

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

*August 5, 2021
10:45-11:45 a.m.
Webinar*

Draft Agenda

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

1. Welcome/Call to Order (*J. Carmichael*)
2. Council Consent
 - Approval of Agenda
 - Approval of Proceedings from May 2021
 - Program Update Document
3. Public Comment
4. Review ACCSP Funding Projections and 2022 Proposals Summary (*G. White*)
5. Accountability Subgroup Report (*J. Simpson*)
6. Discuss Atlantic Recreational Implementation Plan Priorities (*G. White*)
7. Other Business/Adjourn

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

**Webinar
May 4, 2021**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chair John Carmichael1

Approval of Agenda1

Approval of Proceedings, from February 20211

Public Comment.....1

Review of the Funding Decision Document and 2022 Request for Proposals.....1

Program Updates6

Adjournment.....19

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

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda** by Consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Minutes of February 2021** by Consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to approve the FY22 Funding Decision Document and RFP as presented to the ACCSP Coordinating Council** (Page 6). Motion by Lynn Fegley; second by Jason McNamee. Motion carried (Page 6).
4. **Motion to adjourn** by Consent (Page 19).

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

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Bob Beal, ASMFC	Lewis Gillingham, VA, proxy for P. Geer
Megan Ware, ME, proxy for P. Keliher	Dee Lupton, NC, proxy for K. Rawls
Renee Zobel, NH, proxy for C. Patterson	Mel Bell, SC, proxy for P. Maier
Nichola Meserve, MA, proxy for D. McKiernan	Kathy Knowlton, GA, proxy for D. Haymans
Jason McNamee, RI, Vice-Chair	Jim Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley
Greg Wojcik, CT, proxy for J. Davis	John Carmichael, SAFMC, Chair
Maureen Davidson, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore	Brandon Muffley, MAFMC, proxy for C. Moore
Joe Cimino, NJ	Mike Millard, USFWS
Kris Kuhn, PA, proxy for T. Schaeffer	Max Appelman, NOAA
John Clark, DE	Richard Cody, NOAA
Lynn Fegley, MD, proxy for B. Anderson	

Staff

Toni Kerns	Jeff Kipp	Jennifer Ni
Kristen Anstead	Heather Konell	Marisa Powell
Lindsey Aubart	Laura Leach	Mike Rinaldi
Tina Berger	Dustin Colson Leaning	Julie Defilippi Simpson
Lisa Carty	Savannah Lewis	Caitlin Starks
Maya Drzewicki	Kirby Rootes-Murdy	Deke Tompkins
Emilie Franke	Sarah Murray	Geoff White
Chris Jacobs	Joe Myers	

Guests

Karen Abrams, NOAA	Angela Giuliano, MD DNR	Vicky Pohoresky, NC DENR
Bill Anderson, MD (AA)	Melanie Griffin, MA DMF	Nicholas Popoff, US FWS
Joe Ballenger, SC DNR	Doug Haymans, GA (AA)	Bill Post, SC DNR
Chris Batsavage, NC DENR	Asm. Eric Houghtaling, NJ (LA)	Eric Reid, Kingstown, RI
Alan Bianchi, NC DENR	Raymond Kane, MA (GA)	David Sikorski, CCA
David Borden, RI (GA)	Catherine Krikstan, NOAA	Tom Sminkey, NOAA
William Brantley, NC DENR	Rob LaFrance, Quinnipiac Univ.	Somers Smott, VMRC
Jeff Brust, NJ DEP	Wilson Laney	Renee St. Amand, CT DEEP
Heather Corbett, NJ DEP	Mike Luisi, MD DNR	Jason Surma, Woods Hole Group
Karson Coutre, MAFMC	Chip Lynch, NOAA	Jessica Valenti, Rutgers Marine
Jessica Daher, NJ Dep	Shanna Madsen, VMRC	Scott Curatolo-Wagemann, Cornell
Russell Dize, MD (GA)	Jerry Mannen, NC (GA)	DeVonte Weems, USCG
Phil Edwards, RI DEM	Genine McClair, MD DNR	Chris Wright, NOAA
Julie Evans	Steve Meyers	
Pat Geer, VMRC	Roy Miller, DE (GA)	
Jim Gilmore, NY (AA)	George O'Donnell, MD DNR	

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

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened via webinar; Tuesday, May 4, 2021 and was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair John Carmichael.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR JOHN CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Geoff, and thanks everybody for being here this morning. It's 9:00 a.m. not 9:30 on May the 4th, the first two items are Approving the Agenda and Approving the Minutes from our last meeting, February, 2021 by consent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Do I have an agenda to display? I expect everyone has that to see if there are any comments on the agenda. Does anybody have any comments on the agenda, raise your hand?

Seeing none here, we'll consider the agenda approved.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: And then, any comment or discussion on the minutes from February, 2021? All right, seeing no comments on them, the minutes stand approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Our next item is Public Comment. I'll say if any members of the public wish to make a comment, please raise your hand. All right, Geoff, I'm not seeing any. I'm assuming that your little box there is updating itself.

MR. GEOFF WHITE: Yes, Maya has that as she is presenting, so we should be good to move on to Julie and the Funding Decision Document when you're ready.

REVIEW OF THE FUNDING DECISION DOCUMENT AND 2022 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Sounds great, then Julie, take it away and tell us about the Funding Decision Document for this year.

MS. JULIE DeFILIPPI SIMPSON: Okay, thank you, John. The Funding Subcommittee met to consider the recommendations that came through the Operations Advisory Committees, and then through the Coordinating Council. The question was to consider the projects that were at the very end of the life cycle, and would be ending the step-down process.

The Funding Subcommittee has made the following recommendation that the projects that are in the step-down process could have a single-year hiatus, and that all of their 2022 proposals should include a short summary of why the extension was needed by their partner specifically.

Then also if the funds from the previous year were spent in either accomplishing their goals, or perhaps possibly in some cases staff were paid, even though they weren't able to accomplish the goal, simply because of COVID or for some other reason. These are the recommendations from the Funding Subcommittee.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay thank you, Julie, and so considering the discussion that has gone into the step-down process over the years. I just wanted to see if there was any discussion on this from the Committee. Julie, do you think it's best to do that now, or review the actual language? I think it's probably fine, this lays out the gist of it, to at least see if there is support for that at this point, before we go on.

MS. SIMPSON: Sure, just let me know when you want me to review the language.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Sure, let's see, so Megan, I see your hand up.

MS. MEGAN WARE: Thank you, Morning, Julie. I had a couple questions, if that's okay.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, please.

MS. WARE: My first question was, I thought it was Appendix A with the projects, so would those projects have gone to 0 in Fiscal Year 2022? Am I reading that right?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, you're reading that correct. Those projects would have gone to 0, and the hiatus allows them to remain in their Year 6, which is essentially 66 percent reduction from their baseline.

MS. WARE: Okay, and then my second question is, I'm trying to figure out, like where the crunch is going to be, in terms of funding, because it seems like if I'm understanding correctly, we're now going to have seven years of projects. I think under the maintenance funding, because the projects that will go from new to maintenance are now Year 0 instead of Year 1. Am I understanding that correctly that there will basically now be more projects under the maintenance funding, and that that will last, kind of until that Year 0 suite of maintenance projects moves through the system?

MS. SIMPSON: That was actually discussed at the Operations Committee, and hopefully I made all of the appropriate corrections in the Coordinating Council Materials. There was a misinterpretation in the way that the language was written for the Operations and Advisory Committees that the intent of the Funding Subcommittee was that all maintenance proposals would be in a one-year hiatus.

The Operations folk clarified that that was actually supposed to not be all maintenance projects, but only those maintenance projects that were actually in the step-down process, which would be somewhere in that series of 33 percent reduction, which at this point is only those that were actually in the Year 6, so it

doesn't actually extend the maintenance series for all maintenance projects.

MS. WARE: Okay, so this would be more like a short-term crunch for the maintenance funding, as opposed to a longer term one.

MS. SIMPSON: Correct, it's a one-year hiatus for those that are in the step down.

MS. WARE: Okay, thank you very much.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay, next up I see Dee.

MS. DEE LUPTON: To follow up on that question, so those that are in the new category this past year, and if they submit again, they will move in the maintenance categories, correct? If that is so, that means that the maintenance category expands quite a bit, with those that should have rolled off are in there along with new projects moving into the maintenance category.

Making that category highly competitive. I reckon it will still go through the review process. I'm just thinking this through, as far as rankings, but someone is going to get cut short here. Even though they are in the step down, it doesn't necessarily mean that they will be approved for funding next year, is that correct?

MS. SIMPSON: Correct, Dee. If there are projects that were maintenance or new last year and they continue, they would become maintenance. Then the ranking process would kick in. If it exceeds that 75 percent threshold, then the projects that fell to the bottom, regardless of whether they are in Year 6 or Year 2, then the rankings would take effect.

MS. LUPTON: Yes, we can allow the criteria to let projects fall where they may. We could still get new projects under the new category. That keeps innovation, but I just worry that some of these newer projects that may want to go into a maintenance mode, just for a couple of years, may get short changed, because these longer terms they were ranked higher. I'm just trying to think through

how this is going to work out, but thank you for the clarification.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: That's a good point, all right thank you, Dee, and next up I see Lynn.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: Good morning. I just wanted to continue the discussion, because it looks like from the way that I'm reading this that if you're states would need to provide a rationale as to why they need this hiatus. I guess I would mean that they are going to provide this appendix with a summary of why the extension is needed, and if there were any funds from the previous year that were not spent.

I guess that means that ultimately this body would decide whether a request is granted. I'm just wondering where that, I guess the Operations Committee would make a recommendation, and the Coordinating Council would decide. Is that how that would work?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, the Funding Subcommittee basically felt that it was appropriate for everyone to actually voice the reasons why there was this need for the extension, and also to note whether or not they had spent the funds from the previous year. Because if the funds hadn't been spent, and there has been an extension, then theoretically there are funds available, and you don't need the additional funds. There is no move to actually make that an official part of the rankings, but the idea of the appendix is to make that information available during the decision process.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Julie, the expectation is that, I'm assuming there will be Ops review of the situation, or recommendations from the Ops, and then a decision by the Coordinating Council?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: This has been a good discussion; I think it has helped clarify the situation. I guess, you know Julie, one question I have, and I'm not sure that it is fully clear, certainly in the language of the statement. Is it intended that this is a done deal for folks, or is it actually intended that as we just discussed, this is more of an opportunity, and you're going to have to provide a justification?

I think some of the questions that should be added are one, are you asking for an extension? If so, why is it needed? Are there funds from the previous year, and how are those funds from the previous year potentially going to be used in this extended year? Ending up with, you know how much additional funds are you asking for, for the extended year?

MS. SIMPSON: The Funding Subcommittee hadn't, I think your additional questions are actually very appropriate. The Funding Subcommittee was looking to give everyone this equal opportunity to apply for these extra funds, mostly because there was the recognition that if extra funds were available, most partners' leadership would say, there is no reason not to try to apply for extra funds.

I know that Kathy is on the phone, and she was part of this discussion as well, and Bob as well, because he Chairs that Committee. If either of them has anything to add to my answers, please jump in and supplement. But I think adding your question, John, about you know do you need the extension. I think that is a valid question to ask.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, thanks, Julie, and I see, Bob, you have your hand up?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: I think your words are exactly right, John, which is this is an opportunity for the partners, not a guarantee. Each partner will have to go through the application process, and justify the extension, and exactly how much they need, if there is any money left over from the previous year, et cetera, et cetera.

This isn't you know guaranteed that those, I forget it's five or six projects, get funding carried over to 2022. It's just, if there are circumstances in your jurisdiction that need extra help because of COVID, or budget shortfalls with your legislative process, or whatever it may have been. But provide that in your application, and then we'll work it through the Ops Committee Advisors, and ultimately the Coordinating Council approval process.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Bob. I agree. I'm glad the Funding Subcommittee talked about this, and were considering this, knowing that last year was a pretty unprecedented year, and likely threw monkey wrenches into some plans at the states, for getting off of this funding as legislatures turn their attention to more pressing issues to them, certainly in dealing with COVID. Richard Cody, I see you have your hand up.

MR. RICHARD CODY: Yes, John. I just had a question. If the proposals are supposed to include a short summary, and there two basic questions they have to answer, you know, why is the extension needed and are there any funds from the previous year that were unspent. It seems to me that the second question could apply to any proposal that was funded the previous year.

It could be part of the decision-making process to fund for the following year. I just wanted to know if there is some clarification on there if it's just targeting the step-down projects that are in their final year, or if it applies to all maintenance projects?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: That's a good question, so Julie, I wonder if you all talked about that, and if not, certainly that is something that could help head off the issue that Dee raised, about the squeeze on maintenance projects that is expected.

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, this question is part of the appendix, because it is something that the Funding Subcommittee wanted the folks who were asking for the extension to respond to specifically. However, the unexpended fund is a report that the Operations and Advisors review at all of their meetings. We as staff, will go to both of the regional offices, and they show us all of the rewards, and it shows, you know this was the amount of the award.

This is how much has been expended at this point. This is when it expires, and this is how much is left. The Operations and Advisory Committee is regularly reviewing essentially how those awards are being spent down, and reminding folks to get an extension if necessary, or in the case of Florida.

They ended up not needing a little bit of money, and they were able to put it back into the process. At that level there is a consistent review of sort of the unexpended funds. We don't ask everyone to specifically provide that. This is just something that they wanted as part of the appendix for this group. But as an overall, we do review that report on a very regular basis.

MR. CODY: Thanks, Julie.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, so seeing no further hands. I'll give you a second, but I think we can probably move on, Julie, now that we've provided, I think good clarification on this.

MS. SIMPSON: Okay, great. I'm just going to jump into the summary of changes. This is the language that was put in the RFP, and in the Funding Decision Document. It's the same language, it's just duplicated. This is what explains, all maintenance projects in the step-down process will be in the same year of the step-down process as they were for FY21. Before I move to the next slide, are there any questions about this language, or any edits that folks feel should be made to this language?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Julie, I do think it probably should be updated a bit, to not make it so sounding

like such a guarantee. You know it says the process will be paused, and I think something that makes it clear as we discussed, that it is an opportunity to pause it and submit a justification, and have that evaluated.

MS. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Megan.

MS. WARE: I may need more coffee this morning. I think I'm still a little confused. I'm reading all the maintenance projects in the step-down process will be in the same year of the step-down process as they were in 2021. What I'm thinking is, in 2022, a Year 1 maintenance project would still be a Year 1.

But then in 2023, you will have the projects from 2020 that were new that apply to maintenance in Year 1, but you will also have the projects from 2022 that were a Year 0 maintenance go into Year 1. Is that correct? I guess I feel like there is still going to be this crunch of Year 1 maintenance projects in 2023, so maybe I'm thinking about this wrong.

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, and this is something that we had language about, the portion of the step-down process is those projects that are already receiving some sort of cut to their baseline. There is that, in these ending years it's that you know you get your baseline minus 33%, then minus 66%, and then you go to 0. If they were in that step down, they're getting the extension.

If a maintenance project is just applying without part of that reduction, then they aren't considered to be in the step-down process. I can tweak that language. There aren't any projects that were in Year 5, so I can tweak that language, and have it simply say the projects that were in Year 6, and that should make it clearer, simply because step-down process would apply to Years 5 or 6, and there is no Year 5. Would that help, Megan, to make it

more clear as to which projects are affected by this?

MS. WARE: Yes, that would help. Thanks, Julie.

MR. WHITE: Julie, this is Geoff, another opportunity would just say the seven projects listed in Appendix A in the Funding Decision Document. The language already has Appendix A of the FDD, the Funding Decision Document. But just for Committee Member's awareness, those specific seven projects.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, does that sound good? Any other comments on this? Julie, are you clear with the intent?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, I think I'm good. Okay, so the other changes that were made, all of the dates have been updated so that they are relevant. The July meeting language in the Funding Decision Document, that has been changed to simply note that the PIs are invited, but not required to be at the July meeting, so that they can answer questions and hear feedback on their proposals.

This is something that everyone has found to be very useful, so we wanted to make it clear that it was a place where we wanted to include the PIs. We've updated all of the references for Year 6, to just say Year 6/7, so that it addresses the Funding Decision Document. Then also, the Biological Review Panel Bycatch Prioritization Committee have completed new matrices which will be in effect for the next two fiscal years. Both of those documents have been updated. Those are all of the updates to the RFP for FY22.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I have one question on the second bullet, including PIs. I'll put on my budget hat and say, is this something that ACCSP would support the travel of, or is this on them, or would they be participating via webinar or something?

MS. SIMPSON: It's only ever a webinar. The July meeting is always a webinar, it's usually a one- or two-hour meeting. The purpose of the Ops July meeting is just to do the initial review proposal. We find that as we go through the proposals, it's helpful

to have the PI there, so that when someone says, I don't understand what this means, the PI can not only explain it to the group, but hear that is the question. That way when they revise their proposal, they are able to revise it in a way that actually clarifies things.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think it's a great idea, and since this meeting is always webinar, we do not have to worry about any added expense, so excellent suggestion. I don't see any other hands, so we can probably continue on.

MS. SIMPSON: Those are all the summary of changes, so I think I'll pass it back to you, John, and to Geoff for any potential action.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, sounds good. Thank you. We would be looking for a motion to approve the RFP, I expect it will be as modified. Lynn, I see your hand.

MS. FEGLEY: Sure, thank you, Mr. Chair. I would make that motion to approve the FY22 request for proposals as modified today, or if somebody wants to tweak that language so it's better that's fine.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Geoff has it up here for us. Motion to approve the FY22 Funding Decision Document and RFP as presented. I think Geoff, just make that as modified, or as presented and modified.

MR. WHITE: Yes, and Maya is actually helping us out on the screen work, so she is taking care of that for us. Thank you, Maya.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Maya, well done, and do we have a second? I see Jason, do you have your hand as a second?

DR. JASON McNAMEE: Yes, Mr. Chair that's a second.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you. Is there any objection to the motion? Please raise your hand. All right, seeing no objections, the motion stands approved.

PROGRAM UPDATES

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I think the next business is the Program Updates.

MR. WHITE: Yes, John, thank you so much, Mr. Chair. The agenda for the Program Update is up on screen, and we'll jump through this. Thanks, John and Committee and Julie for getting it this far this efficiently, so fantastic. A couple of themes that kind of run through all of these, and what I wanted to present to you today, is both some coordination and metrics that have to do with these topics as we go through, a little bit more of what we accomplished so far this year, and in only a few cases do we say this is the plan for the rest of the year.

With that let's kind of jump in, and go one more slide to the Committee Newsletter. The Newsletters have been big on your agenda for a while now. Everybody likes how the Committee Newsletter is going out and the highlights. But a little bit of the metrics that we were able to pull from how it goes out.

The Newsletter goes to about 130 people, or e-mail addresses distinct per month. The average kind of 50 percent click rate of opening the e-mail, as well as following the links in it, is actually pretty high for the outreach industry. We've gotten a lot of eyeballs and contact points on finding out who your other Committee members are, checking the monthly calendar, which includes not just ACCSP activities, but some of the other major meetings as well.

We found ourselves constantly saying, well wait, when is this other group meeting? So, we added some of the major Councils and Commission meeting weeks to the ACCSP calendar as well. As well as following the highlights towards things like

the Data Warehouse. We've got updates on that a little bit later.

We think not only is the perception of the newsletters doing a good job of getting each committee to be aware of what the other committees are doing, and foster a bit of partner collaboration within house. You know, hey this happened in Coordinating Council, let me check with my Council member.

This happened at a Technical Committee. Let me check with that Technical Committee member, and get a few more details. That was pretty great. One of the things that is coming up next about Committee Newsletters is the Advisor's Campaign and Request for New Members is coming up next month.

I believe that's going to be in the May Newsletter, and in the recent article development for Fishery's Focus and things, is also kind of the interviews that we had with some of the Advisors, and Jerry Morgan as well, so Highlights on Committee Newsletters. Jumping forward is a highlight on some of the things to keep the trains running, but we've always paid attention to information systems and security.

The real task here is of course to balance functionality to staff and end users, the security of the data and the other information that we're passing around, and the resources both in-house of staff and contractors, and what partners can provide. Just a couple of quick notes here, it's been a busy several months. The infrastructure of the SAFIS database was implemented, with both new hardware, and moving up to Oracle 19, and patching that up the ways the e-mail configuration was updated.

You've probably seen plenty of things in the news about different e-mail security items. We've updated three of the six data connections with our federal partner systems. Two others will be updated, probably in the

next month, we just had a call last week with the OCIO and a couple of the regional partners to implement, so updated and improved security in those connections. Then the Data Warehouse, kind of circling back up to the top will get the upgrade to Oracle 19 this summer. I mention those things here, because they are functional and they help.

But the versions of Oracle that can talk to each other does take a bit of coordination with our partners, to make sure that everybody can still continue to communicate and get the information that they need on a regular basis. With FISMA, the Federal Information Security Management Act, we gained the authority to connect last summer, and part of that is quarterly self-assessments.

The Security Team is Ed Martino, Julie DeFilippi Simpson, and myself. Part of that agreement is an annual external audit, and that was just completed over the last two months with a high amount of activity and interviews, and tweaks to our systems and documentation that really was we had a contractor doing the external audit, but Ed was supporting that whole process, and he did a great job of getting us through that.

Fantastic progress, strong security posture overall. We have half of the recommendations that we had last year, and those are really at a more granular level, and raise a couple of areas for improvement. Some of those are process and documentation, a couple of them are technical tweaks to the systems.

It's something that is continuing and ongoing. This is our second year in the solid FISMA process, it has come to the third year, where we have been looking at these and moving towards FISMA and monitoring. It's an ongoing phase, it's getting a bit easier as we bring ourselves up to these levels, and appreciate the work that's gone into it, and we've maintained the confidentiality and the functionality at the same time. That's it for the Info Systems and Security updates.

Next slide we move into some of the recreational activities, and what I want to highlight here is there

are three slides. The first one provides a bit of an update of activities that are going on right now, and then the next two are items that I want to raise awareness for, and ask for your feedback, either during this call or afterwards.

Of course, weather is getting warmer, folks are able to get out and get sampling, and MRIP has provided, as we mentioned last year through the Modern Fish Act additional funding for APAIS sampling to reduce the standard error on the estimates. That is for the Atlantic, about \$900,000 a year.

That translates to about 2,100 assignments, and the table shows kind of that percentage of how many base assignments per sight assignments occur each year. How many were added on, and what those percentages are. Again, those percentages are really based on where there was a longer season, greater species diversity, or a need for additional sampling.

Certainly, want to call out a thank you to the states that come traditionally, and continue to do their own state-funded add-ons, above and beyond what this base is, and that is Massachusetts, Rhode Island does some, Delaware does, as well as North Carolina. Thanks to the states that add on all those extra things. The For-Hire Telephone Survey conduct has been, MRIP has made a bunch of changes to the Vessel Directory, including which vessels are doing logbooks in the HMS permit integration that adds to calling efficiencies for the states, as well as kind of clarity of how the data are collected.

Within the FHCS, we're continuing to make incremental improvements to the system, to make those calls, which really while it's a centralized cost at the moment, it saves time and effort out at the states, as well as in the data checking that the recreational team does on a monthly basis. We're beginning to put on our radar planning for 2022, and the

socioeconomic add-on survey. That is done about every five years.

The Atlantic Coast did it in 2017, the Atlantic and Gulf are going to be doing it in 2022, and MRIP has provided some additional funds to integrate that and program that into the tablet data collection that the field samplers are using. Once that's programmed through our side of that, it's be done in coordination and conjunction with the Gulf of Mexico, and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

We'll hand that development right over to them as well. They are using the tablets this year, and so far, getting some good feedback on that, and they have a desire to also implement the FHTS computer assisted telephone interview. They are looking into that as well, and that is really just a big highlight to the sharing relationship between us, and how the funds and the effort we've put into developing it gets shared, and becomes more valuable, the wider the basis that gets used.

Your next item, this is an upcoming item, the Recreational Implementation Priorities are something that really helps MRIP guide the regional priorities across the country to come up with the Strategic Plan. I'm just updating their five-year strategic plan this year. This is a good time for the Atlantic to update our recreational implementation plan and priorities.

Last time that was done in 2017, we kind of did a full bottom-up process, and Rec-Tech Committee was very helpful, in not just defining the priorities in these six items, but also filling in the details of that document. That is, what is the need, what is the next approach, what is the dollar value of what would be requested? This really guides across the board, where MRIP hits, and highlights the need for all the partners, the Councils, the states, and everybody to weigh in on this process, so it becomes a helpful document.

As we move forward, the question I have for you as a group is, are these six items still the top priorities

in this order, or are there additional items that you would like Rec-Tech and staff to work through and add in, as potential other sources. When we presented this to the Operations Committee last month, we did have one e-mail follow up that suggested that volunteer angler reporting and citizen science was certainly an item.

I will note that that is starting, some work for that is starting in the 2021 Action Plan, Goal 3 for ACCSP. We're also supporting an AFS symposium this November in Baltimore, about voluntary angler reporting and some of the standards. However, that is likely to remain an area of interest, what data are best collected via citizen science, to supplement the MRIP general survey. That is one item that we put in here, and what I would ask is if you've got discussion items that we'll pause at the end of this slide, or if you wanted to just simply e-mail Alex DiJohnson and myself any ideas that you would like explored that are bubbling up. At this point I would just take a moment and look for hands, if there is requested discussion.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Okay, thank you, Geoff. We'll give a minute for some hands. I see some going up, so I think that this is a big topic, so we'll get some suggestions here. But then Geoff, I think I would like to hear some about the timing and the plan to make sure that we have adequate time to talk about it, because it is very critical. I think, Dee, your hand was up first, so Dee Lupton.

MS. LUPTON: I'll just put it on the list that we could discuss later, and I really don't put it in the citizen science category, but we need some real-time reporting in the recreational industry. I know that has been out there for a long time, as we, I hate to call them quotas. But they are quotas. We're getting a lot of pressure in our own state to develop something real-time.

I really won't even say it supplements MRIP. I would say sometimes it may need to replace

the general survey, because it should be census level, much like on the commercial side. I would like to see that as some sort of priority, maybe not for implementation, but some discussion and develop the other program that can be either species-by-species or coastwide. I don't know how to address it. That is one I would like to see discussed.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Dee. Next, I have Lynn.

MS. FEGLEY: I was actually just frantically writing down what Dee was saying. I actually wanted to go back a slide. I just wanted to comment on the 2022 SEAS add on to the survey, and just really make a plea that there be some sort of fairly intensive public outreach about this, you know whether it's web based or handouts to the states somehow that can go out with fishing licenses, so that people understand why this data is important.

It's been our experience that people freak out when you start asking them some of their economic data. I know in Maryland, and in our case, you know I'm a little bit talking now about charter and head boats, but it certainly goes for the general public too. People tend to refuse interviews when you go into that economic stuff. I just wanted to bring that up and hope that there is some sort of plans to really get some outreach out there. Thanks.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: It's a good point. Next, we have Jason.

DR. McNAMEE: I think I'll start with saying, you know the current priorities look right to me, and they seem to be in a sensible order as well. I'll follow on by saying, I agree with what Lynn just said, that I think that's important, hopefully plans for something like that. But I think it will help, certainly the folks that are out on the streets, as they say, if that word is kind of out there ahead of them that's helpful.

Then to the comments that Geoff led off with, and that Dee spoke to. I am very interested in that as

well. I don't know that we can every get to levels of census level data, certainly something to strive for. But one thing that I was more thinking about by way of extending this notion on citizen science and monitor angler information, is not just the collection of it, but how do we integrate that into the overall set of information that we have? I think it's kind of two-fold, you know the collection mechanism. I think we have lots of good ideas and tools that are sort of developed for that kind of thing.

It's that second step of, you know people are making this effort, collecting this data, and then it's used indirectly or not used at all. I think figuring out ways to integrate it into the management realm, I think is sort of a supplement to that concept. Well thanks for the time.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, thank you, Jason. You know Geoff and Julie, I think one I would add for is as we mentioned, things to discuss later, is some way of getting better resolution on recreational effort. You know characterizing things as the trip being in the EEZ in a private boat.

It really doesn't do justice to the variety of fishing effort and techniques, and ways of targeting different species that is going on out there. I've long felt that is one of the reasons we end up getting some really odd estimates at times, and struggle with some of these other fisheries that have fairly specific methods and specialized techniques. Richard Cody, I see your hand is up.

MR. CODY: Yes, just a couple of things, as far as VIMS request about outreach for SEAS. I'll bring your concerns to the Office of Science and Technology, and let them know that you have a concern that there needs to be an improved outreach. Then the other relates to the prioritization of voluntary recording. There are two things I would like to point to for this year.

There is a National Academy's Review that I think that the report is expected sometime in July that looks at the compatibility of MRIP with in-season management. Then there is a second report from a MAFAC Task Force on electronic reporting that looks at the feasibility of monitoring methods, and the appropriate types of data that they might be used for, in terms of their ability to collect data for management purposes.

Those two reports are expected sometime this year, I would say the MAFAC Report is probably going to be later in the year. But they I think would be informative in prioritizing any kind of BR initiative. Then the other thing that I will just mention is that you know NOAA supports non-probability methods when they are used with a probability method, to validate the information that is reported.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Richard. Other Committee members? I guess one idea I have, it maybe covers a lot of these things. Not so much a specific priority as much as an idea to keep in mind, and might help many, is finding ways to make better use of electronic technologies, electronic reporting, electronic monitoring, as ways to perhaps make progress on really several of these current priorities.

MR. WHITE: You had asked me at the beginning to kind of touch on timing, and maybe respond to a few of these other points. The first one that you clearly asked was timing. I wanted to raise this now as a thought item. I really appreciate the ideas and the thoughts that have come out already. This is a document that would take pretty much the rest of this calendar year to get fleshed out by Rec-Tech, and would come back to the Coordinating Council for review and approval, either best case in November, or potentially the winter, you know the February, 2022 meeting would be the goal timeline. But putting these ideas out now, in terms of what are the issues that are important to kind of flesh out, is very, very helpful, so thank you.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I appreciate that, so I think we can consider this fair warning that this is going to be

underway, and everyone should start working within their own folks that they talk with on their staffs, et cetera, to try to see what our priorities should be.

MR. WHITE: Yes. Shall we keep going?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think so, I don't see any further hands, so I think we can move on to the next topic. I think it's been a good discussion, and I appreciate the guidance and ideas.

MR. WHITE: Again, I wanted to raise the MRIP Survey and Data Standards that were published in the fall of 2020. Just in the last two weeks there were some website changes in frequently asked questions that were updated by MRIP and their staff, to be very helpful. The Operations Committee had a document added to their meeting.

Really to flag this here is the idea that most of the seven parts of the survey and data standards, most of this is already being covered by MRIP in the general surveys, the APAIS, the For-Hire Telephone Survey, the Large Pelagic Survey. That doesn't really require additional bits or pieces of workload on ACCSP or the partners.

They do provide clarifications for things like Paperwork Reduction Act for alternate surveys, and some of these other aspects. When you get away from the general survey approach, and go through a different methodology, there are some kinds of additional indirect tasks that need to be thought of, and that is included in this area in Data Standards.

Those made a lot of sense to myself and those that were reviewing them. The item for your awareness at this point is the Data Presentation Changes. Sometime this summer the shift to present high-quality data for MRIP web presentation, will be estimates with a PSE less than or equal to 50. Above 50 right now are presented with kind of a red highlight of they

are pretty imprecise, be cautious. But those are going to be not be presented on the website.

The other piece would be to provide annual estimates only for past full years, so 1981 forward, and for the current year instead of providing individual wave-based estimates, it will become cumulative through the year, and that would be you know Wave 1, 2, 3 would be combined, instead of separate Waves 1, 2, and 3, still by state and species and mode, but cumulative through the year.

That presentation would begin this year, and in conversations with all the partners, those wave-based used would be available on the MRIP website for some time, likely through 2022. I wanted to put this on your radars of awareness, as a partner in MRIP data collection. I've already committed to say that ACCSP Public Warehouse Website will match what MRIP does, and we're talking about potential changes in the Data Warehouse for named user login and additional data presentations for Agency staff. Instead of simply presenting for a period of time for the assessment and management to kind of catch up to the available presentation, and the direction that MRIP is heading on this, to use the platform of ACCSP as a standard way to run those calculations and present it out, to help the partners and their staff, instead of pushing that workload off.

Again, if you have questions, you can submit those over e-mail. We'll get someone from MRIP to help gather that information and present to you at a future meeting. It didn't want to do that right now, because when they are able to present these tools sometime in the summer, we'll have a better ability to kind of see what they are talking about, and look at that either at the August meeting or a little bit later. I'm going to pause there, because I see Richard's hand up.

MR. CODY: Yes, Geoff. I just wanted to just add some context to that. I mean basically the standards would affect the publication estimates on the NOAA website, so anything above a 50 percent PSE wouldn't be published. The reason for doing

this is not really just to censor the data, it is really to put us in line with what other statistical surveys do.

There are standards for publication of data that are met by different surveys, such as the census and CVC and BLS and their estimates that they produce. However, that said, the raw data, the microdata that can be used to develop estimates at different domain levels, will still be available, and tools will be available for users to generate their own estimates. It just really affects what we would publish on our website, so that we're more consistent with other surveys.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Richard, and yes. The survey data itself would continue to be available on the MRIP website. I did not have it on my slide. I see Lynn's hand up.

MS. FEGLEY: Yes, I just had a couple questions about this, and some of it may be due to my incomplete understanding. I appreciate your forbearance. But on the not listing data or estimates with a PSE greater than 50, will the website present which species those are? Would it say like, for example, I don't know snowy grouper, no estimate PSE greater than 50, so that people can actually see which species fell into that category? That is one question, and I had a second question maybe after that answer.

MR. WHITE: I think that is an excellent question, and since it hasn't been shown out to me. I don't know what group is working on this. Since we don't have that visibility yet, which was part of why I would want to wait until it's presented alongside the current data later this summer, before we have that discussion. But otherwise, I would rely on Richard, or someone else from MRIP to answer that.

MR. CODY: Yes, Lynn, I can bring that up with the folks that are working on the web queries, because you know right now, we just have a

suite of species that we cover through the drop-down menu. You know if you pulled up one of those, it would produce no estimate, where in a PSE was greater than 50 percent. I'll get clarification on whether if you include a suite of species, you know those are excluded or not.

MS. FEGLEY: Okay, that is great, thank you. Then my second question has to do with the wave-specific data. The first part of it is kind of philosophical, that if a wave-specific estimate has a PSE that is less than 50, you know or even less than 30, for example. Why not present it? Then the second part of that is, I'm assuming so this is going to now be cumulative.

I'll go on in maybe March sometime or April and see Wave 1, and then the next time later in the year I'll see the estimate for Wave 1 plus 2. If I kept Wave 1 written down, I could subtract it from Wave 2 and get wave-specific estimates. I just want to be clear that there will be no way for the public really to go back, and look at the cumulative estimates. If that makes sense. Once you get to Wave 3, you have that cumulative estimate, but you're not going to be able to go back and get the Wave 1 and 2 cumulative estimates.

MR. CODY: Well, yes. I don't think that is going to be the case, because once you're doing a cumulative estimate. Once you reach that 50 percent threshold, it doesn't really matter what the PSE is for the following wave. If you have reached it in that Wave 2, for instance, you could have all of the subsequent waves below or greater than 50, and they would be added, and you could back calculate your estimate.

But the thing is, the concern for us is publishing the estimates on the website. We are providing the tools for people to do this, so I don't think it's an issue for people to go back and subtract the types of exercises to get to the estimates that they're looking for. But you know we are providing the tools anyway, so they will be able to get a wave level estimate, you know still be able to do that. If

it was a privacy concern, yes, we would try to cover that. But that I think would get very complicated.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Joe, you have your hand up?

MR. JOE CIMINO: I do want to say, it is obviously very important that technical staff get a chance to look at this. We're going through Rec Reform Initiatives that are going to require people to see the raw data still. It's been a tough world for the fluke and sea bass fishermen on the Atlantic coast. They pay a lot of attention, and I do have some concerns with what they are able to see and not see.

In 2020, our four main fairly managed species that are recreationally important, flounder, scup, sea bass and bluefish, all exceeded their RHL. I think the public is very interested in transparency, and they are on these websites trying to see who is the culprit. Spoiler alert, it's usually New York and New Jersey.

If suddenly they are not able to see some of this data, I do have some concerns on where it goes. I understand that there are standards. But we all know this survey is very different than a lot of the surveys we deal with. I know it's just the way it's going to be, but I wouldn't be surprised if there is some public interest in losing some transparency.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Yes, Joe, that is a good point. I feel that way too, obviously coming from the Council perspective, in an area with a lot of high PSE species. There could be some issues with transparency, if the fishery gets closed early, or some other in-season accountability measure applies, or even post season if the end of the year is over 50, and nobody can actually see that information. I expect it will raise some concerns with saying, well you don't think the data is good enough to tell the public. But you do think it's good enough to impose restrictions on the public

using it. But I think we'll just see how that plays out in the court of public opinion, and maybe the legal courts as this process goes forward, because my impression is MRIP has made this decision, and we'll just have to deal with the consequences of it.

MR. WHITE: Thanks everybody.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Richard, I see you have your hand up again.

MR. CODY: Just one comment there related to John's concerns. I think we're rolling this out in a phased approach, so nothing is going to happen overnight. I expect that the earliest would be the middle of next year, before we switch to going to the new standard for publication. We do acknowledge the fact that sometimes the data you have is what you have.

But in the interest of improving the survey and the estimates that we get, we have to hold ourselves to a standard, I think that at least the other statistical surveys do, and you know try to work with our partners as best we can, to make sure that they have the data they need to base the management decisions that they have, to make them as informed as they can.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Richard, and Geoff, I don't see any further hands, so I think we can move ahead.

MR. WHITE: Perfect. Thanks everybody for your discussion on that and brining that up. As I said, if you've got other ideas that you would like us to flesh out and find responses for, please go ahead and e-mail those to me after the meeting. All right, the next section is really about software. We've been presenting some of these redesign type ideas in the past.

Just to kind of revision or revisiting, what does redesign mean? It's really being labeled as SAFIS Version 2, the picture under the left was kind of how the online was developed, then the upload was developed, then the mobile was developed, then

they were kind of three different functional processing that were developed at different times.

Therefore, it took a lot more work to keep those aligned and processing the same way, and doing all the same data validations and those things. The redesign for all the different modules, really to look to take the different pathways of data coming in use one set of gears, and process the data the same way.

It's both efficient from a programming standpoint, and it's a bit more robust, because you're putting it in one place, and you don't lose track of an exception that you had programmed in at one point. It provides, you know as you see in the big green checkboxes and checkmarks there, consistency, efficiency, and ultimately flexibility back to the partners.

Because it allows for a change to be implemented across all those platforms, and guess what? Do exactly what ACCSP is all about, which is at least providing standardization of our own tools, in terms of what questions are being asked, how the data are being validated, and how things go forward. A big part of the redesign, and why it's taking a long time is this data processing in the code that goes towards that means to an end, is a lot of invisible, but highly useful and time-consuming work.

It includes the API, the application programming interface that interacts with our systems, as well as other vendor systems, to get the data in. The piece that folks see is the user interface redesign. On the left there is the pictures of the online, so the older version of online you see more boxes and highlights and dropdown lists.

Those things tend to still exist, but if you notice the picture on the bottom of the redesign eTrips interface, it's a simpler look and feel. It's got a better flow to it, and it has more validations that are included in that. A similar

approach has been taken with eTrips/mobile 2, so that is on Android, IOS, and Windows platforms.

The beauty of what's been done underneath this is the switchboard features. Where questions have to show up, based on a user permit or a species, or a whole suite of items that different partners have in place. Once that switchboard change has been made essentially, those extra questions immediately show up in both the online and the mobile setup.

It relies a bit more on the partner management to get that all right. On the other hand, that is where the flexibility comes back in. I just wanted to kind of highlight and reshow you what some of those pictures are, and what that looks like. But it ultimately does improve the standardization of ACCSP software platforms, and it simplifies to the extent possible, there are a lot of people that want to ask a lot of questions, the data entry.

Staff are constantly looking for approaches to improve that efficiency. One of the areas looking forward, there has been a lot of work on spatial map tools, to collect various location information. Instead of collecting up to four or five different areas, a statistical area, a sub-area, a local area, a lobster management area, a shellfish area. You know things go on that pathway.

But to provide tools where, you know clicking within a map grid or multiple map grids for the lobster 10-minute squares allows an easier data entry that can suffice for multiple questions on the form, and still end up getting the partners the data fields that they need for their requirements. Those are some really cool things that are happening, and will continue to be rolled out.

A side note on that is, as some of these new software tools have been released, we're also allowing some of the historical data entry tools to function for consistent calendar year 2020 data entry. There are still some paper forms that are being processed at the partner level, and entered into the system by staff. We expect that to

continue through June, before we can kind of take some of the older tools and retire those off.

We do those retirements and phases in a communicated way, to make sure that those timelines are supported by the partners that are relying on those systems. Looking forward, we hear SAFIS redesign, and yet SAFIS redesign, SAFIS itself is a pretty big umbrella. When we speak specifically about eTRIPS, well it has the mobile, the online, and the upload components. This year those got rolled out on different days, even though they were within a three-month period, and we're still doing some modifications for SERO and other partners. But the intent is to complete the eTRIPS redesign and bug mixes in major programming parts by June. One piece of that is the PC or the E-1ticket used by South Carolina and Georgia.

That functionality has been built in to eTRIPS at this point, to be able to create a Dealer Report for the partners that need it. That is out in test for partners to test, and we expect that to go into production in cooperation with our partners sometime soon, and hopefully this summer. Then the electronic dealer reporting was one of the major forays into data collection for ACCSP, starting back in 2003, 2004, with the federal electronic dealer reporting.

That is also right for a redesign, and the Action Plan had a goal to really move further on that in 2021, eTRIPS is taking a little bit longer, but for a good reason and doing well. While there is a desire to have the EDR done, there amount of work for that to happen and be robust and roll out online uploaded mobile on the same day, means that there will be development in 2021.

Testing probably early to mid-2022, and that production TBD is really reliant on how long the development takes, what kind of testing occurs, and some of the decision points of, should that be release mid fishing year, or is it really better to do it at a calendar year. Even if we're done

with the development and testing side, to not go all in on the production push for these things, until a partner agreed on date.

With that, there are other areas under registration tracking, lobster trap tags, other systems that ACCSP supports. But those are the major focus points I wanted to at least put on your awareness screen for today. With that, a lot of what happens in SAFIS eTRIPS, it relates to the One-Stop Reporting Objective. Julie has been leading that as our Deputy Director, and doing a great job leading at least the ACCSP side of that. The project is led by others. But I'm going to turn it over to Julie now, to lead and walk you through a couple of our items.

MS. SIMPSON: Okay, thanks, Geoff. The One-Stop Reporting Project, the real objective here is we're developing technical specifications for the eVTR system, and the goal here is to enable an operator to fill out a single eVTR and satisfy the reporting requirements of multiple fishing management authorities on the east coast, whether that be SERO or the Science Center with the SEFHIER program, HMS, GARFO, and also the states.

That brings in our team members, and this was an FIS project that Barry Clifford led it up. This is a list of all of the PIs, and as you can see, there is a range of folks from many of the agencies I already mentioned here. On the next slide, what you can see is that basically what has happened is we got into this, and we realized that the project was much larger than we had really been ready to do, especially given the timing of some of the things that are coming along.

We have the Mid-Atlantic and New England mandatory reporting coming along this year. The promise was out there that we would have some sort of application ready, so that folks who had to do this mandatory reporting could do so, and didn't have to fill out multiple reports. What we realized was, we weren't going to be able to do the full objective in the timeline that was necessary. Really what we're doing here is there is the current phase that we're in right now, and in order to meet the

timing objectives, what we've done is we've broken this up into two phases. Our goal for mid-2021 is essentially to have an OSR compliant application, and that is going to be the eTRIPS application. That would allow someone to fill out their report and it will be good for the SEFHIER reporting, it will be good for HMS reporting, it will be good for the GARFO reporting, and then theoretically it will also be important for the Southeast Commercial Logbook reporting.

Right now, the SEFHIER reporting and the GARFO reporting are already covered, as is the HMS reporting. We're making a few tweaks to the HMS for June, just to make sure that it meets all of their requirements. We're also working with the Southeast Commercial Logbook Program, and so our goal is to meet their timelines as they need us to.

Once we get through Phase 1, what we're going to do is we're going to use the existing technical specifications and some new documentation to essentially create a tech spec for this first phase, and then we're going to move into Phase 2, and this will pick up any remaining federal programs. It's also going to pick up all of the state reporting. Really, the objective long term hasn't changed, we just needed to break it up into two phases, so that we could achieve our goals, and this is where we are now. Before I move on, are there any questions?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: No seeing any, Julie. Oh wait, Renee, yes.

MS. RENEE ZOBEL: Is there a timeline for being able to integrate the state reporting, I mean I know this is a guestimate for you, but state reporting requirements with our dual federal permit holders, who are reporting through GARFO, or another federal authority?

MS. SIMPSON: I think what has to happen is, we need to get through the middle of this year and complete Phase 1. Once we do that we'll

start scoping Phase 2. I think the questions at that point will become again, do we bite off everything and go forward and do all of Phase 2 at once, or is there a low hanging fruit and/or some priority, and lobster is coming to mind, of things that need to happen sooner, in which case maybe we work on those first.

Perhaps Phase 2 doesn't happen all at once. But I would say that probably within the next two to three months we'll actually probably be able to be in a position to start scoping that. I think it has the potential to break Phase 2 up, and so we can achieve some of the things that are higher priority first.

MS. ZOBEL: Okay, thank you.

MS. SIMPSON: The 2020 Spring Load, this was another excellent year. Big kudos to all of the ACCSP partners, and also the Data Team staff. We were able to officially release the data four days before the official deadline of when we needed to have it ready. This was really another success of partner coordination.

There were a couple of partners that just were not going to be able to make the deadline, and that is just due to staffing and other COVID related issues. We wanted to be able to present those data publicly prior to our standard Fall Load. This year we're going to have a Mid-Summer Load, and the first e-mail for the Mid-Summer Load actually went out yesterday. We're going to be able to pick up the North Carolina and New York dataset in June, and then we're going to be able to release those data around July 4th. In early July we'll be able to publicly release data that includes all of the North Carolina and New York datasets. There are some data that is out there, but right now it's not complete New York or North Carolina data.

Because of this, what we're going to do is bump the Fall deadline. Normally you see the data in September. That will probably get bumped by about a month, just so that we give everyone a little bit of a break, and we're not constantly doing data loads. But, I wanted to let everybody know that

one, we truly appreciate everybody's cooperation this Spring, especially because we know that a lot of the staff that work with us have also been doing a lot of work for the CARES Act. Everyone has been exceptionally busy.

We also appreciate everybody responding to this Mid-Summer Load, and hopefully this adjustment in schedule by adding a Load to the process, will make data available as soon as possible to everyone. Okay, I'm going to go straight into the Bio Module. The Biological Module has really sort of taken off, in terms of development.

There was a Biological Working Group, and this included folks from the Biological Panel, but also from the Bycatch Committee, the Rec-Tech Committee, some HMS staff, and then ACCSP staff. Really, the goal here was to create biological sample standards that included a unit of measure. They have been able to do this.

The data structures were updated by the Biological Review Panel quite a few years ago, and those have now been implemented as well. But the need for the sample standard to update as well, was really because there are samples that were being collected where codes did not exist, and so those codes needed to be created.

We also realized that there were places where lengths were being collected, where the unit of measure was not being determined. It was important to make sure that we had a standard that met the needs of all the samples being collected, but also had flexibility to adjust to anything new. We have added all of these codes into the system.

We also brought in a couple of additional ones so that we could accommodate some of the existing data, and also provide that flexibility moving forward. What we've been able to do so far is we're moving the historical data into the new data structures in production. We are

also, we have been working with the Jonah crab folks on their upcoming assessment.

Their biological data is being added in, and this is the first stream really to use the new transfer format. We did get comments from folks who have been sending biological data. We have been getting a limited amount of biological data for specific species. Folks that had already been using the transfer format did note that it wasn't easy to change that transfer format and use the new version.

However, ACCSP feels that once you've made the change, then the change is in place and you have the flexibility moving forward. We understand that the change is difficult, but we're hoping that that burden is going to lessen as folks make the change, and also for those folks that haven't been using the biological transfer format. Whatever they come onboard using is going to be new to them, regardless. We're going to continue to do outreach, so we can improve the data flow, and work with everyone on the new transfer format.

We're also going to start seeking out new data streams moving forward, so that we can slowly but surely really start populating the biological module with the biological data that is available at the partner level. Does anyone have any questions before I pass it back to Geoff?

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: I'm not seeing any, so we've got about two minutes left, so let's pass it over to Geoff, and see if we can't move through these last few things pretty quickly.

MR. WHITE: Everybody, we've got three slides here. This is a summary of what has already been posted in the materials for what projects were funded. I don't need to spend a lot of time here, other than making sure that I say a thank you to Florida, for being aware and returning some funds that they weren't able to use on the project that it was intended for with the head boats.

When we came up a little bit less, and I say a little bit, but about \$54,000.00 less than expected in the funding from NOAA, we found ways to make some adjustments, and still fund all the projects. Rhode Island took a small subtraction, which was agreed to back in February. Between February and now, PRFC was really willing to support projects coastwide, by reducing the cost of their project by \$48,000.00.

That may affect some of their completion points, but in their first year they thought that was very doable, so thank you to Florida and PRFC and Rhode Island in doing that. It flags that the Admin Grant about \$138,000.00 less than the Option 1, which was a new Data Team Lead and a new Software Team member.

Then there were further reductions in when we could actually hire those and fill the Data Team position, and cut a little bit more out for meetings and things, because of how the year is going. All those things are happening, and I just want to flag that while we think we're still going to be pretty successful, there might be some associated tasks that we're going to have to change the timelines on because of that.

This reiterates a little bit of the same idea that Fiscal Year 2021 we really prioritized, and the Leadership Team I have to thank for this. The Partner Project Funding, the Admin Grant reductions, the Data Team Supervisor was posted, and offered, but we needed to repost that position, and to backfill the Data Team Lead spot, and have Julie on one job as Deputy Director, instead of doing two jobs.

That is the pathway, and one of the things that is coming up on future staffing. This goes to the Admin Grant Proposal for next year. The Software Team at the moment, and the ACCSP staff in general, has really great capability and backup standpoints on database storage, record processing, some of the programming pieces. However, we are requesting kind of growth in the areas of mobile app development. Right

now, that is all contractor based. The maintenance and deployment of that is something that I see us needing to onboard a bit more. The other item would be kind of the mobile app testing across environments and features. That is something where we've tried in the past to back off a little bit, and request partners to help out with that. But because of the number of features and the number of partner-specific flexibility, that testing gets a little bit dicey, and partners don't always have time to do that testing. To provide robust applications that have been thoroughly vetted and tested, some additional staff time is requested there.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Geoff, you have a question from Kathy.

MR. WHITE: Yes, go ahead.

MS. KATHY KNOWLTON: Sorry, it wasn't so much a question as that I would just like to publicly acknowledge Julie's work in two positions right now. It's continued a little bit on, since you're having to repost, but I don't know how she does it. I've had the honor of working with her for months on a project, and she is the queen of time management and prioritization. I just wanted to publicly acknowledge that. Thank you, Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, very much.

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: Well-put, Kathy, thank you!

MR. WHITE: Very well put. Wherever we need organization, I always check with Julie first, does this fit? Are these good colors? But project management is absolutely one of her strong suits, which is why we have her as Deputy Director, to keep us all moving. I have one more slide, and then there may or may not be questions or time for questions. I think some of these things have already been noted.

There is a goal to include the ACCSP Leadership Team to comment on next year's Admin Grant Proposal before it gets done. The process last year noted the need to get some comments in earlier, so

we are going to be doing that. Also, earlier in the proposal process, is the opportunity for staff to work with Ops and Advisors in the rankings and the awareness to note what impacts are in other proposals or on the ACCSP work load within that review process.

If there are funding items for things like the SAFIS Help Desk that should be part of the partner projects, then we can add those in early in the process. Again, while there are projects that are stacking up in the Maintenance and the New Areas, and the amount of funding. I think we're quickly going to have more need and more desire for projects than funding available. But the Leadership Team and the process in general is really supporting opportunities to find and rank projects that have the greatest potential for regional impacts and efficiency.

Developing a tool that can be used by many partners, the VMS integration into SAFIS seems to be one of those high impact projects that is a year and a half, two years in, and may have some real use coming up in the next year as well. Those are some of the things that we're looking at in our ongoing discussions, and trying to balance out the growth of staff versus the reliance on contractors and the ability to maintain things that we're developing in-house. With that, I turn it back to you, Mr. Chair, and thank you everybody for your focus today.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR CARMICHAEL: All right, thank you, Geoff. Any further questions? We're 10:35, so about ready to wrap it up if there is nothing else. We are done, and we hand it back over to, I guess Bob, prepping for your next meeting.

(Whereupon the meeting convened at
10:35 a.m. on Tuesday May 4, 2021.)

	Partner	Title	Primary Module	Others	Cost	Year 6 Max	Extension
MAINTENANCE	1	ME DMR	FY21: Managing 100% Lobster Harvester Reporting in Maine	Catch/Effort (100%)		\$ 335,662	
	2	ME DMR	FY22: Managing Mandatory Dealer Reporting in Maine	Catch/Effort (100%)		\$ 61,304	\$ 61,312 X
	3	ME DMR	Portside Commercial Catch Sampling and Comparative Bycatch Sampling for Atlantic Herring, Atlantic Mackerel and Atlantic Menhaden fisheries	Biological (70%)	Bycatch (30%)	\$ 26,254	\$ 44,484 X
	4	RI DEM	Advancing Fishery Dependent Data Collection for Black Sea Bass (<i>Cetopristis striata</i>) in the Southern New England and Mid-Atlantic Region Utilizing Modern Technology and a Vessel Research Fleet Approach	Biological (50%)	Catch/Effort (25%), Bycatch (25%)	\$ 132,005	
	5	SAFMC/NCDMF	FY21: SAFIS Expansion of Customizable Fisheries Citizen Science Data Collection Application	Biological (90%)	Catch/Effort (10%)	\$ 116,182	
	6	RIDEM/GADNR USCG	Continued development of a mobile application to assist Maritime Law Enforcement Personnel with fisheries enforcement tasks	Catch/Effort (100%)		\$ 50,000	
	7	PRFC	Electronic Trip-Level Reporting for the Potomac River Fisheries Commission Commercial Fisheries Sector	Catch/Effort (100%)		\$ 209,476	
Total Maintenance					\$ 930,883		

	Partner	Title	Primary Module	Others	Cost	
New	1	MADMF/RIDMF	Integration of vessel monitoring systems and electronic reporting in SAFIS and SAFIS applications through API development and field testing of multiple hardware options: Phase 2	Catch/Effort (100%)	\$86,244	
	2	NCDMF	Implementation of Electronic Quota Monitoring Reporting in North Carolina	Catch/Effort (100%)	\$63,854	
	3	NCDMF	North Carolina fishery-dependent biological data transmissions to the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Data	Biological	Bycatch	\$79,887
	4	NJDFW	FY22: DNA and Bycatch Characterization of New Jersey's American Shad Fishery in Delaware Bay	Biological (80%)	Bycatch (20%)	\$91,778
Total New					\$ 321,763	

Admin	ACCSP	ACCSP Administrative Budget	Admin		\$2,347,039
	Grand Total Proposed				

**Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
Coordinating Council August Webinar**

MRIP: Recreational Fishing Survey and Data Standards

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/recreational-fishing-data/recreational-fishing-survey-and-data-standards>

These standards promote data quality, consistency, and comparability across the Marine Recreational Information Program's national network of recreational fishing surveys.

NOAA Fisheries' Recreational Fishing Survey and Data Standards guide the design, improvement, and quality of the information produced by the recreational fishing surveys that are administered or funded through the agency's [Marine Recreational Information Program](#). The standards promote data quality, consistency, and comparability across these [data collection programs](#), thereby facilitating the shared use of the statistics these programs produce. They reflect best practices currently in place at the National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Census Bureau, and other federal agencies, as well as statistical survey [standards and guidelines](#) published by the Office of Management and Budget.

While the standards were [established](#) in 2020, their implementation will be phased. This will give our partners and data customers time to familiarize themselves with the standards and with changes to the way NOAA Fisheries will present its recreational fisheries statistics. Ultimately, the standards will further ensure the integrity of our data collection efforts, the quality of our recreational fisheries statistics, and the strength of science-based management decisions.

Summary points: Seven major sections that apply to all recreational surveys that are part of historical general survey and/or are alternate state surveys with certified designs. While all are critical for quality data through implementation, the core changes to proposed data presentation changes in 2022 are described in section 7.

- 1) Survey Concepts and Justification
- 2) Survey Design
- 3) Data Quality
- 4) Transition Planning
- 5) Review Procedures
- 6) Process Improvement
- 7) Access and Information Management

MRIP has published data standard 7.2 on estimation as follows:

- 7.2.1: Cumulative Estimates: For each survey year, MRIP publishes cumulative estimates where estimates are available sub-annually, beginning with the first survey administration of the survey year.
- 7.2.2: Key Statistics:
 - 7.2.2.1: Total (estimated or censused) finfish catch (landed and released) by year, state, fishing mode, area fished, and species.

- 7.2.2.2: Total (estimated or censused) finfish trips by year, state, mode, and area.
- 7.2.3: Measures of Precision for Estimates Posted Publicly: OMB has established [Standards and Guidelines for Statistical Surveys](#) that require agencies to identify criteria for determining when errors are too large for a survey estimate to be publicly released. The U.S. Census Bureau, also within the Department of Commerce, [does not publicly release an estimate](#) when its coefficient of variation exceeds 30 percent. Given the pulse nature and high variability of many recreational fisheries, MRIP has adopted a more liberal precision standard: MRIP presents a warning when the percent standard error (PSE) for an estimate exceeds 30 percent and will not publish an estimate when the PSE exceeds 50 percent.
 - 7.2.3.1: Measures of Precision: All published estimates must include a point estimate and a measure of precision.
 - 7.2.3.2: Estimates are not published if the PSE is greater than 50 percent (i.e., if the standard error represents more than 50 percent of the estimate).
 - 7.2.3.3: Warnings are presented for estimates with PSEs between 30 and 50 percent. (Estimates with a PSE of 30 percent or greater are not considered sufficiently reliable for most purposes, and should be treated with caution.)

ACCSP Notes:

These data presentation standards are intended to focus MRIP website data queries that are regional in scope, aggregating to the annual level to reduce PSE and provide data for species most commonly encountered by the surveys. The survey data will continue to be available for download and development of domain estimates.

MRIP is developing updated data queries and comparisons to current data for users to see in mid-2021 alongside the current estimates (wave by wave for all species PSE's).

The changes, when implemented sometime in 2022, will present cumulative data for the current year (e.g. waves 1-3 combined). Prior year's data will only be presented at the annual level. Records with PSE > 50 will not be presented on the MRIP website.

MRIP staff presented the survey data standards to the ACCSP Recreational Technical Committee in June. The committee shared concerns on the workload for state and federal staff to run more detailed data estimates historically available through the MRIP website, such as wave by wave estimates. The RecTech Committee also supported a standardized approach to named agency users. ACCSP and MRIP are developing options recognizing the tradeoffs. One option is to utilize ACCSP resources to support assessment and management data use. That process requires more discussion at the technical level on implementation goals, resources required and time to complete.

NOTE: MRIP staff are presenting the data standards during the ASMFC Policy Board immediately following the ACCSP Coordinating Council.

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
Coordinating Council August Webinar

Atlantic Recreational Implementation Plan

The Implementation plan was first created in 2017 to guide the MRIP strategic plan on items of greatest importance to the Atlantic regional partners. The plan is due for updating in 2022 and was briefly discussed at the spring Operations Committee and May Coordinating Council Meetings. The priorities are also used in the ACCSP's annual request for Proposals.

The prioritized list of data needs, which were reviewed and approved by the ACCSP Coordinating Council in 2017, is provided below:

- 1. Improve precision (PSE) of MRIP catch estimates**
- 2. (t) Comprehensive for-hire data collection and monitoring**
- 2. (t) Improved recreational fishery discard and release data**
- 4. Biological sampling for recreational fisheries separate from MRIP APAIS**
- 5. Improved spatial resolution and technical guidance for post-stratification of MRIP estimates**
- 6. Improved timeliness of recreational catch and harvest estimates**

Additional items suggested for inclusion in the next Atlantic Implementation plan are:

- Recreational in-season quota monitoring as follow up to the National Academy of Science report (website release July 21, 2021: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/26185/data-and-management-strategies-for-recreational-fisheries-with-annual-catch-limits>)
- Citizen-Science angler reporting, data collection and use

The Council is asked for additional topics for inclusion in the 2022 Atlantic Implementation Plan to be provided to Geoff White and Alex DiJohnson by the end of August, 2021.

The draft document will be presented to the Coordination Council for action at a future meeting.