

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

JOINT EXECUTIVE/FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Sheraton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront
Atlantic Beach, NC**

December 3, 2007

SUMMARY MINUTES

Finance Committee Members:

David Cupka, Chair
George Geiger

Mac Currin
Duane Harris

Executive Committee Members:

George Geiger, Chair
David Cupka

Duane Harris, Vice-Chair
Dr. Brian Chevront

Council Members:

Robert H. Boyles, Jr.
Mark Robson
Tony Iarocci
Mike Ray

Dr. Roy Crabtree
Columbus Brown
Tom Swatzel
Rita Merritt

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins

Gregg Waugh
Kim Iverson

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Margot Stiles
Libby Fetherston
Darden Rice

Jack McGovern
George Sedberry
Buffy Baumann
Dick Brame

The Joint Executive and Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Pamlico/Hatteras Room of the Sheraton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront Hotel, Atlantic Beach, North Carolina, Monday afternoon, December 3, 2007, and was called to order at 2:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

Mr. Cupka: We would like to go ahead and convene the meeting of the Joint Executive and Finance Committee and so if you'll take your seat, we'll go ahead and get started. The first order of business is the Approval of the Agenda. Are there any comments on the agenda?

Mr. Geiger: With everybody's indulgence, what we're going to do is go ahead and close the first few minutes of this session and take up some personnel issues and we'll notify everybody not on the committee to come back in the room and then we'll proceed with the rest of the agenda and/or any changes that are proposed.

Mr. Cupka: Thank you, Mr. Geiger. Are there any other additions to the agenda? Seeing none, then the agenda is approved with that one change. Why don't we go ahead and approve the minutes, while we're at it.

Mr. Geiger: The council members, you're all welcome to stay in here for the closed personnel session. It's just members of the general public that we ask to leave, but all council members can stay.

Mr. Cupka: The next order of business, before we get into our closed session, is the Approval of the September 2007 Finance Committee Minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? Seeing none, then those will stand approved and that will bring us down to our closed session.

(Whereupon, the meeting went into closed session.)

Mr. Cupka: Our next agenda item is the Approval of the Calendar Year 2008 FMP/Amendment/Framework Timelines. In order to discuss some of that, I think Gregg is going to actually touch upon our last agenda item there on the new scoping process. Are you going to kind of combine those, Gregg?

Mr. Waugh: I wasn't, but I could, if that's what you would like. It would be about the new timeline and then some of the changes to the various amendments, Attachments 1A and 1B.

Mr. Cupka: However you want to do it. I know the one just goes through 2008 and the other one, we'll be talking through 2010. However you think would be the best way to proceed on that.

Mr. Waugh: If we look at Attachment 1A, which is the -- What we did here is pulled the activities from 2007 and I'll project this. Also, if anybody wants to look at it, I've got a printout here. I couldn't figure out how to get it small enough on the screen to see the whole thing and yet read it, but what this is intended to show -- I don't expect you to read all of this that's up on the screen. I'll go through some of the actual documents, but coming up in 2008; we have a lot

of different documents that we're working on.

We're going to be finishing up 15B and sending that in in March and the proposal is that's where you approve Amendment 16 that deals with gag and vermilion snapper for public hearings, that we hold the public hearings in April and May. You'll review it at June and you'll also have the SSC comments at June and make your final choices at June. We complete the document and address all the directives from you all and you have a final approval and a vote to submit and we do submit the document in September.

That puts us one meeting, three months, behind the deadline. We got a letter and I think its June 12, 2007, saying we have one year to prepare an amendment. Given the complexity of that amendment and the alternatives, we just don't feel we'll have it ready until September.

We've got Amendment 7, Shrimp Amendment 7. We're taking some scoping now and we'll continue scoping into January and then we've got approval for public hearing in June and so that's an item we'll be working on in 2008. The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment we'll be working on and this is required in order to come up with all of your ACLs. We've indicated for snapper grouper that we're looking at interim allocations right now.

Snapper Grouper Amendment 17, we'll look at dealing with those species, the remaining overfishing species, as well as responding to greater amberjack and mutton snapper assessments. Amendment 18 is LAPPs and this is something that the SSC has recommended very strongly that we get moving on.

As you know, the LAPP Workgroup is continuing their activities. They've requested another meeting in January and February and they'll present their results to you in March. Our proposal is to scope this in February, and perhaps at the March meeting also, and then begin options and have a document to approve for public hearings in December.

Mr. Geiger: In regard to the LAPP amendment, 18, and the schedule that we've got here, how are we going to move forward with LAPPs before we move through the allocation amendment and determine what the allocation is going to be?

Mr. Waugh: We'll have interim allocations and the schedule for the comprehensive allocation amendment slightly precedes the LAPP amendment and the LAPP will be dealing with whatever available yield is allocated to the commercial sector in the snapper grouper fishery. There is some interaction here, but the comprehensive amendment, allocation amendment, is on a slightly faster track. We would be approving that for public hearing in September, whereas December for the LAPP.

Mr. Currin: Gregg, one of the things that at least has been discussed, to some degree, by the working group has been a survey or a polling of the permit holders regarding their desire to approve a LAPP for the snapper grouper fishery. Does the schedule that we have here include the ability to conduct that poll and then enter the results or consider the results before we get the cart too far down the road and perhaps mislead the fishermen and the public?

Mr. Waugh: No, it does not. We have not factored that in here. That is a recommendation coming forward from the workgroup. I suspect that will remain in there. It's not a requirement for the South Atlantic Council under the Reauthorized Magnuson Act, that we do that before we move forward with a LAPP. If you wish to do that prior to moving forward, then we would need to add that to this activities schedule.

Mr. Currin: Just a follow-up. I know that it's my been my stance, at least, from the beginning, in considering these, regardless of my personal opinion about LAPPs, and I'm very positive about the future of the industry operating under limited access privilege programs, but I, at the same time, have been very forthright in my consideration of the desires of the participants of these fisheries. I want their buy-in in it.

It's not something that -- Regardless of how good I think it is for the fishery and for the future, it's not something that I feel like I need to say I know more than you do and I have a better knowledge of this and trust me, this is what's good for you and that sort of thing. I would like the buy-in from the fishermen, from my personal perspective.

I would like them to say yes, we've looked at this and we understand fully what the implications are to us and the other fishermen, non-permitted fishermen in our states, but this is something we think is good for us in the future.

Dr. Chevront: My question about this is sort of a procedural one. Is the council required to get OMB approval of a survey before they give it out? If they are, you're talking a year before you've got the survey written, OMB approval, administering the survey, and getting any results back. That's always been an issue with doing surveys in a federal framework.

I know Mac is probably making reference to in North Carolina -- When I give my agency report at the end of the meeting, I'm going to be talking about the survey that we did in North Carolina on LAPPs, where we went out and interviewed the fishermen, and there was some very interesting findings that we got from that.

I agree with Mac. If there's some way that we can find out if the fishermen want it, that would be great, but we're talking that we may be just adding a year to the possibility and if we want to wait for that. I just want to make sure that procedurally we're aware of what this would mean if we decided to do this.

Mr. Mahood: Brian, that's what I was going to bring up when I deferred to Mac, is the fact that there's two things -- I guess it still operates like it used to, Roy, that you have to get approval for the amount of burden hours it will take for the fishermen to respond to the survey and then the survey itself has to go through OMB approval.

We have tried that in the past and it's been very, very difficult, in some instances, to get that approved and it's certainly very time consuming. I assume it hasn't changed much, Monica or Roy, from that. I guess the Region probably still has a certain number of burden hours, or the Center or whoever. I'm just wondering, Brian, since you all have got the format for doing it at the state level, maybe we could encourage -- With a few bucks, we could encourage the states to

conduct it on a state-by-state level or something like that.

Dr. Chevront: I don't know. We might entertain that, certainly, in North Carolina, especially if the council is willing to foot the bill for it at the state level. We did a very quick survey and between, I guess it was our September and November meetings, we actually -- Our commission asked us to do it at the September meeting and we gave them results in November on it and we had responses from several hundred fishermen in that time and so it can be done. It was like eight questions. It was not very long at all.

Dr. Crabtree: Bob is exactly right. There are Paperwork Reduction Act requirements and all sorts of things that procedurally we would have to go through. The idea of having the states do it might make sense, but what I would point out is you wouldn't go to the fishermen and poll them until after you have basically developed the amendment and are pretty close to taking final action on it.

That's the way the referendum requirements in the Gulf are going to be set up, is that the council will have to have the amendment largely complete, with all the supporting analysis, because you want the fishermen to be able to read it and read the analyses and impacts to make a reasoned decision on it.

I suspect by the time you get that far along with this that you're going to have a pretty good feel of what sort of buy-in you have and you could come back at it at that point, because there's a long way to go before we get even close, I think, to asking the fishermen do you want this or not. We could sort of deal with how to do that at that time.

We will publish a proposed rule putting out guidelines for referenda on LAPPs for the Gulf of Mexico and New England that's going to lay out a kind of procedural process and whether you could decide, okay, we want to have one too, I don't know that there's anything that would prohibit you. I think our view would be follow that similar sort of process on it.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Some of the comments that I was going to make have been brought up. Brian brought up the Paperwork Reduction Act wrinkle, if you will, and I'll be glad to look into that and make sure that that's still in effect, that the council has to go through that process, but it also came to mind that the, I guess, public scoping meetings -- I'm not quite sure what you've called it that Vishwanie and Terry Gay embarked on when you were talking to fishermen about economic data collection and all that kind of thing on trying to educate them as to what was out there and what was coming. You could even think about something like that as well.

Mr. Boyles: I'm not on your committee, but just a procedural question. When the then-called Controlled Access Committee met in Charleston last January, didn't we -- Weren't we very clear that we were not making a commitment that we weren't rushing into something?

I'm just concerned about -- If this is just a placeholder for a workload perspective, that's one thing. I'm just concerned about the implied commitment that the council is going to move forward on and should we be concerned about that implied commitment to this and maybe Rita has something to add to that, perhaps, I don't know.

Ms. Merritt: I don't have anything to add to it, but I certainly agree with you. That is something that we have been very forceful about saying, that this is just a tool and we're not going to shove it down your throats. I think that should we not honor their wishes about a poll or something similar, I think that will diminish our credibility. Also, I did want to say, to Mac's point that we really should do that and I think that buy-in is the only way to go. If we don't get a commitment on this, I don't think it's going to work.

Mr. Cupka: We've certainly tried to make that point all along, that this is something that if the fishermen don't want that it's not going to work. I can see the concern, too. If somebody was to look at this, it's like a decision has been made and we're moving on, when maybe what it actually is is kind of a placeholder for assuming that we're going to move ahead to work on this, but that the decision really hasn't been made.

Ms. Merritt: I forgot one point. It's actually a question. As I'm hearing it, the OMB requirement, is that something that we could start on now with a proposed survey and maybe in the end we don't do it, but it would be something that would get the ball rolling on it and speed up the final approval process?

Mr. Mahood: Certainly if we decide we're going to do it, we would need to get it rolling, but I agree with Roy. I hate to ask a fisherman whether he would like or would approve of something when they don't really know what it is.

I'll guarantee you anything new that you ask a fisherman about, he's not going to like, until he understands there's going to be some benefit to the program or understands what the downsides of the program are to his operation. I think we really do need to get a little further along in the process before we go out for -- I don't know if its approval or whatever the LAPP group was looking for.

Mr. Cupka: Roy, you had something to that point? I guess Brian does too, but --

Dr. Crabtree: Just to agree with Bob and remember that there's more to this than just LAPPs. We've had a number of problems in the fishery that we've talked about for some time and we've talked about what are we going to do about latent permits and what about the two-for-one provision and what about the people who failed to renew and somehow we want them back in and what about the shortening seasons and early quota closures?

I would think when we lay this amendment out that LAPPs would be a part of it, but we ought to probably look at what are the other approaches to come at these problems and kind of evaluate those, because the purpose and need is not going to be to create a LAPP program.

The purpose and need is going to be here's the problem with the fishery and now how do we fix it? LAPPs are one way to do it, but there are a lot of other ways we could probably come at it. That way, the fishermen get a more balanced view of well, if we don't accept LAPPs, what are some of the other things we may be faced with? I think that kind of balances it all out.

Dr. Chevront: In North Carolina, we addressed the issue that we've all been talking about before we sent out the survey, is that do people really even know what we're talking about when we start talking about LAPPs? We asked that in the survey, do you feel like you have enough information to know what this is all about?

We had a large percentage of folks who answered that no, they didn't. I think the process is much more complicated here at the council, when we're asking about all these different potential management schemes and we're not committed to any of them yet and in North Carolina, we're not committed to LAPPs yet either, but it's really pretty interesting about how -- We also asked them do you think that the Marine Fisheries Commission in North Carolina should continue looking into LAPPs and the response rate was exactly 50/50 yes and no, out of several hundred. It was within one person on each side.

It's a very contentious issue, but a lot of people are willing to admit that they don't know enough. My suggestion would be, as Roy and Bob and others are suggesting, let's wait until we're a little further in the process, so that people can actually have something that will help them to understand before we ask them for their uninformed opinion.

Mr. Waugh: Just to clarify what the workgroup is recommending and this is included in the briefing book under the LAPP tab. You all here are talking about polling the industry to get their opinions. What the LAPP Workgroup is recommending is they want a referendum. It's very different. They want to be able to control whether this goes in, similar to the procedure that's in place for the Gulf and New England. Its two very different things. What they're asking for is that we have to hold a referendum and if they don't approve it, it doesn't go forward.

Mr. Currin: Thank you, Gregg. I guess I misspoke by my choice of terms. Really, a referendum is what I'm talking about and I'm not suggesting that it occur now or in the near future, before the working group has finished their deliberations. I think the timeframe that Roy has suggested and that mechanism would work fine with me.

My other question, I guess, on that is in the eyes of OMB, is a referendum the same thing as a survey that has to -- It's basically a yes or no question and here's a program that was designed by the working group and are you in favor, yes or no. Is that considered to be a survey by OMB and have to be approved and jump through all the twelve-month hoops and all that?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I'm going to find that out, Mac.

Mr. Cupka: That's a good point.

Mr. Waugh: If we do a referendum, you're going to have to follow the guidelines that NMFS is putting together for the Gulf and New England. I wouldn't think why we would do it differently.

Dr. Crabtree: We may be getting too far in the weeds on this. The only thing that comes to mind is because the Act puts specific requirements on the Gulf and New England and they're different for the Gulf and New England in terms of who gets to vote and how much the majority has to be before it passes.

We'll look into it. I can't think of why you couldn't do a referendum, but regardless of the fishermen's view on this, it would not be binding to you and it would still be your decision whether to move forward with this or not, because the statute clearly puts the decision in your hands. I think getting into the details of all this -- We're a year or more away before I think we have to get down to that level.

Mr. Cupka: I agree with you there, Roy. These are all good points that are being brought up, but we aren't going to take care of them now. We're going to continue to work on this and the process is going to evolve. Are there any other comments on this particular aspect? If not, I'm going to ask Gregg to go ahead and finish going through the 2008 Proposed Activities Schedule.

Mr. Waugh: That brings us back to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, which we would approve for scoping in December of 2008. This would deal with the annual catch limit requirement for all non-overfishing species and in terms of other activities for 2008, we've got our Fishery Ecosystem Plan, which we're scheduled to approve for public hearing in March. That's our proposal.

The Fishery Ecosystem Plan Comprehensive Amendment, we expect some changes to what is in that document. We'll get that guidance here and have something for you to approve for public hearings in March.

We'll hold public hearings in May, perhaps June, approve at June, and final approval at September for the FEP and the Comprehensive Amendment and submit in October. Then we would start our annual process under the FEP of approving issues for scoping in December and holding scoping meetings in February and then picking up with that activity.

The other item is Mackerel Amendment 18 and don't worry about the amendment number. This may or may not be right, but this would implement the separate FMPs, deal with responding to the output from the SEDAR assessment and then the spiny lobster amendment, the one that the Caribbean is lead on, and at some point, we'll have another one that the Gulf is lead on.

At some point, the one fishery that's sort of hanging out there that we don't have an FMP for is calico scallop. We're not proposing any activities on that. One thing I wanted to show with this visually is there's an awful lot of activity in 2008 and that's in large part to meet these congressionally-mandated timeframes.

2009, things become a lot more manageable. We're finishing up the Comprehensive Amendment and finishing up Snapper Grouper Amendment 17 and perhaps out at public hearings on LAPPs. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment, scoping that the first of the year and finishing up with public hearings later in the year and we would have our FEP Comprehensive Amendment.

Our long-term goal has been to try to get on a more streamlined and noticed regulatory process and the vehicle we've talked about in the past of doing that is to use one comprehensive amendment. We would scope issues and approve them for scoping in December of one year and

scope them in February and work on options and approve it for public hearing in June, hold our public hearings prior to the September meeting, give final approval and submit the document in October, so that the regulations become effective January of the following year.

This is what is shown beginning in January of 2010. There's some concern that we don't want to be bound to just one amendment and perhaps we want to use frameworks and certainly if we have things that come outside of this timeline that require framework action, we could prepare a framework.

If we get a stock assessment and we have to respond to it and it's not within this timeline, then we can prepare a framework, but the idea is long term to let fishermen know that they will have an opportunity for scoping in February, the council will be approving a document for public hearing in June, and they will have an opportunity to have public comment in August and then the council will be finalizing a document in September and the regulations change the following January.

All of that is with the intent of laying out what our activities schedule is for 2008 and Bob and Mike have reflected this level of activity right now in the Draft Activities Schedule that you have before you.

1B goes into more detail about what is within each of the amendments and we need some guidance from the committee to approve this. We got some guidance from George, Duane, and Mac back at the end of October and that's what led to us putting this together. 15A and B remain unchanged. 15A, we have final approval at this meeting and 15B in March.

16, we're working on and that's to deal with gag and vermilion snapper. This will have the SFA parameters and ACLs for gag and vermilion, interim allocations, management measures to limit the recreational and commercial sectors to their ACLs, and we're proposing we move consideration of this shallow-water grouper unit to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

We still would consider some actions that will deal with bycatch and that could address some of these species, but we don't want to get caught up in the SSC's concerns about the species groupings, given that Amendment 16 is on a one-year timeline.

Dr. Crabtree: Gregg, what about consideration of moving that into I guess the shallow-water grouper multispecies ACL and a deepwater and trying to do that in Amendment 17? My concern is we've got at least three species in the shallow-water complex that we'll have to have ACLs and AMs done for in 17 and then we've got snowy grouper, speckled hind, warsaw, and the deepwater fishery that would have to be done.

I really want to avoid trying to have separate individual ACLs and AMs for all those species and so I would like to at least have some discussion as we get to that stage about potentially looking at those, because I would like to see us get some of these things off the Status Report to Congress and I think that's an opportunity to make some changes to that and so if we could do it in 17, I would like to try and meet that goal, if possible.

Mr. Waugh: We can certainly add that to Amendment 17. I think when we get into our SSC Selection Committee, that's a closed meeting and we'll talk more about the level of detailed input we need from the SSC to come up with these requirements, but certainly we can try and include that in Amendment 17, because as you can see, we've got in here that Amendment 17 has to deal with all the species for which we have overfishing and so what Roy is suggesting is to look at species groupings that involve those species. We can certainly do that.

Mr. Currin: I think Roy's suggestion makes a lot of sense. I think at the last meeting I expressed some concern about moving consideration of the groupings. In that case, I think it was deepwater groupers, because, as everybody is aware, the concerns about bycatch are not going away.

This is probably the best way that we've, at least to date, determined to try to deal with those. I think they're extremely important and I think the quicker we get those done, the better off we're going to be. The same thing applies to the shallow-water groupers as well.

Mr. Waugh: Then the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment -- Again, this would discuss -- We've asked for clarification here when we get to full council, are we talking about just a methodology or are we actually going to specify the allocations? Amendment 17, again, this will address all remaining overfishing species and also address greater amberjack, mutton snapper, and accountability measures. We have to deal with all our overfishing species by January 1, 2010, which means final council action at June of 2009.

We need to work out the details of what goes into this. We don't have to do that now, but we will pick up interim allocations if it's necessary, if the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment isn't moving along. Management measures to limit the recreational and commercial sectors to their ACLs, again we've received you all's recommendation now to deal with the species groupings for the shallow and deepwater group and so we'll look at that here, as well as accountability measures.

I'm sure this will generate some discussion, because we're not just -- We're proposing we not just look at the overages for the various sectors, but that we also look at what it means to our data collection programs.

If we are indeed going to need to limit our recreational sector to their allocation, it may mean we need to do some changes to how recreational data are being collected and we've got a presentation at full council on that. We also need to look at our biological sampling, our bycatch data, our fishery independent surveys, and our SSC pointed out that we also need to add the socioeconomic data. When we get to talking about these details, I'm sure we'll have a lot of discussion.

We also want to exclude species from the fishery management unit, species that are being adequately managed at the state level that we perhaps don't need to manage at the federal level. Then one final action that should be on here is to also extend the fishery management unit through the Mid-Atlantic Council's area.

We've added two voting slots at our Snapper Grouper Committee level for them. We're having more and more catches of our snapper grouper species particularly in Virginia, as well as north of there, and so we need to get similar regulations in place.

Then our Comprehensive ACL Amendment, which is all other species, we have to ACLs in place for by January 1, 2011. That means final council action at June of 2010 and so SFA parameters and this gets into all the remaining snapper grouper species, coastal migratory pelagics, dolphin and wahoo, coral, golden crab, shrimp.

There's some shrimp that are annual crop and so we can get out of that ACL requirement and then spiny lobster that's joint with the Gulf. We'll have interim allocations if necessary, management measures to limit recreational and commercial sectors, perhaps species groupings, and then, again, the accountability measures.

That's it for -- We need guidance from you all that this is how you want us to structure the amendments, with that direction to add the species groupings for shallow and deepwater groupers in Amendment 17.

Mr. Cupka: Any questions for Gregg? Seeing none, then we probably need to back up and the first order of business would be to approve the 2008 FMP/Amendment/Framework Timeline.

Mr. Mahood: I have just one comment. We certainly would like you to approve us going in this direction, but a lot of this is going to depend on our budget situation, which, as we get into the next couple of items, you'll see is very uncertain at this point. One thing I would like to point out is we've tried to compensate some for that by, as you look, holding the various public hearings and scoping meetings at the same time. That allows us to do some of these things under the budget that you'll see we have proposed to accomplish these tasks.

Bear in mind we had a conference call with Dr. Hogarth this past Thursday and all budgets are very uncertain at this point in time and so we won't know exactly how we're going to come out. As you recall, we approved our final budget for this year this past June and I'm hoping we don't have that same circumstance, but there is that possibility.

Mr. Cupka: Are there any comments then on the planning document that Gregg has outlined? We've got a couple of comments that he's been given so far and are there any additional comments or any further changes that anyone wants to make on the planning document that really goes hand-in-hand with the timeline document? Seeing none, then can we have a motion then to approve the 2008 timelines?

Mr. Currin: **So moved, David.**

Mr. Cupka: We have a motion by Mr. Currin and a second by Mr. Harris. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.**

Mr. Currin: David, I was just going to ask if Gregg or if the staff needed formal approval of the

draft planning document for activities or are you content with the discussion that we had or have had? It looks reasonable to me, if you guys can miraculously pull this all off and the budget works and all of that, but it certainly looks like a good way to proceed to me.

Mr. Mahood: The planning document kind of goes hand-in-hand with the timeline, Mac. You really can't have one without the other. The planning document kind of lays out how we intend to make the timelines. Obviously all timelines, if you've ever worked in government, are subject to a moment's change and, again, budget will play a major role.

We may come back to you at the March meeting with a budget that has got so much money in it that we'll do more, but that's not likely to happen. It will probably have very little and we'll be only able to afford to do less. We will move forward and talk a little bit about the budget and then I suspect we're going to be rehashing this in March.

Mr. Cupka: That brings us to our next order of business, which is to Develop and Approve the Proposed 2008 Activities Schedule. Bob, you were going to cover that?

Mr. Mahood: Right. Those of you that have been involved in our process for some time know that the way we develop our budget for the year is we look at what activities we would like to accomplish in 2008, based on the direction that the council has given us. Gregg and the technical staff sit down and look at what will be required to meet those mandates during 2008.

They then supply that to myself and Mike and we sit down and we put, based on our tremendous amount of past history of what things cost to do, we put numbers to it. Generally, after we put the numbers to it, I go back to Gregg and say, okay, you need to cut this in half, because it's twice as much money as we're going to get.

Unfortunately, the last couple of years we haven't known the amount of money and so we have proceeded somewhat in the dark, but what the activities schedule does is it sets the money that we need related to the activities. The rest of the budget is pretty much fixed costs for salaries, facilities, and other costs that the council has fixed, such as the liaisons with the state funding and that kind of thing.

Unless somebody wants me to go through this page-by-page, I'm not going to go through it, but if you do look at the last page, and that's page 14, it does give you across the board what the activities are going to cost for 2008 as proposed.

You've got council member comp, travel, staff travel, other costs, which make up a number of things, like SSC and AP travel and meeting rooms and this type of thing, and then you have a total cost for the activities for the year. That then is coupled with the SEDAR budget. We have our SEDAR and administrative budget that are under the same grant number.

We then take those amounts and add in the SEDAR amounts and then that gives us our meeting-related costs that go into our budget. Mr. Chairman, if anybody has any questions on the activities schedule -- Again, this also follows along, obviously, with the timeline document.

Mr. Cupka: Any questions for Bob? Also, the SEDAR will be dealt with as part of the SEDAR Committee meeting and so -- Isn't that correct that SEDAR will be dealt with at the SEDAR Committee meeting?

Mr. Mahood: Right. You've been provided the SEDAR activities schedule. It was lacking three meetings that the SEDAR Steering Committee had approved. Also, as Gregg pointed out, we had not included a Snapper Grouper AP meeting in here, which will be some additional funds, as well as Shrimp. It may be a little bit higher than what we have, but at this point in time, until we actually get a budget, this kind of gives a direction, but it certainly is not set in stone as far as what it will cost.

Mr. Cupka: Questions for Bob? Seeing none, then we need to go ahead and approve the Proposed Activities Schedule for next year, understanding, again, that it may have to be tweaked, but -- I would entertain a motion to approve. There's a motion from Mr. Harris. Do I have a second? Mr. Currin seconds. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** That brings us down to --

Mr. Mahood: I think this will be taken up in the SSC Selection Committee meeting, but also, the SSC has requested that they meet with the council in March. It will be a third meeting in 2008 and we've only budgeted two and so I think when that's discussed at the SSC Selection Committee, if they want to go ahead and talk about a third SSC meeting -- Obviously we can talk about it here if you want also. That would be an additional cost.

You can look and see that SSC meetings have a certain amount of cost related to where we meet and March, we're in Jekyll Island, Georgia, I think, which is probably about a medium cost area that we meet. That's another potential cost on the budget that's not in here at this point in time.

Mr. Geiger: Before we venture down that road, I would like to see a complete schedule and list of what they plan to accomplish and why they want to meet with us. I'm just going to leave it at that.

Mr. Cupka: Other comments?

Mr. Harris: Whenever the SSC meets with the council, we obviously have additional meeting room requirements and I guess that's a consideration as well. Based on where we are planning to meet, if we can do what we can do at this particular hotel. I guess that's another consideration and you all already know that, but I'm just pointing that out for consideration.

Mr. Mahood: You're correct. This has just come to our attention at this meeting and certainly Mike would have to have Cindy check if there was room availability. That really has been the biggest constraint we have found in June and December now, is the fact that we have the SSC meeting with us.

If they do a breakout between the biological and the socioeconomic groups, it actually requires three rooms at the same time and so we will be looking at that and that's certainly a consideration.

Mr. Cupka: Further comments? That brings us down to our 2008 Budget and I'll turn it back over to Bob.

Mr. Mahood: If you look under Attachment 3, you'll see what budget we have proposed to cover the costs associated with the activities schedule both for the council and for SEDAR. The bottom line is -- If you look at 2007, our budget was \$2.7 million. We anticipate, with the level of activities in both the council and SEDAR for 2008, we're looking at about \$2.9, approximately \$241,000 more than we had this past year.

That's why it may be a little ambitious, because there's a good chance that we could be level funded. On the line item -- If you look at the red box up at the right, where I don't have anything but question marks, we obviously don't know what our line item funding is going to be. That will depend on what Congress comes up with.

As far as the House and Senate markups, they look pretty good for the councils, but whether that's going to happen or not -- I think they were about a \$3 million increase, which would get us up to at least a starting level to let us accomplish the budget we need next year. Additional funding from NMFS, again, we have no idea, because on Thursday, Bill had no idea what they would be getting and what they would be able to share with the councils, both in the NEPA area or the regulatory streamlining area.

Carry forward from 2007; I do have a handout that we will go over. It shows you where we are on the budget. I got this kind of put together last minute, to make sure where we are. It looks like we might have a carry forward this year of about \$339,000, which will help.

Again, some of this money is related to funds we got from NMFS last year for the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act activities. In other words, to follow up on some of the guidance we get from NMFS and the costs associated with what we may have to do with that. Obviously we didn't get any guidance in any areas this year and so we haven't spent that money and we still have it there to use if we do get some requirements from the National Marine Fisheries Service.

SEDAR funding, I've been working with Alex on that. We're requesting this year, based on the level of activities of the SEDAR Steering Committee, about \$528,000 to administer that program for the Gulf, Caribbean, and South Atlantic. Alex has not said anything about it yet and we've talked a little bit about it.

Of course, Alex is leaving and I told him to just give us the money and don't worry about it and he said it may not be up to him whether we get the money or not. Again, they don't know what their budget is and so it's very difficult for them to commit to anything, but based on the level of the SEDAR activity levels, that's what we'll need to do the job.

If you look at what we got for level funding last year, which was \$1.590, plus what we got from additional NMFS money last year, plus carryover plus SEDAR, we would still have a deficit of about \$115,000, with the activity levels we're looking at for next year. We've got to hope that Congress comes through with some budgets for the Department of Commerce and that we get

what has been proposed in the House and Senate marks. I think we'll be okay if that happens, but at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, I can't give you any -- I can't read my crystal ball.

Mr. Cupka: Questions at this point?

Mr. Geiger: Bob, does this proposed budget that you've got listed here, does it include the last action that Gregg is going to talk about, his new proposal to have like a career day or whatever that's going to be called?

Mr. Mahood: Is he going to talk about a career day? Are you talking about the staff going out and -- You're talking about the briefing sessions? That's not a career day. Our chairman has been giving us a lot of -- He's got a lot of comments about that particular plan, which we will talk about in a minute, but yes, it does. It certainly does.

Mr. Harris: Bob, does this include filling any vacant staff positions? Does this budget include filling any vacant staff positions?

Mr. Mahood: No.

Mr. Cupka: Other questions or comments? You see before you the comparison we get each year of the current year budget with the proposed budget and you can see the changes and Bob has highlighted some of these in yellow. I don't know if anyone has any questions about any of those.

Mr. Mahood: The yellow numbers -- What's in yellow correspond -- On your electronic version, it's in yellow. Those correspond to the activities schedule. If it's in yellow, it's affected by what we do in the activities schedule.

Mr. Cupka: Any questions on the budget? I don't think we're going to be able to approve a budget, because we don't really have a budget. We'll probably have to come back in March and hopefully by then we'll know what the situation is, but I think staff has laid out the resources that are going to be necessary to undertake the activities for next year and as Gregg pointed out, you can all see it's an extremely ambitious and busy year scheduled for next year.

Hopefully we'll get the fiscal resources to meet those activities and whatnot. We'll just postpone until March and hopefully we'll be able to finalize a budget then. That brings us down to our last item before Other Business and this is the proposed new scoping/public -- Before we get to that, Bob has one other comment.

Mr. Mahood: I apologize, Mr. Chairman, but this was just passed out and this shows you where we are in the 2007 budget process. In the far left-hand corner is the budget that was approved by the council. If you go to the far right-hand corner, that shows what we expect, based on what has been spent and what is obligated through the end of the year, to where we'll be.

The bottom right-hand corner, the bold numbers that say \$165,107, that's what we expect to have as somewhat of a surplus this year, with the possibility of carrying that -- We would carry that

forward. We also, as you recall, last year we were given \$107,000 from NMFS for the Magnuson-Stevens Act Reauthorization activities, again, which I said we have not gotten direction of what those activities will be under any kind of guidelines.

That money is still there and that gives us total funding we received last year of \$2.877, with about \$174,000 that we did not put into the budget, because we weren't sure what the activities associated with that was going to be.

That gives us a potential carry forward, as I said earlier, of about \$339,000, which I think will give us a little -- Even under the worst case scenarios, it will give us a little bit of a buffer to continue at some level next year. Mr. Chairman, that's where we are. If anybody has any questions about the numbers, I would certainly be glad to answer those.

Mr. Cupka: Any questions for Bob on our current budget status? Again, I think staff has done a commendable job in seeking ways to save us money wherever they could and we certainly recognize their efforts there and appreciate those.

Mr. Mahood: I do commend the staff for that, because we have -- I think you all know by now that I like to hedge a little bit and not spend all of our money and then come to find out we don't have enough money. That comes from my state training, where we never had enough money to do the job and you certainly had to plan ahead for the bad times, but I would like to commend the staff.

They've been pretty darn frugal this year, because these are uncertain times when it comes to budget, and I would especially like to commend Mike, as I have in the past. Every time I turn around, Mike has figured out a way to save money and that is reflected quite a bit here.

It's kind of ironic that the only state now that we have to pay sales tax in is South Carolina. Every other state, Mike has figured out a mechanism that we don't have to pay -- It's only so Robert can survive over there. What's ironic about South Carolina is we could actually forego the tax in South Carolina using a federal credit card to pay for our rooms and merchandise we purchase and everything, but that credit card is only available for airline tickets through the federal government.

Mike has weighed in on that and I think he's convinced them that when they redo the contract with Citibank in 2008 that they consider other charges other than just airline tickets and so we may take some money away from Robert here in the long term anyway, but I would like to commend the staff for watching their expenditures.

Mr. Cupka: Thank you, Bob. That, I think, does bring us down to our final agenda item and I'm going to call on Gregg to outline these proposed changes.

Mr. Waugh: I'll call your attention to Attachment 4 and this is a new scoping and public hearing process that we're proposing that we try out next year. The council is moving towards ecosystem-based management. In the past, we've indicated our intent to promote stability within the management process and we're talking about this issue of a set time of year when fishermen

know they're going to have their input, a set time of the year when we change the regulations, and then a set time when those regulations become effective.

Just to go back to our activities schedule very briefly, what became apparent, in order to meet all these congressional mandates, is we've got a lot of items that we will either be taking to scoping or to public hearings next year.

When we do our analysis and look at the linkages across these various amendments, these fishermen are going to be affected by Snapper Grouper Amendment 16 and they're going to be affected by the Comprehensive Amendment and they're going to be affected by Amendment 17 and they're going to be affected, potentially, by LAPPs.

It would be doing a disservice to go out and just talk about one of these, because you've got all these linked activities that are in the works. What our suggestion is is to use a scoping process that's more similar to what's used by the Department of Transportation and other federal agencies do this as well, where they hold a workshop typesetting, to where the staff would be there in order to explain what's being proposed.

If you look at Attachment 4 on page 2, what we've got proposed is that we do this in a workshop type of setting, we have tables, multiple tables, set up in the room, where John or someone from his staff are there talking about SEDAR and Kate is manning a LAPP table and I would be explaining the allocations and mackerel and Rick would be there to talk about snapper grouper and Roger about ecosystem and Myra about coral and Kim talking about outreach and trying to get someone from NMFS to talk about NMFS issues. This is where the misnomer about a career day surfaces.

The idea here is to have a two-way exchange with fishermen and explain to them what's being proposed and answer their questions, because you know from the scoping process that you've got a lot of misinformation and they ask questions and by the time you get to their scoping input, sometimes you don't get to useful information.

The idea here would be we would spend time at the staff level talking to them and then in another room, we would be set up to actually take formal scoping comment. After they got all their information, they could go next door with a council member and give their formal input.

Our proposal that's laid out here was to do this during -- Spend a whole day in one location and if we have public hearings, we could do that in the evening, because some people aren't going to be able to come during the day. This obviously takes a lot of staff resources, but we feel it's necessary in order to adequately explain what's being considered in upcoming amendments.

We've had some input that rather than -- This would take two weeks to do and I'm going to talk about locations in a second, but it would take two weeks and that's a lot of staff time twice a year. A suggestion has been made to pare it back some and just try it in an afternoon, spend an afternoon doing this workshop type of session and then have your comments in the afternoon and the evening. That way, we could pare this back to get this done within one week.

Concurrent with this new approach, we can't do three of these in every state and so we don't have to agree on the details here today, but we would need to pare back our locations and it's sort of our staff feeling that if you're telling the public that you're giving them an opportunity to come in and get all their questions answered, then they'll have a chance to have scoping input, much more meaningful input, and we can tell you ahead of time when we're going to do this, that it's not unreasonable to expect them to travel a fair distance to do this.

What we've suggested is hold these so that no one has more than a two to three hour maximum time to drive and we would suggest that in North Carolina primarily we'll look at two locations, Morehead City and the Wilmington area. One in Charleston to take care of South Carolina and a good suggestion we received is to do that the week before you go on the road, to work out all the bugs, and then a site in Miami, Canaveral, and then one in Savannah.

If we were to do that, we could do that over two weeks, doing Charleston one week and then the following week go out for one week on the road, but we really think it's the only way to get through this hump with all of these different actions that are linked that have cumulative impacts on the same fishermen. With that, that's our suggestion for trying it out for next year and I would be glad to entertain any questions.

Mr. Cupka: Questions or comments for Gregg?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Gregg, I have a question. For 2008, you would try this workshop-type approach, but that wouldn't mean that you're meshing all the documents into one big document. You're still keeping everything separate until 2010, or whenever you decide you're going to try to do one amendment a year?

Mr. Waugh: That's correct. We would be scoping these different documents at the same time and we would also be there to talk to them about what's coming in Amendment 16, but it would not change the structure of the documents at all.

Dr. Crabtree: I have just a few comments. I would be interested in seeing how the scoping meeting would go with something like this. I agree with you that they're not particularly satisfactory the way they're doing it. One problem I see with scoping only at one time of the year is the linkage to the SEDAR process and then the statutory requirements.

You're going to have SEDARs completed at different times of the year and then you're going to get notifications that you have one year or whatever to take action and that's likely to require you to then go out and do scoping and you probably won't be able to just wait, because of the requirements to take the statute.

The other problem I kind of see with it is more not so related to how you handle the scoping, but more the notion of trying to get to just one amendment done a year, because I think then what you're going to see is, because the levels of analysis and the complexities of the actions are very variable, that you're likely to end up with things that are largely complete and could move forward being held up waiting for the more complex and controversial things to be done.

I think if you look at Amendment 15 that you kind of see some of that. A lot of things in Amendment 15 were probably finished two years ago and we split it up and we're getting them done now, but some of the things that were in 15 are probably still nine months to a year away from getting done and so that's kind of one concern I have towards that approach of getting it done.

Then on page 1 of the document, when I looked through the timelines, I don't think most of this allows enough time, really. I would guess it's the exception, rather than the rule, when the council is able to follow these sorts of timelines. It depends on how controversial and complicated the document is, I suppose, but if the goal is to have regulations effective on January 1, that means we have to publish a final rule by December 1 and if you submit a document to us in October, that's impossible.

If your goal is to have regulations effective on January 1, you probably need to move everything back I would say six months to make that goal, because we simply can't take a council document and get to an effective date on a final rule -- Remember, there's a thirty-day cooling off period after the rule publishes and so I would guess we would need minimally probably seven months to get to an effective date, at least on an amendment.

Now, if it's a framework action, that could be shortened some and with the way things have gone lately with OMB and workload issues and NOAA General Counsel, seven months is ambitious and so I think that we need to recognize a little bit that you can't really make this schedule, I don't think, in terms of the way it's laid out.

Mr. Geiger: My question goes to Roy's comment in regard to how we make changes as a result of information we derive from SEDAR, which requires us to take action on something possibly within a year. Gregg, wouldn't we be able to -- In those particular actions, wouldn't we still use the framework to make those adjustments?

Dr. Crabtree: If it was an EIS, you would need to go out and do scoping and so if you were only going to scope in February or March, I don't think that's going to work. Now, you could follow this process when it works and recognize that there will be other times when you'll have to go out and do scoping and that would be fine.

Mr. Waugh: This would not preclude the council from considering frameworks and going out to scoping at other times of the year. This is just setting out a goal to try to reach this and we have to be cognizant of the real world. There's a statutory deadline laid out in the Magnuson Act, but we're not following it. This is based on, in part, that statutory deadline. I think this is a goal that we should work towards and it's a goal -- The council has said in the past, in considering the FEP that they want to try to get to point where this is how we operate.

Transitioning to that point, certainly there can be other activities that surface that need to be addressed. It doesn't mean you have to wait until the following year. If it's important enough to address -- If we've got an overfishing species and we need to make a change within a year, then obviously we start a new action, just like we did with gag and vermilion.

Mr. Geiger: To that point, Gregg, help me visualize what impact that would have on our operating schedule. I guess it would be just as we're operating now. We would get the result of a SEDAR and we would get a letter from the Regional Office telling us that we've got to take action and end it within a year.

We would basically be still working under the same parameter, but utilizing this process -- Putting this process in place in an effort for transition and moving towards this eventuality in the future, but always recognizing if we have a SEDAR result and we have to take immediate action to end overfishing that we have to work on that.

Mr. Waugh: That's correct and that's why we've factored in with our activities -- In Amendment 17, we will be addressing the outputs on red snapper, greater amberjack, and mutton snapper. Each year, we know when we have these SEDAR assessments scheduled and so we will factor them into the schedule. If it doesn't fit this one-time-a-year activity, then it will be a separate regulatory amendment.

Mr. Mahood: There's three comments that have come up from the discussion. One is that don't forget that the intent of doing it this way is to be fair to the fishermen. If you've got things coming at them from six different directions, giving it to them one at a time doesn't really give them a true picture of how it's going to affect their business and their operations.

Secondly, we have actually done this before in relation to public meetings that we've had where we've sat down with the fishermen in round table discussions and cleared up a lot of misinformation. Spiny lobster right now would probably be a good candidate for having some meetings with fishermen and clearing this up.

Secondly, remember that we're on the brink of combining NEPA and the Magnuson Act into one review. I can't give you any information, because it's all top secret, but believe me that we're almost there and you can lose the term EIS, because it's going to be something else. That's going to change the process somewhat and it may change the process we're talking about here right now.

Certainly it's supposed to shorten things up. We'll see if it does or not, but there are some other changes taking place and I don't know -- The staff have proposed in this to go in this direction primarily because we have so much going on in 2008 and then the third item is hopefully one day we are going to catch up with all these overfished species and where overfishing is going on and we're going to take care of it and certainly at that point in time things should simplify and hopefully we won't have SEDARs coming back that say there's overfishing occurring and that it's an overfished species. Hopefully it will be going the other way.

We've certainly got to be there by 2011 or 2010, in some cases. There are some other things going on that hopefully one day we'll be out of this morass we're in of trying to catch up and we'll be ahead of the curve on overfishing and overfished species.

Mr. Geiger: I apologize for my unfortunate choice of nomenclature I used earlier, but English is not my native tongue sometimes and I lose perspective. I didn't mean it that way, but without

the name in front of me, I get confused.

I think this is a commend -- Again, we talked about this, the manner in which staff goes about preparing documents and interfacing with the public and I think this is a tremendous initiative in an effort, again, using Bob's words, to be fair to the fishing community, to let them know long-term what is coming up, because 2008 is an extremely aggressive schedule and a lot of things -- If we implement everything, an awful lot of things happen to everybody during that period of time and I think this is a very innovative approach to carry that information to the public.

My concern was about the amount of time staff was away from the office and sitting there potentially with -- Who knows how many people are going to actually show up? It's scary to think of our entire staff sitting in a hotel room somewhere with their laptop in front of them waiting for somebody to come and nobody shows up. It's like a funeral.

I can see the merit in this and I think it's commendable and I support the shorter version, where we go out and put that in play and maybe we go to the two-week version. If we see we have this tremendous turnout and it proves to be beneficial, we can always expand it and make it even more user friendly, but I think with the clarification that we still move forward as we would normally, based on SEDAR results, I would support this shortened process wholeheartedly and commend you, Gregg and staff, for coming up with the methodology to help convey the message to the fishermen. I think it's good.

Mr. Cupka: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Waugh: Just to mention that it was the staff. We kicked this around together and I'm just presenting this here. This is something we sort of stumbled into, in looking at the large number of activities. Thank you and I'll pass those compliments along.

Mr. Cupka: Questions or comments?

Mr. Boyles: I'm not on your committee, again, but I just wanted to reiterate something I mentioned earlier. This process is not intuitive, regardless of the workload for 2008 or just the way we've done things. Again, at the few public hearings that I've presided at, I have found the number of fishermen who aren't the paid professional folks to sit and go to meetings and to watch what the council is doing; I think they really appreciate the ability to interact informally with both staff as well as members of the council.

The degree to which this process will encourage that, I'm all for this. I think it's very, very important that we make ourselves and this process as accessible as we can to those folks, the folks who are paid to watch this process and to monitor this process as well as those folks whose avocations or livelihoods are affected by this. Thank you.

Mr. Geiger: To that point, Robert, I would encourage every council member -- I'm sure you all do, but if you don't, please consider, every time you talk to a fisherman, to encourage them to speak to the council staff and explain to them that we've got staff people who are responsible for species and if they're interested -- If they're a mackerel fisherman, they need to get with now

Kate, or Gregg, I guess, now that Kate is on LAPP full time and Rick DeVictor for snapper grouper and certainly all the fishermen already know Kim and so they should have the benefit of being able to interface with staff, but we need to encourage that as often and frequently as possible.

Mr. Mahood: Robert, when they call us, we tell them to call you and so you -- No, we do and we encourage -- If we have somebody call from a particular state and they want to know how they can have input, we take what they have to say and then we also tell them to please contact your council member in that state and that's the only way they're going to know how you feel about a particular issue.

Mr. Cupka: Other comments?

Dr. Crabtree: Just one final one and I'm not on the committee either and this is just sort of my opinion as a council member, but I think the way of interacting with the public and setting scoping meetings up this way may be a really good idea and may work well and I think it is innovative.

I just feel like we work better when we have smaller and more tightly focused amendments and so kind of my vision of where I would like to get for is we're doing more amendments that are narrower in scope and more focused on what they're doing. I'm a little bit concerned that if we start heading towards one amendment a year that it's going to be -- The paper will be so big you can't lift it and we don't do well when we get in those kinds of situations, I'm afraid, in terms of getting things done timely.

I think yes, there's a lot to be said for letting the public know we're on a fixed schedule and we're going to do scoping usually this time of year and try to have rules this time of year and maybe we can get towards that and make some progress, but I also think there's -- When the documents get too big and too complicated, that turns the public off and there's that side of it, too. Just keep all that in mind and let's make sure we recognize both sides of all this if we move forward.

Mr. Cupka: Other comments?

Mr. Currin: When we first talked about this on the phone, and I appreciate the staff's innovation in putting this together and I hope, for a number of reasons that it will work, but I say that still having some skepticism and reservations. I don't know what the appropriate questions to ask are. It's one of those things that I think we're going to have to try it and see if it works.

Roy brings up a good point about the depth of documents or thickness of the documents and that can be a real problem and we've talked about that for years. I'm sure there will be some bumps and some hurdles in trying to implement this approach, but I think there are a lot of potential benefits from it, too, and I would encourage us to at least -- Let's give it a try and see what works and what doesn't and we can always back up and go back to the way we've always done things.

Mr. Cupka: What's the desire of the committee then? I sense that there's a lot of support for at

least trying this and there's been a lot of good points raised in regard to why we ought to try it and I also recognize some concerns we have, but there's nothing that says that we can't back off if it doesn't work.

Again, I would like to know what the desire of the committee is. I don't know if we need a formal motion or if somebody wants to make a motion or whether we just move ahead by consensus in this direction or -- Is there any opposition to moving in this direction? Seeing none, then we will do that.

Mr. Mahood: Mr. Chairman, I can tell you if we go to the first one and nobody comes and we're sitting around twiddling our thumbs, we'll come back to you and say we don't want to do this anymore, because it's certainly -- Our intent is to benefit the fishermen that have questions about what's going to happen this year and what the council is doing.

We'll probably try it, I suspect, on the smaller scale to start with and see how that works and then we'll let the council know and we may want to even encourage, if we hold them in a particular area, a council member sitting in on the meeting and that type of thing.

Mr. Geiger: Thank you, Bob. In that regard, I think there's a lot of legwork that needs to be done before we even embark on this process. I think we need to develop some form of really extensive explanation, a cheat sheet or a crib note or Cliff note of what it is we're doing and trying to attempt here and working with Kim and getting the word out to the people that this is in fact going to happen.

We need to really publicize this, to make sure that the public understands the opportunity available and that they capitalize on it, because it's for their benefit. Again, this is an opportunity for council members to take back to their constituents the fact that we're going to do this and maybe we can the states to help publicize the fact that we're going to do it in some way, shape, or form, through state literature. I think we've got a big effort to try and develop an information sheet, I guess. I don't know what else to call it and again, my second language. With that --

Mr. Currin: Just one comment regarding the two meetings in each state and I think that's a great idea. We might want to consider trying to get somewhere between Morehead City and the northern Outer Banks, whether that's New Bern or Little Washington or somewhere kind of up that way. I think that's going to be a little more acceptable, perhaps, to the northern Outer Banks fishermen. It's going to cut a little bit of time off their drive. They get quite perturbed at times because they have to drive so far.

Mr. Waugh: Certainly we'll be in touch with council members, because that's one thing that sort of stand out, having just driven back from Manteo. It's certainly longer than three hours and we will work with council members, all the council members in each state, to make sure we've got the right locations.

Our intent would be to do a lot more in terms of finding a location that people are familiar with and working with our APs in those areas and certainly working with Kim to get the word out. I

think we need to do some special notices on this and we can develop some documents to distribute and put on our website.

Mr. Cupka: That brings us down to Other Business then. Is there any other business to come before the Executive and Finance Committee? Seeing none, then we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 4:22 o'clock p.m., December 3, 2007.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2007 - 2008 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

David Cupka, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

ECONOMICS

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin
Roy Crabtree
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
John Wallace
Staff Contact: Kate Quigley

**ECOSYSTEM-BASED
MANAGEMENT***

Duane Harris, Chair
Columbus Brown
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Gregg Waugh- FEP Comprehensive
Amendment

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / NEPA

George Geiger, Chair
Robert Boyles
Columbus Brown
Brian Chevront
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Rick DeVictor

EXECUTIVE

George Geiger, Chair
Duane Harris, Vice-Chair
David Cupka
Brian Chevront
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

FINANCE

David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Tony Iarocci, Chair
John Wallace, Vice Chair
George Geiger
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

**HABITAT & ENVIRON.
PROTECTION**

Duane Harris, Chair
Robert Boyles
Columbus Brown
George Geiger
Vince O'Shea
John Wallace
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Rita Merritt, Chair
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Columbus Brown
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

David Cupka, Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Rita Merritt
Tom Swatzel
Ron Smith, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Jack Travelstead, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
John Wallace
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

**LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE
PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

Rita Merritt, Chair
Robert Boyles
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Susan Shipman
Tom Swatzel
John Wallace
Staff contact: Kate Quigley

MARINE PROTECTED AREA

Tony Iarocci, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice Chair
Columbus Brown
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

PERSONNEL

Susan Shipman, Chair
David Cupka
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Mark Robson, Chair
Columbus Brown
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Susan Shipman
Brian Sullivan
John Wallace
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

(Continued on the next page)

MONICA-SMIT BRUNEL JACK MCGOVERN
MIKE RAY GMFC

Staff Attendee List

Bob Mahood

Gregg Waugh

Mike Collins

John Carmichael _____

Rick DeVictor _____

Dale Theiling _____

Julie Neer _____

Andi Stephens _____

Roger Pugliese _____

Kate Quigley _____

Myra Brouwer _____

Kim Iverson

Julie O'Dell _____

Rachael Lindsay _____

Cindy Chaya _____

Deb Buscher _____

2007 Budget Status

ACCOUNT NAME	Total 2007	Total Expended	%	Obligated	Obligated & Expended	Balance
Council Comp	\$ 194,524	\$ 121,280	62%	\$ 25,276	\$ 146,556	\$ 47,968
Staff Comp	\$ 1,042,084	\$ 837,846	80%	\$ 163,317	\$ 1,001,164	\$ 40,920
FICA	\$ 72,946	\$ 58,237	80%	\$ 12,594	\$ 70,831	\$ 2,115
Health Ins	\$ 176,459	\$ 194,396	110%	\$ 263	\$ 194,659	\$ (18,200)
Retirement	\$ 96,753	\$ 75,188	78%	\$ 21,489	\$ 96,678	\$ 75
Life Ins.	\$ 16,317	\$ 18,205	112%	\$ 486	\$ 18,691	\$ (2,374)
Council Travel	\$ 128,093	\$ 86,175	67%	\$ 23,904	\$ 110,079	\$ 18,014
Staff Travel	\$ 150,229	\$ 122,870	82%	\$ 64,730	\$ 136,442	\$ 13,787
SSC Travel	\$ 43,770	\$ 15,852	36%	\$ 13,953	\$ 29,805	\$ 13,965
AP Travel	\$ 79,943	\$ 20,628	26%	\$ 19,765	\$ 40,393	\$ 39,550
Other Travel	\$ 141,340	\$ 107,672	76%	\$ 6,110	\$ 113,782	\$ 27,558
Office Rent	\$ 102,553	\$ 94,359	92%	\$ 15,583	\$ 109,942	\$ (7,389)
Equipment Rent	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Mtg. Room Rent	\$ 60,550	\$ 36,752	61%	\$ 10,335	\$ 47,087	\$ 13,463
Telephone	\$ 15,858	\$ 10,397	66%	\$ 5,461	\$ 15,858	\$ -
Postage	\$ 6,500	\$ 3,360	52%	\$ 3,140	\$ 6,500	\$ -
Uncategorized Intr/Serv	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ 432	122%	\$ -	\$ 432	\$ (391)
Printing	\$ 25,000	\$ 36,189	145%	\$ -	\$ 36,189	\$ (11,189)
Adm Contracts	\$ 101,393	\$ 58,330	58%	\$ 43,063	\$ 101,393	\$ -
Vis Sci-Allen	\$ 2,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ -
Transcription	\$ 32,000	\$ 38,362	120%	\$ 6,362	\$ 44,724	\$ (12,724)
NC-State Liaison	\$ 35,000	\$ 17,500	0%	\$ 17,500	\$ 35,000	\$ -
SC-State Liaison	\$ 35,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ -
GA -State Liaison	\$ 35,000	\$ 16,564	0%	\$ 18,436	\$ 35,000	\$ -
FL-State Liaison	\$ 35,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ -
Supplies	\$ 47,629	\$ 30,500	64%	\$ 17,129	\$ 47,629	\$ -
Training	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,440	89%	\$ 560	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Equip & Furniture	\$ 23,000	\$ 13,300	58%	\$ 9,700	\$ 23,000	\$ -
Total	\$ 2,703,941	\$ 2,018,836	75%	\$ 571,157	\$ 2,538,834	\$ 165,107

2007 Grant Funding	\$ 1,590,313	Extra Funding from NMFS for MSRA	\$ 107,500
Amount carry over from 2006	\$ 449,225	Total 2007 Funding	\$ 2,877,857
2007 NEPA funds from NMFS	\$ 263,340	2007 unbudgeted amount	\$ 173,916
2007 SEDAR	\$ 461,979	Potential carry forward	\$ 339,023
Reimb Magnuson Act Workshop 9/07	\$ 5,500		

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

**Joint Executive and Finance Committee
Atlantic Beach, NC
Monday, December 3, 2007**

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

George Sedberry / Gray's Reef NMS 912 598 2439 10 Ocean Square Circle, SAV, GA 31411

Margot Stiles Oceana 202 467 1901

Libby Felhoffer TOC-FL

BUFFY BAUMANN OCEANA 202-~~467-1938~~ 467-1938 2501 M ST. NW, SUITE 300 WDC 20001
(PLEASE ADD TO MAILING LIST)

Darden Rice OCEANA 727-560-2479 110 18th Ave South, St. Pete, FL 33705

DICK BRAME CCA 910-338-0012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10