

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 8, 2018

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Chester Brewer
Jessica McCawley

Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Dr. Michelle Duval

Council Members

Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig

Mel Bell
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Doug Haymans

Council Staff

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Kimberly Cole
Mike Collins
John Hadley
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand

Observers & Participants

LDCR Trish Bennett
Dr. Jack McGovern
Leann Bosarge
Erika Burgess

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Erik Williams
Tony DiLernia
Rick DeVictor

Other observers & participants attached.

The Executive Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, Thursday afternoon, March 8, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Charlie Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: The first order of business would be Approval of the Agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda or objections? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Then we have the Approval of the December 2017 Committee Minutes. Are there any changes to the minutes? Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. I will turn it over to you, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In terms of Magnuson-Stevens Act Reauthorization, I give a little bit of an overview in the overview document. The hearings have basically all been done, and we have put together a working paper that has the council's positions, and, when I get into the CCC Meeting Report, I have a few more comments on that, but that's been very useful.

Testimony from council folks is available on the U.S. Regional Fishery Management Councils' website, and some of the councils have been asked to provide written comments, and those are there. We were contacted by Senator Graham's office and asked for our comments on the Senate bill, and that's there as well, and so, if you're interested in seeing what the other councils are saying or what has been said, that's a good place to see that.

The CCC was asked to send that working paper to the Secretary of Commerce, and so they have that. We will give a little bit more of an update on where we are when we give the CCC meeting report. We've got an overview of what's in that working paper, and I think that's all I really need to cover right now. We're waiting to see what happens next, in terms of reauthorization, and, should we be called on to provide written comments, we will draft those, as we did for Senator Graham, and have those reviewed and go out over the Chair's signature. I will be glad to answer any questions that you all might have.

MR. PHILLIPS: No questions. Go ahead.

MR. WAUGH: Hearing none, Mike is going to walk you through the 2017 final expenditures relative to our budget.

MR. COLLINS: As I have described in the past, when I formulate the budget, it's kind of a mixture of hard costs, like rent, and then some of the softer or unknown costs, like travel, and so I'm just going to go down the list and maybe explain some of the areas that were a little out of sync. As far as staff comp, we had some changeover in personnel, and so we had double people working the same job for a couple of weeks while that transition took place. We also had to buy out Kimberly's contract from the agency where we obtained her.

Transcription, we're going to change that category for the next budget. You will see it described as Sub-Contract Labor, and it will be two individuals in there. One of them is our transcriptionist, and one of them is Kari MacLauchlin, and so that's why that's up there a little higher. I was pretty close on the \$45,000, and it was actually \$43,000 in transcription costs, and so the other part was contract costs of Kari.

On the travel, I did a pretty good job, I think, overestimating what we had. That's where most of our carryover comes from anyway. However, in AP travel, I underestimated, and I can only say that we had more participation than I anticipated for AP meetings. In Supplies and Admin Ops, we had to obtain a new server. Our server aged out, and, in fact, it was so old that we were not able to update it with security patches, and so we had to get a new server. Then, while we did that, we also got a new IT staff to support us, so that whole evolution inflated those original numbers that I had in there.

Along with that, we upgraded our internet carrier to a higher speed, and that transition cost us a little money, but, overall, for next year, our T1 costs should be down a little bit. Then, in case anybody is wondering what the Miscellaneous/Other is, that is bank fees, monthly bank fees, and then a one-time moving expense for a new hire, and I will entertain any questions, if anybody has anything.

MR. PHILLIPS: A question from me. For some reason, I was thinking that when we were figuring budget on AP costs that you all figured that at 100 percent.

MR. COLLINS: We did that for 2018, but, if you go back to 2016, when I was talking about the 2017 budget, I explained how I kind of do it through a guesswork plus historical attendance, and I come up with a number, and that's how it did it in 2017, but, for 2018, we went strictly 100 percent attendance. However, there is still some guesswork as to airline fares, mileage costs, what the hotel is going to be, that type of thing.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. I'm just trying to make sure I'm on the right page. Thanks. Are there any other questions?

MR. HAYMANS: Mike, you were mentioning IT, and did you say that you added IT staff as well?

MR. COLLINS: That's one of the items that we contract out, and we had a sole individual before, and he retired, and we went with a company called ITS, and they provide twenty-four-hour monitoring of our system remotely, to make sure that all the security on the computers is up to speed all the time, and then, through a mixture of onsite or offsite remoting in, if we have an issue, they will take care of problem.

For example, there is a big problem with Macs and High Sierra, and that's their latest operating system. When they implemented that, there was some big security issues with that, and so Apple had to fix that, but, when they fixed it, it wasn't compatible with a lot of the software we use, like Adobe and like SecureSync, which is how we access the Office Share when we're away, and so that cost us a lot of time and effort to get that fixed, but, anyway, the answer to your question is we have a third-party provide IT support.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? Seeing none, we'll keep rolling.

MR. WAUGH: Next is the 2018 budget, and this is Attachment 2b, and we'll talk about outreach costs in a moment. They're within -- We were asked, and Michelle was interested in looking at how we could look at what we're spending for outreach and how we might restructure that, and so we've got a separate table and some information dealing with that, but the overall amount is

included in this budget. We're not asking you to approve this budget here. We won't know what our final funds are until prior to our June meeting, hopefully.

The information we received is that 2018 should be basically level funding, and so we're hoping that's going to continue to come through, and so we've got the various categories here, and, as Mike said, Sub-Contract Labor, that's where we put the transcription costs in. The AP travel is higher, as Mike said, to account for 100 percent, and this draft that you're looking at here, the total is \$3.7 million. Our level funding, including SEDAR, is expected to be around \$3.6 million, and so, when we get to June, we'll trim this down a little more. We'll know what we have expended through a good part of the year, and then we'll bring you a budget to approve in June that is level-funded at the \$3.6 million level.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any questions? Seeing none.

MR. WAUGH: Okay. Next is dealing with outreach, and I will go over these numbers first and then some explanation. Looking at the funds that we spent during 2017, in terms of news releases, printing, and mailing, it totaled about \$8,000. Hard copy postcards totaled about \$4,000, and the newsletter was about \$10,800. Then some miscellaneous travel and some materials to distribute at meetings, or SWAG, and so we spent about \$27,000. We are proposing to reshuffle how that money is spent, and I will pull up some -- What we are proposing is to take that same amount of money, basically the \$27,000, but spend it differently.

The majority of the budget right now, in terms of outreach, is currently being used to print and process hard copy mailings, and so we're recommending that we change how we do this. In terms of printing, reduce the amount spent on printing and move more to electronic distribution, and this is something our I&E AP has encouraged.

Stop producing and mailing meeting postcard announcements, we did that in preparation for this meeting, and we haven't received any negative feedback from that. Stop printing and mailing news releases, and those would be distributed electronically via Constant Contact only. Then we would suggest moving to an electronic newsletter, and that would be distributed via Constant Contact. We would also utilize the council's website and blog for expanding articles of interest.

Our intent is, if you all are comfortable with this, we would implement this for the newsletter that goes out prior to the June meeting. We may do it in the same format that we're using now and just distribute it electronically, and the intent is to eventually move to a fully electronic format, and whether we can do that in time for the June meeting or that's something we phase in for September, we'll just have to see how that goes.

Doing that, we could reshuffle where those existing funds were spent in 2017 and build in some more travel to festivals and tradeshow and events like ICAST that really give us a chance to meet a lot of our constituents that we wouldn't otherwise and meet with fishing clubs and groups, bumping up the materials to give away at festivals and tradeshow a little bit, and then we've got several special projects coming up.

We're working on a system management plan, and so we'll have to do outreach associated with that, and, for photo archiving and library, we have built up quite a library of photos, and we need to get that organized, so that it's more easily used. The I&E AP suggested more use of short

videos, and so we're looking at doing that as well, and so that's sort of the rationale behind these changes.

Like I said, the money is the same amount, but we would propose printing at about \$7,000, travel at about \$10,000, materials to give out at meetings and festivals at \$3,000, and then \$7,000 for special projects. It's basically the same amount of money, but just changing how we spend it, and we can get Kim and Cameron up here if you have any specific questions and want more of the details, but that's our suggestion to you for 2018.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Are there questions?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have one. I guess I'm just thinking. Sometimes when I've seen groups go from printed to electronic, they send out like one last printed whatever that says, hey, this will be the last one of these that you're going to get and we're going electronic, just some way of notifying all these people who, for a lot of years, have been receiving your newsletters and post cards and all that sort of thing, and so that's one thing I was thinking of, is how you're going to tell everybody, especially if those aren't folks that necessarily go online a lot anyway and look at your stuff.

You probably still have a fairly good sized contingent, I am thinking, that expect those. They keep up with the council via the newsletter or the postcard or whatever, and I'm just thinking about your transition. I can see, eventually, you want to do this, or whenever you -- These are not legal issues, but they're just issues that I throw out there because I have seen them happen in kind of other arenas, and you might be leaving a group by the wayside, and maybe it's time for them to move into the digital age completely, and I don't know, but it's just food for thought.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Monica.

MR. HARTIG: My concern ties right into what Monica mentioned, and I know there's a number of fishermen that don't use computers and won't be able to get it electronically, and I was wondering what they did in the federal system. Jack, do you have any idea? When you guys went to primarily electronic information, did you also -- I remember sometimes there was a card that sent out that said do you still want to receive this, the paper, and do you guys still do that?

DR. MCGOVERN: That's what we did. We sent out something similar to what Monica said, asking people if they wanted to get it electronically or paper, and we still do have some people that want to receive all the Fishery Bulletins and that sort of thing by paper, and so we mail out a small portion. Most of it is electronic, but we mail out a small portion of the Fishery Bulletins to those people that want to receive them.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Anything else? Just a note, Gregg. I see where you've got \$7,000 in printing and nothing in mailing, and so you were going to cut out all mailing, ideally, or at some point in time?

MR. COLLINS: Mailing, what that really is, it's preparation for mailing. We don't pay for the postage, but, the folding and the tabbing and the getting it sorted for the bulk mailing, that's all those costs, but, the actual postage, we don't pay for that.

MR. BREWER: I don't know what the magnitude of the cost would be, but, in line with what Jack is saying, there is some of us dinosaurs that really kind of like to get that publication in paper. I know that RFA recently, fairly recently, went to totally electronic, and their stuff is a bear to read, at least on my computer, to scroll through it, and so maybe we could consider doing an opt-in/opt-out, or just opt-in. In other words, you're given the opportunity to request paper, and, if you don't, you automatically default to pure electronic.

I don't think there would be a tremendous difference in preparation of the content. There might not be any difference at all, because you would just take what you are electronically sending out and have it printed on paper and send it out to folks. I am glad to hear that the council doesn't have to pay for postage, because that might be a significant expense, but the printing might not be that bad.

MS. IVERSON: I recognize that there are people that still want to receive the hard copies, and I realize that, and we have talked about that in the past, but, for the sake of budgeting, if you continue to print, it's kind of like planning a wedding. It's going to cost you about as much for seventy-five as 175 once you go to that processing and printing cost.

If you're looking at it from a budgetary standpoint, to go and reach out and continue to produce an eight-page newsletter and to print 500 postcards versus 2,000 postcards, numbers like that, I think, if you're looking at cutting back and reducing staff time and budget costs, that you may not -- I mean, we can do a mailing and see how many people still want the hard copies, but, from a budgetary and staff time standpoint, you're still going to be incurring those printing costs, the setup and the printing costs, and so I just wanted to bring that forward and let you know that we can certainly reduce the number of copies, but, from a budgetary standpoint, I don't know what the savings would be.

MR. COLLINS: Just to Kim's point, if we did that and we found out how many, and there is a small number, we could probably do the printing in-house at that point, instead of doing it outsourcing.

MR. HARTIG: It's critical to inform the participants who don't have electronic reporting of what we're doing, and they're an integral part of our process, and they need to be informed. At this time, a number of them don't have this technology, and fishermen in particular are slow people to get involved in this type of technology. For me, from a budgetary standpoint, this is a critical need of the council, and so I would urge you to expend the funds necessary to inform our participants who don't have electronic capability.

DR. MCGOVERN: What we did is what Mike said. We used to contract out sending out all of the Fishery Bulletins, and now we do it in-house, because it's just a small number of Fishery Bulletins, and so it's feasible to do it, to print them all out and then to mail them out in-house, and so it has been a reduction in cost.

MR. BREWER: My suggestion was only from the standpoint of the newsletter and not the postcards and not the news releases and whatnot. News releases, at least to me, I prefer, quite frankly, to get them electronically. The postcards, that's fine. Electronic is fine on that, but I really kind of enjoy reading the newsletter, Gregg, your message and the message from the chairperson and that kind of thing, and I like it, and so I'm only suggesting that we do the opt-in

or opt-out thing for the newsletters, and I see that we're doing a little bit over \$12,000 is the news releases and postcards, and I just don't know how many people are going to opt-in on the newsletters. I don't know. Ben may be right that we're all pretty crusty old guys and probably won't even realize that we need to opt-in, and then we'll just be saying why is it that we don't get the newsletter anymore.

MR. PHILLIPS: Chester, I'm thrilled that you like our articles and editorials. I will stop there.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to say that I appreciate staff going through and looking at this, and I think finding efficiencies. I am sensitive to what Ben is saying, that there are a number of folks who don't always use electronic means of communication. I think my experience in North Carolina with some guys is that they have a smartphone, but they don't have email, and so they have a smartphone, and they're on Facebook, and they will text, but they don't have email, and I'm like, you're on Facebook, but you're not on email? That's kind of been my thing.

I guess one question for Kim, because I saw her kind of falling over over there, and I'm thinking it was probably in respect to things like newsletter layout. If you're going to do a paper -- If you're going to continue to do a hard-copy newsletter for a limited number of folks, is the layout -- Is it any more time for you to do that for a few folks than it is to lay it out electronically? It is? Okay.

MS. IVERSON: Yes, the layout is time consuming, doing it in a layout and making sure that everything is laid out justly, and the other reason -- One reason for switching is that I have a very limited amount of space to explain a very sometimes complex issue, like cobia, and so I'm trying to minimize that, and we are hoping, on our website, to increase the use of our blogs, so that we can write a little bit more freely and put links to some videos and how-to and have photos, images, and take advantage of that. That was one of the other impetuses for going to an online newsletter.

We could certainly -- I was thinking about what Monica mentioned earlier, about letting people that receive the print materials know that we're migrating towards the online availability, and we certainly could do it via Facebook and make notifications via Facebook for those that don't have email addresses.

They could click a link from our Facebook page and have access to it, but perhaps maybe do a postcard announcement, just print the postcards and let them know we've migrated and this is how you can access it. You can follow us on Facebook if you don't have email, or you can visit our website and access it, and so it's really up to the committee, as far as doing a layout for a newsletter on a quarterly basis versus an online version, and, if you do both, then you have increased that staff time.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks for that explanation, Kim. Anybody else?

MR. WAUGH: I don't know what your guidance is.

MR. PHILLIPS: I was basically making sure -- What is the committee's pleasure with this? What kind of direction do you want to give Gregg?

DR. DUVAL: I like the move towards trying to get everything to as much of an electronic platform as possible. I would say, if we could do like what Jack has suggested the Regional Office did,

some kind of postcard or something, to get a sense of -- To define the universe of people who still would like to see the printed product and then move on from there. That would be great, and I think, if it can be -- Depending on what the results are, if there are some limited copies that could be printed in-house, maybe that's what we do.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Michelle. I am sorry for going around the circle and not telling you where we were getting off.

MR. WAUGH: Again, that is specific to the newsletter, right? We would send out a postcard asking people if they want to opt-in for the newsletter alone. We will make sure and reach out to them through Facebook and other means for our other information.

MR. HARTIG: I wasn't specific to the newsletter. I was specific to the postcards and other things of how we inform our public. I mean, I think we need to find out, as Michelle said, that we need to know the universe of people who don't use electronic reporting and then make an informed decision based on that for everything we send out.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think Ben may have a good point. If we get a lot of people opting-in, then we may know which way we want to lean.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to make a similar suggestion, where we sort of surveyed in the postcard what portions they wanted to opt-in for. To me, I take a slightly different view from Chester. I think the newsletter is sort of the luxury item that goes away first, and, as needed, the other things that actually state regulations are more important for those commercial fishermen that may not have access to email to actually opt-in and receive, and so, if I was going to get rid of one, I would get rid of the newsletter first and give people the opportunity to opt-in for the regulatory changes that we send them.

I think an easy way forward would just be to send the card saying that this council is looking to move towards electronic and, if you don't have access to computers or email, would you like to opt-in, and these are the locations where you could find the information, to just use it as sort of an informative -- A survey and information.

MS. VON HARTEN: I just wanted to remind you all that almost two years ago we did send out a postcard asking if you felt that you would be missing out and unable to stay involved with the council process if you stopped receiving printed mailings, and we sent it out to our 4,000-plus mailing list, and we only got about 400 responses back. Of those 400 responses, it was a 50/50 split, essentially. Then, most of the people that did send it back, that said that they wouldn't be, they said to please remove me from your mailing list, and so we did that.

That's just to remind you that we've gone down this route before, and, just back to what Kim was saying, I think the content is what is the problem with the newsletter. It's that Kim will have to develop two separate things if we do a printed version and a more electronic blog-style version, and maybe it would have been helpful if we had an example of that, but, essentially, the electronic version would be blog-style with a header, a little a blurb, and you click on the link to get more about the article. Like Kim said, it gives more of an opportunity to link to further content, videos and all of that, and so just keep that in mind.

MR. GRINER: I am not on the committee, but that brought up something that I did receive. I have had a magazine or a newsletter like that, that comes in the mail, but they also do the exact same that you can receive electronically, and it's almost like the electronic newsletter. The pages actually flip, and they have links in the articles. Of course, you can't click on the link in your printed version, but the version that comes out electronically is exactly the same, and it is exactly laid out the same, and the pages actually flip, just like you were flipping through the magazine or the publication itself, and I like that, but I also like having the printed copy, too.

I like having it in my briefcase, where maybe I just want to -- I get it in the mail, and I want to pick it up and hold it and look at it from time-to-time, for a few minutes, and I don't want to get bogged down by sitting there and, all of a sudden, I have spent an hour at the computer going through and clicking links, and I get so wound up in that, but that's just my thoughts on it.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am guessing, from my sense, it's that they want to test the water.

MS. RHODES: Just to that point, that requires additional software, most likely. There is a program called Issue, and we would have to investigate what the cost would be associated with that. Most programs don't let you have flappable pages online, unless you actually go forward with that additional software, but it's certainly something that we could do, and our WordPress website would absolutely allow for that.

What we have been talking about is more akin to a Story Map style, and so how many of you guys -- Just a show of hands, but how many of you guys use our Story Map or visit it? Okay, and so we're pretty low within our council members, but I think you guys know the material pretty well, in-and-out, but the public has been really receptive to those Story Maps. It's been a really nice way to be more innovative. Those Story Maps actually allow us to host videos and photo content, and we can link anywhere we want, and it's a scrolling page. Rather than having a flappable page, you have a scrolling page.

Now, we already have that software, and it's actually made available through ArcGIS, and it's free to us, and so, if that's something you would rather see Kim and I playing around with, in more of a newsletter style, that's certainly something we can do. We're already doing that with all of our public hearings, all of our scoping, everything that's kind of a hot topic. We did a cobia end-of-year update at the end of 2017, and so we're kind of already moving in that direction, but, if you want to talk about it more, Tim, and the software that that magazine uses, I am more than happy to hear that out, and we can see if it's something that we can implement on our end.

MR. GRINER: I like the scrolling too, and so either one.

MS. RHODES: Great. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Cameron. Anything else? Gregg, do you have some kind of direction out of that?

MR. WAUGH: I am still a little unclear as to whether we're using a postcard and having them opt-in for paper, whether you want that done again and see where we end up relative to two years ago.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes or no? I am seeing some heads nod and some maybes. Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: I am not on the committee, but I appreciate the decisions this committee makes. I went back and actually read the minutes of the December meeting that I missed, and I saw the comments from the state directors who -- We talked about the cut in the liaison budgets, and everybody was sort of reluctant, but they could if they had to, and then we had this discussion a little bit in Personnel on Monday, and then we just kind of breezed over it a few minutes ago, and it kind of popped back into my head that I would appreciate if someone who is on this committee would consider making a motion to reinstitute the state liaison budgets to the point where they were in the 2017 budget.

Then, if we're not able to balance this out, come June, then we'll pull them back out at that point, but I know that the \$6,000 or so change isn't great, but it does help fully support the work of our research vessel and the data collection that's on that vessel, plus the folks who attend the SSC meetings and the SEDAR Committee meetings and all the stuff that we put in our report, and so, if someone would be willing to do that, I would appreciate it.

MR. PHILLIPS: We can take a motion, but I will tell you that I think we're going to still be looking at priorities when go into Personnel and what we've got for money and how we want to spend it, and I think that might be up high on the list, and so, rather than do a motion here and start that process here, we might want to just wait and gather all of that together in our Personnel meeting that we're going to have, because I think there's going to be an awful lot of stuff talked about there, and we can do a motion, if somebody feels the need to do it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't want to do a motion. My opinion is the opposite of Doug's, but I will say, if you remember in Personnel, you're supposed to send me the priority lists, and it sounds like that's at the top of your priority list.

MR. HAYMANS: I am sorry, but are the state liaison grants part of the Personnel actions? I thought they were part of this committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The wish list was the management and science things that you wanted.

MR. PHILLIPS: Is there anything else?

DR. DUVAL: I also agree with Jessica, and I feel like we made that decision, and, yes, it is impactful, but I also don't want to see us whiplashed back and forth, and that's what this would be doing. I am sensitive to what Doug has said, and it supports all the same types of activities for us as well. I think that there is going to be -- As you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, the Personnel Committee is probably going to be looking at a whole suite of items, and so I don't really want to go back on a decision that's already been made that I have already communicated to folks in our budget office, and so thank you.

MR. BELL: I am not on your committee, but I would concur with that, and we'll just pick it up in Personnel.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Then we will take that and let that be the plan. Anything else? All right, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: We will move on to Follow-Up and Priorities, and Brian is going to walk us through that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: First, let's talk about the follow-up, because I think that's going to be a little bit easier and quicker. As you remember, and it's in your briefing book, but the follow-up document has sort of the status of things that are going on. You will be getting a new version of that in a couple of weeks, after the council staff and then SERO staff review it, and then this document is continually updated between council meetings. If you see something that maybe is not there, but has come up recently, chances are, if you need a later version of it, just contact me, and I will be glad to get it for you.

There is a couple of things that I do want to point out for you that's in the follow-up. In there, those of you who are committee chairs, recall that, prior to each of our council meetings, we have committee chair meetings. That always works through a conference call, and, in the past, what we had done is we just contact you a week or two before and set it up, and what we've done is we've tried to standardize that, and so now, in the follow-up, is the date and time for all of the follow-ups for the rest of the year, and I think I may even have 2019 in there as well already, because we already know where and when the meetings are going to be in 2019. From that, I can just calculate out when we will be doing those run-through calls ahead of time, and so I wanted to point that out to you.

MS. BECKWITH: I definitely still want email reminders, because I just need those.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You will get email reminders. That will still happen, but I'm just saying, for planning purposes, if you do some long-range calendar sorts of things, it's there and it's available, and you can lay it out, and so you will always get an email and probably a reminder a day or two ahead of time, to remind you that this is going to happen. Typically, we send out -- When the briefing book goes out, we will let you know that that call is coming up.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Anybody else? Okay, Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The next thing is, and this is going to be a little bit dicey here, because we're going to need to have some discussion to figure it out. What we have up here now is the -- This is a spreadsheet that is -- To be able to make it so that you can even read it is -- It's Attachment 3b in the briefing book.

It shows the things that the council staff are doing by column, the main things that they are responsible for, but, if you read across the rows, like here, this one, Row 5, that's where we are now. In the first quarter of 2018, it shows you all of the things that your council staff has been working on in that quarter, the main projects that they have going on, and likely are the things that are going to be coming up for you to discuss at the meeting for that quarter.

In this case, under John Hadley, we had the red grouper rebuilding plan, the for-hire moratorium, and then this socioeconomic report, which we've talked about in the past, which I believe you're going to receive something in June about that. Then he continues doing economic analyses for all of our management plans, and then it goes across this way, and so you can see everything that's

kind of on your plate, either at this meeting or the next meeting that you're going to have or in the very near future.

Typically, what we've been doing is setting some council priorities. We have set four priorities, main priorities, that the council has had. Coming into this meeting, there were both of the visioning amendments as well as we had cobia and red grouper, and so we've also -- Now, we're still working on the visioning amendments, but we've got golden tilefish and red grouper rebuilding, both of which have statutory requirements that these things get done.

Then, at this meeting, you have made several decisions about other amendments and things that you would like to see started, and so we've got -- I will give you a list of those things right now. One of them is the allowable fishing zones, and that's that deepwater shrimp and golden crab fishing zones that we talked about the other day, and that's already listed as something over here for Chip. As you can see, right now, on here, it's just abbreviated as Coral/Shrimp, because that's the two FMPs that are affected by that.

You decided, at this meeting, that you wanted to take Amendment 46 and split it into two amendments, and with one a framework amendment looking at circle hooks, descending devices, powerheads, and that sort of thing, and then the other amendment -- That will be probably a framework amendment, and then you would have what is currently Actions 1 and 2 remaining in 46, and that is whether it's the recreational stamp or the permit or whatever you're going to do and recreational reporting. That would continue on as a regular amendment.

I had, for myself, listed down here, for amendments that I am working on, I still have the wreckfish ITQ, but also golden tilefish, which currently is Regulatory Amendment 28, and, also, I had started working on the recreational AMs. Then a couple of the other things that came up was the sea turtle release gear, which that amendment needs to be looked at, and then the king mackerel trip limits, which we don't have accounted for, and then there was the yellowtail amendment and whether or not we put the ACL in with the other ACL amendment. You still have that you wanted to consider the action of instituting a trip limit after a certain percent of the ACL -- No?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're looking at the accountability measure, and so there were two yellowtail amendments. One is on accountability measures, because we discussed possibly adding it to the other document that John presented on accountability measures, and then a long-term yellowtail amendment that looked at some of those other things that you're talking about of trip limits and combining ACLs and others.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. I lost that part in the translation, but we are going to have the AM part being looked at probably with the AM amendment?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Only if that's going to move quickly, because the yellowtail was a timing issue, and those folks have been waiting, and this will be the third year that it's going to close early. That's why I would rather have it stand on its own, but I know that that's a decision of the committee, but that's just my opinion.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Right. I think what we need to do then is we need to figure out what are the current priorities and then how are we going to work on some of these other things and when you

want them back, timing, et cetera, for these things, so we can figure out things like do we need to do the accountability measures for yellowtail as a separate document or what we need to do.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are there thoughts from the committee?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Michelle, the document you're looking at is the one that's in your briefing book, and it doesn't have all the updated stuff in it that has come up this week that I've just been talking about. It's not on that document yet. Some of it is, but not all of it.

DR. DUVAL: Right. I know that, but this does have that or no?

DR. CHEUVRONT: What you're looking at up there is what's in your briefing book, and so it doesn't have everything on it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess my first question is, based on the fact that you've already gotten these laid out so that you have individuals by particular amendments, and then I count that we have seven new items, and so is one of our decisions to replace -- Like find and replace the items? Do you see what I mean? Are we trying to replace some things that people are working on as well as picking our top four or whatever? Is that what we're trying to do?

DR. CHEUVRONT: No, and the only one that I really haven't been able to place with somebody yet is if we're going to do a yellowtail amendment immediately, separate from something else. Basically, everything else, I can fit in with staff. I think part of it is the priorities of what you want us to be working on and bring back to you in June. For example, we got some direction during wreckfish that you don't want to see the wreckfish ITQ in June. Great. We got that part, but there are some things that -- You have been setting priorities, is what you've been doing, and we would like to know what your priorities are, to make sure that that's what we're putting most of our emphasis on.

DR. DUVAL: I am just trying to make sure I've got the list of the new stuff. It's the yellowtail amendment, and then we've got this yellowtail long-term thing, and so I'm not sure -- I think the yellowtail long-term thing needs to be on the list, but it kind of needs to be near the bottom of the list, just so that we can -- We need to keep it there, but I don't know if it factors into immediate like next quarter or next couple of quarters type of stuff.

Then we have the accountability measures amendment, the ABC control rule amendment, and we've got Amendment 46, which I am assuming is the recreational reporting, and then the best practices amendment, which was the other two actions, Actions 3 and 4, that we split out, and then what's the one that I am missing?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Did you have the sea turtle release gear?

DR. DUVAL: I did not. Thank you.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The king mackerel trip limits.

DR. DUVAL: Is that not -- That isn't already in there under -- No.

DR. CHEUVRONT: It is not.

DR. DUVAL: Okay.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The ABC control rule, however, already is, and that's under John Carmichael.

MR. BELL: The yellowtail accountability might go in with the accountability or it really depends on, I think, which is quicker, right? How would we decide that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: It depends on how much of a priority do you want to put on the recreational AM amendment overall, and so that's the kind of guidance that I need. If that outweighs the other recreational AMs and we need to move that one more quickly, then that's the kind of guidance we need.

MS. MCCAWLEY: In my mind, the yellowtail accountability measure, by itself, to me, outweighs the overall. It would be nice to fix all of these accountability measures, and so I feel like the yellowtail accountability measure is a need right now.

MR. WAUGH: Just a question for yellowtail, in terms of the accountability measure, because, all our other AMs, the main emphasis there is fixing the recreational in-season closure, and this is not recreational. This is commercial, and it's just a little different.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with Jessica that I think that could move faster, just the short-term yellowtail accountability measure itself, and so that would have to go to the Gulf, or no? Remind me which one it was that you were thinking of again, which of the accountability measures in that document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This is not close the fishery after the Gulf and South Atlantic ACLs are met, but it's just ours, and so it's just the South Atlantic.

DR. DUVAL: I feel like we could get that done quickly, but that's just me. We have adjusted the fishing year, and that hasn't worked, and so I feel like, if we could do this, then that might provide a little bit of relief, and we could do it quickly. I feel like the recreational accountability measures are going to need to -- That's going to need to go to an IPT, and there's going to have to be some massaging of purpose and need and working up to an options paper, whereas I feel like the yellowtail actions that we looked at earlier are already fleshed out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's what I was going to say. They are left over from the South Florida Committee, and they were already fleshed out, and I believe there was some analysis done on all of that, because this is a holdover from South Florida.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and, literally, this is sort of cooking and figuring this out as we go, and I have just had a quick sidebar discussion with Myra, and she is sort of feeling that, because the visioning for the commercial amendment is wrapping up a little more quickly and is a little further along than some of the recreational things, even though they're kind of still on the same timeline, and the amount of work that is going to go to the commercial visioning amendment is not as heavy now, and she's thinking that she could probably take on this yellowtail, and my thought was that Myra would be the right staff person to do this one anyway. If we want to put that -- We've got

the personnel issue knocked out. Is this something that is now a priority to be moving on now to get things really going along for June? I will put that under the list of priorities.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am seeing heads nod.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. Then do we want to continue with the two visioning amendments as priorities as well?

MR. PHILLIPS: I am seeing another yes.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Then you've got two things that are under statutory deadlines here to get done, and that's the golden tilefish and the red grouper rebuilding plans, and so those probably have to be considered as priorities, right?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think we have a choice.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That has us with five priorities. We've got some of these other things that - - Just because they're not on this main priority list, it doesn't mean that we won't be coming back to you, obviously, in June with additional things, but this kind of helps us to know exactly where to be putting most of our efforts.

Now, there is also the issue -- I know that was brought up earlier, and maybe this is what Jack is going to address, is about the fact that SERO is down some staff and some things are going to come to the council staff, in terms of analyses and things, that we need to help provide them with some support, just as they have done for us in the past when we've had positions that went unfilled. I know this isn't going to be easy stuff. I mean, this is a lot of work that's being asked of the staff, and we're going to do it. We will make it happen one way or the other. It will happen, but maybe Jack has more to add.

DR. MCGOVERN: It's true that we're down one analytical person. Nick Farmer has gone over to Protected Resources, and we're going to try to pick up some of that slack with Jeff Pulver and Alisha DiLeone, to do some analytical work and replacing some IFQ work that they've been doing. I also wanted to mention that I didn't see on the list the -- We're down an economist, too. We haven't replaced Stephan Holliman, and so we've got a shortage there as well, but I also wanted to mention that I didn't see the amendment that Chip was talking about with the allowable gear zones for shrimp and golden crab and the changes to the shrimp transit provisions. Maybe that's on the list and I just missed it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Jack, it is on the list. Right now, it's listed under Chip, under Coral and Shrimp, because those are the two FMPs that are affected by that. We talked about it, and we anticipated that this was going to be coming up, and so, in December, we put that on there, because Chip was going to be doing some work on that between December and now, and we assumed that it was going to continue, and he has done that work, and it is continuing, but that's already accounted for on the list.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just to follow-up to Jack, you are going to send those transit rules to Chip, so he can make an alternative for transit, right?

DR. MCGOVERN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I will send the regulations for the three transit provisions in the South Atlantic, and I will also look to the Gulf and see what they have there and send that to Chip as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and so it would be really nice for the Coast Guard and the fishermen to just have something that's the same and say we use it here, and we're going to use it there, and it would probably make everything else a lot easier.

MR. HARTIG: The king mackerel, this season is a wash. There's no way you can do anything to implement anything this season, but, if you wanted to have it implemented by April or May of next year, when would you have to start working on that King Mackerel Amendment 6 Framework?

DR. CHEUVRONT: It would be now.

MR. HARTIG: That's what I thought.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had a similar question about lobster, since the Gulf is the administrative lead on that and they're doing the work on that, and I assume we're coming back to June with that, since we're kind of in lockstep with that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, we are working closely with them, and it's like either they make a decision and then our next meeting we follow-up, or vice versa, and so we're staying on top of it with each other. It's pretty clear to me now that I think we know what the priorities are. You all know what the different amendments are that are here, and it's a lot. We're going to do our best to make it all happen exactly as you're prescribing, and we'll be back in June with lots of different amendments.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think we're going to add anything else, and so I think we're good. All right.

MR. WAUGH: While Brian is pulling that up, the next item is Regulatory Reform, and this is where we're trying to remove regulations, and the procedure that we have instituted is we sent a letter to Chris Oliver on December 20, indicating that we would continue to request public comments at March and June, and you can see that we highlighted that in our agenda and materials here, and there isn't a lot of public interest in it, but each tech staff has reviewed the regulations, and we're bringing those recommendations to you. We coordinated with the Regional Office, and they've got a couple of additional ones.

The Executive Finance Committee here will give us guidance on these, and then we get public input and we take it to our advisory panels that are meeting, and, any advisory panel that's not meeting, we're sending it to them, and then we coordinate with the Region and NOAA GC between March and June and bring a revised list to the Executive Finance Committee in June, and then you all will review it and approve it at June, and we send it to NMFS Headquarters by June 22.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I will briefly go through the things that have been identified, and what we did is, after the December council meeting, I had the staff go through all the CFRs related to the species that they are the council lead for and read through all the CFRs to see if they could identify

things that were either unneeded, unnecessary, or outdated, and those are the criteria. The first thing we looked at was things that we definitely know that we can get rid of now, because of those criteria.

Then we also looked at things that the council is currently considering, which it's surprising how many things that the council is considering that could get rid of some of these regulation as well, and then, by the time we got all of that done, it was getting right up to the briefing book time, and SERO staff sent us a list of their things, because, as you saw in the letter that we were working on -- I have a list of those things, but I simply didn't have time to flesh those out and get them into this document before the briefing book, but I have a separate list of what those things are, and, between now and the next meeting, they will get included in there.

Then anything additional that we would get from any of the APs or the SSC or whatever, they will be added to the document, and that will all come back to you again in June. Again, the public will have another opportunity to comment on it. This is when you all will get that opportunity to say yea or nay and this looks good and let's send this in or give us further direction on what you would like for us to do. With no further ado, I am going to jump into regulations that are currently in place, and I forget what document number this is.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's 4b.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. They are listed in CFR order, and so that's why they appear this way in here, and I think it's a little bit easier, for those who are trying to use this as a reference document, if they're looking at the CFRs at the same time they're looking at the stuff that is being recommended to be removed.

One of the things that was identified that we really don't need at all now, and we don't look to be changing in the near future, is some of the language that exists in 622.241 regarding golden crab. There are some things that were in there that really only were necessary as the fishery was being set up, with the permits and allowable fishing zones and things. That has been done. That was done years and years ago, and this is no longer necessary to be in the CFRs, because a lot of this stuff doesn't apply.

Issuing new vessel permits for the Northern Zone, applying for permits in the Northern Zone, and how they have to respond to all of that, these can just be removed, because they are simply outdated. They have served their purpose when they went into place, but they really have no applicability at this point.

Now, we have several things that the council is considering removing through a future plan amendment process, and so we have the things like the powerhead prohibition area off of South Carolina that you're talking about through the fishing practices amendment, the new one, getting rid of that off of South Carolina, and so this would be 622.182, and that could potentially be removed, since South Carolina has requested that that be removed.

In 622.200, under Sub-Part J, under shrimp fishing, we have the issue with operator cards, and so it was thought that this could be removed. The council is considering removing operator cards for charter vessels, and they may also want to consider removing the requirement for rock shrimp as well, and so that is something that is out there that you all can consider.

There is also, looking at the 622.210, Adjustment of Management Measures, they are -- It's looking like the things that can be done through a framework procedure, identifying coral HAPCs, that is probably not likely to happen, considering how much effort has to go into determining HAPCs, and it's probably not likely that they will be established by framework, and so maybe that could be removed from that framework, and that would just then become a regular plan amendment.

Under Dolphin and Wahoo, Sub-Part M, we have then the issue of the operator permit cards that folks have talked about wanting to get rid of, and that's on our list for our next dolphin wahoo amendment, that that would be considered, and so there are several parts here that could be stricken out, if that actually happens.

Then, under CMP, removing the Atlantic migratory group cobia regulations from the CFR, assuming that goes through, and then there is that whole list of regulations that would be related that could be stricken from the CFRs, and you can see that's quite a bit, and so we'll see how that goes tomorrow.

Then, under Spiny Lobster, there is some discussion about ACLs, ACTs, and AMs for spiny lobster, and there has been talk about, because of the life cycle of spiny lobsters, that maybe they could be considered for exemption from the ACL requirements under the Magnuson Act, and that was what council staff came up with, the things that we thought that you all might want to consider offering up as things that could be removed.

Rick DeVictor sent me an email, and it had three things on it in addition to what council staff had come up with, and they had reviewed that, and it was the deepwater species minimum size limit, and this is proposed for removal in the visioning amendment, and then there was also looking at the regulations requiring a permit application to be mailed to people for removal, and SERO is considering a change that would just send a letter to the individual, and they would be able to print out the application or fill it out online, and so that would be a change.

Then shrimp transit provisions, and that is something that we've talked about now and that is getting considered in the coral/shrimp amendment, and so it would be changing regulations that would make the transit provisions consistent and avoid confusion and help law enforcement, and so I guess, at this point now, we would like to know what you all think about what we have proposed and if there are additional things that you think that we need to include that are not already here.

MR. HARTIG: For any of those listening on the webinar, when Brian said permit applications should be mailed to folks for removal, it is renewal. There is a difference.

MS. MCCAWLEY: My question, or suggestion, is I felt like the spiny lobster item that is moving through the Magnuson process, I thought that one was a little more presumptuous than the other ones. I see why it's in there, and I like it, and don't get me wrong, but I think it might be a little presumptuous or premature at this time.

I was also wondering, with the lobster amendment that we're working on, where we're incorporating a bunch of these FWC rules, and we submitted a bunch of technical changes and some other minor fixes, and I am wondering if there is some deletions that go along with that that

you could add to this list as well. There were wrong phone numbers, and they were referring to the Marine Fisheries Commission instead of FWC, and so there might be some little things in there that you could add to this list as well.

If one of the two, between the procedure and the policy, or whatever the names of those two documents were, if one of those still exist, you could add that to the deletion list, because that's being combined into one document, and so just some other ideas on lobster that could be added here, maybe in exchange of the one about the Magnuson Act. I mean, I like it, and I hope that this passes, but it might be a teensy bit presumptuous.

DR. CHEUVRONT: A little wishful thinking, huh? Okay.

MR. BELL: Just a question about process. We turn this list in, I think in June, and then what happens, time-wise, and what is the likely time -- We've got things that we're working on, which are in here. If these happen first, then we don't worry about it anymore?

MR. WAUGH: Headquarters is combining all of these suggestions from the various councils, and then I don't know if they have fully thought this through, what the process is to then implement it, because some of these things may require action by the councils, and I think, if they do, then it will come back to us, and we would have to amend the plan. If there are some things that they can change, like some of these that are outdated, they may be able to do that by a technical rulemaking, and so I think that process will be determined, and we'll keep track of it, in coordination with them, but at least I haven't heard a clear explanation of how that process works after that.

MR. BELL: So, we could actually achieve our process first, maybe, and there is no telling.

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would bet on that.

LCDR BENNETT: I know you guys have discussed this before, questioning the utility of the operator cards, and I can tell you that, yes, they are a pain, and I know you guys hate them, but I think that it's not an issue of having them or not having them. I think it's an issue of the system as a whole. There needs to be consistency between GARFO and SERO.

We've got to get out of this vacuum of the two Regional Offices operating in their own independent way, especially when you have species like dolphin and wahoo that are going up and down the Atlantic Coast, and so I think it's a system that works, and I can tell you -- I can give you an example of when the Coast Guard can issue a Captain of the Port Order to terminate a vessel, but, if the operator of that boat, who just cost the taxpayer dollars of \$600,000 for us to rescue him, i.e., it was a dolphin wahoo boat, he just hopped on to another boat to do the same stuff, and so that's the utility of the operator permit, where we can actually request NOAA sanction the permit, and he's not operating anymore and costing you guys a lot of money. That is why I think it's a useful tool, where sometimes we come up short. Our regulations don't allow us to keep someone in port, a physical person in port, and so I'm just throwing that out there.

DR. MCGOVERN: We had conversations with Mike Cahall last week about electronic for-hire systems, and he said having an operator card really works well just for a unique identifier for the

system, and that's what he would like to see us have in the Southeast Region, and so it has utility there as well, and I also agree with Jessica that it's probably a little early to be talking about getting rid of the spiny lobster ACL.

MS. BECKWITH: To Jack's point, our operator card doesn't actually have a unique identifier, and so I agree with both statements. I think if GARFO and the South Atlantic and Gulf Council got together and created one operator card for all of our fisheries that had a unique identifier and was actually a legal U.S. ID, then I think it has a lot of utility.

I would like to see the operator card, in its current form, done away with. Even if we got to the point where we started working with GARFO and the Gulf Council and actually got to a point where we were creating one system, one operator card, we would have to amend the management plan, irregardless, to put in the new operator card requirements and the new standards and so forth, and so I think our current operator card needs to disappear, because the utility is just none, in my opinion, but I think the concept has value, and I think we should pursue the concept in partnership with GARFO and with the Gulf Council and actually move forward and make it something that is actually worthwhile and could be used for logbooks and VTRs and one identifier across all of the regions, but, this operator card, this one needs to go away.

MS. MCCAWLEY: On a different subject, those of us from Florida over here have decided that there is some Gulf Council rules that we would like to repeal, and so, if we can just add those to our list.

MR. PHILLIPS: The rules or the Gulf Council?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The rules. I will stick with some rules. We have some choice ones that I can think of that we could add to our list.

MS. BOSARGE: If you all are going to pick on me, then get rid of that operator card. It's a pain in the butt, because I have to have them in the Gulf for some of the permits we over here, and you have to go get a passport photo made, and do you know how often these guys lose their wallets, and so I'm getting more passport photos made and mailing more paperwork in and getting another copy of this danged thing. If you want them to have an ID, they've got an ID. I mean, we have IDs in this country. We have a unique identifier for everybody in this country. You've got to have a Social Security number. I think we have plenty of avenues that we've already covered those, and please get rid of that thing, and then let me know what you want done away with in the Gulf.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will send you a list.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Anything else? All right, Gregg. Next.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I am assuming that, from the document that you had in your briefing book, you would like to see us add the ones from the Region as well, and then we'll go back and look at the spiny lobster things, based on the things that Jessica had said, and I was checking with Christina on that, making sure that she captured all that as well, and so expect in June to see an updated version of that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Also, send over those things for the Gulf that we would like to sneak in on our list. It would make our list longer.

MR. BELL: We didn't get anything from the public at any point in time? Then, to that, how were we asking them that? I know we said they could comment or whatever, but did we explain it to them? I am just curious.

MR. WAUGH: It's been included on our agenda, and I think we've done, in some of our newsletters, and I have talked about it in my article. It's just not something that has drawn a lot of attention. We hope we will get some attention by now taking this draft list to our APs, and that may precipitate something, and then, when we come back in June, we'll have a more refined list, and we can publicize that some more and see if we can't get some public input at June.

MR. BELL: I think part of it is they kind of can't grasp the concept, and I've had a couple of conversations with a couple of folks that would just as soon that I went away, and that's part of it, or we went away, and so I think it's kind of a matter of grasping what you're looking for.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just so you will know, I think the kind of things we're hoping for is that, when we bring this back to you all in June, we will then, by the time you're finished with your discussions, we will have that list, and that's the hope, because we have a week after the end of the June council meeting that we're expecting that we're going to be sending it up to Headquarters. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Brian. What's next, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Next up is the Atlantic Coast-Wide Group Discussions, and, if you remember, what we did is recommended that the three east coast councils, the Chair, the Vice Chair, and the ED, get together and continue this discussion. This is something that Michelle initiated with Chris Moore at the Mid-Atlantic Council, and we met at the CCC meeting last week, and it was a very interesting discussion.

They are seeing more and more species show up farther north, and we sort of took the approach that maybe the way to handle this is to work with our state partners and have the states implement some sort of regulations that could be enforced with a landing limit. They were much more interested in the council extending its jurisdiction, which surprised me. They want us to go back and dig out the letters and the process that we used when we extended the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP from the South Atlantic to include the Mid-Atlantic.

We now need to consider extending that up through New England, and I think this is reflective of how much our council worked to bring the Mid-Atlantic in at the committee level for cobia. I think people really see that as a way of having their voice heard for their region, and so they're comfortable with that process, and there are other FMPs, like bluefish, that the Mid-Atlantic has that is the entire east coast, and we have dolphin wahoo, but we give them voting seats on our committee, and so that seems to be the direction that we're headed in.

They have already worked with the Northeast to get some of our priority species on the list, so that routine data collection programs are going to start picking that data up, and there is other issues

that we have raised in the past, but that's sort of what we focused on. They want us to come up with a prioritized list of species that we think are most critical to start focusing in on.

The Mid-Atlantic is interested, and they are going to attend our September meeting, the Chair, Vice Chair, and ED, and so we're going to be working with Charlie to have a short session to talk about this and flesh this out a little bit more when they're there, and we may consider asking the New England Council if they want to have a representative there, and so, Michelle, this is moving on, and I think we're making some progress.

MR. PHILLIPS: Gregg, do we want to have kind of draft list of species when we meet in May that might help expedite the conversation?

MR. WAUGH: I think it would be helpful, and we can start drafting that list, and certainly, from council members, if there are some that -- Remember when we went to that NRCC meeting that we put together -- Christina put together coastal migratory pelagics information, and Myra put together snapper grouper, and so we've got that information to rely on, and those are certainly some species there, and we can look at that. If anybody else has some suggestions, and we will certainly coordinate with Erik and others at the Center to see if they have any feel for species that we need to get on that list as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Very good, and obviously this is not going to be fast-track. All right. What else have we got?

DR. DUVAL: I just want to thank you and Charlie, Gregg, for continuing to push this issue forward and talking about it and going to the NRCC meeting. I mean, I know it's yet one more meeting to go to on top of everything else, and I'm really glad that we continue to have discussion about this, like at the CCC meetings and stuff, and I hope that we can find some peaceful resolution to these issues, and I am sort of pleasantly surprised to hear that folks want to see those letters from 1997 when the CMP management unit was extended northward, and so I guess that's encouraging.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know about Gregg, but I am still in sticker-shock that they had a standard and an operational in the same year on the same species, and that's your goal, Erik.

MR. WAUGH: Next, you all asked us to look into council training and webinars. What we've got here, and this is in the overview, and you can follow along in that. We do an internal orientation for new council members. There is an agenda from our last one included, and we give them an overview. I am not going to go through all of that, but we give them an overview, and this is some of the information that we share with them. Each staff gives them a background on what they do.

We talk about additional information about data and stock assessments and the MRIP and SEDAR reference documents. We train them about our partners, the basics of Roberts Rules, and then, also, for new and existing council members, NMFS does that annual training for new members each year, and we provide the link here for the training materials from the October/November 2017 meeting, and so that has a lot of material there as well.

We can put together presentations on recreational and commercial and fishery-independent data, and we can give them an overview and give you all -- This is for new members and for you all,

periodically, and we can give council members an overview of stock assessment, and there are some other training opportunities available. One new item that I wanted to run by you all is I thought there is a resource that we're not tapping, and these are past council members.

I think, for new members coming on, there's nothing like getting the inside scoop from the side of the table that you all sit on, and we can tell them about how the procedure works, but only you all can tell them about the pressures you face and the issues you deal with, and so, so far, I have talked to Michelle, Susan Shipman, and Ben Hartig, and they're all willing to participate, and we've got David Cupka in Charleston that, if you all think this is worth pursuing, that I can reach out.

The idea was to, when we do this in-house training, to bring these council members in for an opportunity to meet and share with them, and staff would leave and let them have some time to themselves, and then it would give the new council members a contact in their particular state that they could work with, and so that's one new idea, and those council members could mentor these newer ones as they are on the council, and so it would cost -- It would be the cost of bringing several council members in for this two-day meeting, and that includes travel, and so we wanted to see what you all thought about that idea. Then the other is Roberts Rules, and we would look at another formal training session, maybe late in 2018, because we're getting in a lot of new council members, and we cover administrative information, social media, and others, and so that's sort of the overview on training, but particularly your input on that mentoring topic.

MR. GRINER: I would like to request Michelle as my mentor.

DR. DUVAL: I tried to be your mentor already.

MR. BREWER: I think your mentoring idea is great, absolutely great, and I don't know that it necessarily has to be past council members coming in to tell war stories in Charleston, but to assign a new council member a mentor that they could call on during council meetings and get help and advice with what's going on or say I've got this one issue that I really want to bring to the table and how do I go about doing that efficiently. The Florida Bar has a mentoring program, and it's been very effective, particularly as you've seen more and more lawyers who come out of law school and they literally hang up their own shingle and they don't have a clue what they're doing, and so I think the mentoring idea -- Not just one meeting, but longer term, and that has an awful lot of merit.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chester.

DR. MCGOVERN: I just want to mention that we're going to have Magnuson-Stevens Act training at the Southeast Regional Office with Mary McPherson the week of June 22, and I think council staff has taken that training with her before, but we do have spaces available, and I am going to mention it to the Gulf Council as well. I'm going to talk to Carrie about it, as well as the Caribbean Council.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Anything else?

MS. BECKWITH: I found my council training at the office in Charleston super helpful, and so I wouldn't want to take away time with the staff that we got, like sitting around with John Carmichael. It's invaluable, and I agree with Chester's idea, actually, of just assigning a mentor,

an older council member to a newer one, or an active one to a new one, where they can feel free to call or have that communication, that direct communication. It doesn't necessarily need to be done in a sit-down, but certainly we're all pretty accessible people, mostly.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and it definitely applies to the new members. We can check with the current council members. I remember when Tom Burgess got on and he called me, and he said, how many hours a week do you spend, and we talked about it, and I won't answer it on the mic, but we talked about it, and so we're all in it, and it works really, really well, and, even to this day, I walk around and ask other people stuff.

MR. WAUGH: All right. Anything else on that topic of training? Okay. Then, under Other Business, we had a report from the CCC meeting, and that is in the late materials, under Tab 11, and it's Attachment 7. It was just put there earlier today, and so I'm not going to go through that in great detail. Maybe you can take a look at it between now and Full Council tomorrow.

I will tell you that we, unexpectedly, spent a lot of time talking about aquaculture, and there's a big initiative to have aquaculture help with the balance of trade. They want to expand that, and they want to do it in a way that complements the existing wild fisheries. Senator Wicker also has a bill that is being drafted that would only allow a role for the council where we could provide comments and not sort of be involved like the Gulf was in setting up maybe areas that would be conducive to aquaculture.

I talked with them, and the idea was that there is two approaches. If Senator Wicker's bill gets introduced and becomes law, then the only role we have would be to comment, and so we're tracking that. We will probably develop some new wording for the working paper addressing aquaculture, and so I will work with Charlie and Mark and you all, and we would like to have some draft language that we can take to the May CCC meeting.

The other role would be for us to develop an aquaculture FMP, and obviously we don't have the staff time and resources to do that, and so I had some initial discussions, and I'm going to continue them, with the folks in NMFS. If there is some money available, perhaps we could get sufficient funds to hire somebody for a two-year or three-year period to provide that staff function to write an aquaculture FMP, but, at some point, we're going to have to talk about this and decide whether that's an approach the council wants to take. I don't know if, Charlie, you or Mark want to add anything, and, of course, Leann was there as well, on aquaculture.

MR. PHILLIPS: They are definitely -- There is a lot of energy for it, and a lot of talk, and, unfortunately, a lot of the aquaculture is probably going to be in state waters, but they're still going to be looking and wanting us to be ready, in case somebody goes into federal waters, like they did for that EFP in the Gulf.

If we can be part of that process and they can help us with some money to do it, I think it would be a good thing, because we've got the expertise of fisheries, and we've got some great staff, and, if they can give us a little more staff, it would probably be more efficient, I think, if we did it, but we serve at their discretion, and so we'll do what we're told.

MR. BELL: That was my question. Right now, it's kind of a state-focused thing, and I know we're undergoing a lot of interest in expansion of shellfish mariculture in state waters, and I know

North Carolina had an initiative, legislatively, to promote aquaculture and interest in moving into federal waters, but I was curious. Was there discussion of particular species or particular ideas for federal waters, because you kind of come back to some things that are pretty straightforward for state waters, but I was just trying to see what their feeling was.

MR. PHILLIPS: They left it pretty open-ended. They just said we want to be open for when industry wants to do it.

MS. BOSARGE: In the Gulf, we had an EFP that just came before us, and I was going to tell you this in my liaison report, but I've got a plane tomorrow, and so I don't know if you will get to me or not, but an EFP that came to us for aquaculture. Now, we do have an aquaculture FMP in the Gulf, and so we had some guidelines to go by. It was going to be in federal waters. It was a net pen with almaco jack. That's what they were going to raise.

We had a few questions, rightfully so. It's the first one, and so we sent a letter to NMFS outlining the information that we wanted back from the applicant, and I think they're going to come back and see us maybe in April with that information, and hopefully we'll be able to go from there, and that's where we're at.

MR. BELL: Were the pens associated with -- They were just floating pens, or were they anchored somewhere, or were they associated with structures, because you all have a lot of structures in the Gulf.

MS. BOSARGE: No, and that was kind of one of our concerns. The pen was going to be tied off to the stern of the boat, and the boat was going to be anchored. But then, eventually, the boat has got to go in and do crew changes and stuff, and so, anyway, we wanted to see some actual engineered drawings about how all of this is going to work, and it was in pretty shallow water. It was off of Florida.

MR. PUGLIESE: Just a quick note is our council isn't starting from zero on the aquaculture issue, because we've been dealing with it. We worked really closely with the national office when we were developing the policy, and we really worked with our Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel.

The states were kind of setting the stage for at least getting to this kind of next step, and it was kind of begging the question of, if we get this far, where do you go from here, and one of the things is that we have upcoming panel meetings this year, and one of the things that I wanted to try to get to provide additional background information is to have a session during the meeting, similar to what we had done with artificial reefs, et cetera, to look at ongoing research at the states and look at the state activities and look at some of the actual marine efforts ongoing, such as what has gone in with the cobia work in Puerto Rico and other areas and then maybe just the structure of how the Gulf is actually moving forward, to build some background information beyond the policy statement as the council considers into the future, and so at least it provides it from that context.

You are drawing from the group that has already provided a policy statement for the council to move forward, and it just gets us a little closer to that consideration, wherever the council ultimately wants to go.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Roger. Anybody else? Go ahead, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: On Magnuson reauthorization and the CCC Legislative Committee report, H.R. 200 is going to be the vehicle in the House. Once that is filed, we will have all the amendments. They are waiting on some additional cosponsors on that. Senate 1520 represents the views of the recreational community. Senator Wicker is drafting a substitute amendment that will reauthorize the MSA and address other issues as well, and the feeling is that the items in Senate 1520 will get folded into that Wicker bill, and I mentioned that he's also working on a potential aquaculture bill.

There is a few items that we have been asked to provide comments on. Item 10, the recusal policy, this gets into the issue of the 10 percent threshold and if you're a partial owner. Right now, you're deemed to have met that, and we haven't had to deal with this much here, but, in the West Pacific, there is a council member, I believe from Guam, who is an employee of Star-Kist, and, because he is an employee of Star-Kist, he has to recuse himself, and so it's a big issue for some of the councils, but they are coming out with a proposed rule, and we will address that in June.

Electronic monitoring policy, there was a presentation on a draft procedural directive on an electronic monitoring cost allocation. The industry is going to be required to share part of the costs of this, and so this can certainly have a huge impact for us in our area if we move into the electronic monitoring area, and, again, we'll look at that in June and develop some comments.

MRIP regional implementation plan, they talked about that, and we'll be getting a presentation tomorrow. One of the questions that we had is that the re-estimation -- All of the new numbers will be available July 1, and then it's up to the Center and the Region to do back-calibrations for comparison to our recreational AMs, and so we'll be working with the Region and the Center on the timing of that.

Best scientific information available guidance, we provided some additional input, and they're looking for any further input prior to May, and so John Carmichael looked at this and provided some comments, and Michelle had some comments, and so, if any of you want to provide any additional comments, and the presentation is available from that link, if you get that to me by Wednesday of next week, they want us to draft some comments. If some of you need a little longer time to look at it, we can work with that as well, but they do want us to get feedback prior to that May CCC meeting.

National Standard 1 technical guidance update, there is some workgroups that are being established to work on various aspects of this, and they have made the offer to have council staff participate. I have talked to John about this, and we're going to talk about who on staff might be appropriate. We just want to make sure that that's a wise use of our time, because, obviously, everybody is really busy.

Then, just quickly, under Other Business, the Communications Group is meeting, and our staff is going to participate via webinar, giving the high cost of getting to Sitka. The Legislative Committee, I chair that right now, and I have told them that I will do it for this year, but, in 2019, we then are the host of the CCC, and so I told them they have to have someone ready to take that over, and so we're looking for a Vice Chair, and they do want us to develop some wording on aquaculture, and, depending on what happens with MSA reauthorization, if there are new items, that Legislative Committee would draft material.

I did raise the issue that Doug had about penalty increases for non-reporting, to see if the other councils were willing to take this on as a national issue. They weren't, and their suggestion was that more rigorous use of fines for late reports would be effective, and we went through and gave them all the background and the explanation and so forth, and so we will come back and work on that here.

I also gave them an overview of the Fish Rules app, and that addresses recreational fishing right now, and that was developed by GARFO for the -- They paid for it for the New England and Mid-Atlantic areas, and I'm trying to ask the other councils if they were interested in pursuing this for their areas. There was a lot of interest from the Pacific, because they were about to move down this road to develop something similar, and they saw a lot of utility in some of the data that's coming out of this, and so they're interested in it, and we're going to continue to pursue this with NMFS, to see if there is some interest in providing some funding to do this for the commercial side.

We had to upgrade our app, and we had commercial and recreational regulations on our app, and it had to be upgraded, and we looked around, and there was this existing Fish Rules already in place for the New England and Mid-Atlantic areas, and some of the states use it at as well, and so we just piggy-backed onto that group, and Cameron has got that up and running now. We maintain the regulatory changes in that, and so now we're focusing on how do we get this information up for our commercial regulations and trying to work with the agency to see if there's a little funding there to help that.

Then, just in terms of wrap-up, when you look at it, there is some of the draft items for the May CCC meeting that's hosted by the North Pacific in Sitka, and then, in May 13 through 16 of 2019, we host the CCC meeting in Charleston at the Francis Marion Hotel, and so I would be glad to answer any questions now or see me one-on-one, either way.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any questions for Gregg? I am not seeing anything.

MR. WAUGH: The only other item we had under Other Business is there was some interest in providing some more input on the decision document format, and I don't know if you all are ready to talk about that.

DR. DUVAL: I think Jessica and I probably have the same type of input. I really like the standardization. I think, when we were going through, I think particularly the vision blueprint decision documents, I think it just became clear -- I know you all have been using this template for a little while now, but I think it became clear that it's probably more helpful to have -- I mean, I love the bullet points of the discussion right under the title of the action to remind us what we did and why we're looking at certain changes. I think that's really incredibly helpful for council members.

I appreciate the detailed captioning of tables and graphs so that, when you're looking at a table that shows projected closure dates, that you know that Alternative A is this and Alternative B is this and Alternative C is this, but I think having the actual language of the alternatives ahead of those tables is probably actually better, because we were scrolling through the tables and then looking for the language, and I know that there is limited ability, sometimes, to make those table headings as specific as folks would like, so that you can see the full language.

I think staff has done an amazing job of making those tables as detailed as possible, so that you can -- When you're looking at the table, you can actually determine what each alternative is and what it's doing, but I still think it would probably -- Flipping the order of those, after going through these two sets of decision documents, is probably more helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I have the exact same comment. The bullets were fine, but it's when all those tables come in, and I can't find the actions and the alternatives, and so I agree with everything that Michelle said about flipping that around. Otherwise, I really like the standardization, and I think it looks great.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? We are three minutes past our schedule. I am sorry that I got behind schedule, folks, but --

MR. WAUGH: We're ahead. We did Tony's liaison report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, we did Tony's liaison, and I know that was more than three minutes. All right. We will come back at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow, which is the time on the agenda. That way, we can -- Maybe we can get out of here by lunch, if it all goes well, and so thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 8, 2018.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
March 26, 2018

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUKNIL
2017 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CITIZEN SCIENCE

Mark Brown, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Robert Beal
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Tim Griner
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Robert Beal
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner

(Dolphin Wahoo continued)

Jessica McCawley
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Mid-Atlantic Liaison: Tony DiLernia & Dewey
Hemilright
New England Liaison: Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

✓ Charlie Phillips, Chair
✓ Mark Brown, Vice Chair
✓ Chester Brewer
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM-
BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Co-Chair
Wilson Laney, Co-Chair
Robert Beal
Mel Bell
Mark Brown
Michelle Duval
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
FEP: Chip Collier – Coral/CEBA

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Staff contact: John Hadley

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2017 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Ave
N.E. Townsend, GA 31331
(912)832-4423
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777 (ph)
wcbafmc@gmail.com

VICE-CHAIR

Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
(843)881-9735 (ph.); (843)881-4446 (f)
Capt.markbrown101@gmail.com

✓ Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(843)543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

Robert E. Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St.
Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

✓ Dr. Roy Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(727)824-5301 (ph); (727)824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

✓ Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
(252)808-8011 (ph); (252)726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

✓ Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph); 843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

✓ Tim Griner
4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
(980)722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

✓ Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
(912)398-3733 (ph)
zackbowensafmc@gmail.com

✓ Ben Hartig
9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
(772)546-1541 (ph)
mackattackben@att.net

(continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUKNIL
2017 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

✓ Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-2318 (f)
haymanssafmc@gmail.com

Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
(919)515-5019 (ph); (919)515-4415 (f)
Wilson.Laney@fws.gov

Jessica McCawley
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation
Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)
Jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

LCDR Jeremy Montes
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6788(ph); 305/710-4569(c)
Jeremy.J.Montes@uscg.mil

Deirdre Warner-Kramer Office of Marine
Conservation OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
202/647-3228 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

LCDR Trish Bennett
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Erik Williams
Leann Bosarge
Tony Di Lemia
Erika Bulgrass
Rick DeVictor.

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
Gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Deputy Directory-Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
John.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Management

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
Brian.chevront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
Myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

Kathleen Howington
Kathleen.howington@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/ Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
Cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
Kim.iverson@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Kimberly Cole
Kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
Roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Dr. Chip Collier
Chip.collier@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
Cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
Mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Suzanna Thomas
Suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

Kelsey Dick
Kelsey.dick@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ Amber Von Harten
Amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
Mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fishery Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
Christina.wiegand@safmc.net

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer- Julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd- Julia.byrd@safmc.net

MARCH CRUNCHE Mtg Day 4 - 3/8/18

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@ncdenr.gov
Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org
Bennett	Patricia	patricia.m.bennett@uscg.mil
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bubleby	Wally	bublew@dnr.sc.gov
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Conklin	Chris	conklincc@gmail.com
Cox	Jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com
Cunningham	Leda	lcunningham@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Dick	Kelsey	kelsey.dick@safmc.net
Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov
Exley	Gary	river92@bellsouth.net
Fitzpatrick	Eric	Eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov
Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
Geer	P	pat.geer@dbr.ga.gov
Geer	Pat	pat.geer@dnr.ga.gov
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Gorham	Bill	Getbowedup40@gmail.com
Hadley	John	john.hadley@samfc.net
Hart	Hannah	hannah.hart@myfwc.com
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Howington	Kathleen	kathleen.howington@safmc.net
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Lupton	Dee	dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
PUGLIESE	ROGER	ROGER.PUGLIESE@SAFMC.NET
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov

Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Revere	Justin	hatterasfishingadventure@gmail.com
Rhodes	Ray	rhodesr@cofc.edu
Schnettler	Erin	erin.schnettler@noaa.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@gmail.com
Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@ncdenr.gov
Shiple	Krista	krista.shiple@myfwc.com
Simmons	Carrie	carrie.simmons@gulfcouncil.org
Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
bowen	zack	fishzack@comcast.net
brennan	ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
brewer	chester	wcbafmc@gmail.com
brouwer	myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
cimino	joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
colby	barrett	bcolby3@cfl.rr.com
knowlton	kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
o reilly	Robert	rob.oreilly@mrc.virginia.gov
poland	steve	stephen.j.poland@gmail.com
rindone	ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
Chaya	Cindy	candrchaya@hotmail.com
FARMER	NICHOLAS	nick.farmer@noaa.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Meinhold	Timothy	timmeinhold4020@gmail.com
Parrish	Joshua	jeparrish@liberty.edu
Reynolds	Reggie	reggiereynolds@protonmail.com
conklin	chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
dilernia	tony	tony@rocketcharters.com

Thursday Sign Ins 3/8/18

Name	Last	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)			If Other, please provide more information:
Robert	Crimian			NGO	
Robert	Lorenz	Private Recreational Angler			
Robert	Lorenz	Private Recreational Angler			
Dean	Foster			NGO	
Leda	Cunningham			NGO	
Susan	Shipman				Other
Lora	Clarke			NGO	
Amy	Dukes				Other SCDNR
Bill	Weeks		Charter/Headboat/F or-Hire		member Cobia sub committee advisory board