

ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM  
(CSP)

JANUARY 1, 1995 - DECEMBER 31, 1995

FEBRUARY 1996

CSP-1



## INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Statistics Program (CSP) is a cooperative effort among agencies to collect, manage, and disseminate statistical data and information on the commercial fisheries of the Southeast Region<sup>1</sup>. The CSP is designed to provide sound scientific information on catch, effort, and participation that managers need to prudently conserve and manage marine commercial fisheries resources in the Region.

The vital information needed to meet minimum management information requirements is lacking for many important fishery resources in the Region. This deficiency has been recognized by management agencies and attempts have been made to improve and expand current efforts. Although considerable progress has been made in the collection of fishery statistics, the continuing changes in the nature and status of marine commercial fisheries in the Region and the increasingly complex management regimes are creating ever-increasing demands for more comprehensive, accurate, and timely data.

A long-standing partnership exists among fishery management organizations in the Region which have similar or related mandates to conserve and manage living marine resources in their respective jurisdictions and areas of responsibility. The Region's fishery management agencies recognize the need for and benefits of a cooperative program for commercial statistics.

The CSP currently includes four separate data collection activities: 1) monthly landings, 2) South Atlantic shrimp, 3) Gulf of Mexico shrimp, and 4) the Trip Interview Program. The constituency served by the CSP are state and federal agencies in the Region concerned with conservation and management of marine recreational fisheries. Primary data users will be the MOU signatories that assess stocks, forecast trends, and monitor fishery regulations. Also benefiting from the CSP information will be other agencies responsible for the conservation and management of living marine resources in the Region.

The mission of the CSP is to cooperatively collect, manage, and disseminate landings (including finfish and shellfish) and bioprofile information for marine commercial fisheries in the Southeast Region. The three goals of the CSP are:

- To manage and evaluate marine commercial fishery statistics program;
- To collect marine commercial fishery information; and
- To operate marine commercial fishery data management system.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Southeast Region (the Region) includes Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

## **PROGRAM ORGANIZATION**

The organizational structure of the CSP will consist of the Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee (SCSC), Geographic Subcommittees (ASMFC, GSMFC, and CFMC), ad hoc subcommittees, technical work groups, and administrative support.

The SCSC Committee, consisting of the signatories of the MOU or their designees, is responsible for planning, managing and evaluating the program. Agencies represented by signatories to the MOU are National Marine Fisheries Service, Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Mississippi Department of Marine Resources, North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, Puerto Rico Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, U.S. Virgin Islands Department of Planning and Natural Resources, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, Caribbean Fishery Management Council, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

The Committee is divided into three standing subcommittees representing the major geographical areas of the Region: Caribbean, Gulf, and South Atlantic. These subcommittees will be responsible for making recommendations to the Committee on the needs of these areas. Standing and ad hoc subcommittees are established as needed by the Committee to formulate administrative issues and technical work groups are established by the Committee to carry out tasks on specific technical issues. Coordination and administrative support of the SCSC is accomplished through the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

## **PROGRAM ACTIVITIES**

The CSP is comprised of coordinated data collection activities, an integrated data management and retrieval system, and procedures for information dissemination. Ongoing CSP surveys were conducted by various state and federal agencies throughout the year. The SCSC will review and evaluate ongoing activities and provide recommendations for continued operations

### **Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee**

Major SCSC meetings were held in February and September 1995. The major issues discussed during these meetings included:

- identified tasks to be accomplished in 1995 and directed the Data Collection, Data Management and Future Needs Work Groups to either begin or continue work on these tasks;

- developed the 1995 Operations Plan which presented the year's activities in data collection, data management, and information dissemination;
- began development of the 1996 Operations Plan;
- reviewed activities and accomplishments of 1995;
- reviewed findings of technical work groups, and received recommendations from these groups for activities to be carried out during 1996;
- began compiling licensing information for marine commercial fisheries from each state and NMFS in the Region;
- reviewed and make recommendations on TIP sampling protocols and began planning a TIP workshop; and
- began the identification of non-reported sources of landings in the Region.
- Conducted a work session concerning the confidentiality of commercial fisheries data;

Committee members are listed in Table 1. Minutes for all meetings are included in Appendix A and the approved 1996 Operations Plan is included in Appendix B.

### **Subcommittee and Work Groups**

The SCSC work groups met this year to provide recommendations to the Committee to formulate administrative policies, address specific technical issues for accomplishing many of the CSP goals and objectives, and examine other issues as decided by the Committee. Work group members are listed in Table 2. Their activities included:

- The Data Collection met in January and 1995 to address such issues as development of a set of minimum data elements and identification of current and future data needs. During subsequent correspondence, the group revised the list to include minimum elements necessary for general fisheries information, stock assessments, economics, and anthropology/sociology. This information was presented to the Committee for their approval and is being used in current Committee activities.

## **Coordination and Administrative Support**

Working closely with the Committee in all aspects of program coordination, administration, and operation was a major function of SCSC coordination and administrative support. Other important coordination and administrative activities included but were not limited to providing coordination and logistical support, including communications and organization of meetings for the Committee, subcommittees, and work groups; serving as liaison between the Committee, other program participants, and other interested organizations; preparing annual operations plans under the direction of the Committee; preparing and/or supervising and coordinating preparation of selected documents, including written records of all meetings; distributing approved CSP information and data in accordance with accepted policies and procedures as set forth by the Committee; and coordinating with the ASMFC activities regarding the development of a data collection program on the Atlantic coast. Activities of the SCSC for 1995 - 1999 are outlined in Table 3.

## **Information Dissemination**

Committee members and staff provided program information in 1995 via a variety of different methods such as distribution of program documents, and presentation to various groups interested in the CSP and SCSC:

- Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee. 1994. *1995 Operations Plan for Cooperative Statistics Program (CSP)*. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, Ocean Springs. 9 pp + appendix.
- March 1995. SCSC article in the ASMFC monthly newsletter.
- May 1995. SCSC article in the GSMFC newsletter.
- August 1995. SCSC article in the GSMFC newsletter.
- December 1995. SCSC article in the GSMFC newsletter.

If you are interested in any of the documents, they are available upon request from the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission office.

**TABLE 1.**

**SCSC MEMBERS FOR 1995**

Steven Atran  
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council  
5401 West Kennedy Boulevard, #331  
Tampa, FL 33609-2486  
(813) 228-2815 FAX (813) 225-7015  
gulf\_council@ccgate.ssp.nmfs.gov

Page Campbell  
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
100 Navigation Circle  
Rockport, TX 78382  
(512) 729-2328 FAX (512) 729-1437  
campbellp@access.texas.gov

Lisa Kline  
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission  
1444 Eye Street, NW, 6th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 289-6400 FAX (202) 289-6051  
74107.2632@compuserve.com

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources  
Marine Resources Division  
P.O. Drawer 458  
Gulf Shores, AL 36547  
(334) 968-7577 FAX (334) 968-7307  
lazauski@gulftel.com

Ronald Lukens  
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission  
P.O. Box 726  
Ocean Springs, MS 39566-0726  
(601) 875-5912 FAX (601) 875-6604  
rlukens@southwind.com

Dee Lupton  
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries  
P.O. Box 769  
Morehead City, NC 28557-0769  
(919) 726-7021 FAX (919) 726-6062

Bob Mahood  
South Atlantic Fishery Management Council  
1 Southpark Circle, #306  
Charleston, SC 29407-4699  
(803) 571-4366 FAX (803) 769-4520

Daniel Matos  
Puerto Rico Department of Natural and  
Environmental Resources  
P.O. Box 3665, Marina Station  
Mayaguez, PR 00681-3665  
(809) 833-2025 FAX (809) 833-2410

Stephen Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife  
6291 Estate Nazareth  
St. Thomas, VI 00802  
(809) 775-6762 FAX (809) 775-3972  
ab307@virgin.usvi.net

Joseph Moran  
South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 12559  
Charleston, SC 29422-2559  
(803) 762-5072 FAX (803) 762-5001

Joseph O'Hop, Chairman  
Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection  
Florida Marine Research Institute  
100 Eighth Avenue, SE  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701-5095  
(813) 896-8626 FAX (813) 823-0166  
ohop\_j@harpo.dep.state.fl.us

John Poffenberger  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
75 Virginia Beach Drive  
Miami, FL 33140-1099  
(305) 361-4263 FAX (305) 361-4219  
john\_poffenberger@ccgate.ssp.nmfs.gov

Joseph Shepard, Vice Chairman  
Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries  
P.O. Box 98000  
Baton Rouge, LA 70898-9000  
(504) 765-2371 FAX (504) 765-2489  
shepard\_j@ruoaxp.wlf.state.la.us

Gina Rogers  
Georgia Coastal Resources Division  
1 Conservation Way  
Brunswick, GA 31523-8600  
(912) 264-7218 FAX (912) 262-3143

Thomas Van Devender  
Mississippi Bureau of Marine Resources  
152 Gateway Drive  
Biloxi, MS 39531  
(601) 385-5860 FAX (601) 385-5864

Miguel Rolón  
Caribbean Fishery Management Council  
Suite 1108, Banco de Ponce Building  
Hato Rey, PR 00918-2577  
(809) 766-5926 FAX (809) 766-6239

## TABLE 2.

### SCSC WORK GROUP MEMBERS FOR 1995

#### Data Collection Work Group

Page Campbell  
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources  
Marine Resources Division

Dee Lupton  
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

Stephen Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

John Poffenberger, Leader  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Gina Rogers  
Georgia Coastal Resources Division

Joseph Shepard  
Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries



### Data Management Work Group

Steven Atran  
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council

Stephen Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Mary Anne Camp  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Joseph Moran  
South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources  
Marine Resources Division

### Future Needs

Steven Atran  
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council

Dee Lupton  
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

Mary Anne Camp  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Stephen Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources  
Marine Resources Division

John Poffenberger  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

**TABLE 3.**

### PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR SCSC 1995 - 1999 (CSP Goals and Objectives are in Appendix C)

	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
<b>Management and Evaluation</b>					
Operations Plans	X	X	X	X	X
Funding priorities		X	X	X	X
Information dissemination	X	X	X	X	X
Program Review					X
<b>Data Collection</b>					
Data needs	X	X			
Standard collection protocol	X	X			
Quality control/assurance	X	X			
Data confidentiality	X	X			
<b>Data Management</b>					
Standard coding system			X	X	
Data management system		X	X	X	X
Data maintenance	X	X	X	X	X
Standard management protocols		X	X		
Data confidentiality	X	X			







## APPENDIX A.

SOUTHEAST COOPERATIVE STATISTICS  
COMMITTEE MINUTES  
Tuesday, February 28, 1995  
Jacksonville, Florida

Chairman Joe O'Hop was called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following people were present:

Charlie Anderson, MDMF, Boston, MA  
Mary Anne Camp, NMFS, Miami, FL  
David Donaldson, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS  
Albert Jones, NMFS, Miami, FL  
Lisa Kline, ASMFC, Washington, D.C.  
Steve Koplin, NMFS, Silver Spring, MD  
Skip Lazauski, ADCNR, Gulf Shores, AL  
Ron Lukens, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS  
Dee Lupton, NCDMF, Morehead City, NC  
Daniel Matos, PRDNER, Mayaguez, PR  
Joe Moran, SCWMRD, Charleston, SC  
Joe O'Hop, FMRI, St. Petersburg, FL  
John Poffenberger, NMFS, Miami, FL  
Lance Robinson, TPWD, Seabrook, TX  
Gina Rogers, GDNR, Brunswick, GA  
Tom Schmidt, USNPS, Homestead, FL  
Joseph Shepard, LDWF, Baton Rouge, LA  
Tom Van Devender, MDMR, Biloxi, MS

### Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the following changes:

- \* Adding Status of IT-95 and Update of Dealer Codes under Unresolved Administrative Issues;
- \* Adding Update of Processed Products Report and Red Snapper Collection Methods under Other Business.

### Follow-up Discussion concerning Data Confidentiality Workshop

J. O'Hop stated that the group needed to discuss where the similarities and differences between agencies exists concerning confidentiality. R. Lukens stated that the staff will develop a proceedings which will be very detailed minutes of the workshop. J. Poffenberger asked that assuming all agencies in Southeast Region agree to share data, should there be a description section which alerts an user that, based on some criteria, they could be accessing confidential data. Historically, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has denoted data as confidential when there were fewer than three dealers in a particular area (rule of three). It was suggested that the Committee establish a criteria for determining if data are confidential. Without a definitive definition of confidentiality, the rule of three is probably a good criteria to use. It was suggested that it may be best to let the NMFS decide what criteria to use. S. Lazauski pointed out that even if the rule of three is used, it is still possible to determine particular fishermen. J. Poffenberger stated that the group

can add additional criteria along with the rule of three such as market share, etc. The criteria developed by the group would essentially be a warning to users that they need to explore the confidentiality status of the data. The Committee discussed several scenarios of the number of dealers and percentages of market shares. It was suggested the rule of three and 65% of the market share would be used to tag confidential data. J. Shepard stated that these numbers and percentages are not really based on anything and that they appear to be arbitrary. R. Lukens moved that the Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee use the rule of three and 75% of the market share as a criteria for determining confidential data. S. Lazauski amended the motion that if a confidentiality flag appears, the user contact the state(s) of origin and discuss the use of the data. After a lengthy discussion, the motion was withdrawn and the group decided not to take any action concerning criteria for confidential data.

#### Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the CSP meeting held on September 26-27, 1994 in St. Petersburg, Florida were approved with minor editorial changes.

#### Unresolved Administrative Issues

##### a. Update of Dealer Codes

J. Poffenberger stated that under the new system, the data will not be loaded unless the dealer id number has been validated. Therefore, that is the reason for the need for more timely updates from the states of the dealer codes. The intent of this activity is to be able to assign a name with a dealer code. S. Lazauski noted that a dealer may have a finfish dealer code as well as a shrimp dealer code which can cause some problems. J. Poffenberger stated that NMFS currently used the state dealer codes for finfish dealers and are in the process of initiating a similar policy for shrimp dealers which should prevent any problems.

##### b. Coast Guard Vessel Registration Number

M. Camp reported that the Coast Guard vessel identification number has changed from a 6-digit to a 7-digit number, which could cause some data entry problems. She stated that the numbers will be strictly numerical and right justified. The state identification numbers will be kept in a separate database since they have alpha characters. The Coast Guard file will be used at the Silver Spring computer center.

##### c. NOAA Administrative order 216-100 and Status of IT-95

M. Camp distributed a complete copy of NOAA Administrative order 216-100 which refers to disclosure of confidential data. She stated that there is a new non-disclosure form which all states need to read, sign and send back to her in order to get access to the new NMFS computer system. Once the signed non-disclosure forms are received, M. Camp will assign access numbers to appropriate personnel. This is different from how it worked in the past. Now, each individual will have their own access number. In an effort to address turn-over of personnel, NMFS is considering a

policy that would suspend the access number for people who have not accessed the computer for six months and remove their files from the system and store them on tape. If the tape has not been accessed for year, NMFS will contact the state supervisor and ask what should be done with the files.

M. Camp stated that the A-10 has been disconnected. There is an A-7 working which is used for old archived tapes. The NMFS will be contacting the states concerning the old data and asking if the states want the data on the tapes. If an agency has Internet access, they can currently access the new system. If an agency does not have Internet access, they need either PPP or SLIP software to access the machine and can do file transfer.

#### d. Update on Port Agent Meetings

R. Lukens stated that at the last meeting, the Committee discussed the prospect of continuing to hold port agent meetings and from that, a letter to Brad Brown was sent which stating that port agent meetings would be useful and interaction between the different port agents and the Committee would be beneficial to the program. B. Brown responded to the letter by stated that he would encourage the lab directors to continue to conduct meetings of port agents and that state agency personnel would be notified of meetings in their area.

#### Development of Shrimp Vessel Registration Process

R. Lukens stated that under Endangered Species Act (ESA), Section 7 consultation on sea turtles, it is now required that a permit be issued to shrimp vessels in the Southeast Region. Preliminary discussions between NMFS and state personnel leaned towards using existing state systems for issuing these permits. Since then, NMFS personnel has visited all the states in the Region to discuss this issue and have developed a set of questions to collect as much information as possible without being overly burdening the vessel owners and fishermen. Although the purpose of the permit is to satisfy the ESA, it may be possible to collect pertinent data on vessels to adequately identify the universe in the shrimp fishery.

#### Presentation of Licensing Information in the Southeast Region

\* D. Donaldson stated that he compiled licensing information received from various people and presented the document to the Committee. However, the shrimp permitting activity discussed above and this activity are very similar. It was suggested that this issue be suspended until the outcome from the NMFS activity is complete. The Committee agreed to delay action concerning collection of licensing information until the NMFS activities with regards to shrimp vessels are complete. D. Donaldson stated that his only concern is that the Committee be involved in the NMFS activities and that these activities collect at least the data that would have been collected by the Committee's activities. **G. Rogers moved that the Committee stop any progress on the collection of licensing information until such time that the NMFS completes their activities related to this issue.** The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

## Work Group Reports

### a. Data Collection

J. Poffenberger stated that the Work Group was charged with establishing a minimum set data elements necessary for fisheries management. He then updated the Committee on progress accomplished by the Work Group. At the next meeting, the Work Group will provide a formal presentation to the Committee for their consideration. The Work Group developed several lists of data elements needed for a variety of activities such as general fisheries management, stock assessment (primary data, derived data), economics (harvesting, processing, and retail), and social/cultural aspects. Some of these categories were grouped into various portions or sectors which are shown in the parentheses. This information will be distributed to the Committee for their comments. Once comments have been incorporated, the Work Group will present the final list to the Committee and have a discussion concerning these data elements at a subsequent meeting.

## Commercial Fisheries Information Network (ComFIN)

### a. Status

R. Lukens stated that at the last meeting, the Committee was scheduled to consider the MOU and Framework Plan for ComFIN, however, that did not occur. Thus at this meeting, the Committee needs to consider these documents and vote on their approval.

### b. Framework Plan

\* D. Donaldson stated that the plan has been distributed to the Committee and comments have been incorporated into the document. The plan has been reviewed and discussed at previous meetings and should be very close to being complete. **R. Lukens moved to accept the Framework Plan for ComFIN as written.** If there are any editorial comments concerning the document they should given to the staff before they leave the meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

T. Schmidt stated that the National Park Service (NPS) is interested in being involved in ComFIN. It is important for the NPS to be involved since they do monitor the commercial resources in Biscayne National Park and some U.S. Virgin Islands parks. Species such as stone crab, spiny lobster, and several bait fisheries are prosecuted in NPS jurisdictions. Since the NPS does have regulatory authority in these areas, it would be useful to have some consistency in data collection methods to ease the burden on the fishermen. Thus, it seems logical for the ComFIN to include the NPS. R. Lukens stated that it would be appropriate to also include the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in ComFIN. He has talked with FWS personnel about this issue and they were interested in becoming partners. R. Lukens stated that he would pursue this issue. The Committee agreed that the NPS and FWS should be included in the ComFIN.

### c. Memorandum of Understanding

R. Lukens stated that there was question concerning the status of the RecFIN MOU since the program is in its third year of a three-year pilot time frame. It was determined that it would probably be necessary to develop and sign a new



RecFIN MOU. R. Lukens suggested that since the ComFIN and RecFIN MOUs need to be signed, the two MOUs should be combined into one document which incorporates both programs. The combined MOU would be very specific about the two separate components (ComFIN and RecFIN) and not diminish either program, as it would be very clear that there are two separate components. This issue will be discussed with commissioners and state directors at upcoming Commission meetings so they realize it is not a new program but just a blending of two existing programs. J. Moran suggested that this issue be tabled until the FIN meeting when all the partners are in attendance.

#### Other Business

##### a. Update of Processed Products Report

S. Koplin stated that the processed products manual has been revised and everyone should have received copies. The NMFS has completed the conversion from the previous NMFS, state, and county codes to the FIPs system. The employment data block has been expanded to include all employees at a particular site. During the revision of the manual, information was added to further explain some areas of confusion. S. Lazauski stated that it would be easier if a dealer had one code for finfish, shrimp, processed products, etc. There is a possibility of using the state codes. S. Koplin likes the idea of using state codes, however, there is the problem of those codes being recycled after a dealer goes out of business which can be confusing.

J. O'Hop asked if the processed products survey could be used to determine the value of commercial fishing to a state and assess the impact on the commercial seafood industry due to net ban or similar actions. S. Koplin stated that you would have to go through a lot of imputations. To get any useful assessment, there would need to be some modifications to the current survey and region-wide cooperation among the participants.

##### b. Red Snapper Collection Methods

J. Poffenberger stated that the NMFS Miami Lab initiated an activity to get better sampling distribution for size frequency and bioprofile data for conducting stock assessment for red snapper. As a result, NMFS determined the number of fish that need to be sampled at particular dealer site and asked the states to help in the collection of these samples. It has yet to be determined who will be responsible for aging all of these fish that are being collected. In the future, sampling will be expanded to include other species with specific sampling targets which will allow scientists to conduct stock assessments. J. Shepard stated that he was not sure that collection of otoliths was part of the CSP but if participants are going to engage in this type of collection activity, there needs to be some type of sampling protocol developed by the Committee on how to collect the information. There needs to be more coordination for this activity. R. Lukens stated that this is the type of activity that needs to be coordinated under the auspices of ComFIN. This issue will be discussed at the next meeting to begin developing some type of protocol.

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**

SOUTHEAST COOPERATIVE STATISTICS COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
September 27 - 28, 1995  
Miami, Florida

Chairman Joe O'Hop called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. The following people were present:

Julie Califf, GDNR, Brunswick, GA  
Mary Anne Camp, NMFS, Miami, FL  
Page Campbell, TPWD, Rockport, TX  
Joe Desfosse, ASMFC, Washington, DC  
David Donaldson, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS  
Albert Jones, NMFS, Miami, FL  
Lisa Kline, ASMFC, Washington, D.C.  
Tony Lamberte, GMFMC, Tampa, FL  
Wilson Laney, FWS, Raleigh, NC  
Skip Lazauski, ADCNR, Gulf Shores, AL  
Ron Lukens, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS  
Dee Lupton, NCDMR, Morehead City, NC  
Joe Moran, SCDNR, Charleston, SC  
Joe O'Hop, FMRI, St. Petersburg, FL  
John Poffenberger, NMFS, Miami, FL  
Tom Schmidt, NPS, Homestead, FL  
Joe Shepard, LDWF, Baton Rouge, LA  
Tom Van Devender, MDMR, Biloxi, MS

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the Cooperative Statistics Program (CSP) meeting held on February 28, 1995 in Jacksonville, Florida were approved as written.

Discussion and Review of Confidentiality Workshop

R. Lukens stated that a copy of the proceeding from the confidentiality workshop has been distributed to the Committee for their review and comment. The document including various recommendations and suggestions. He suggested that the Committee review and possibly take some further action on each of the recommendations. The first statement referred to having a uniform statute for data collection. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that it was not necessary to have a uniform statute. The Committee discussed the issue of non-reporting and mandatory reporting and it was suggested that the staff develop a white paper concerning the list of penalties and implications of not reporting catch and landings data. After some discussion, the Committee decided to take no action on the issue. The issue of developing an interstate agreement to address fishermen who have a fisheries-related violation(s) in one state not being able to get a license in another state, was discussed. The Committee decided to inform GSMFC Law Enforcement Committee about this issue and have them explore the possibilities. The topic of data confidentiality was

examined. After a lengthy discussion, **R. Lukens moved to establish as Committee policy that any request for data from one state that originates from another state must be referred back to the state of origin. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.** Also from this discussion, the Committee decided to develop a policy document which outlines all the policies and procedures of the Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee. It would be similar to the one being developed by the RecFIN Committee. The issue referring to developing a list of designated personnel identified as the contact for an agency for data transfer or questions regarding sharing of data was discussed. The Committee agreed that the people on the SCSC Committee will be the designated personnel. The last issue was development of a list of certified confidential agents. The list would be distributed to all appropriate state and federal personnel, and updated on a regular basis to assure that new personnel are added and those who quit or are terminated are deleted. After some discussion, **J. Moran moved that state personnel are required to contact Mary Ann Camp of changes in personnel who have access to confidential data. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.** Also, a review of personnel who have access to confidential data will be conducted at each meeting of the CSP/ComFIN group to ensure that the list is up-to-date. **R. Lukens moved to adopt the proceedings of the workshop, as amended, as the official record of the workshop. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.**

#### Status of TIP Sampling Protocols

J. Poffenberger stated that the Trip Interview Program (TIP) has had established protocols for quite some time. Last year, Phil Goodyear asked if NMFS could implement via changes to existing protocols, a process for selecting vessels or trips to collect biological and size frequency data for various reef fish species. J. Poffenberger asked P. Goodyear if he would need this information again and if so, indicated the need for some type of protocol established to collect this information. Also, the states need to examine their cooperative agreements and determine if additional funds and/or personnel will be necessary to accomplish this task. S. Lazauski said that the states need some clear guidance on what exactly needs to be collected. J. Shepard stated that the TIP should be separated into two parts: bioprofile and trip information. J. Poffenberger stated that there has not been any decision on whether to split TIP into two data bases. Because a variety of data have been placed into the TIP data base, it may be difficult to access the needed data. The Committee discussed the various issues and problems related to TIP. In an effort to address and rectify some of these issues, the Committee discussed the possibility of conducting a TIP workshop in 1996. After some discussion, **J. Shepard moved to direct staff to review the possibility of conducting a workshop regarding TIP. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.**

#### Discussion of Net Ban Issue in the Southeast

J. O'Hop stated that it might be interesting to discuss the effects of the Florida net ban on other states in the Southeast Region. S. Lazauski stated Alabama just recently passed a law in which there was gill net limitation component. The bill stated that a fisherman had to have a gill net license for five years since 1989, and during those years, at least 50% of his/her income must have been derived from mullet fishing for at least two years. This regulation is intended to

remove the part-time fishermen from the roe mullet fishery. This law was the result of a multitude of public hearings among all the different fisheries groups in Alabama. Starting in October 1995, fishermen also must purchase an additional permit to participate in the roe mullet fishery. D. Lupton stated that an issue similar to the Florida net ban was addressed in North Carolina. The way the issue was presented was very misleading. The bill that was introduced would ban all nets except cast nets in state waters. However, this bill never made it out of the subcommittee. Currently, the State of North Carolina is under a moratorium for all commercial fishing licenses, but that moratorium may be lifted. The North Carolina Marine Fisheries Division is currently looking at the gill net issue and will probably develop different licenses for the different types (part-time, full-time, etc) of gill netters. J. Moran stated that in 1987, South Carolina passed law /that designated red drum and spotted sea trout as game fish. Also, as part of this law, gill, stop, hoop, and pound nets were outlawed. There was some concern that there would be an increase in illegal gill netting due to the Florida ban but none has been detected. J. Shepard stated that there is a bill currently in the Louisiana legislature, and it is extremely complex. The bill establishes a mullet strike net season (for about 3 months). In addition, a fisherman can catch spotted seatrout with a mullet strike net, but a fishermen needs to qualify for a spotted seatrout permit. During the mullet/seatrout season, a fisherman can also catch restricted species (black drum, sheepshead, and flounder) but the fisherman has to use a pompano strike net, and he/she needs to qualify for a pompano net permit. There is no commercial net fishing at night or on weekends. T. Van Devender stated that the Mississippi legislature passed a law which stated that Mississippi will not sell a license to a person from a state which does not sell a similar license. The Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources became involved in the net ban issue. The Department stated there was no scientific reason for banning gill nets; however, as a compromise, a series of additional regulations on gill netting was passed. It bans commercial net fishing on weekends, holidays, and at night. It also bans commercial net fishing within a certain distance from shore. All of the regulations passed in the Gulf States were probably not in response to the threat of Florida fishermen moving to other state water, but as a convenient reason for further personal agendas for certain groups.

#### Update on NMFS Shrimp Vessel Registration Process

R. Lukens reminded the Committee that this issue is the new shrimp vessel registration process is under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), section 7 consultation on sea turtles. According to the rule, all shrimp vessels must be registered. The NMFS conducted a survey of each state concerning their licensing systems, and, following that survey, NMFS discussed the results of the survey with the Gulf and South Atlantic States. Follow-up discussions resulted in Georgia and Alabama expressing an interest in issuing shrimp vessel registration certificates but the rest of the states preferred that the NMFS issue the certificates. The rules for implementing the registration process have been completed and are currently being reviewed by the NMFS. Once this is complete, the rules will be sent out for public comment. Following public review, the program should be operational some time in 1996.

**The meeting was recessed at 5:05 p.m.**

September 28, 1995

The meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m.

#### Work Group Reports

##### a. Data Collection

J. Poffenberger informed the Committee that a copy of the Data Collection Work Group report has been distributed to the Committee for their comment. The report outlines the minimum data required for fisheries management. These data will be established as the foundation for fishery statistics that need to be collected under any commercial fisheries data collection program. The data elements are separated into four categories: general fisheries information; stock assessment; economics; and anthropology and sociology. There was some discussion concerning the purpose of developing a list of minimum data elements. It was stated that the list is a starting point for developing a data collection program. It should be used as a reference. The Committee reviewed the document and made several comments and changes. The revised report is attached. During the discussions, it was suggested that the data elements being collected with the state commercial data programs be compared to this list of minimum data elements. The staff will develop a matrix which presents this information and the Committee will discuss this issue at the next meeting. The matrix will help identify the gaps in data collection and will allow the Committee to associate some costs for filling those gaps. J. Poffenberger stated that it is also important to identify what is needed for long-term data collection. **S. Lazauski moved to adopt the Work Group report as amended. J. O'Hop asked that once the matrix is completed, that it be included as an appendix to the report. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.**

#### Data Confidentiality Issues

M. Camp stated that all NMFS port agents must sign a non-disclosure form before they can collect data in the field. However, non-federal port agents have not signed non-disclosure forms. Therefore, states which have state port agents must have them sign a non-disclosure form, and send the completed forms to M. Camp.

#### Operations Plan

##### a. Status of 1995 Activities

D. Donaldson presented the identified tasks for 1995 and their status (attached) which was reviewed by the Committee. All tasks to be completed or started in 1995 have been addressed by the Committee, subcommittees, work groups, and/or staff.

##### b. Development of 1996 Operations Plan

A draft copy of the 1996 Operations Plan was distributed to the Committee. The Committee completed a thorough review of each task. After some discussion, **J. Shepard moved to accept the 1996 Operations Plan as**

**amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.** The revised 1996 Operations Plan represents the administrative record for this portion of the meeting.

#### Election of Officers

After some discussion, Joe Shepard was elected Chairman and Joe Moran was elected Vice-Chairman.

#### Other Business

S. Lazauski asked that staff draft a letter to the NMFS-Miami staff thanking them for use of their facilities and to Susan Gold for her presentation on the IT-95 computer system.

J. Poffenberger reported about the log book program operated by the NMFS. This program includes the following fisheries; swordfish or large pelagic, Gulf of Mexico reef fish, South Atlantic snapper-grouper, shark and wreckfish. The permit-logbook program began in 1986 with the implementation of the swordfish regulations. This program was implemented to provide better statistics on catch per unit effort and catch by area to meet the United States' commitment to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna. Regulations were promulgated that require each vessel that catches and lands swordfish for sale to have a Federal permit and to submit a logbook for every longline set. In April 1990, a permit-logbook program was initiated for the reef fish fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. Like the swordfish reporting regulations, all fishermen that fish for and sell species in the reef fish management unit are required to have a Gulf reef fish permit. The logbook program for the snapper-grouper fishery in the South Atlantic was implemented in January 1992. In April 1991, an individual transferable quota (ITQ) program was implemented for the wreckfish fishery in the South Atlantic. This program requires that every vessel in this fishery have a Federal permit and comply with the logbook reporting requirements. The fishery for sharks in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico is the latest fishery to be included in the permit-logbook program. The reporting requirements went into effect in July 1993. As with the other programs, all of the vessels that have Federal permits for this fishery must submit a logbook for each trip when sharks are caught. The permit-logbook program has been implemented to collect detailed and accurate statistics on a certain segment or segments of federally managed fisheries. The permit eligibility requirements include specific income and ownership criteria that are intended to define a commercial fishing vessel and the associated fishing activity. The program is designed to collect fishery statistics on the total amount of catch that is landed and sold by the specifically defined "commercial" fishing sector by species, area, and gear. These data provide the means of determining catch per unit effort by area and gear. In addition to the collection of comprehensive statistics on the commercial fishing activity, the logbook program is also the means of monitoring compliance with the federal reporting requirements. Although the permit-logbook program includes five fisheries, it is managed as a single program. The program is made up of several components: issuing and processing permit applications; logbook forms and processing; and compliance and enforcement. The NMFS Southeast Regional Office is responsible for issuing all federal permits in the region and maintaining the data base that contains the information relating to the vessels and the permit applicants (mailing addresses, active vs non-active status, physical attributes of the vessel, etc). Permits for the five fisheries

included in this program are issued in accordance with several requirements or qualifications. First, the applicant must own or operate a vessel that is either documented with the U.S. Coast Guard or registered in a state if the vessel does not meet the USCG qualifications. Second, the applicant must earn at least 50% of their income from commercial fishing or charter boat or headboat operations, or, for the four fisheries excluding the Gulf reef fish, total income from commercial fishing or charter boat, headboat operations must have exceeded \$20,000 for a year. If the earned income qualification is made by the operator of the vessel, the permit is only valid as long as the person that qualified is the captain. In addition, permits issued for the four fisheries except the Gulf reef fish are not transferable to another owner or operator. Because of the diversification of many vessels, the same vessel can fish in more than one of these fisheries. The vessel is only issued one permit and a single, unique permit number is maintained for each vessel, regardless of the number of fisheries that are listed on the application. When a vessel is issued a new permit or a permit is renewed, the owner is also notified of the reporting requirements and a logbook or logbooks are sent. The fishing activities for the other fisheries in the program include gear that are not deployed for extended periods of time. Consequently, it is inappropriate to have the catch and effort data reported for every deployment. For these fisheries, a form has been designed to report the data for an entire trip. When the fishermen has completed the appropriate form or forms for a trip, they are instructed to mail the form to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) in Miami, FL. The logbook forms are reviewed by SEFSC staff for completeness. If some of the information, especially the dates, fishing area and gear, are missing, the form is returned to the fishermen with a letter explaining the deficiencies that need to be corrected. The remaining part of the program is the task of monitoring the submission of logbooks to assure that the reporting requirements are being met.

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.**









## **APPENDIX B.**

### **1995 Operations Plan for the Cooperative Statistics Program (CSP)**

January 1, 1995 to December 31, 1995

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Cooperative Statistics Program (CSP) is a cooperative effort among agencies that manage commercial fisheries resources. These agencies have an interest in and the need to collect, manage, and disseminate statistical data and information on the Southeast Region's commercial fisheries. The CSP is designed to provide sound scientific information on catch, effort, and participation that managers need to prudently conserve and manage commercial fisheries resources in the Southeast Region.<sup>2</sup> This operations plan implements the CSP Framework Plan for 1995.

#### **II. MISSION AND GOALS**

The mission of the CSP is to cooperatively collect, manage, and disseminate landings (including finfish and shellfish) and bioprofile information for marine commercial fisheries in the Region.

The three goals of the CSP are:

- To manage and evaluate a coordinated State/Federal marine commercial fishery statistics program for the Region;
- To collect State/Federal marine commercial fishery information for the Region; and
- To operate an integrated marine commercial fishery data management system for the Region.

The goals and objectives of the CSP are found in Appendix A.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Southeast Region (the Region) includes Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

### III. OPERATIONS

#### A. Data Collection and Management

Ongoing CSP surveys will be conducted by various state and federal agencies. The Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee (SCSC) will review and evaluate ongoing activities and provide recommendations for continued operations.

#### B. Committee and Work Group Activities (see Section D for membership)

The tasks below cover all 1995 objectives.

##### Task 1: Annual Operations Plan, 1996 (Goal 1, Objective 1)

Objective: Develop 1996 Annual Operations Plan, including identification of available resources, that implements the Framework Plan.

Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee.

Approach: Through meetings and mail, the Committee will develop and complete an Annual Operations Plan for 1996.

Resources: Travel/meeting costs, report costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.

Product: 1996 Annual Operations Plan.

Schedule: The Plan will be drafted by mid/late July 1995 and submitted for approval by the Committee at the fall 1995 meeting.

##### Task 2: Information Dissemination (Goal 1, Objective 5)

Objective: Distribute program information to cooperators and interested parties.

Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee and staff.

Approach: The Committee will distribute information concerning the structure, mission, goals and objectives, etc., to cooperators and interested parties documented by a request log. Each committee member is responsible for maintaining a list of information distributed and providing that list to the CSP administrative staff.

Resources: Copy and mailing expenses and inkind (time) and staff time.

Product: A report which compiles a record of information distributed and presentations given by the Committee and staff.

Schedule: This task is an ongoing activity.

##### Task 3: Current and Future Data Needs (Goal 2, Objective 1)

Objective: Annually compile a listing of current and future data needs for fisheries management.

Team Members: Data Collection Work Group

Approach: Begin collecting information concerning data needs through telephone contact and existing documentation including stock assessment reports. Accomplished by telephone and mail.

Resources: Telephone costs, report costs, possible travel/meeting costs, inkind support and staff time.

Product: A report which lists the current and future data needs necessary for fisheries management and recommendations.

Schedule: A preliminary report will be presented at the spring 1995 meeting. This is an ongoing activity.

##### Task 4: Compilation of Licensing Information (Goal 2, Objective 1)

Objective: Compile licensing information for marine commercial fisheries from each state and NMFS in the Region.

Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee

Approach: Each participant will provide licensing information for marine commercial fisheries concerning their jurisdiction to the CSP staff. This information will be compiled by staff and presented as a report. Accomplished by telephone and mail.  
Resources: Telephone costs, report costs, inkind support and staff time.  
Product: A report which describes each participant's licensing structure for marine commercial fisheries.  
Schedule: The report will be presented at the spring 1995 meeting.

Task 5: TIP Sampling Protocols (Goal 2, Objective 2)

Objective: Review and make recommendations on TIP sampling protocols regarding target sampling levels by species.  
Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee.  
Approach: Via the mail, the Committee will review current protocols and provide recommendations to the appropriate personnel. These recommendations will be forwarded to stock assessment panels and TIP coordinators with a request that any reports developed by the groups include a section concerning data needs.  
Resources: Mail costs, conference call costs, report costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.  
Product: Report.  
Schedule: Work began in 1994 and will continue this year. Periodic progress reports will be presented to the Committee. The final report will be ready for the fall 1995 meeting.

Task 6: Development of List of Necessary Data Elements (Goal 2, Objective 2)

Objective: Review of the Commercially-related Sampling Programs and the Data Elements Description document.  
Team Members: Data Collection Work Group.  
Approach: The staff will send the Commercially-related Sampling Programs and the Data Elements Description document to the work group for their review and recommendations. The group is charged with developing a minimum set of data elements which are necessary for fisheries management. Accomplished by mail, telephone, possible meeting.  
Resources: Mail costs, telephone costs, possible travel/meeting costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.  
Product: Minimum set of data elements.  
Schedule: The initial phase of this activity has been completed. The next step is to distribute the resulting document to the work group and have them develop a list of needed elements. The list of elements will be compiled and presented to the Committee at the spring 1995 meeting.

Task 7: Non-reported Sources of Landings (Goal 2, Objective 3)

Objective: Identification of non-reported sources of landings in the Region.  
Team Members: Geographic Subcommittees.  
Approach: This will be an independent activity conducted by the geographic subcommittees. As sources are identified, each subcommittee will compile a listing and periodically mail the listings to CSP staff members. Accomplished by mail, conference calls, and meetings, if necessary.  
Resources: Mail costs, conference calls costs, report costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.  
Product: Report which lists sources of non-reported landings.  
Schedule: This is an ongoing task. A preliminary draft will be presented to the committee in spring 1995.

Task 8: Incorporation of Processed Products Survey (Goal 2, Objective 4)

Objective: Evaluate the incorporation of the processed products survey in the CSP.  
Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee.

Approach: This task will be addressed via a workshop. The workshop will discuss issues related to the processed products survey including possibly making it part of the CSP. The NMFS will provide a program description to members and be the main presenter at the workshop. The details of the workshop will be developed by the geographic subcommittees. Accomplished by workshop, mail, and telephone.

Resources: Travel/workshop costs, mail costs, conference calls costs, report costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.

Product: Report and recommendations

Schedule: The workshop is tentatively set for the spring 1995 meeting. It may have to be delayed until the fall 1995 meeting

Task 9: Confidentiality Workshop (Goal 2&3, Objective 5)

Objective: Conduct a work session concerning the confidentiality of commercial fisheries data.

Team Members: Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee.

Approach: This task will be addressed via a workshop. The workshop will discuss issues such as definitions of confidentiality, protection of confidentiality versus enforcement use, confidentiality from data collection versus data management perspective, and others. The details of the workshop will be developed by the Committee. Prior to the workshop, a letter will be sent to each participant that requests they develop a list of questions that need to be addressed during this session. From these lists, the outline of the workshop will be developed. Accomplished by workshop, mail, and telephone.

Resources: Travel/workshop costs, mail costs, conference calls costs, report costs, and inkind (time) and staff time.

Product: Report and recommendations

Schedule: The workshop is tentatively set for the spring 1995 meeting. It may have to be delayed until the fall 1995 meeting

### **C. Administrative Activities**

Coordination and administrative support of CSP will be accomplished through administrative structures established in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic areas. Major tasks involved in the coordination and administration of the various levels of CSP include but are not limited to the following:

- Work closely with the SCSC in all aspects of program coordination, administration, and operation;
- Implement plans and program directives approved by the SCSC;
- Provide coordination and logistical support, including communications and organization of meetings for the SCSC, subcommittees, and work groups;
- Develop and/or administer cooperative agreements, grants, and contracts;
- Serve as liaison between the SCSC, other program participants, and other interested organizations;
- Assist the SCSC in preparation or review of annual spending plans;
- Prepare annual operations plans under the direction of the SCSC;
- Prepare and/or supervise and coordinate preparation of selected documents, including written records of all meetings;
- Distribute approved CSP information and data in accordance with accepted policies and procedures as set forth by the SCSC;
- Assist in the identification of regional and geographic needs that can be satisfied through CSP activities;
- Seek funding for CSP activities as the need develops; and
- Conduct or participate in other activities as identified.

#### D. Time Table for CSP

	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
<b>Management and Evaluation</b>					
Operations Plans	X	X	X	X	X
Funding priorities		X	X	X	X
Information dissemination	X	X	X	X	X
Program Review					X
<b>Data Collection</b>					
Data needs	X	X			
Standard collection protocol	X	X			
Quality control/assurance		X	X		
Data confidentiality	X	X			
<b>Data Management</b>					
Standard coding system			X	X	
Data management system		X	X	X	X
Data maintenance	X	X	X	X	X
Standard management protocols		X	X		
Data confidentiality	X	X			

#### E. Committee and Work Group Membership

##### Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee

Steven Atran Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council	Joe Moran South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources
Page Campbell Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Bob Mahood South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Jack Dunnigan Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission	Joe O'Hop Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection
Skip Lazauski Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Paul Phalen North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
Ron Lukens Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission	John Poffenberger National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center
Daniel Matos Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources	Gina Rogers Georgia Department of Natural Resources



### **Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee (continued)**

Miguel Rolón  
Caribbean Fishery Management Council

Joe Shepard  
Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries

Steven Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Tom Van Devender  
Mississippi Department of Marine Resources

### **Data Collection Work Group**

Page Campbell  
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

John Poffenberger  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources

Gina Rogers  
Georgia Coastal Resources Division

Steven Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Joe Shepard  
Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries

Paul Phalen  
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

### **Data Management Work Group**

Steven Atran  
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council

Steven Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Mary Anne Camp  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Joe Moran  
South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources

### **Future Needs**

Steven Atran  
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Mgmt. Council

Mary Anne Camp  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Skip Lazauski  
Alabama Department of Conservation  
and Natural Resources

Steven Meyers  
Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife

Paul Phalen  
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

John Poffenberger  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Fisheries Science Center





## **APPENDIX C.**

### **CSP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

**Goal 1:** Manage and evaluate a coordinated State/Federal marine commercial fishery statistics program for the Southeast Region.

- Objective 1:** Establish a Southeast Cooperative Statistics Committee responsible for 1) development of strategic and operations plans; 2) providing direction, guidance and evaluation for the CSP on a continuing basis.
- Objective 2:** Utilize the South Atlantic Statistics Committee of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Data Management Subcommittee of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and the Scientific and Statistical Committee of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council and, as appropriate, representatives of Fishery Management Councils and other interested parties to accomplish working group tasks and provide advice to the CSP.
- Objective 3:** Maximize effective utilization of available funds and personnel for data collection and processing.
- Objective 4:** Establish and maintain cooperative agreements that are consistent with goals and objectives of the CSP.
- Objective 5:** Distribute program information to the program participants and to interested parties.
- Objective 6:** Conduct a program evaluation by an outside review team every 5 years.

**Goal 2:** Collect State/Federal marine commercial fishery information for the Southeast Region.

- Objective 1:** Collect landing statistics and bioprofile data (size and age composition, etc.) at a level needed for management of marine resources.
- Objective 2:** Promote uniformity of data element definitions and comparability of data collection methods and procedures.
- Objective 3:** Provide for regular assessment of the quality of the data collected through reviews, edits, and verification procedures.
- Objective 4:** Eliminate duplication between state and federal data collection activities.
- Objective 5:** Protect the confidentiality of personal and business information, as required by state and/or federal law.

**Goal 3:** Operate an integrated marine commercial fishery data management system for the Southeast Region.

- Objective 1:** Process State/Federal marine commercial fishery data for computer storage.
- Objective 2:** Supply, operate, and administer a regional data management system.

- Objective 3:** Maintain all data in a computerized data base that is accessible by all CSP participants.
- Objective 4:** Develop and maintain standard data management protocols and documentation for data formats, inputs, editing, storage, access, transfer, dissemination, and application.
- Objective 5:** Protect the confidentiality of personal and business information, as required by state and/or federal law.