Hire Subcommittee

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee felt this proposal was good and the project needs to be completed.

19. ACCSP Rec. Tech. Comm: Reducing Catch and Effort Variances for Important Managed Recreational Fisheries on the Atlantic Coast (Maine through Georgia)

There were no Operations Committee comments on this proposal.

The Advisory Committee believes it is doubtful a new survey methodology will be in place by 2007 and therefore this information is important to gather now instead of waiting until the MRFSS review of recreational fisheries survey methods is completed.

20. NC DMF: Conduct of Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey Random Digit Dialing, For-Hire Telephone Calls, and Dockside Sampling in North Carolina During Wave 1

The project added dockside sampling this year (year 3).

North Carolina is not included in the ACCSP Rec. Tech. Comm. proposal for Reducing Catch and Effort Variances for Important Managed Recreational Fisheries on the Atlantic Coast (Maine through Georgia). This proposal covers North Carolina needs, just as the Rec. Tech. proposal covers the needs of the other states.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:00 PM

Thursday, October 5, 2006

Ranking of FY07 Funding Proposals

Before the ranking of proposals the Operations Committee discussed if the three NMFS members would rank individually or if their ranking scores would be averaged. It was decided that the NMFS members would rank separately, but that the issue would be looked into further. The Operations Committee was then reminded of how to rank (1.0 being the highest rank, 3.0 being the lowest rank, and the ability to rank to one decimal place) and was reminded of evaluation criteria from the Implementation Plan: preventing backslide, improving fishery statistics, increasing/sustaining confidence in fishery information, developing and maintaining active support and participation by multiple partners.

On a proposal-by-proposal basis each Operations Committee member spoke his/her ranking score while ACCSP staff inserted the rankings into an excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet was then sorted by rank and shown alongside the Advisory Committee's ranking.

Four proposals fell below the funding limit of \$3.5 million in the Operations Committee rankings.

1. NMFS – NEFSC: Characterization of seasonal maturation and growth rates of *Illex illecebrosus*
 - Reason for low ranking by the Operations Committee
 - Data collection resolution went beyond ACCSP standards.
2. NJ DEP: A Pilot Program to Develop a Vessel-Based Reporting System for the New Jersey Oyster Fishery
 - Reasons for low ranking by the Operations Committee
 - Data collection resolution went beyond ACCSP standards.
 - Data would only be from one localized fishery, as opposed to all New Jersey fisheries.
 - Data would not be useful for stock assessments.
3. ACCSP Advisory Committee: A Pilot Study To Develop A Real-Time Reporting System for Vessel Trip Reports Using A Vessel Monitoring System for Party Boats
 - Reasons for low ranking by the Operations Committee

- There is a categorical difference in point of view concerning data collection (census vs. survey) between the two committees. The Ops Committee felt the project did not match up with current ACCSP goals.
 - At the point in time the project would begin, NMFS and ACCSP would not have the time and manpower to help with the coordination of the project.
 - ACCSP and its partners need to do the for-hire evaluation first before money is spent on real-time electronic reporting.
 - Real-time data, while useful in improving quality of information, is not important or necessary for stock assessments. Real-time data is more important for quota monitoring and compliance issues.
4. MD DNR: IT Support for Maryland Data Collection, Storage, and Transfer in Support of ACCSP Objectives
- Reasons for low ranking by the Operations Committee
 - The need to immediately file for a no-cost extension if the proposal was funded. Their FY06 funding will take most of FY07 to use up.
 - Maryland needs to get their FY06 funded project progressing first. However, the Operations Committee would like to see this proposal come back next year for FY08 funding.

There was also a discussion about the North Carolina Estuarine Bycatch Assessment proposal since it was the final proposal to fall within the \$3.5 million budget. A couple of Operations Committee members felt that since it was the third year of a three-year study and because of its sensitive subject matter (monitoring turtle bycatch) that it was important to fund. They even supported ranking it higher. If a rescission occurs, the project is in jeopardy of not being funded. **D. Lupton, the North Carolina Operations member, said if a rescission occurs she would go to the project PIs and see if they could accomplish the project with a decreased budget. (Will contact once rescission occurs)** In preparation for a possible rescission, Chair Patterson asked every Operations Committee member whose state submitted a proposal(s) to look back through their proposal's budget to see if they could shave some money off anywhere.

Update on ACCSP Activities

M. Osborn gave a brief update on ACCSP activities and asked if there were any questions with the FY07 Operations Plan. D. Lupton questioned what sub-task 10c (Conduct focus groups in the SE to determine reasons for lack of industry interest in accessing ACCSP website) was all about? M. Osborn said ACCSP did a baseline awareness survey, which assumed there was good data in the warehouse, to see if people would be interested in using the data warehouse. The survey showed that individuals are not interested and ACCSP needs to assess why that is the case. D. Lupton said it was just a cultural issue (the NC fishing community will probably never go to the ACCSP website to get information and would always contact state staff to ask questions) and that she supports taking the task out of the Operations Plan. K. Knowlton said it would be a good idea to bring the issue up during Commercial Technical, Recreational Technical, and Outreach

Committee meetings to get those committee members' opinions on the matter. The Operations Committee decided to move the task to 2008 for the Outreach Committee to start working on. **M. Osborn said she would postpone sub-task 10c (Conduct focus groups in the SE to determine reasons for lack of industry interest in accessing ACCSP website) to 2008 for the Outreach Committee. (Done)**

D. Van Voorhees thought the discussion on sub-task 10c showed the need for ACCSP to develop a communications plan. Aligning it with users/constituents needs should be an important part of the plan. ACCSP needs to think about how it can reach out to users and make sure their needs are being met.

Demonstration of Discoverer Query applications

M. Cahall gave demonstrations of several Discoverer applications ACCSP has been working on, which included ACCSP's internal committee management application, confidential/non-confidential data access account management application, commercial query application, and SAFIS administrative interface application.

With the ACCSP Committee Management System/confidential access application, M. Alexander wondered if a report on confidential access could be based on a state as well as an individual and if it would be possible to generate an electronic email contact business card from the application. **M. Cahall will see if a report on confidential access could be based on a state as well as an individual and if it would be possible to generate an electronic email contact business card from the HTMLDB CMS application. (Done)**

With the commercial query application, G. Power wondered how smart the non-confidential text was at the bottom of the page and if it knew which page to reveal itself on. M. Cahall said the text was not smart and was displayed on every page even if data has not been removed. D. Lupton and G. Power said it is important to know what information is complete and what is not (the completeness of the data). One idea would be to put an asterisk (*) or color change in cells that have incomplete data due to confidentiality issues to show users that the data is not complete. Currently, there is not a way to show the completeness of the data, but the intention is to build something to show metadata along with the data. It would be done in a way to handle statutory data, regulatory data, weather condition data, etc. and could be linked to the actual metadata application. **M. Cahall will see if putting an asterisk (*) or color change in cells (in the commercial query application) that have incomplete data due to confidentiality issues is actually feasible. (Done, users can now tell when confidential data are not included in the totals.)**

T. Hoopes questioned when the data warehouse was expected to be populated with SAFIS data. M. Cahall said there would need to be another meeting of the Information Systems Committee to make the decision of how and when to actually do it. As that meeting would probably take place in the next few months, his best guess would be mid-2007.

Other Business

Approve Funding Decision Document changes

Due to the additional changes (coming from the NOAA Grants process discussion) being made to the Funding Decision Document, the approval of the document will be addressed at the next Operations Committee meeting.

Compensation for Advisory Committee members

The ACCSP Advisory Committee submitted a memo to the Operations Committee concerning Advisory Committee member compensation. The memo follows:

Dear ACCSP Operations Committee,

The ACCSP Advisory Committee wishes to request an honorarium for their attendance and participation at Advisory Committee meetings. The Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from the fields of commercial, for-hire and recreational fishing, provide valued perspectives on a variety of fisheries experiences, and they are relied upon to evaluate technical recommendations. Their input and guidance towards the continuing development and full implementation of ACCSP is crucial.

Committee participation, however, is difficult to encourage. Each in-person meeting often takes away one to three full days of work, which can lead to losses of thousands of dollars for some participants. This loss of income greatly reduces interest and willingness to serve on the committee.

As a show of appreciation and encouragement for active participation, we believe an honorarium of approximately \$100.00, much like Sea Grant honorariums awarded to those who review grant proposals, would improve and encourage participation on this committee.

The Advisory Committee thanks the Operations Committee for their consideration of this request.

Before making a decision on the issue, the Operations Committee needed more clarification.

- Who actually gets the honorarium? (Every committee member who attends an Advisory Committee meeting, only commercial industry members, commercial and for-hire members, etc.)
- Do Advisory Liaisons also get money for attending ACCSP Technical Committee meetings?
- Is the honorarium per day for a meeting or for an entire meeting?

The Operations Committee decided to form a subcommittee along with members from the Advisory committee to discuss the issues about advisory compensation. Once that occurs, the subcommittee's recommendations will be brought back to the full Operations Committee for discussion. The Advisory Compensation Subcommittee should include 2 to 3 members from each committee. The subcommittee currently includes:

- Dick Stone
- Dave Pecci
- Dee Lupton
- Stephanie Iverson
- Bruce Joule

Staff will send an email to the Advisory Compensation Subcommittee to start planning a conference call about the issue. (Done)

Update on NMFS response to NRC study

M. Osborn mentioned that the report, “Proceedings of Recreational Fisheries Statistics Requirements Management Framework Workshop,” from the NMFS workshop meeting in Denver could be found on the NMFS website, located at:

http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/recreational/Review_Recreational_Survey_Methods/nrc.html

Next Meeting Location

It was decided that the next Operations Committee meeting will be Feb 20-21st (Tues and Wed) in North Carolina (cities of Wilmington, New Bern, or Beaufort-scheduled at NMFS Lab conference room if in Beaufort). If North Carolina does not work out then other location choices are Charleston, SC; Savannah, GA; and St. Petersburg, FL.

Meeting Adjourned

ACTION ITEMS

1. The August 2006 meeting minutes will be made final and posted to the ACCSP website by staff. **(Done)**
2. Staff will post R. Liogys’s presentation to the ACCSP website. **(Done)**
3. Staff will work with all partners to bring them into synchronicity on their performance reporting so ACCSP semi and final report due dates are the same as NOAA Grants due dates. **(Done)**
4. M. Osborn will convene a conference call of the Funding Decision Document Subcommittee to begin the process of making changes to the document regarding performance reporting. **(In Progress)**
5. Staff will post S. Olsen’s presentation to the ACCSP website. **(Done)**
6. M. Osborn will draft a memo to the Executive Subcommittee of the Coordinating Council concerning the issue of making available both the Advisory Committee’s proposal comments and rankings before the Operations Committee makes their rankings. **(Done)**
7. D. Lupton, the North Carolina Operations member, said if a rescission occurs she would go to the project PIs and see if they could accomplish the project with a decreased budget. **(Done)**
8. M. Osborn said she would postpone sub-task 10c (Conduct focus groups in the SE to determine reasons for lack of industry interest in accessing ACCSP web site) to 2008 for the Outreach Committee to start working on. **(Done)**

9. M. Cahall will see if a report on confidential access could be based on a state as well as an individual and if it would be possible to generate an electronic email contact business card from the HTMLDB CMS application. **(Done)**

10. M. Cahall will see if putting an asterisk (*) or color change in cells (in the commercial query application) that have incomplete data due to confidentiality issues is actually feasible. **(Done, users can now tell when confidential data are not included in the totals)**

11. Staff will send an email to the Advisory Compensation Subcommittee to start planning a conference call about the issue. **(Done)**

**Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
Funding Work Group
WebEx, August 10, 2011 1pm
DRAFT Minutes**

WORK GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT:

Name	Partner Agency	Phone Number	Email Address
Eleanor Bochenek	NJ Rec/Com	(609) 898-0928	bochenek@hsrl.rutgers.edu
Dan Costa	RI DFW	()	
Amy Dukes	SC DNR	(843) 953-9365	dukesa@dnr.sc.gov
Kathy Knowlton, Vice Chair	GA DNR	(912) 262-3122	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org
Greg Power, Chair	NOAA NERO	(978) 281-9304	greg.power@noaa.gov

NOT PRESENT: Stephanie Iverson (VMRC), Beverly Sauls (FL FWCC), Dick Stone (Advisor – NC), Andy Strelcheck (NOAA)

STAFF: Mike Cahall (Program Director), Ann McElhatton (Outreach Coordinator)

G. Power opened up the meeting by making certain everyone was able to get on the WebEx portion of the call. After A. McElhatton took attendance he continued stating that he was regretful that he had to cancel a scheduled call earlier in the summer and that work will continue back up with momentum. He also thanked everyone for taking the time to make the call. As a final note to opening up the meeting he asked if anyone had any additions to the agenda. No one did.

G. Power continued by reviewing the recent activity and current goals of the work group. He reiterated points from the call the week before with both the Operations Committee and Advisory Committees that at this point in the funding cycle there was very little opportunity to change the way things are done for the FY12 process. He reminded the work group that he did tell the committees that reviewing a potential shift in how the results would be presented would be discussed for FY12. That is a goal for the call today. As well as review in more detail the results of the funding survey that was distributed earlier this year.

He explained that as a timeline he would like to see any potential changes that are to be made in the FY13 process should be discussed at the October meeting so that results of the discussion can be executed and either brought to the attention of the Coordinating Council in November or be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee later in the year. He also reminded the work group that a lot of the issues with the ranking mechanisms will be reviewed in more detail with during the independent program review.

K. Knowlton presented the in depth overview of the results of the funding survey that was distributed in the spring of 2011. She had distributed the results earlier and requested that if folks had questions or comments further than what she was discussing today to feel free to bring to her. Today she was going to focus on the in-kind question (#5). She proposed just making this comment more descriptive since it is only 6% of maintenance proposals. M. Cahall agreed that it wouldn't be necessary to make a long debate over it at this point. Although, everyone did agree that the in-kind question deserves due diligence but that the time is not on this call. K. Knowlton noted also that if we were to put a lot of confides on it that folks may end up just adding what they wish. D. Costa stated that he feels as though he adds in what is adequate while other partners add in what they wish and call it a 50% match. He thought that cash would be the only appropriate match. E. Bohenek also noted that time is appropriate and it is easier to track. G. Power noted that matching funds and in-kind can get awfully merky and some clear definitions

are needed for the funding process. He noted that using the word match is not what we want to use for what we are speaking in terms of for the ACCSP. K. Knowlton noted that "in-kind can only be funds that are supplied by the partner for work within the work with the scope of the project."

The question of whether federal funds and/or state funds is appropriate was questioned. It was mentioned that all are considered appropriate for ACCSP.

For this year's funding cycle it was requested that all Operations and Advisory Committee members will jot down what they consider favorable or unfavorable in-kind contributions and send them to A. McElhatton prior to the ranking process.

There needs to be a request also (in future years) that the partner commits to staying within the confines of the scope of the work when delineating time as in-kind. Also, those indirect/overhead charges to the grant cannot be used as in-kind. It was also noted that in-kind per state needs to be reviewed. K. Knowlton noted that Georgia does not charge for overhead. K. Knowlton stated she'd like to present the in-kind issue to the Coordinating Council in November.

Lastly, G. Power noted that anything this group does may get overwritten by the Coordinating Council, especially, during the program review time.

G. Power also asked if November would be a good time to bring up the ongoing struggle with continually funding some projects. D. Costa spoke to the fact that he is regularly frustrated with the spinning of the wheels during the ranking process. He feels as though this committee should be looking for long term solutions to the issue on constantly funding ongoing projects. He proposed the idea of a sliding scale that would fund projects 10% less each year. He voiced frustration that the process is bias. He wants folks to get back on track. E. Bohenek agreed and noted that the advisors have been saying that for years. M. Cahall noted that he even had a discussion with G. Colvin who agreed that ACCSP needs to break out of this cycle.

Discussion continued and revolved around the ranking process including the idea that no matter the two committees rank projects the Coordinating Council will fund what they to fund.

G. Power did not that new ways of doing old business does not constitute a change in the scope of a project.

It was noted for the fall that a letter would be sent to the committees from him requesting less subjectivity and to use the matrixes and guides as much as possible.

Also, A. Dukes and D. Costa requested and volunteered to come up with a strawman of a quick way to uncover what the proposals were trying to accomplish in terms of the expectation of the 'funding decision document'.

G. Power also noted that with the review of the projects from project investigators in January that he sees the role of these two committees transitioning from ranking the projects to overseeing the projects.

Lastly, G. Power reviewed the results of the new way of presenting results. He only did the Operations Committee ranking for time sake. Ultimately none of the three new ways changed the ranking significantly. He presented them by 1) getting rid of the ranking from the partner state, 2) getting rid of the highs and lows, and 3) transferring them all to whole numbers instead of averages. He noted that there is a lot of internal consistency among individuals. D. Costa expressed concern that there is where bias lies. It was discussed that bias could be alleviated if results were presented anonymously. That was brought up as a discussion point for the Operations summer business call.

ACTION ITEMS:

Staff will coordinate lists of the favorable and unfavorable in-kind contributions.

G. Power and K. Knowlton will draft a letter to the Operations and Advisory Committee requesting more objectiveness when ranking proposals.

A. Dukes and D. Costa will draft a strawman for PIs to include when submitting proposals to outline.

Operations Committee will discuss presenting results anonymously as the advisors do.

**ACCSP Operations Committee
Conference Call
Thursday August 25, 2011
Final Minutes**

1. Welcome – Greg Power

Review and approve agenda – Greg Power

Folks are scrambling to get ready for Irene so the call was abbreviated and may be interrupted.

G. Power added a review of the minutes from April for approval.

A. McElhatton will send out with an update on accomplished action items.

2. Committee Updates – ACTION REQUIRED

a. Biological Review Panel/Bycatch Prioritization Committee – Julie Defilippi

The Biological and Bycatch Committees as they are informally called presented proposed participation guidelines. J. Defilippi explained that they hope to promote accountability. She explained that they struggled with how to define attendance. It was decided as a suggestion that staff members will look at annually and if they do not show up for a year staff can tell the relevant Operations member than they are participating or not. M. Cahall noted that these would be useful for all committees. It could be added to the program design. T. Hoopes agreed. It was asked if this should go down to the subcommittee level. It was decided against. A. Strelcheck asked about the consequences. It was noted that all should have an alternative. It was discussed if the Operations Committee should have ownership. J. Carmichael stated that a designated alternate needs to be written down. He was in agreement if there was an overall policy for all committees. It was noted that folks have many others things to worry about but if folks want to look at the membership of their state than a mechanism would be put in place to do so. G. Power noted that back when the committee structure was getting under way people were supposed to be relived of 30% of their duties but it can't happen that way anymore. There was still the discussion of consequences. It was noted that looking at other committee (SSC) could bring light to the discussion. For the time being M. Cahall will build a structure that will allow each state Operations Committee member to review their states participation. It was also noted that everyone should remember that their respective staff on each committee are representing the partner agency. If the state member isn't there to raise a significant issue of the state than it will not be noted.

January will be when a tool for reviewing participation (good or otherwise) will be presented to the committee. P. Campfield asked about the additional workload of the topic documents. J. Defilippi

mentioned that that will be rewritten to clarify it will only be for major documents.

b. Commercial Technical Committee – Tim Sartwell

T. Sartwell explained that there is no standard for unknown vessel name for SAFIS. He explained how several partners have brought up the issue for state registered dealers – all unknown or null vessels. He sees that they would like a standard of ‘not named’. G. Power asked if there were any questions. G. White asked if this would be on a pick list. M. Davidson asked that if it is she would like to be made aware whenever there is a change on a pick list. T. Sartwell mentioned that since he aims for approval he will send along a spreadsheet for the review.

c. Outreach Committee – Ann McElhatton

A. McElhatton mentioned the need to coordinate with various partners and combine efforts. A. Strelcheck questioned he has is if this would be an increase in cost. She responded stating that it would be a shift in the usage and not an increase. G. Power noted that they are doing a similar effort at NOAA. T. Berger added that it will not only be a method group but a message group. Since we’re all under increased burdens we could share resources more and more. She also added that it will be an outward expression of the collaborative relationship. A. McElhatton noted that we will keep all old outreach people involved if they have the time.

3. Briefings

a. 2011 ACCSP Funding Work Group – Greg Power

It was mentioned that the group came together earlier in the month to 1) identify stress the importance of being objective in proposal review process and to 2) put together a document for coordinating council that voiced concerns on the longer termed proposal and that it needs to be addressed. He explained that the funding working group is not the place to make a change. He moved on to explain how he presented the rankings differently to the funding work group (also noted he only did the rankings).

- assigned a relative rank within each reviewer (so highest rank was 1 and the lowest 10)
- next he took out the ranking of the proposal and took out there own agencies.
- removed highs and lows

Ultimately, he noted that no results changed significantly.

M. Bucko expressed that he would like to see if there was an average of the Operations Committee and Advisors also set as a third option.

b. *2012 Independent Program Review (Charge of Work Group and Terms of Reference attached with meeting materials)* – Mike Cahall
He expressed that the group had a conference call to set the charge for the 'charge' and 'TOR' and that they were both approved at the meeting 8/4/11. M. Cahall went over the key facets of the charge that the committee (program design (3), key partners (number 4)) and that this time the director will not have so much influence as they did last time. There were no questions on the charge.

He also reviewed the change in budget including that there could be results sooner since funds were set aside to begin work this fiscal year.

G. Power noted that there was a good discussion at the Coordinating Council meeting about the skills set of the potential reviewers. The work group indicated that they want folks that are comfortable with the partners. He also discussed that the review will only go as so far as to review data management technologies processes and not necessarily the back end data needs. He went on to explain that the partners have the right to express the concern that the back ends needs to be reviewed more.

P. Campfield requested more information about the timeline. M. Cahall stated he'd pass it on the committee. There was more discussion about the makeup of the panel and what type of oversight would they need from the Operations Committee. It was noted that the Operations Committee will only be called upon and no extensive work will be solicited.

4. 2011 edition of Program Design (Draft attachment with meeting materials)

It was noted that the Operations Committee recommends priorities as is dually noted in the annual implementation plan.

There will be more consistency in the titles of staff in this document and the administrative grant to avoid confusion.

G. White presented the updates on the recreational standards. He explained that there are suggested changes in geographic scope and waves one action as well as cutting off for 38 days for data.

The suggestion of changing the name to something other than the program design was brought up. Feedback will be solicited.

Plans for October joint Operations Committee

It was noted that the group will review and approve letters to the Coordinating Council, review program design and rank proposals. The meeting destination will most likely be the Baltimore or Annapolis area.

Discussion of Operations Committee items on November Coordinating Council meeting agenda

It was noted that there will be a letter on funding concerns and the updated program design presented in Boston in November.

Action Items:

- Using the attendance guidelines brought forth by the Biological and Bycatch Committees (see materials for more detail) as protocol for all committees. Some adjustments will be made and integrated as an attachment to the next edition of the program design. (DONE)
- Mike Cahall will also be working on a mechanism that can track attendance for meetings/calls so that the Operations Committee member from each partner can review participation easily. (IN PROGRESS)
- Tim Sartwell is moving ahead with the approval of his codes for not named vessels (see materials for more detail). (DONE)
- Ann McElhatton is moving ahead with the approval for integrating outreach strategies with ASMFC (see materials for more detail). (DONE)
- The Funding Work Group is drafting a letter to the Operations and Advisory Committees requesting more subjectivity when reviewing proposals. Also, the Funding Work Group is drafting a letter from the Operation Committee to the Coordinating Council reviewing methods on how ongoing projects should be addressed. (IN PROGRESS)
- The Terms of Reference for the Independent Program Review were looked over and discussed. There was a lot of discussion as to the next steps, particularly, who the reviewers would be and how would they interact with the Work Group. This was said to be fleshed at the call which would be happening in the next few weeks. (IN PROGRESS)
- The program design was reviewed. The Operations Committee still needs to decide if adding a more descriptive title is appropriate. For instance, Atlantic Coast Fisheries Standards: A third Edition of the ACCSP Program Design. (IN PROGRESS)

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP)
 Fall 2011 - Joint Operations and Advisory Committees Meeting
 October 12 – 13, 2011
 Doubletree Annapolis
 210 Holiday Court | Annapolis, MD 21401
 FINAL MINUTES

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Name	Partner Agency	Phone Number	Email Address
Thomas Baum	NJ DFW	(609) 748-2020	tom.baum@dep.state.nj.us
Patrick Campfield	ASMFC	(703) 842-0726	pcampfield@asmfc.org
Dan Costa	RI DEM	(401) 954-7546	dan.costa@dem.ri.gov
Amy Dukes	SC DNR	(843) 953-9365	dukesa@dnr.sc.gov
Tom Hoopes	MA DMF	(978) 282-0308	thomas.hoopes@state.ma.us
Stephanie Iverson	VA MRC	(757) 247-2061	stephanie.iverson@mrc.virginia.gov
Bruce Joule	ME DMR	(207) 633-9505	bruce.joule@maine.gov
Carrie Kennedy	MD DNR	(410) 260-8295	ckennedy@dnr.state.md.us
Alan Lowther	NOAA	(301) 713-2328	alan.lowther@noaa.gov
Kathy Knowlton, Vice Chair	GA DNR	(912) 262-3122	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org
Dee Lupton	NC DMF	(252) 726-7021	dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov
Rod McLeod	CT DEEP*	(860) 434-6043	rod.macleod@po.state.ct.us
Greg Power, Chair	NOAA NERO	(978) 281-9304	greg.power@noaa.gov
Andy Strelcheck	NOAA	(301) 713-2328	alan.lowther@noaa.gov
Steve Turner	NOAA	(305) 361-4482	steve.turner@noaa.gov

* CT Department of Environmental Protection is now the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Available via WebEx (but unable to get it to work): Beverly Sauls (FFWCC), Renee Zobel (NH FGD)

NOT PRESENT: John Carmichael (SAFMC), Jessica Coakley (MAFMC), Maureen Davidson (NYS DEC), Wilson Laney (USFWS), Scott Newlin (DE DFW)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Name	Representation	Phone Number	Email Address
Dale Beaumariage	FL Commercial	(303) 216-9476	9476beaumads@comcast.net
Rick Bellavance	RI Recreational	(401) 741-5648	makosrule@verizon.net
Eleanor Bochenek	NJ Rec/Com	(609) 898-0928	bochenek@hsrl.rutgers.edu
Michael Bucko	RI Recreational	(508) 674-7900	mjbucko@mindspring.com
Ellen Goethel	NH Commercial	(603) 926-2165	egoethel@comcast.net
John Jolley	FL Recreational	(561) 272-2053	jolleyjw@yahoo.com
Jerry Morgan	CT Recreational	(203) 245-8665	8665captainmorgan.fish@sbcglobal.net
Dave Pecci	ME Commercial	(207) 841-1444	dave@obsessioncharters.com
Richard Roberts	GA Commercial	(912) 262-3115	N/A
Richard Stone	NC Recreational	(910) 454-9888	dstone9958@aol.com
Frank Watkins	MD Recreational	(410) 641-5444	frank101@mchsi.com

NOT PRESENT: Rita Campbell (MD – C), Chuck DiStephano (MA –C), Tom Lukegard (MA – R), Louis Papp (DE – R), Kelly Place (VA – C), Edward Yates (NJ – R)

STAFF: Mike Cahall (Program Director), Julie Defilippi (Data Coordinator), Ann McElhatton (Outreach Coordinator), Geoff White (Data Team Leader)

DAY 1: Wednesday, October 12

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

G. Power opened the meeting and welcomed all that could attend. M. Cahall explained that staff is in the middle of dealing with logistical issues with the hotel and that currently we are not connected to the WebEx and there is no internet service for anyone in the room. All in the room took time to introduce themselves by stating name and affiliation.

REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA

G. Power continued with a review of the proposed agenda. A. McElhatton circulated an updated agenda with additions to everyone. The only differences were some rearranging of items. G. Power then also added to the agenda public comment to follow the review of the agenda and an update on the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) for the afternoon of Day 1. There were no other additions. He also explained that lunch tomorrow will be brought in and it will be a working lunch to allow for people to get early flights.

There was no public comment.

UPDATE ON THE ASMFC COMMITTEE ON ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CESS)

G. Power explained to the committee that CESS has requested to sit in on the Operations Committee in an advisory capacity. He explained that this is one of the joint committees with ASMFC, similar to Law Enforcement and that they would send one representative. CESS has asked if there would be objections to their presence. J. Jolley expressed support of a CESS representative given the current economic situation. M. Cahall asked P. Campfield to give the group an update on the activities of CESS. P. Campfield explained that CESS hasn't had many meetings but they have become active again. One of their ideas was to reengage with ACCSP by having Ray Rhodes act as representative on the Operations Committee. A. McElhatton explained to the group that she presented at the latest meeting of CESS (8/30/2011) to engage them in the review and update of the Program Design. R. Bellavance moved to invite them as a liaison, seconded by E. Goethel.

M. Cahall noted that they would be a liaison and not a voting member. G. Power asked if as a new member they would be able to submit a proposal as a committee. M. Cahall confirmed that they would, noting that there are not a lot of funds available for that module. It was also noted that they would not be participating in the ranking. D. Lupton noted that they would be at the same level as the Recreational Technical Committee or Commercial Technical Committee. G. Power noted that the representative's comments would be taken as any other public comment, without actually participating in the rankings. Comments could be submitted via ASMFC representative on the Operations Committee (at this time is P. Campfield).

REVIEW FUNDING DECISION PROCESS (FUNDING WORK GROUP)

G. Power summarized recent activities of the Funding Work Group relative to suggested changes to the FY2012 and FY13. He explained that the major FY2012 change was to have anonymous rankings done by the Operations Committee just as the advisors do.

It was also noted that the positions of the chairs of the Operations and Advisory Committees sit on this Work Group and for the coming year those two seats will be replaced. The Operations and Advisory

Committee chair will be on the committee so G. Power and M. Bucko will need to be replaced with the newly elected chairs. It was mentioned that M. Bucko and G. Power are more than welcome to remain on the work group and both agreed that they would.

K. Knowlton noted that anything of substance that is possibly going to be presented to the Coordinating Council in November needs to be approved at this meeting. She noted that since there is the independent program review process also about to be underway that she is cautious about recommending any significant changes.

G. Power continued with the progress of the work group reminding the two committees that a survey was distributed to both committees and responses were reviewed by the work group. The in-kind issue was deemed to represent only 6% of the ranking score within maintenance projects (and similar percentage for new proposals) and therefore it was decided that it was not a significant enough portion of the rankings to get buried in details of delineating what can/cannot be used as in-kind. However, comments could be made on this issue during the ranking process, including if someone questioned specific item listed as in-kind. However, no changes to the rankings would be made.

He also reviewed that the work group went through the various options for reviewing rankings, including removing a partner's rank of their own proposal, removing the high and low scores, and using the ordinal rank as the score, rather than the each partner's numeric score. He noted that these changes made little difference and no changes were recommended.

Continued funding and a sliding scale were also discussed by the work group (i.e., after first year of funding, reduce amount by a set percentage in each subsequent year funded). A. Dukes noted since many of the maintenance proposals use the same language annually (and many states are in financial need and continually submitting) then an abridged version of details could be used. D. Costa mentioned that a data quality component was necessary. K. Knowlton mentioned that there is a proposed strawman in production by the funding group. She also noted that the winter meeting in which PI's present brief summaries of FY12 projects (likely via conference call/WebEx) will add more active involvement in the projects instead of just ranking.

M. Cahall also mentioned that the NE NOAA Grants Office Administrator (Cathy Bozek) visited with ACCSP staff to work on streamlining the process for the PIs. He explained that she sent a list of suggestions that he forwarded on to the working group for discussion. He highlighted that she noted that ACCSP should be monitoring the partner's level of drawing down on the grant funds and that she will send routine information. One of the benefits/challenges would be that this would make partners more accountable for each dollar spent. T. Hoopes mentioned that the grants office told him that remaining funds would be rolled over into his next year. G. Power mentioned that he has been told this is not true.

M. Cahall also mentioned that C. Bozek also suggested that the proposals should align more to what the NOAA grants office needs. E. Goethel disagreed stating that there are ACCSP needs that NOAA doesn't share. K. Knowlton noted that Bozek's comments were focused on the budget narrative. D. Lupton stated that all of this is best worked on through the Funding Work Group first. She also asked that that group keep in mind that some proposals are further complicated by having multiple partners, and thus then need to be broken out and submitted individually to the NOAA grants office.

G. Power noted that the draw down information should lead to more involvement in oversight and follow-up by Operations Committee.

K. Knowlton asked if the in-kind and ranking score issues recommended by the work group were accepted by the committees. There were no objections. She also asked the committees if they want to task the Funding Work Group with continued discussion/options for long term funding of maintenance projects. There was consensus to do so. She also noted that the work group will get more details on the rollover and incorporation of inclusion of the budget narrative changes from ACCSP staff and the NOAA Grants Office Administrator (noting that the NE and SE should both be researched).

G. Power and K. Knowlton continued with potential changes to the FY2011 Funding Decisions Document (FDD) for FY13. They explained that ultimately they sought to clarify additions and changes for a 'maintenance project' and what constitutes a 'new project'. Also, 'in-kind' was addressed and deletion of any mention of the technical review committee (TRC) was removed. He noted that the mid-year review would be replaced for the TRC.

G. Power asked that there be a note to have the ability for public comment added to the document. There was much discussion on this suggestion. S. Turner asked if other public comment has been at meetings would this be a review process. G. Power noted that the public comment would remain at the meeting and that this is not an official public comment process. M. Cahall noted that staff could extend that the proposals are available. D. Lupton noted that the advisors stand in that role of providing public comment on proposals already. D. Beaumariage agreed. K. Knowlton noted that a public process is defined in the program design as dictated by the Coordinating Council. D. Lupton noted that the request for proposals is public and is wondering if this should just be internal and proposals not publicly available before awards are granted. S. Turner noted that it needs to be clarified what is part of the 'meeting processes' and part of the 'review processes'. A. Strelcheck noted that the bullets (options) are available in the document if needed but the standard process of sending recommendations to the Coordinating Council will be done. K. Knowlton and G. Power agreed that the comment process as noted by the Coordinating Council will be added to the document.

With reference to PIs making brief presentations on currently funded project this winter, D. Beaumariage requested that language be added requesting more flexibility such that a formal publication could be substituted for the presentation. G. Power noted that formal publications would not be completed in time since the work of these projects would only be at the mid-point for that grant cycle. The mid-point conference calls are planned for January/February via WebEx. This timing allows PIs to have made some headway on their projects. D. Lupton noted that funds in the southeast often work on a different cycle and that should be investigated by the work group to see when they get funds so PIs can be ready.

It was suggested that for projects that are funded several years in a row, presentations could be repetitive and more flexibility on the qualitative/quantitative aspects of the review could be explored. T. Baum reminded everyone that this is intended to be a 5-10 minute presentation including time for questions. A. Strelcheck requested that the work group should consider asking the PIs for a second presentation before the review of the proposals (especially for those requesting more funds). J. Jolley agreed and would also like to see more follow-up on how the data are used and if it is ever used in peer reviewed publications. G. Power reminded all that all the projects are required to submit a report and those are available on the ACCSP website. A. McElhatton noted that after the meeting with C. Bosek, a more streamlined process for submitting the reports (in the Northeast) was formulated for the next year. All PIs will send their reports to the grants office and it will then be forwarded to ACCSP. ACCSP will send a 'receipt' including the link of the uploaded report to the PI. T. Hoopes agreed a second presentation just before the rankings would be useful.

T. Hoopes also asked if this was for current projects or those putting in a proposal for the next year. G. Power noted that this would be all previous year projects as part of the increased oversight process and not for proposal currently under review for funding.

D. Costa noted that the shorter proposal would include some quality measures that would be part of what he would present in January. K. Knowlton noted that the point of accountability has been an issue, but we need to be cautious of including more detail than we are really going to want (e.g., the TRC developed into such a detailed and onerous process that it was dropped). G. Power noted that we are also not directing the projects.

E. Goethel wanted to go back to long-term maintenance proposals and would like to see 1-2 sentences on how their data are being incorporated into the management decisions. M. Cahall noted that they won't always know all the ways that their data are being used if it is in the Data Warehouse. Sometimes you simply collect/maintain data without necessarily knowing all the ways in which it may be used in the future (i.e., data for the sake of data). D. Lupton agreed it is a reasonable request. A. McElhatton noted that all

avenues to which the PIs know how their data are being used are mentioned in subsequent reports and those highlights are noted in the annual report each year. S. Iverson also noted that it is part of the proposal ranking process already. A. Lowther agrees that he likes the idea of taking advantage of lessons learned and is worried if this exercise is limited only to accountability then folks are less likely to present valuable problems (i.e., partner's might not highlight problems they have encountered if they feel it may reflect poorly on the project, and potentially decrease ranking for future projects). D. Stone noted that we do know how data are being used and maybe we just need to highlight it better. S. Turner noted that maybe we need a meeting in September next for the presentations again. A. Dukes voiced appreciation for the 5-10 minute presentations. She also noted we have a review process through the regional offices and that should be sent back to this group. A. McElhatton mentioned that we have asked for those and the regional offices will not share. G. Power added that in the northeast the issue is that the review is done by a single person and they want to keep that person's identity confidential. E. Bochenek thinks that this should be part of the proposals. A. Strelcheck agrees that there are a lot of good ideas circulating but the key is that overall the process is too cumbersome. K. Knowlton asked his opinion on moving the presentations to later in the year. He thought it would be better. K. Knowlton noted that moving them to late summer/early fall would be a busy time of year but it wouldn't be impossible. D. Costa added he thinks that small proposals will have some details and S. Turner noted a lot of the maintenance proposals will have work in progress so an update might be possible. K. Knowlton added that the amount of work completed all depends on when funds are distributed, which was later in FY11 due to the federal government delay.

FY2012 PROPOSAL REVIEW

It was noted that the ranking spreadsheets are available on the website and that rankings should be sent to J. Defilippi if you are an Operations Committee member or A. McElhatton if you are an advisor. M. Cahall provided an overview of the maintenance proposals including the Administrative grant. S. Turner suggested that the 75:25 split be made after the Administrative Grant is deducted. That change was agreed to be discussed tomorrow morning. A. McElhatton noted that NY did not resubmit.

M-1: Managing Mandatory Dealer Reporting in Maine

K. Knowlton asked if comments sent back to the PI were identified. All were pointed out as highlighted. D. Costa directly asked if this project's catch and effort module is 100% through logbooks. B. Joule said he would bring that question back to Heidi Bray, the PI. K. Knowlton noted that it was more useful if D. Costa himself would just email her and ask. E. Goethel stated she had an issue with the socio-economic data and noted that that has been changed. Also, she is still confused on the correction of data inconsistency that is happening. Also, T. Hoopes wanted to know how much of a burden it is on staff when updates are made to SAFIS (Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information Systems) and are they loaded into the Data Warehouse. M. Cahall responded that it is minimal work and refreshes happened whenever needed.

D. Costa also noted that on the overview spreadsheet the secondary module was not listed for Maine, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. He also noted that these are subjective and maybe shouldn't be on the sheet.

M-2: Continue Trip-Level Reporting for All Massachusetts Commercial Permit Holders

It was noted that the secondary module for this project was socio-economic. All comments were noted via highlights in the resubmitted proposal. There were no additional questions.

M-3: Maintenance and Coordination of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP from the State of Rhode Island

It was noted that the secondary module for this project was socio-economic. A. McElhatton noted that this as well as the last one is up to date on reports. All comments received were addressed in the proposal. T. Hoopes asked if there was a new endorsement for whelk harvesters, if they were reporting

in the past, and are there others not reporting. D. Costa responded that Rhode Island has 100% reporting through a one-ticket system for shellfish and this is separated now because the pot fishery had additional requirements. T. Hoopes also noted that the NOAA fee was calculated incorrectly as well as with others. M. Cahall noted he would review all of them and submit after the meeting. T. Hoopes mentioned that it should be 5% of the total, not including the in-kind contribution. S. Turner requested to see the equation that will be used. M. Cahall stated he would share it. D. Beaumariage asked about the sharing of finfish port and sea sampling will be fed through BioTrack. M. Cahall noted that he is reasonably certain that BioTrack will be delayed but that the data will come through the biomodule. J. Defilippi clarified the status of BioTrack.

M-4: Continued Dealer Reporting, Trip Level Reporting, and Biological Sampling for Commercial Fisheries in New Jersey

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to New Jersey were addressed. K. Knowlton noted that she would like it if others would adopt the format New Jersey used. Also, she noted that New Jersey was the only state that submitted an updated maintenance proposal with a budget narrative for the previous year as requested by the committees for final proposals.

D. Beaumariage noted that Table 2 had disappointing results. T. Baum stated that the current project does have budget for the ageing of those otoliths. D. Beaumariage noted that on page 14, New Jersey uses an in-house biological tracking program and asked if this program is capable of incorporating second readings. T. Baum noted he would confirm. T. Hoopes wanted to know if there were species collected that don't need a specific license type and if 100% of catch and effort covered. It was noted that the species covered are listed on page 3. T. Baum also noted that the project supports only quota managed species.

M-5: ACCSP Data Reporting from South Carolina's Commercial Fisheries, 100 % Trip-Level Catch and Effort Data Collection; and Biological Sampling for Hard Part/Ageing of Offshore Species

It was noted that all but one of the comments previously submitted to South Carolina were addressed. A. Dukes noted the cost of logbooks was reviewed but they feel that the current option is what works best for South Carolina including that some people fill out electronic and paper so the state can verify. F. Watkins noted that South Carolina is trying to collect good data and that the system should be as used friendly as possible. A. Dukes continued to state that this one ticket system may seem like a slower option but the data are stronger. D. Beaumariage noted that he likes the portion of the proposal that collect biological data and stated there is a need for more of this.

M-6: Observer Program for Mid-Atlantic (New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia) and Rhode Island Small Mesh Otter Trawls

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to ASMFC were addressed. D. Costa commented that at some point a discussion could be had in Rhode Island to funnel some money to the state observer instead of the federal observer as was in last year's proposal. P. Campfield explained that it was a timing issue for staffing and they are willing to explore going back to state staff. K. Knowlton asked about the reference transferring the funding to National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). P. Campfield explained that that funding opportunity is specific to river herring and could only be used with the expansion of the project as outlined in the new proposal. F. Watkins asked about the difference for purchasing or training observers. E. Goethel explained that there is one federal standard for observer training. She also expressed her gratitude for addressing her comment on mortality. P. Campfield noted that the spiny dogfish statement on page 5 should have been struck from the document.

M-7: Increase intercept sampling levels for the For-Hire Survey (FHS) charter fishery on the Atlantic Coast (New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, and South Carolina)

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to the Recreational Technical Committee were addressed. K. Knowlton noted that the new dockside methodology will not be rolled out until 2013 so references to that in the proposal are now null and void. D. Lupton wanted to know if that change would have added partners that had originally dropped out for this reason. K. Knowlton noted that she did not believe that was an issue. E. Bohenek wanted to know if MRIP funds would ever be put toward these projects. K. Knowlton responded that the process so far will not spend more money on current sampling until the changes in the methodology are implemented. J. Jolley wanted to know size and age range data for the table on page 16. K. Knowlton explained that size data were available, but that hard parts for ageing and gonads are not currently approved for collection within the intercept survey. J. Jolley voiced he is still concerned. K. Knowlton noted that these issues can be discussed during the standards review later in the day. D. Beaumariage was concerned that the efficiency statement on page 7 would box you into collecting everything you could. S. Turner stated that collection of hard parts would have to be separate funding for separate surveys. K. Knowlton responded that that statement specifically speaks to the two bullets directly above that statement on efficiency in the proposal. A partner could only apply for this funding if they currently, for this mode, were between 20-40% proportional standard error (PSE), because adding samples above or below that level were not as efficient as use of funds. S. Turner asked about staffing of full-time employee listed as in-kind. K. Knowlton noted that that was only 5% of full time person. A. Strelcheck questioned the intercept cost differences for the various states. K. Knowlton clarified that it is more expensive when sampling is less productive in low activity areas/waves.

M-8: *Increase at sea sampling levels for the For-Hire Survey (FHS) headboat fishery on the Atlantic Coast (New Hampshire through Florida)*

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to the Recreational Technical Committee were addressed. K. Knowlton noted that there were no additional changes other than what is mentioned in the proposal. S. Turner noted that the PSE charts show total removals and harvest. He would like to see the PSEs on the B2s rather than the totals, because that is really what you are buying. It will probably be a higher PSE but could be good information. K. Knowlton will take that suggestion back to the committee for the future.

ACCSP Administrative Grant

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to the Program were addressed. M. Cahall noted that most comments were semantics. He continued that there are two open positions and gave a briefing on how the shared position with ASMFC will work. M. Cahall also reviewed the additions to the budget for the Independent Program Review.

BREAK FOR LUNCH (OFF-SITE)

FY2012 PROPOSAL REVIEW - CONTINUED

N-9: Update Angler Contact Information for Grandfathered Lifetime License Holders in North Carolina

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to North Carolina were addressed. P. Campfield noted that this type of work along the entire coast may have the opportunity of being supported through grants from MRIP. He also stated that an RFP for that type of work will be distributed in March. T. Hoopes noted that this proposal points to the problem states have with life-time permits and not getting updated contact information. D. Lupton responded that North Carolina used to survey life-time holders, but was dropped because this was extremely costly. B. Joule noted that they require anglers to register annually in Maine. D. Lupton noted that North Carolina currently uses actuary tables to determine at what age a license holder is likely to be deceased, making the license no longer active.

N-10: Observer Program Expansion for Mid-Atlantic (New York, New Jersey) and Rhode Island Small Mesh Otter Trawls

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to ASMFC/MAFMC were addressed. P. Campfield noted that this project is an expansion of the maintenance project. D. Lupton asked if they had thought about submitting this to NFWF program and P. Campfield noted that a pre-proposal was submitted. K. Knowlton asked why the ageing archive was the last priority. P. Campfield stated he'd confirm with the PI, but he believes that it could have to do with trying to include New York and that this project is attempting to target river herring. He continued that the PI would be happy to get only the funding for ageing data, but would prefer the full amount because there really is a need in New York to get their work accomplished. It was discussed that rankings are contingent upon the priorities.

N-11: Normative and Social Influences Affecting Compliance with Protected Species Regulations in the Northwest Atlantic

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to the Program were addressed. G. Power offered to answer questions. E. Goethel stated she felt the intent of this project is flawed. K. Knowlton appreciated her comment and stated she was very much looking forward to hearing from the Advisors on whether this was a viable project. E. Bohenek agreed with E. Goethel that this is not a viable proposal. G. Power noted that he believed that the next step would be to determine how the participants being surveyed in the proposal could not break the law. E. Goethel understands where this information is important, but does that it does not pass the common sense test for a realistic proposal. She even stated she is willing to talk to the PI on this issue. She also questions what the fishermen stipend would be because they would be losing quite a bit of money.

D. Costa wanted to clarify why the 5% overhead was in these proposals. G. Power noted that is incorrect and should be removed.

D. Lupton asked for clarification on how this links back to the current ACCSP social and economic standards. K. Knowlton agreed with that point. She also noted that the PI had done a lot work on improving the proposal and that the PI believes that this work could identify gaps in the current ACCSP standards. D. Pecci noted that this is a little more of a public relations problem than a data problem. E. Bohenek asked why it was not a NOAA Fisheries funded project.

K. Knowlton wanted to know if we should drop this project now. The group decided that they need to rank everything and make comments and then send that up to the Coordinating Council.

N-12: Processing and aging biological samples collected from U.S. South Atlantic commercial and recreational fisheries in response to ACCSP biosample targets

It was noted that all of the comments previously submitted to the PI were addressed. The proposal did not have a representative in the room so S. Turner from the NOAA Fisheries Service –Southeast Regional Office (SERO) answered questions. K. Knowlton noted she still does not understand why federal employees are being funded to attend the SEDAR. P. Campfield also voiced this concern. S. Turner did not have an answer to that question.

D. Beaumariage stated that this should be funded because it recognizes the backlog of ageing. P. Campfield wanted clarification on the species involved and how they coordinate with the ACCSP biological priorities. S. Turner noted that that was in the proposal on the top of page 3. He continued that they have historically had 2 people processing, that will be going up to 3, but it is still underfunded. He also noted the SERO will continue to collect these samples, but they need to catch up on the sampling. J. Jolley noted that this was an excellent example of the need to develop cooperative agreements with state laboratories that have the processing capabilities. E. Goethel voiced concern on why SERO is only processing a portion of the samples and if that could lead to unrealized bias. S. Turner responded that they have just developed a system for monitoring samples in-house and that a part of that was how to best approach that to reduce bias as much as possible.

A. McElhatton requested that if anyone has changes for their budgets to get those numbers to J. Defilippi as soon as possible. G. Power asked if there were questions on the ranking process. There were none.

MRIP

M. Cahall briefed the group on the possibility of ACCSP receiving state recreational license data to assist NMFS' efforts to create an angler registry necessary for the NSAR (National Saltwater Angler Registry). He explained that ACCSP has offered our help in the past because we already do this commercially, but have not been needed in the past for recreational license data. He continued stating that ACCSP was approached last week on the willingness to be a part of this process. He noted there were a number of issues to be worked out but that it essentially comes down to flexibility, funding and staffing.

He elaborated that NOAA would like to work out a deal with ACCSP similar to what they have with the Gulf. He noted that ACCSP would act as the collecting point for data on the Atlantic coast. He stated that potential benefits are access to the data, ability to leverage existing tools to clean up the data, and that it would lead to interesting applications with the data already in ACCSP. He explained that some of the pitfalls include very tight existing state NSAR exemption MOUs with NMFS, and that partners will need time to see if those agreements can be updated/redone. But he does see this as a part of what ACCSP already does. He noted that we don't have enough information yet to provide details on the resources that are needed or other types of details related to work load. MRIP has offered that funding could be part of the deal. He noted that this is being brought to the group today to have a determination made that this is within the scope of ACCSP work and that more details would be provided at a later date.

F. Watkins asked for clarification on whether we would be simply a gathering point or also have access to the data. M. Cahall said it is something to be worked through and currently almost no one uses the commercial list. S. Turner noted that states are currently having issues with commercial dealer lists so they would have to have some support for maintaining the recreational lists. M. Cahall agreed with this point and noted that MRIP acknowledged this at the meeting and plan on making accommodations to the states that need it. M. Cahall noted that the data collection would be an ACCSP issue as opposed to the list maintenance which would be the role of MRIP.

T. Hoopes wondered what reservations MRIP had and would ACCSP merge records (e.g., angler with licenses in multiple states, or fishing modes). M. Cahall noted that if we had access to the data we would have a merge process. T. Hoopes wanted to know who would be responsible for that process. M. Cahall responded that it would be ACCSP staff. P. Campfield wanted to know what the staff work load would be. M. Cahall said it would be a 3 on a scale of 1 to 5 and it would be beneficial to get additional staffing from MRIP.

A. Dukes asked that if we cannot use the data is there a reason to do it. K. Knowlton stated NMFS is currently required to create the angler phonebook, so if ACCSP can assist the states and NMFS with that requirement, and it falls within the scope of ACCSP's mission, that would be of benefit to many partners. ACCSP access to data and those benefits would be additional benefits above the original purpose. M. Cahall noted our server can handle this work. D. Lupton warned that matching these records will be a problem. M. Cahall noted that this would be a value added at ACCSP. She also noted that ACCSP would have to be a contractor and not a MOU. M. Cahall noted that the RTC had similar concerns but thought it was worth pursuing for more details.

This issue will be addressed again in the morning for consensus by both the Advisors and Ops groups.

REVIEW REVISIONS TO PROGRAM DESIGN DOCUMENT

G. Power reviewed the task and thanked all for their hard work. A. McElhatton reviewed in brief the major additions to the document including new appendices (A and J). It was noted that specific references to program names for adoption now are used only in example.

G. White reviewed the specific changes to the recreational and for-hire portions of the document. He stated that the Recreational Technical Committee (RTC) has worked over the last year to update recreational and for-hire data collection and standards.

He noted that the biggest changes are going from waves to monthly sampling (with prioritization of May through October as priorities). Wave 1 would be sampled annually for catch data from Maryland to Florida and every 5 years the effort only from Delaware to Maine and using that as a basis to determine the need for additional sampling. He explained that geographic extent requires prestratification by natural boundaries. There are also goals for improved precision.

S. Turner wanted to know if these levels of precision were different than the previous standards. G. White noted that they were different and are now more precise. S. Turner expressed that he felt that this new precision level had the potential to be extremely expensive and substantial justification should be provided for making this change. G. White noted that the data timeliness workshop was considering the cumulative PSE. S. Turner pointed out that that was a regional, not state, basis and that putting this expensive piece in means that biological sampling may be compromised. G. White noted that the work group felt as though this is a priority. M. Cahall noted that this is the ideal just like the commercial catch and effort standards were years ago. He noted that we need to make progress toward the goal and not something that has to be implemented immediately. G. White noted that Gordon Colvin (NOAA Fisheries Service) and the MRIP Team were looking to ACCSP for the ideal standards and not something that would be the immediate goal. S. Turner thinks that this is a 10x increase in sampling, which is an unrealistic goal. J. Jolley noted that there is a need for flexibility. A. McElhatton noted a line in the Executive Summary which mentions that the standards are the long-term goal. A. Lowther expressed concern about specifying PSEs when so much study on this issue is still ongoing. G. White wants to know if the concern is high enough to remand this back to the Recreational Technical Committee. R. McLeod stated he agrees that it is tough to put specific numbers on things.

A. Lowther stated he is uncomfortable making decisions because there has not been enough time to review the document. E. Bohenek agreed since they just received the document the previous Thursday. D. Lupton noted that in the past these documents have had source documents to outline/justify these changes and that would be beneficial. She stated that this is too early and in the past the decision document has been voted on item by item. K. Knowlton strongly supports that concept. G. Power stated that the process, including creating the decision document, will be presented to the Coordinating Council.

It was decided staff will pull together a decision document and the remainder of today's discussion would be limited to the major changes that occurred.

G. White noted that updates included supporting innovative methods and state conduct of interviews. T. Hoopes had a question about section 4 and the reference to table 5 and the lack of need to track an individual. In table 7, it seems that we are tracking the individual. G. White noted that the catch data do not need to be brought back to the individual level, but does need to collect the individual information so that we can validate that the interview occurred. K. Knowlton noted that we can clarify this language. G. White stated that based on the Gulf survey results the language in the charter/head boat section has been changed to allow for flexibility in methods based on circumstances. He noted that last week at the RTC meeting they got feedback from the Gulf MRIP pilot and ended up with about 70% response rates.

G. White also noted that another change was to the submission timeline, moving to 30 days and should not exceed 38. D. Pecci thanked the group for allowing this flexibility. K. Knowlton noted that the introduction to both the charter and headboat sections now have that survey or sampling methods can be used, given specific parameters, with neither preferred. A. Lowther wanted to know if there would be revisions to this document based on the results of the MRIP Gulf for-hire pilot study. This was discussed extensively by the RTC and this set of options is designed so that it hopefully wouldn't have to change based on the result of a single pilot. G. White noted that the very detailed information on sampler training in the old version has been moved to the appendix.

G. Power noted that it seems that these comments need to go back to the RTC.

J. Defilippi explained the changes to the Biological and Bycatch sections. K. Knowlton noted that references to MRFSS would need to be removed.

G. White noted that updates to the commercial section were primarily limited to the confidentiality section. There is also a section that discusses conversion factors up to whole weight, and has added a start and end date. T. Hoopes wonders since often requests for confidential data come from an entire committee, if it is working on a stock assessment, if it would be possible to grant access to the entire group instead of each person applying individually. This would then make it easier on people, like himself, that grant requests. G. White explained that if a group member changed then the whole group would have to re-apply. T. Hoopes also noted that on table 2 data related to recreational anglers is usually listed as 'number of hours' fished, and is confused by use of 'total soak time' for hook and line gear. K. Knowlton clarified that the current intercept survey asks both total time spend on the fishing trip, as well as subset of time in which the fishing gear was actively being fished, with the latter essentially total soak time. But language could be clarified. G. White will work with T. Sartwell.

A. McElhatton noted the minimal changes to the Sociological and Economic data section. She explained that as the standards are evolving Appendix J will be updated.

With no further questions the process for reviewing the document continued. D. Lupton suggested that she would like a decision document to bring back to her staff for their review. M. Cahall agreed and asked if 30 days for comments is adequate. All agreed. At that point comments would go back to committees and a new version could be reviewed and sent to the Coordinating Council. P. Campfield wondered about the timeline. M. Cahall noted that the delays in the MRIP schedule in implementing new intercept and effort methods until 2013 gives ACCSP more time and he mentioned that the program review is not a factor. The new goal will be to have the Coordinating Council approve it at their February meeting.

There was brief discussion on the guidelines for ranking the proposals and the meeting was adjourned at 4pm so members could work on their ranking spreadsheets.

DAY 2: Thursday, October 13

ADVISORY COMMITTEE BREAK OUT MEETING

M. Bucko opened the meeting with the opinion that the advisors do not favor funding projects #9 and #11. They feel as though #11 has little application for any results and consequently that it might be a waste of time for all those involved. E. Bohenek noted that she would gladly create a list of reasons that the project should not be funded. E. Goethel mentioned she would as well and she'd also add in ways it could be improved. As far as project #9 they felt that it should be funded through state license fees or MRIP. Also, it was noted that some states have instituted a free lifetime license but people are still expected to register annually.

Next the committee reviewed recommendations for the following years ranking process. Modifications to the proposal print outs and tally sheet include:

- *Secondary* module should read *other* module
- Use lines to separate the secondary modules (e.g., primary and label them)
- ACCSP staff should pre-load the in-kind contribution for each of the project before the final rankings
- Number each tally sheet and project with bold titles
- On tally sheet "primary program module" should also say "include only one"
- Put the state in each title on both proposal and tally sheet
- Tally sheet needs to separate new projects
- Add a blank page so all start on a fresh page

Also, it was noted that a summary of the proposal should be included. A. McElhatton mentioned that this is something the Funding Work Group has in production.

Lastly, it was suggested that a space for “merit” be added but A. McElhatton noted that this would have to be brought up at the Funding Work Group for review.

D. Pecci mentioned that more projects could actually be funded if the meetings like this were not held in-person since he feels all of this work could be done remotely.

E. Bochenek disagreed and thought that an in-person meeting helps to boost morale. All agreed that the in-person conversations help all in the process. This was an especially good point since the WebEx wasn't working at this particular meeting.

A. McElhatton noted that she will review conference call etiquette before each call (i.e., ‘*6’ mutes all and only speak once you identify yourself). For all ACCSP WebEx calls a support line should be made available if a direct email is not.

There was a review of the advisors on each committee.

- Coordinating Council – Chair of Advisory Committee sits in on the meetings as a liaison just as the Chair of the Operations Committee.
- Operations Committee – Chair of Advisory Committee sits in on the meetings as a liaison
- Biological Review Panel – Ellen Goethel and Dale Beaumariage
- Biological Prioritization Committee – Jerry Morgan and Eleanor Bochenek (removed Louis Papp)
- Commercial Technical Committee – Rick Bellavance and Ellen Goethel (removed Rita Campbell)
- Outreach Committee (note it is being reconstructed) – John Jolley (removed Rita Campbell)
- Information Systems Committee – Frank Watkins
- Recreational Technical Committee – Frank Watkins and Mike Bucko (remove Tom Lukegard)
- Funding Work Group – Eleanor Bochenek and Mike Bucko

A motion was made to make F. Watkins the Vice Chair and Rick Bellavance the Chair. All approved the motion.

A. McElhatton will send out the new list to all the Operations and Advisory Committee members as well as staff. A list of appropriate guidelines for advisors will also be distributed including: ability to communicate with members in the fishing industry, knowledge of recreational and commercial industries within the state, and the ability to talk to the state's Operations Committee member.

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE BREAK OUT MEETING

Chair G. Power reconvened the meeting with only the Operations Committee members at 8:15am. He announced that everyone should submit their scores by 10am. He also added that an update on the 1) NE NMFS data management review and 2) meeting schedule were added to the agenda. He noted the other agenda items that would also be covered this morning.

MEETING SCHEDULE

G. Power stated that we've reduced to a single in-person Ops meeting and numerous webex calls and asked if this works for all. B. Joule said he likes it. D. Costa asked if there was interest in video conference. Some opposed the idea. M. Cahall noted that it is harder to cover serious issues without the in-person meetings. Many mentioned oppositions to the calls including that it was harder to jump in on the phone and the calls compete with other people in the office for the attention of the attendee.

K. Knowlton noted that this group may be missing a level of discussion that doesn't happen since so many meetings are shared with the advisors. T. Hoopes asked if the budget would allow for an additional in-person meeting. M. Cahall responded that with the staff vacancies ACCSP can afford another face to face meeting for the Operations Committee. D. Costa wanted to know if the project presentations would be done at this January meeting and noted that it could be a logistical issue. P. Campfield wanted to know if there was unfinished business from the past year. G. Power stated he felt there were many items

not completely finished. D. Costa wanted to know if this pertained to other committees as well. K. Knowlton noted that another issue was low attendance for conference calls. M. Cahall noted that many items will get completed even outside any official face to face meeting. It was stated that the committee will need to meet again to finish the program design prior to forwarding to Coordinating Council. It was suggested that a second in person meeting be based on work that needs to get completed and not just put in the budget for the sake of having one. M. Cahall noted he and staff would need 30 days to plan a meeting and will begin to plan for one in January since the budget allows it this year. It was also mentioned that an official agenda should be sent out to the committee at least 30 days before the meeting to get travel approval.

NORTHEAST DATA MANAGEMENT REVIEW

G. Power stated that a review came out from the request of John Pappalardo the past chair of the New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) but acting in his private capacity. NERO staff met with the reviewer a couple of weeks ago. G. Power wanted to make sure the group was aware that New England is doing a similar review to what ACCSP is planning to conduct next year. He noted that the level will be more detailed in the northeast whereas it will be mid-level and up for ACCSP. He continued that the timing in the northeast was earlier than ACCSP's timeline, with an initial NMFS report due this year. Hopefully that review can help to inform the ACCSP review. The document for the original review is on the public website and G. Power will forward to this committee. The group also looked at Jane Lubchenco's testimony to Congress.

MRIP NSAR

G. Power reviewed the issue as discussed yesterday and pointed out that this would be an appropriate thing to investigate further. B. Joule supported further investigation. C. Kennedy wanted to know the progress of the previous discussion of a few years ago of ACCSP taking over the collection of MRFSS. M. Cahall noted that at that point ACCSP wasn't quite ready and then the National Research Council (NRC) report came out so the issue was not pursued further within ACCSP. He sees that this project would be a first step in that general direction. A. Strelcheck noted that the details of the process in the Gulf are still being developed. M. Cahall responded that we would be doing the same thing and that our goal would be more involvement of the states in the surveys. A. Strelcheck stated that there was some concern for the reputation of ACCSP getting involved in MRIP because the reputation of MRFSS was so bad. He noted that he doesn't see this as an issue because ACCSP would not be doing the estimates. M. Cahall agreed.

C. Kennedy wanted to know when we could revisit the issue with more details. M. Cahall stated that this could be done in January as we will have a document from G. Colvin outlining expected work load in a few weeks. M. Cahall has to prepare a response and this back and forth could be presented to the committee in January. S. Turner thinks it is better to have the registries at ACCSP than at Silver Spring because ACCSP has systems and relationships in place. K. Knowlton wanted to know if we should ask G. Colvin to contact the state representatives about the MOUs and whether they could be updated or needed to be completely redone. M. Cahall noted that is currently underway. D. Lupton asked whether estimates of cost could also be prepared for January. M. Cahall noted that it will be done. P. Campfield stated he thinks ACCSP should be cautious about jumping in and carefully consider how we could use those data. M. Cahall said his understanding is that they are allowed to use it for NSAR and other research frames. M. Cahall responded that we don't release registry data in any way that violates the confidentiality 'rule of 3'. He continued that in a long term vision he sees ACCSP holding the data for research on trends or indices rather than limited to just individual angler license data. He believes it would be beneficial to hold on to it and figure out what to do with it later.

G. Power noted that it sounded like the group felt we should proceed. M. Cahall responded that he would have reports in January. The committee decided that it can be unofficially mentioned to their members of the Coordinating Council, but should not be presented until we have organized and detailed information. D. Lupton noted that we will have to make sure that the next Coordinating Council meeting will need to be

longer than the normally allotted few hours. G. Power wanted to know if this or Program Design was more vital. M. Cahall stated this is a more timely issue.

The decision of the Operations Committee and the consensus of the joint meeting was that this is an appropriate function for ACCSP, but that it should only be taken on through a well-planned effort and with full funding from NMFS. M. Cahall should continue to explore the concept with NMFS and partners and report back at the January Operations Committee meeting with additional information on scope, costs and funding.

ELECTIONS

S. Iverson nominated K. Knowlton as Chair, seconded by D. Costa and it was a unanimous vote.

B. Joule nominated T. Hoopes as Vice-Chair, seconded by A. Dukes and it was a unanimous vote.

G. Power thanked everyone on the committee for the last four years, especially D. Lupton and K. Knowlton. He noted that there has been a lot of progress and a change in the direction to more oversight of what is happening in the Program and providing direction and overseeing the Partners in how they spend the project money. M. Cahall noted the significance of G. Power being the first chair from NOAA Fisheries Service. G. Power notified everyone that this will be his last meeting as a member of the Operations Committee and that Joan Palmer will be taking his place. ACCSP will add J. Palmer to the Operations Committee list. G. Power did agree to remain on the Independent Program Review and Funding work groups.

MISCELLANEOUS

S. Turner expressed additional comments on the ASMFC proposal. He feels it would be useful if they 1) noted the number of samples taken as opposed to the number of trips and 2) show what samples are being bought as opposed to trips that are being bought. He noted that the Recreational Technical Committees provide details are what of being bought and a similar analysis would benefit this proposal. He also suggested the proposal note the specific species and incorporate some of the work done by Susan Wigley and others. T. Hoopes noted that this is only the first year that this project has been done and so the January presentation will have that information. P. Campfield noted that the SBRM is being referenced.

S. Turner noted that on the socio-economic proposal the focus groups will be held without federal staff present so that this project is actually stronger than was discussed yesterday. K. Knowlton and A. Lowther thought that the travel funds meant they would be there. S. Turner noted that we could comment that those specific things could be pulled. D. Lupton noted that she agreed with the comments that E. Goethel made yesterday. C. Kennedy and T. Hoopes agreed with that position, even though they agree that this is intending to collect important information. K. Knowlton wanted to know if we 1) don't fund it because we don't think it is going to work, 2) to recommend not funding it, or 3) if there is enough money, do we let it go forward. C. Kennedy thinks that we have the responsibility of not wasting this money. A. Strelcheck noted that we have to meet the objectives of the ACCSP and also go back to the PI with suggestions on how the project can be improved. D. Costa agrees with those points. D. Lupton pointed out a previous socio-economic study of spending money on a similar project that was a failure and we need to learn lessons from that. A. Lowther suggested that we could partially fund a portion to prove that the project would work and then it could be fully funded the following year. S. Iverson noted that it is always better to provide constructive criticism that is detailed rather than just dismissing the proposal.

REVIEW OF RANKINGS

It was noted that there is a surplus of funds in the maintenance and a shortage in the new funds if the current 75:25 split is kept. The Operations Committee rankings are the same as the Advisors with the exception of the switch between the ASMFC and North Carolina. S. Turner noted that the ASMFC proposal was scalable. D. Costa suggested bringing the excess maintenance funds down and dropping

the ageing from the ASMFC proposal. K. Knowlton suggested discussing that later because she and others feel that the ageing is an important part of that project. The group noted that the numbers are very close this year and align well with the Advisors. S. Iverson and others noted that this shows a maturity of the process and also that submitters are doing a better job of following the requested ranking criteria. P. Campfield noted that he will have to take suggestions back to his group and for now stick to the priorities in the document. G. Power noted that this could be changed in the future. K. Knowlton noted that we should follow the earlier suggestion by S. Iverson to provide very detailed notes on the socio-economic project. T. Hoopes noted that the Advisors' scores for the North Carolina and ASMFC projects are very different and so that is something we may have to discuss.

RECONVENED AS JOINT MEETING

G. Power stated that the minutes from the August 2, 2011 conference call are tentatively approved and requested that the minutes from the August 25, 2011 call be sent out again for review. Final approval is pending.

M. Bucko announced the new chair of the Advisors committee is R. Bellavance (a commercial representative from RI) and the new vice-chair is F. Watkins (a commercial representative from Maryland).

G. Power announced that K. Knowlton will be the new chair and T. Hoopes is the new vice-chair.

M. Bucko requested the support of the Operations Committee to try to actively recruit new members. A. McElhatton will send out a list of vacancies.

M. Bucko also noted that in their business meeting they suggested some logistical changes to the ranking process all of which can easily be accomplished except the suggestion of adding 'merit' to the ranking criteria. For example, without a category for merit, you could rank a project fairly high but still not think it merits being funded in spite of a score high enough to qualify it for funding. He is looking to this committee or the Funding Work Group to consider this change. S. Turner noted that he sees 'impact on stock assessments' as an appropriate place to consider merit. K. Knowlton stated that there has been some struggle with this before (i.e., some proposals, though ranked high enough for funding, were specifically not recommended regardless of score). She also wondered if adding a few points to the ranking process for a merit category would make a substantial enough difference to result in the change the advisors were requesting. G. Power noted that it is still subjective and could be something for the Funding Work Group to review.

M. Bucko completed the updates from the Advisors joint meeting noting that they all felt that projects #9 and #11 should not be funded at any level. G. Power stated that is something that has happened in the past and will take into consideration.

PROGRAM UPDATES

Independent Program Review

M. Cahall listed members and reviewed the timeline and process. He noted that the purpose is to judge the impact of the Program and is not a technical review. He stated that it will help to write the next strategic plan. He also noted that this group is doing a lot of work to minimize any and all bias. G. Power noted that the process is looking to be solidified by the end of 2011 and the goal is to have a report by the fall of 2012. However, it was noted much of this timeline will be contingent on the availability of the external reviewers.

Committee Reports

M. Cahall noted that all of the committees having been focused on the revisions to the program design over the past year. He noted that the RTC also submitted proposals. He continued on that the

Commercial Technical Committee/Standards Codes Sub-committee updated market and grade codes. A. Dukes also noted that T. Sartwell did a great job at transitioning unnamed vessel information in the database. S. Iverson noted that that can be difficult since quite often if you do not own the information it can be difficult to maintain (i.e., another division within agency manages licenses).

J. Defilippi reviewed the evolution of the biotrack module. She noted that the committees working on this see this as a tool to help catalog what has been collected and not necessarily a place to monitor biological collection targets as well.

G. Power stated he sees utility in both concepts since he knows he often has trouble getting the samples he is expected to collect and that knowing others have them will be a good tool to use. M. Cahall noted that they are looking at ASMFC to test databases and not relying on these committees (Biological Review Panel and the Bycatch Prioritization Committee) to provide too many details as he doesn't see that as their function.

He noted the Information Systems Committee is working on lobster trap tag system with ASMFC. It was discussed that Rick Wahle may be charging for the use of these data. J. Defilippi will research this and bring back to the group. M. Cahall stated he will not allow that to happen.

M. Cahall noted that Maine is in the developmental stages of eTRIPS. B. Joule explained that they would use it as a way to supply charter data to Clarrise by internet, as opposed to always over the phone. There was continued discussion that it is sensible to add in some information on the relative structure of the data used in eTRIPS if it is to be used for stock assessments. M. Cahall noted that Massachusetts is also in the developmental stages of implementing e-1ticket.

A. McElhatton reviewed the new Outreach Committee and the plan to merge/coordinate with ASMFC and other state partners.

The Operations Committee decided its task this year would be to review the program design, review and approve the recommendations of the funding work group, recruit advisors, and review membership, as need be.

The groups reviewed the committee task lists for 2012 and made changes accordingly.

M. Cahall continued with an update of the program stating that the server for the Data Warehouse will be updated. He noted the old one will be repurposed.

He also noted that there is currently a lot of coordination of HMS with partners. ACCSP will provide server resources for the HMS eDealer system which will collect HMS data directly from dealers in the Gulf and Caribbean. ACCSP will write software to provide eDealer with Atlantic coast landings collected by SAFIS. S. Turner reiterated that ACCSP is a major part of the activities of HMS and that it is a very broad effort. A. Dukes asked if the start date of January 1 was still feasible. M. Cahall stated he didn't believe they were working toward that anymore.

M. Cahall mentioned the site visit from the grants office and also expressed gratitude to ASMFC that we were able to borrow funds from them until our five year grant was signed again. The delay was all due to the deliberations in congress.

It was noted that the hand off to the new chairs would not happen until after the November 2011 Coordinating Council Meeting.

REVIEW OF THE RANKINGS

After reviewing the two sets of rankings it was noted how they are quite similar with a difference illustrated in the new projects. M. Bucko reiterated that the advisors do feel as though #9 and #11 should not be funded at all.

P. Campfield reviewed the priorities within the ASMFC/MAFMC project.

D. Costa mentioned that the Operation Committee also discussed the possibility of not funding #11. M. Cahall reminded all that ACCSP may or may not be funded the entire \$3.5M as requested.

J. Defilippi sorted the table for the Operations Committee rankings. T. Hoopes stated that these rankings are good enough to bring forward to the Coordinating Council and major reconstructions of budgets should not happen at this point but overview recommendations would be appropriate. A. Strelcheck noted that if they recommend funding the #9 and a portion of the ASMFC it could work. He also noted that his rankings were similar to the Advisors. It was noted that more information on ASMFC is needed even to make a recommendation. R. Stone noted he gave that project a high score since it involved ageing and that if it didn't it would drastically change his rankings. S. Iverson noted that #9 was in the middle and made a difference if it is kept. The advisors would like to toss it. D. Lupton noted that several options should be presented since budgets may change and proposals on the bottom could get funded. It was agreed that separate options will be presented (Operations and Advisors) for the Coordinating Council to resolve. G. Power noted that the surplus of maintenance funds could also influence the decisions.

The Operations Committee noted that they support funding proposal #9 and #11 if full funds were available and are going to keep all the ranking process recommendations.

G. Power explained he will give a summary with far less information to the Coordinating Council.

M. Bucko will do the same as the Advisors Chair.

Meeting adjourned

ACTION ITEMS

A. McElhatton will work with ASMFC staff to bring on a member of the CESS that will act as a liaison (not a voting member) to the Operations Committee.

The Funding Work Group will continue to work on recommendations listed above (including but not limited to: a strawman 'summary' for proposal, adding 'merit' to ranking spreadsheet, review suggestions from NOAA grants office, research what happens to funds that are not used, and what can be done with the ongoing funding).

M. Cahall will research on what the expectations are for maintaining the state angler license databases for NOAA's MRIP/NSAR and report back at the January Operations Committee meeting with additional information on scope, costs and funding.

M. Cahall will present reports of the progress of the ACCSP/MRIP NSAR relationships including the limitations of the states' existing MOUs at the next Operations Committee meeting in January.

The comment process as noted by the Coordinating Council in the 2004 edition of the Program Design will be added to the FDD.

A. McElhatton will send out the new list of the advisors (and committees they are additionally on) and vacancies to the Operations and Advisory Committee members as well as staff.

ACCSP staff will create a decision document to outline the major changes to the program design and distribute to the Operations Committee. The committee will review with their staff and provide feedback

for incorporation of a new draft and/or further discussion at a meeting in January. The new timeline for the program design is anticipating a release in early February 2012 to the Coordinating Council.

Agendas for in-person meetings will be distributed no later than 30 days prior to meeting.

ACCSP staff will plan an in-person meeting planned for January 2012.

G. Power will distribute the documents associated with the Northeast data review. (DONE)

ACCSP staff will add J. Palmer to the Operations Committee as the NOAA Fisheries – NERO representative as a replacement for G. Power. (DONE)

G. Power and M. Bucko will present the recommendations of their committees to the Coordinating Council November meeting.

P. Campfield will research the order of priorities of the ASMFC/MAFMC and share with the group the possible reductions.

A. McElhatton will distribute advisors vacancy spreadsheet so the committees can recruit accordingly.

J. Defilippi will research potential costs R. Wahle is interested in charging for data.