

Meeting Notes  
Angler Registry Database Work Group  
02/25/2008

Participants:

Mark Alexander, Kevin Anson, Erik Barth, Donna Bellais, Julia Byrd, Bob Clark, Lauren Dolinger Few, Dee Lupton, Richard Reyes, Scott Sauri, Vicki Swan, Henny Winarsoo

Topics Discussed:

1. Work Group Participation
  - a. All candidates listed in the project plan have agreed to join the work group except Bill Herber from Oregon Fish & Wildlife who has not responded – Scott Sauri called and left a voice mail message, but received no response
  - b. Bob Clark from Alaska Department of Fish and Game has been added as a work group member
  - c. Bill Hunter from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission has been added as a work group member
  - d. All confirmed work group members participated on the conference call except the following (due to schedule conflicts):
    - i. Tina Chang from NMFS ST
    - ii. Gordon Colvin from NFMS ST
    - iii. Bill Hunter from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
  - e. The following people are not work group members but have been added as work group participants that may occasionally represent or join the respective work group member for their region/organization. None of these participants were on the conference call:
    - i. Chris Denson from Alabama Marine Fisheries
    - ii. Don Hesselman from North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
    - iii. Scott Meyer from Alaska Department of Fish & Game
    - iv. Mark Robson from Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
    - v. Tony Straw, CA Fish & Game
2. Conference Call Minutes
  - a. Reviewed minutes from 02/01/2008 meeting; Richard Reyes commented that Tony Straw participated in the first conference call.
  - b. All meeting notes/minutes will be posted to the NMFS ST Collaboration Tool by Scott Sauri or Erik Barth
  - c. Lauren Dolinger Few will coordinate getting the meeting notes/minutes uploaded to the MRIP website
3. Project Plan
  - a. Solicited any final feedback before finalizing – no further changes requested

- b. Reviewed revised milestones document put together by Erik Barth
  - c. Action Item: Scott Sauri and Erik Barth will finalize project plan
4. Reviews of target state license spreadsheets by workgroup members (note: only key points that were discussed are included in the minutes to supplement the spreadsheets; full content of spreadsheets can be viewed in the collaboration tool).
- a. Alabama – Kevin Anson
    - i. System/ Data Quality
      - 1. Large number (30%) of licenses sold as paper licenses and not available electronically
        - a. Willing to investigate options for eliminating paper licenses
      - 2. Electronic records subject to QA/QC including
        - a. In-house data cleaning
        - b. Address validation
      - 3. For-Hire licenses
        - a. Managed in same software but handled differently
        - b. 100% electronic
        - c. Managed by Kevin Anson's office
    - ii. Data Sharing
      - 1. There are laws and policies regarding data sharing, but memorandum of understanding (MOU) with GSMFC and NOAA should cover MRIP Angler Registry needs for fisheries and license data
      - 2. SS# not an issue
    - iii. Coverage/Exemption
      - 1. Age exemptions
        - a. Under 16
        - b. Over 64
          - i. Willing to investigate option of issuing no fee permits for anglers exempted by age
    - iv. Registry Category
      - 1. Likely to be Type 3 (Included, National Registration)
  - b. Texas – Vicki Swan
    - i. System/ Data Quality
      - 1. Major revision in 2004-2005
      - 2. Revisions are ongoing
      - 3. System has unique customer ID that follows customer through system
      - 4. All licenses handled in electronic systems, including For-Hire
      - 5. Can be issued via
        - a. Online system – higher quality data
        - b. Point-of-sale (e.g. Walmart) system – lower quality data
          - i. Only about 20% have phone numbers

**Comment [S1]:** This should not preclude exemption. I believe the national registry will allow but not require registrations for anglers under the age of 16.

**Comment [S2]:** This should not prevent initial exemption if the state agrees to address the issue within two years.

**Comment [S3]:** Vicki indicated that this conflicts with what is on the spreadsheet. She will update the spreadsheet accordingly.

- ii. Data Sharing
  - 1. Reluctant to share SS#, but can release full data to NMFS as long as only Name and License Type are released beyond NMFS
- iii. Coverage/Exemption
  - 1. Guide licenses are considered commercial
  - 2. Age exemptions include
    - a. Under 17
    - b. Over 77
- iv. Registry Category
  - 1. Would like to be considered for Type 1 (Exempted, Regional Program) based on participation in GSMFC FIN else Type 2 (Included, State Registration)
- c. North Carolina – Dee Lupton
  - i. System/ Data Quality
    - 1. System is one year old
    - 2. All licenses electronic
    - 3. Can be issued via
      - a. Online system
        - i. 80% of these have phone numbers
      - b. Service agent (e.g. Walmart)
        - i. 40% of these include phone numbers
    - 4. Originally estimated 1.2 million licenses
      - a. Actual number was closer to 450,000
      - b. 750,000 including grandfathered licenses
      - c. Hoping number will increase to 1 million this year
    - 5. Duplicates do get into the system
      - a. There is a merge algorithm to identify them
    - 6. Data are owned by the Wildlife Commission, who have not expressed much interest in cleansing data
    - 7. Blanket licenses handled in separate system
  - ii. Data Sharing
    - 1. There are laws about data confidentiality but should not be a problem for NMFS since there is language allowing data sharing for administrative and enforcement activities as long as the entity receiving the data maintains the confidentiality of the personal identifying information
    - 2. May require MOU
  - iii. Coverage/Exemption
    - 1. Tried to minimize exemptions
    - 2. Offering instead waivers/free licenses
    - 3. Still have the following:
      - a. Under 16
      - b. For-Hire blanket license that covers everyone on board

- c. Pier blanket license that covers everyone who fished off the pier – must have commercial license to get it
  - 4. Some people have lifetime licenses that have been grandfathered in, but these are not really exemptions because contact info is stored
    - a. Post cards are mailed out to adult lifetime license holders in order to receive updates on contact info – not sure what happens if no response (if anything)
- iv. Registry Category
  - 1. Would like to be considered for Type 2 (Included, State Registration)
    - a. Analyzing gaps caused by exemptions
- d. Connecticut – Mark Alexander
  - i. System/ Data Quality
    - 1. No saltwater fishing licensing system
    - 2. Hoping to get approval for one this year
    - 3. There is an online system for hunting and freshwater fishing being implemented this year
    - 4. We currently have a requirement for a "Party / Charter Boat Registration". This permit has been in place since 1981 and the data is currently used for the For-Hire survey
  - ii. Data Sharing
    - 1. There have been data losses in the past so there is sensitivity regarding data sharing
      - a. These data losses occurred outside the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and had nothing to do with fisheries data or fisheries licenses
    - 2. Will require an non-disclosure agreement (NDA) and/or MOU
  - iii. Coverage/Exemption
    - 1. No federal access waters
    - 2. Vessels need to go through another state's waters in order to reach federal waters
    - 3. Subject to fishing laws based on where you are, not what you are fishing for
    - 4. Has reciprocity with other states, which may be a problem unless all partner states provide data
  - iv. Registry Category
    - 1. Will currently be Type 3 (Included, National Registration)
    - 2. The state expects that its marine recreational license, if approved by the legislature, will meet all of the requirements to be classified as Type 2 (Included, State Registration)
- e. South Carolina – Julia Byrd

- i. System/ Data Quality
    - 1. System has been in place since 1993
    - 2. Phone number is not required
      - a. 40% of records have phone numbers
    - 3. Do have customer IDs
    - 4. Saltwater and freshwater licenses in separate systems
    - 5. Can be issued via
      - a. Licensing offices
      - b. Vendors (e.g. Walmart)
        - i. Can be hard copies
        - ii. Eventually entered into the system
    - 6. Licensing office system is different system from vendor system
    - 7. All systems will be switched to Oracle by summer 2009 (maybe a little bit later), including all vendors (i.e. all licenses will be electronic by then)
    - 8. Duplicates do get into the system
      - a. There is a merge algorithm to identify them
  - ii. Data Sharing
    - 1. Everything goes through legal
    - 2. Should not be a problem sharing data except maybe SS#
      - a. Have SS# data but do not want to share it
  - iii. Coverage/Exemption
    - 1. Large number of exemptions
      - a. Age exemptions
        - i. Under 16
        - ii. Over 65
      - b. Disabled
      - c. Disabled veteran
      - d. For-Hire blanket
      - e. Pier blanket – track number of people, not catch
      - f. Shore
    - iv. Registry Category
      - 1. Likely to be Type 3 (Included, National Registration)
  - f. Alaska, California, Florida and Virginia will be reviewed at the next conference call
5. General discussion of registry data structures
- a. Work group agreed to use the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission (GSMFC) field list, provided by Donna Bellais, as a starting point for determining the field list for the registry
  - b. The work group agreed upon the following initial list:
    - i. Cust\_ID **[Required]**
      - 1. This is the ID that the source assigns an incoming record and is separate from the unique identifier that the new system will assign to all records

2. Can be used for updating records from specific source
3. Per Donna Bellais; different states provide different unique identifiers (e.g. driver's license #, fishing license #), but are still unique across states
4. Per Scott Sauri; it may still be beneficial to have a unique identifier type field
- ii. Customer Last Name **[Required]**
- iii. Customer First Name **[Required]**
- iv. Customer MI
  1. Allow full middle name or middle initial
- v. Customer Suffix
- vi. Customer Address **[Required]**
  1. May have address 2 and address 3 options to accommodate mailing and physical addresses
  2. Per Scott Sauri; addresses should be assigned a type and addressed in a separate table in order to provide maximum flexibility
- vii. Customer City Name **[Required]**
  1. Same issues as address
- viii. Customer State 2 digit FIPS code **[Required]**
  1. Same issues as address
- ix. Customer Postal Code No dashes in digits **[Required]**
  1. Same issues as address
- x. Customer County 3 digit FIPS code
  1. Could be omitted and then generated based on zip code
  2. Per Donna Bellais; states participating in the Gulf Coast dual frame study use a GSMFC application to look up county
- xi. Customer Phone Number digits only **[Required]**
  1. May have primary and secondary phone numbers(eg. cell phone, home, work, etc).
  2. Per Scott Sauri; phones should be assigned a type and addressed in a separate table in order to provide maximum flexibility
  3. May include "Time of Day" field
- xii. License Type Code **[Required]**
  1. Different states will have different license types and related codes
  2. We can store these in lookup tables but will need to identify a method for updating
  3. Another option is to require states to convert to standard method before submission
- xiii. License Description or Name
  1. May be omitted and handled in metadata system (InPort)
- xiv. License Expiration Date **[Required]**

**Comment [EB4]:** We will probably be lucky to get one good address, but no harm in multiple addresses; should designate a primary address. I would encourage submission of single license record by states; if multiple addresses or phone numbers are submitted they could be placed in separate tables by registry data managers as needed.

**Comment [EB5]:** If we store multiple addresses we need to determine which or all will be used to lookup county code. Note in VA we have zip codes that cross county/city boundaries, so lookups should also use address data.

1. May also need to include “Issue Date” and/or “Start/Effective Date”,
  2. Some discussion of full data reloads versus updates; it was noted that GSMFC data submissions are full data reloads.
  3. Per Scott Sauri; we may not want to do full reloads because we may want to retain expired records (needs clarification).
  - xv. License Issue State 2 digit FIPS Code
  - xvi. DL State Issue 2 digit FIPS Code
  - xvii. Customer DOB **[Required]**
  - xviii. Housekeeping fields?
6. Miscellaneous Issues that came up
- a. Reciprocity
    - i. Will need all partner data to properly identify potential anglers in each jurisdiction with reciprocity
  - b. How to handle temporary licenses
  - c. Alaska – Bob Clark
    - i. Conducts mail survey
    - ii. Start receiving data back in October
    - iii. Final numbers in by February/March of the following year
  - d. Virginia – Erik Barth
    - i. Phone number is not required
      1. 40% of records have phone numbers
  - e. briefly reviewed ACCSP registration tracking document provided by Dee Lupton (NC) that included a technique for creating a static length unique identifier based on licensee attribute data. No conclusions, one comment that the extra field not be required from states unless its needed.
7. Metadata requirements
- a. Will be entered into InPort
  - b. May or may not use an intermediate system; state spreadsheets should have much of the metadata that may be required.
  - c. Action item: Scott Sauri will document requirements for this
8. Next meeting
- a. Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM EST
9. Action Items
- a. Scott Sauri and Erik Barth will finalize project plan
  - b. Scott Sauri will document requirements for metadata storage
  - c. would like workgroup members to supply potential license/database contacts for adjacent states that currently have licenses (need WA, OR, ID, GA, MD, DC, DE).

**Comment [EB6]:** Donna Bellais has provided LA and MS contacts already.