

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, GA**

March 9, 2017

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair
Chris Conklin
Doug Haymans

Charlie Phillips
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley

Council Members:

Robert Beal
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Dr. Wilson Laney

Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Lt. Tara Pray

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mike Collins
John Hadley
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Roger Pugliese

John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Kimberly Cole
Amber Von Harten

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Kristin Foss
Leann Bosarge
Rob O'Reilly
Kathy Knowlton

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Rick DeVictor
Erica Burgess
Dr. Jessica Stephen
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. George Sedberry

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 morning, March 9, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We will call the Executive Finance Committee to order. Just to let everybody know, the members of the committee are myself, Charlie Phillips, Chris Conklin, Ben Hartig, Doug Haymans, and Jessica McCawley. The first item is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. The next item is Approval of the December 2016 Committee Minutes. Are there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved.

The next item of business is a Report from the CCC, which is Council Coordination Committee, Meeting that occurred -- Gosh, that was just last week, wasn't it? Wow. That is Attachments 1a and 1b in your briefing book, and I'm going to turn things over to Gregg to kind of walk us through that.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Michelle and Charlie attended that meeting, as did Roy, and so feel free to chime in, and we're just going to give a very brief overview, and then Mike will touch on what came out of the Administrative Officers' meeting. There is one item that you all need to be made aware of, in particular.

If you look at page 2, this highlights each agenda item. We got an update, and you have heard some of this before, but just to touch on it briefly. On January 20, there was a regulatory freeze that held actions, initially for sixty days, and the National Marine Fisheries Service worked with the administration and got some items moved up. There are still several items that are held until a March 21 effective date, and that's Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16, Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 1, and the SBRM final rule.

January 30, we got an Executive Order, that two-for-one Executive Order. There has been some clarification on that, that that only applies for items that are deemed to be significant under Executive Order 12866, and that is -- We do an RIR with the Region, and that determines whether those actions are significant or not. Our actions generally are not significant. One of the thresholds is it has to be in excess of \$100 million, and there are several others, but virtually all of our actions are not considered significant, and so it wouldn't be under that. Right now, the non-regulatory actions, notices for meetings and so forth, are moving fairly quickly.

We got a Management and Budget update. There is a ninety-day hiring freeze in place, and the policy has yet to be developed that would apply to any staff reductions. In terms of budget, we were told that the Fiscal 2017 budget could still be adjusted, and so we're waiting to hear on that. The expectation is, if we were to get anywhere near level funding, that would be good news. The agency itself is looking at budget cuts. As I'm going through, if you all have any questions, please stop me.

The legislative outlook, we got an update on the bill, and there is a bill to reauthorize the Act, House Bill 200, that was filed, and so that is one item that is out. There is some expectation that there will be action to reauthorize the Act, and the councils want to be ready to comment on those items, should we be asked.

MR. HARTIG: Before we get too far away of the impacts on the administration on our amendments, is there somewhere where we can access that information about how our amendments are being slowed down or expedited or when things are released. I mean, is there any one place that I can get to to find that information?

MR. WAUGH: I don't know that there is. We could certainly put a short document together that lays this out, and I think those are the three actions that would apply to us that are currently in that delay until March 21, but we could put something together and get it out to council members, so they know.

DR. DUVAL: I think Gregg had sent around earlier one of the Federal Register notices that came out sort of clarifying that Executive Order. He had sent that around to council members, and so we could probably circulate that again. Really, Ben, this update, it was a verbal update from Headquarters staff about how -- There wasn't any documentation attached to it, in other words, but it was about how fishery management council proposed rules, for the most part, just don't fall into this two-for-one bucket that is out there, just because of the threshold for significant regulatory action, I think, and so I'm not sure there was anything. We could, like Gregg said, probably put something short together, with Monica and Roy's help.

MR. WAUGH: Continuing with the legislative outlook, the councils are going to be requested to comment on how we see reducing the regulatory burden on fishermen, and so that will be a request that is coming to each of the councils for a specific response.

Then, on MSA reauthorization, given that the expectation is that something will happen and could happen fairly quickly, we wanted to have a draft letter on behalf of the councils to respond, if we got any specific requests, and so there is a sub-committee that worked on a draft letter, and that is being finalized. The New England Council is the lead council for the Council Coordinating Committee this year. They will have that letter, if we get any specific requests. Then we'll have a more general letter to respond to. We have added a couple of members to that legislative workgroup, and I've got a slide towards the end that will show that membership.

That takes care of some of the more general issues, where the councils had a lot of agreement. Some of the more thorny issues the councils are going to be addressing in a working paper, and that addresses overfished, overfishing, data confidentiality, and other issues. Those, we will have some more time to work on between now and May, and we will bring that to the CCC meeting in May. We will also have a chance to look at that in June and continue to work on any potential responses, should we be asked to respond.

In terms of guidance and updates, there is a draft policy directive addressing conflict of interest and procedural guidance, and there are some revisions there that outline a little more specifically the responsibilities of the Executive Director to look at some of these potential conflict of interest issues and working with NOAA GC and NMFS to ensure that those issues are covered.

We had put together a list of questions for the National Standard 1 Guidelines, and each of the other councils has some similar questions, and the agency is working on a response for those, and we'll have those in May, and that will be available for you all at the June meeting.

National Bycatch Reduction Strategy, the National Implementation Plan should be out for comment in the spring or early summer. Then they will be working on regional implementation plans, with the council working with their regions to have input into that. The requirement is that all FMPs be consistent with these new requirements by February 21, 2022, and so we've got basically five years to accomplish that. Unfortunately, like many of these other directives, there is no new monies to accomplish that work, and, again, in the face of reductions, at least over the short term, that's something we're going to have to address in how we respond to that.

Marine National Monuments is still a big issue, and the CCC had sent in a previous letter, and they worked on a revision to that to send to the new administration. That is being reviewed by a couple of the councils now and then that letter will be sent in.

The next National SSC Meeting was discussed some. They worked on a draft list of items to address, and that meeting will take place January 17 through 19 in 2018 in San Diego, and so the Pacific Fishery Management Council is hosting that, and I should mention that Leann attended that meeting as well, and so, Leann, feel free to chime in as well.

On page 3, the NMFS science update, we got a briefing on a stock assessment improvement plan and some revisions to that. They initially wanted comments by April 28 of this year, and a number of us councils pointed out that we need at least a council meeting to develop comments on some of these major items, and that was a theme we presented to them, that when you have things that you want the councils to comment on, look at the council agendas and meeting schedules and give them at least a meeting to address those comments, and so we will be looking at draft comments on that in June.

Best scientific information available document, again, there are some revisions to that, and that comment period is June 30, and so we'll be able to develop comments at our June meeting. Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management Roadmap Implementation, we talked about that some. There was no action taken, but we did raise the issue, again, of a concern of lack of funds to do some of this work, and we also pointed out that what we've heard from our fishermen a lot is you have got -- As red snapper have increased to rebuild, you've got red snapper and lionfish out there eating a lot of the other species and how do we address this, where the fishermen are saying we should be concerned about gag grouper and scamp and these other species, vermilion snapper, due to the higher abundance of red snapper and lionfish. We also raised the shark issue and how, as sharks rebuild, that is impacting our fisheries and the available yield from some of our fisheries.

We mentioned red grouper as an example of a species that perhaps you get these periodic good year classes. For whatever reason, the environmental conditions are right, and you get a good year class. It's difficult to manage that in the current ACL structure, and so no resolution of those questions, but there's an agreement to work on that.

We spent a good bit of time talking about MRIP reviews, and the National Academy of Science had a review, and those presentations are interesting, and they're really open to looking at alternative methodologies to address some of these concerns, and we offered some examples that we've had to deal with, and there is three points that will be addressed that I will touch on in Slide 7. We're taking the lead on this and working with the Gulf, getting a representative from the Gulf Council. It's more important for us, down here with the higher recreational catches, and we will have to comment on the strategic plan.

There was a short discussion about -- We received a presentation the last FAO meeting, and the councils are going to attend the next one as well. In Other Business, we did approve letters on the monument, as mentioned earlier, and we have a draft letter ready to go if we get requested to comment on specific items or MSA reauthorization in general.

We clarified the workgroups that we have, and these workgroups are comprised mostly of CCC members, and so the Legislative Workgroup, I chair that, and Michelle is on there representing the South Atlantic Council, along with Terry Stockwell from New England, Kitty Simonds from the Western Pacific, Dan Hull from the North Pacific, and we added two reps, one from the Gulf and one from the Pacific, and those councils are working on identifying those representatives. Dale Whaley, who is under contract with the councils, is an ex-officio member. This is a group that helps develop specific responses to any legislative requests that we get, and so we will coordinate any input from you all, as necessary.

There is a Habitat Working Group that's continuing and a Council Communications Group that Kim sits on, and Roger is involved in the Habitat. In the SSC, we've got all of the councils involved in that.

We also had a couple of follow-up items, and this is on page 5. One was a budget-related issue, and we talked about this some at our last June meeting, but the councils and commissions are in one line item, and the councils have a revenue sharing formula that was developed over much blood, sweat, and tears. One thing that Bob said on his way out is, whatever you do, don't let them revisit that allocation process.

We want to do the same thing with ASMFC. We get a lot of services from ASMFC. ACCSP is housed within them. The East Coast councils have various levels of involvement with ASMFC. We tend to do complementary plans. As you go farther north, there are joint plans, involving the Mid-Atlantic and New England, and so what we have agreed to do is have a group of myself, Michelle, Mike Luisi from the Mid-Atlantic, Terry Stockwell from New England, Tom Nies is the New England Executive Director, Chris Moore is the Mid-Atlantic Executive Director, and Chuck Tracy is the Pacific Executive Director, and Bob Beal is an ex-officio member.

We are going to work together and bring some alternatives for the CCC to consider on how we can agree on sharing monies in that line item. There is talk about trying to get a potential increase, if all recall, and it's unclear exactly how that money should be shared.

Then MRIP, we're continuing to work on this issue, and the agenda will show some items that our council and the Gulf Council -- They're working on a rep to work with me on that, or as leads on that. Fishery-independent data programs, this is an issue that we raised with them, other councils, to see if they had similar issues, and all the councils are concerned, particularly now, about potential budget impacts to the fishery-independent data programs, and so Michelle and I are working on that issue, and that will be discussed at the May meeting, and we have requested NMFS to give us an update at that meeting. We have a social scientist coordination group that's continuing to work. The next CCC meeting will be in Gloucester in May, the 16th through the 18th, and I will make sure and distribute the links to the briefing materials for that, so that everybody has it.

Finally, page 7 has a preliminary May agenda. This is what is on the slate. I will call attention to the MRIP item. The three items that we requested that we work on and look at there are alternative ACL tracking methodologies, and we have a letter later that we're going to be talking about that Ben asked that be drafted that we'll ask for some help from MRIP on that. Alternative methods to estimate the private recreational catch, the National Academy of Science Review pointed out that there are opportunities to use alternative methodologies, including logbooks, to estimate and track the catch of certain areas.

Then the other issue we have, and you heard about this in cobia, is this weight conversion issue. There is a different weight conversion methodology that's used in the Southeast, and my understanding was that was to be resolved and that MRIP was going to adopt the Southeast methodology. That has not happened yet, and so we continue to have this issue of two sets of numbers.

If someone looks at a document is put together from the South Atlantic area, or the Southeast, there is one poundage figure. If you go to the MRIP site, you get another poundage figure, and that disparity doesn't do anything to help convey to the public that we know what our numbers are, and it's just a source of frustration for them and for us, and particularly now, working with ASMFC, when they are doing analyses. This is causing issues with which set of data do you use. Those are the three items for MRIP, and then, of course, again, pushing this issue of the level of funding for fishery-independent data. Michelle or Charlie or Roy or Leann, I don't know if you all have any other issues that you want to raise.

DR. DUVAL: I think Gregg did an excellent job of covering the major components of the CCC meeting. I certainly don't have anything to add. There were a number of things of importance. Are there questions? Bonnie and then Jack.

DR. PONWITH: Thanks very much for the report. I appreciate hearing what was discussed there, and, on that very first table you had with the blue on the left-hand side and the topics, one of the bulleted topics was overfished and overfishing. I am presuming that mapped back to the Magnuson reauthorization, and can you talk just a little bit more about that? Is it concerns about the guidance or recrafting how it's framed up in the Act?

MR. WAUGH: I think the Act treats overfished and overfishing the same. It's one definition, and the councils are looking to define them, to separate the definition, and depleted. Maybe that's what it is. Depleted, they wanted clarification on.

DR. DUVAL: Right now, overfished and overfishing are used interchangeably within the Act. I mean, I think we know what we mean by overfished and overfishing, in terms of what's happening, you know too high of rate of removal versus a population level that is too low, but they're used interchangeably in the Act, and so clarity on that. Then, as Gregg mentioned, the H.R. 200 also includes a provision for use of the term "depleted", rather than overfished as well. Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: Gregg covered a lot of different topics in his overview, but one thing that you talked about was the monuments, and there is a monument in the Northeast that affects us, and that was issued by President Obama last September. It's the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument, and it was done under the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906. It's been subject to a lawsuit, just this week, from a coalition of New England fishermen.

In that area, which is off of Cape Cod and is about the size of Connecticut, commercial fishing and other resource-extraction activities are prohibited. All commercial fisheries, red crab and American lobster, would be phased out over seven years. Two FMPs that we have that would be affected by that are Dolphin Wahoo and Coastal Migratory Pelagics, although they have a table in there that shows the reported commercial landings, and dolphin, over five years, is 2,100 pounds, and wahoo is 213 pounds. There are no reported landings of coastal migratory pelagics. Anyway, it affects us, and our General Counsel, Monica and Shep, are looking into it and how regulations should be implemented for that.

The other thing I wanted to mention is Gregg talked lionfish, and, last week, there was a rollout of a lionfish trap design by Steve Gittings from the National Ocean Service, and he has a design that he has been testing that attracts lionfish. There is like a fish attracting device in the middle of the trap, and it just lays flat. Then, when they retrieve it, it surrounds the lionfish and selectively removes the lionfish, and so he has a nice design, and he gave us a presentation that was very good on this.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks. Who did the lionfish design again?

DR. MCGOVERN: It's Steve Gittings from the National Ocean Service, and I should also mention that it's a fish trap, and fish traps are prohibited in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, and so, to test any design, there would be some kind of authorization needed from NMFS.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: One of the things that I am talking to my staff about is how we could come up with some framework that would allow us to exempt certain types of traps from the fish trap prohibition, so that we could certify something as a lionfish trap, and therefore exempt it, without having to go through EFPs and all of those types of things, because we're getting interest in trying various traps, in all three of our councils, to try and capture lionfish.

I am told, in some areas, they are getting as much as five-dollars a pound for lionfish, and so I think it's a way for fishermen to make some money and get fish into the marketplace and also hopefully keep lionfish populations from growing at the rate they otherwise might. We likely will be coming to you at some time with some sort of modification to our framework to allow the use of some of these traps.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Roy. Doug and then Charlie.

MR. HAYMANS: Thanks. Jack, that sounds like a good old-fashioned pyramid crab trap that lays flat and folds up when it's raised. That's been around for a long time, but it's just a different application.

DR. MCGOVERN: He showed two different designs. One was like a curtain that comes up and goes around, and another one was what he called a purse trap. You pull it up, and it just folds over the fish attracting device. The lionfish just kind of hang out around it, and the other fish kind of scoot out of the way, I think, and so it kind of selectively removes the lionfish.

MR. HAYMANS: I have a question for Gregg, if I may. On the MSA reauthorization, and I may have missed it, and apologies if I did, but is there any effort amongst the CCC to recommend some sort of ACL, or a lack of ACL usage, for recreational fisheries, especially when there is low PSEs? I mean, is that a discussion in the reauthorization?

MR. WAUGH: Not thus far.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, there is a provision in H.R. 200 that allows for -- It's like on the very last page, or the very last section, I think, that allows for the use of alternative means of managing recreational fisheries that would allow for management by F rates and different types of approaches in lieu of an ACL. Jessica, to that point?

MS. MCCAWLEY: There is actually two sections. There is that section, and then there's another section earlier in the bill. I actually have a copy of the bill with me, if someone wants to look at it, but, yes, there are two sections in there that are trying to address that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, are you thinking the trap certification as something similar to how they do TED certification, something similar to that?

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not sure I've gotten that far, but, yes, something like that, where we would have some criteria, and it seems to me that you would have to show that the proposed trap mostly catches lionfish and minimal amounts of other things. Then somehow we would do a notice in the Federal Register that says this trap is exempt from the fish trap rules and can be used.

Now, I think, at some point, we'll have to have a discussion of is it a situation where we wouldn't want to have too many of those traps out there, because they may, in turn, have impacts on habitat and other types of things, and so I think there are a number of things that would bear consideration. Vertical lines to the surface will be an issue for entanglements and that, and so there will have to be a whole series of conditions on their use, but we just -- My goal is to get to some more streamlined process to allow the use of some of these to address the problem.

MR. WAUGH: Coming back a second to Doug's question, the H.R. 200 has some verbiage in there. The CCC has not taken, that I know, a position on that yet. That is one of the things that will be addressed in that working group, and so there is an opportunity for that to be supported. If that's something that there is interest in us trying to get some more support for, I think it would be helpful guidance to have that.

MR. HAYMANS: I think that would certainly be something that this council would ask the CCC to look into and to try to support, if written correctly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: FWC is preparing a letter on this, and I can tell you that there are some things in there that we support and some things that we don't.

DR. DUVAL: I am pretty sure that's going to be the case for every council, and what the CCC does is try to develop comment letters that touch on issues at a higher level and where we can find agreement on certain items. Certainly I was interested in that provision in H.R. 200, just from our council's perspective. Are there other questions about the CCC meeting report? Okay. I am not seeing any hands, and so we will go over to Mike for the Administrative Officer Report.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first thing I want to bring up is something that is more of a reminder to the council members. It was covered in the council member orientation, dealing with email retention. Emails have been determined to be federal records, and they need to be preserved. That is pretty much the bottom line.

A document received, written or received, by an individual council member reflects council business if it relates to a matter within council jurisdiction. Official council business does not include documents that reflect personal or private business matters or matters relating to their employment, to their other employment.

What I encourage you to do is to have, and a lot of you already have it, a separate email account for your personal business and one for council business, because, as federal records, they are FOIA-able, which means they can be requested by anybody. If you have co-mingled personal records with official records, it all kind of becomes a problem when they get released, and so I am familiar with Yahoo and Google, and they both allow you to create sub-folders, and I can get with you on that and show you how to do it. It's easy to slide different topics into different folders, so that, if the records are requested by a court or through a FOIA, it will be easy to supply those.

MR. HAYMANS: My first year on the council, seven years ago, I asked if there was a way that the council could create emails for council members with safmc.net at the end of it, and I would ask that question again. I would love to separate my personal from council business. That is basically what you're saying here, right, is to create an email that is just for council accounts, so that it's not -- For us, it's FOIA.

MR. WAUGH: We could do that, but it's going to cost us to set that up internally, versus if you do it on your own, set up your own Gmail account, then it doesn't cost us anything. That is just a consideration.

DR. DUVAL: What's up, Doug? You look like you want to say something else.

MR. HAYMANS: So what is the cost per email account?

MR. WAUGH: Twenty-dollars a month per person, per email account.

DR. DUVAL: So I guess I am not understanding why it would be difficult -- If you wanted to set up a separate Gmail account just for your South Atlantic Council emails, you could do so very easily.

MR. HAYMANS: It's just much more official if it comes out of a safmc.net account rather than a Gmail account. I have got a Gmail account, and that's where everything comes into, and I will want to set up a separate Gmail account for this purpose, but I don't really want to spend \$240 times ten or twelve people. I really don't want to spend \$3,000 to set up a separate account per year.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, this is part of my job responsibilities, and so my state government account is the email account that I use, and so I don't use anything separate for this, and so I would be interested to know if other state representatives use something separate. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was one of my questions. If you're a state rep, and Florida has a very open public records law, and everything that comes in and goes in from my account is considered a public record, and that can be searched and anybody can ask for it. I assume that, by having that type of account and using that strictly for the South Atlantic Council business, that I am in the clear here.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and we would just need to coordinate -- Should you at some point move to a different position, we would need to coordinate to be able to archive that information, so that we have it, in the event that we get sued or a FOIA request.

MR. BREWER: I don't know that we have had an FOIA requests for council emails. Maybe that has happened. It has happened?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, absolutely.

MR. BREWER: Well, if such a request comes in, it's going to -- It just seems like, to me, the information that would be responsive to that request should all be in one location, if possible, because, if we don't have something that is flowing through the council offices, you're going to have to come to us, if it's a personal account, and say, hey, we've gotten this in and please go through your private account and see what information you have that relates to this.

Then we're going to have to individually go through our emails and try to collate the ones that we think are related to it, so that we can properly respond to the FOIA request, and so I would love to see if there was some way that it wouldn't be as expensive, but I would love to have like a central database that has all of these communications that potentially are public record.

MR. WAUGH: Maybe Monica can give us some guidance on this, but, in the past, when we've gotten FOIA requests, we haven't sorted through the emails. We have just made -- Mike can correct me if I'm wrong, but we've just made those emails available, and so, in the event that we got a FOIA request, we would contact you and get your account information, so that we could download your emails, and then we would provide the emails. We haven't been asked in the past to sort that.

MR. COLLINS: What I have seen so far with FOIA requests is it's normally something like requesting all the emails from Chester to Roy and Roy to Chester, and it would be blanket like that. Then that would be an easy search for you to do. That's how we've seen it before, instead of just the whole account.

MR. BELL: Kind of along those lines, I have also seen, on the state level, where we get them, and it says between a certain date and a certain date all emails from these individuals concerning this subject or something, and so I guess, from our standpoint, like Jessica is talking about, if we're using our state thing, we would just drag those out and submit them to you guys, if you got such a thing.

MR. COLLINS: Normally, the FOIA request starts off very broad and then it gets negotiated down to more specific, and so, by the time it gets to us, it would be like you just described, about a certain topic or something like that, or a certain date period.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I agree with all of this. I mean, it's very important, and then I would urge you to be mindful of what you put in emails. I have seen some interesting emails that people would probably have rather not have had in administrative records or released in FOIAs or whatever, but it's a public record and so it gets released, and so there is that aspect, too.

I think, frequently, we have asked for those -- It depends on the FOIA request, and it depends on -- Sometimes, in litigation, we produce emails, and it depends on what the litigants can agree on as well, and so certainly, if you get a request and you can cull out, and "cull" is a nice word right, to not just give us a dump of all the emails that potentially could be responsive, but it really should be responsive to the FOIA request to give to us, because you can imagine that there are tens of thousands, sometimes, of documents that we have to go through to see if they're responsive, and so it can be a really big undertaking on GC's part as well.

MR. BROWN: Mike, I've already got mine organized into folders, where I just drag everything over. If it's council stuff, I put it in one folder, but I also have a Google account that I don't use, and it's just kind of sitting there. Should I just keep using it the way I'm doing it or do I need to change it?

MR. COLLINS: I would recommend that you have an email account specifically for council business and your personal charter business would be a totally separate account.

MR. BROWN: That's the way I've got it right now, but I've got other emails that come to that account, but I do have separate folders. Like all the council stuff goes into one folder.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am sensitive to the expense, but I'm a little bit like Doug, in if you've got an email and it's got safmc.net or something behind it, it lets everybody know exactly what it is and where it's coming from, but I am like Mark. I've got a couple of different accounts. I've got a Google account that I almost never use, partially because I can't remember the password to get into it.

MS. BECKWITH: I will tell you guys how I do it, because it seems simple. I have a Gmail account, and I have a sub-folder that says "2017" and a sub-folder under that that says "trash". Everything gets moved into 2017 or trash and then I'm done. It's simple, and then you sort of have one for each year. That way, it's searchable, including the trash, because, when you delete the public comment that's come into ours -- I don't even think we're supposed to delete that, are we? I don't know. That's actually a question I do have, is if we only have to keep what we respond to or write or if we have to keep every email that comes into our email addresses.

MR. COLLINS: The way the Federal Records Act reads is that documents written or received by council members are agency records.

DR. DUVAL: For me, I am not going to get a new email address that's just specific to the South Atlantic Council, because people already know my email address, and they're going to contact me about South Atlantic Council stuff via my state government email address, and then I would just have two email addresses that I would have to manage for that stuff, and so I don't anticipate myself doing it.

Our agency also receives a significant number of FOIA requests, and I would expect that, at some point, one of those is going to involve something with regard to the council, but a topic where North Carolina state interests and council interests intersect, and so I would need to be able to access those emails anyway. I absolutely understand that, particularly for appointed council members, for whom this ends up being a whole new nine-year experience that you need to maintain those records, but I think, for myself, just from my perspective, I probably would not do that.

MR. WAUGH: I think it's different for state individuals. For instance, you don't conduct any personal business, or, if you had a private business, you wouldn't be using your state email address for that. I think that's where you get into the distinction with other council members who have then the council and private business and personal business, maybe, on one email account.

As Mike has said, the guidance recommends getting a separate email account, if you're a private council member, for council-related business. That would be cleaner than just, as Mark has suggested, just having separate folders, but I would think that's one way to do it, but, just for your own privacy, I think the cleanest way is to have a separate email account.

DR. LANEY: I am not on the committee, but I will mention this, just because it may have some utility, but obviously the Fish and Wildlife Service gets hit with lots of Freedom of Information Act requests, and one of the things we've discovered recently, in having to respond to a very large one, is that Microsoft Outlook has some tools that enable you to apparently do very good tracking of particular topics and pull out email messages that deal with one issue.

Even though the service has the Google Chrome setup, I can sync my Google Chrome with my Microsoft Outlook, and that greatly facilitates our FOIA folks that have to respond to these things in assembling those sorts of packages of emails that have to be submitted in response to a request, and so that's something we may want to check into. I don't know if that has utility, Mike, and I can put you in touch with our office assistant, who is an expert on this stuff, because he had to respond to some very large FOIA requests that involved digging into people's emails, and so I just mention that as a possibility.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Robust discussion on email. Can we let Mike move on?

MR. CARMICHAEL: (The question is not audible on the recording.)

DR. DUVAL: The question is does this records retention policy pertain to SSC members as well?

MR. COLLINS: I stayed at a Westin, and so I don't have an answer for that, and so I'm going to defer to Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I will look into that, but I would imagine, if they are participating in their capacity as a South Atlantic Council SSC member, it very well might, and so let me look into that.

DR. DUVAL: Advisory panel members?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Same answer.

DR. DUVAL: All right, and so we will look forward to -- Man, Monica, we are just loading you up with follow-up tasks. Not that we don't always do that anyway.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And I am having a lot of fun.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Anything else on this topic?

MR. COLLINS: Not on this topic.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Let's let Mike move on.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Just a couple of things. We had a very significant discussion with GSA. They came in and gave a very nice presentation dealing with a lot of different topics that I won't necessarily bore you with, but the purchase card came up again, where councils are not allowed to have the purchase card. It turns out that the Department of Commerce says that you have to be a full-time federal employee to have it, because it locks the person with the card -- It completes a contract with a vendor, and, as a non-federal employee, you cannot enter a contract with a vendor for the federal government, and so we're not going to get that.

However, they are going to put together -- The GSA and Commerce are going to put together some documentation that we can use with vendors to show them that we are a federal agency, and hopefully that will get around the requirement to have the purchase card to be tax exempt, but we'll see how that works.

They also talked about vehicle rentals and vehicle purchases and building services, and the building services is going to come up with us, because our lease ends in 2019, and we're going to look at maybe leasing property in a federal building or a federal-leased building, and we'll have to see how that goes. All councils are continuing to struggle with the health insurance issues, and we will talk a little bit about that further in the budget side, and that's all I have, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that, Mike. Any questions of Mike? Okay. If not, then the next item is the Council Year 2016 Expenditures and the Draft Council Year 2017 Budget.

MR. WAUGH: This is Attachment 2 in your briefing material, and Mike is going to walk us through this.

MR. COLLINS: This is the final budget picture for 2016. I think we did a pretty good job on predicting what our costs were going to be. The bottom line is we were able to transfer \$292,000 to the 2017 budget. Gregg touched on it a little bit a couple of times, and we've talked about the 2017 budget, and we have not received the second slug of money yet. I guess what makes it difficult for us is that, at the end of March, the federal year will be halfway over, and we still haven't received our second part of the money. It's something we play with every year, but I think, if we get level funded with this year, with the carryover, we should be just fine for 2017.

DR. DUVAL: Any questions on the 2016 budget? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Mike, are you on a calendar fiscal year or what is your year?

MR. COLLINS: We are on a calendar.

DR. DUVAL: Any other questions? Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: At the end of your five-year period, does it look like you all might be in the red, just out of curiosity?

MR. COLLINS: I don't anticipate that. We'll have to really look closely at 2018. I mean, if there's a 5 or 6 percent reduction in the grant, the council is going to have to make some big decisions about lots of issues, like travel and state agreements and benefits to staff and all those different things.

MS. BOSARGE: We're going to be tight, and so I just was wondering if other people were seeing that same thing, especially if they decrease the budget.

DR. DUVAL: Any other questions on 2016? I guess we do have a draft 2017 budget, but we're not really in a position to do anything, in terms of approval, at this point, and so we will come back to it in June, but Mike has got it pulled up there on the screen, and I think it's Attachment 3c.

MR. WAUGH: Just to elaborate just a small amount, Michelle is right that we don't know what our numbers are. We have got it pretty close to where we need to be right now. When we do get our numbers, we will bring to you in June a budget equal to what we are expecting to receive. In the interim, we will operate under the general guidance of these figures that we have here.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to make sure you guys were -- We had a couple other attachments, like the SEDAR activities schedule and the council activities schedule, and I know those are just for information, and so I just want to make sure that nobody had any questions about those. Okay. Then we will move into the Council Follow-Up and 2016 to 2018 Priorities.

MR. WAUGH: Chip is just going to touch on the follow-up a little bit, and then we will get into the priorities.

DR. COLLIER: With the follow-up, you guys can look at that. We have completed most of the actions that you guys had requested, with the exception of some of the ongoing items, and I believe there was item from the Coast Guard that got postponed, due to the HMS Committee meeting getting postponed, and so we're meeting the schedule pretty well for that, and I don't have many more items to go through with the follow-up. If you guys have any questions, I will be glad to answer them for you, but I was more concerned with going over the council priorities.

I am pulling up the draft version that we had sent to you guys, based on our last meeting. That is going to be Attachment 4b. If you look at that, it's a pretty cleaned-up version. We don't have any of the sections highlighted or anything like that. I know it's very difficult to see. It's small, but, if you go into some of these options here -- What I want to point out is, under Myra's slot, where we had combined, in the third and fourth quarter, and I have it highlighted here, under Column H, or 6, whichever one you're looking at, but we had combined visioning for commercial and recreational.

Given the discussion at the table, those are going to be very intensive amendments, with several species involved and a lot of economic analysis and a lot of overall analysis, and so those two can't be combined into one. In addition to that, they're likely going to be taking up a significant amount of John Hadley's time as well, for economic analysis, and well as Kari's time, for socioeconomic issues, and so just keep that in mind as we're going through this.

We have another version that we provided to you guys, and it was 4b, Version 2, and so that has some highlighted changes that we're suggesting. As I have suggested, we changed Myra's. We split out the recreational and commercial visioning amendments into two slots. Therefore, we had to move Snapper Grouper 42 down some. However, Snapper Grouper 42, that was previously Snapper Grouper 39. We had some mislabeling for that, and that's going to be for red grouper.

Based on indications that you guys have discussed at the table, that stock is not going to be doing pretty well, and so it might be an issue where overfished and overfishing is occurring, and there is a little bit of confusion whether or not it's in a rebuilding plan as well, and so that could be a priority stock. It might have to move up, where other things might have to drop back.

Another thing that we want to point out is the for-hire amendment. It, for John Carmichael, has pushed back in 2017. Therefore, that is going to delay further development of the Snapper Grouper 45 and control rule. As things get pushed back, it does impact other FMPs, and so that's going to drop those down some, and you can see, as you go further down the line, how that's going to impact the commercial e-logbook amendment.

At this meeting, we are also adding a couple other options onto this, the portfolio analysis, and talking with Kari and John Hadley in regards to that, that's likely to take two quarters for both of them, because it is going to be another intensive analysis. It's going to be some ideas on how to do that, and they're going to have to work through that. They're going to have to work with SERO staff, in order to get everything set up, and so that's going to take a while for that. It could have some impacts on FMP amendments. I think Gregg had some other suggestions as well.

MR. WAUGH: Brian, Chip, John, and myself got together yesterday to review the workload, and we've got some recommendations, some issues to identify and some recommendations. This is projected on the screen for you. The council is addressing, as you well know, more amendments at each meeting, and you all have given us guidance before to help us try and figure out how we can prioritize these and reduce the number that we're working on, so we can be more effective and efficient.

If you just look at this March meeting, we've had eight major amendments that you had to deal with, a for-hire limited entry white paper, and two quite controversial EFPs. Council staff, IPT, and NMFS, we can't move this number of amendments through the development, review, and implementation process effectively. An example of this is you all finished the for-hire amendment in December, and it took us until Saturday to get that finished up and out of here, and so it's really affecting the throughput.

In addition, as Chip pointed out, you've begun to request a large number of analyses, particularly in these visioning amendments, and it's almost like we're creating a buffet of alternatives that need to be analyzed and then going out to the public and seeing which bits and pieces they favor and then which bits and pieces you all favor, which there is nothing wrong with that approach, but,

when you start looking at the cumulative effects of all of those analyses to get that put together, it just makes the workload impossible.

We have got some proposed solutions for you all to consider as we look at this, the priorities for moving forward. Our recommendation is to suspend work on Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, that looks at the dolphin reallocation, and Snapper Grouper Amendment 44, that looks at the yellowtail snapper reallocation, until the MRIP data are revised and finalized. All the analyses that are in those documents have to be redone once we get the final numbers anyway.

In addition, when we get those revised MRIP numbers, it may well show that the recreational ACL is being fully utilized in those two fisheries, and so our recommendation would be to suspend work on those two. If that is done, then the portfolio analysis -- As Chip mentioned, it's a significant amount of work, and it will require closer to two-quarters of a year of John and Kari's time, and we feel that could be done if we put those two amendments on hold.

Three, that you all look at your list of amendments that we're working on now and choose four amendments to work on for the June meeting. These would be the four amendments that we would work with the Region and you all on to move through the process and then, in June, we can talk about what amendments you want to have behind those as we continue to move forward.

Something that we talked about that we can do to help make our meeting time more efficient is to take the overview, and this is Number 5, take the overview document and expand it to include a recap of what was done at the last meeting and to date, and so to refresh where we are in the development process.

We could identify what decisions need to be made at the current council meeting and then a short description of the remaining timeline, to help frame where we are in the development process, because, if we block out a year to work on one amendment, and you don't accomplish what needs to be done at one meeting, that slips us a meeting and then has a domino effect on the others.

Then the ABC control rule modification is our staff will continue to work with the SSC to look at modifications for that ABC control rule and have that ready, so that whatever amendment is appropriate for that to be inserted in that it will be ready at the appropriate time, and that looks at those things of phasing out overfishing and carryover of ACL.

Those are our recommendations to help you manage your workload and to help us manage our workload and the region and make it so that these amendments move through quickly. We are hearing more frustration from the fishermen's side that you finished an amendment and it's still in the review process and isn't getting implemented and why is there that delay. We can work with the Region and do more frontloading if we have fewer amendments. Then, when we look at it at a final meeting, that is the final document. We've done all the work ahead of time, and then it's ready to go right after the meeting. Madam Chair, those are our suggestions, and we would be glad to answer any questions, and we await you all's guidance.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Gregg. Doug and then Chester.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Gregg. Excellent suggestions. I am proud of this council for not having any new amendments at this meeting and actually reducing the amendments that we're at,

but my only question is do we have this? I don't see it in the late materials. Have you sent it around?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, we can email that around to everybody.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, and I would be in favor of much of what you said here.

MR. BREWER: I am very much in favor of everything that is on this paper. Thank you. I am not prepared to, at this point, to pick out four to really prioritize, but I think the idea of four is a very good idea, because it's gotten to the point that I can't keep up with these things. I simply can't.

MR. WAUGH: Not to cut off the discussion on this, but what we can do is we will email this around, and then perhaps we could come back to it at Full Council tomorrow and you all can give us our guidance there on which four to prioritize, or do you want to try and do that now?

DR. DUVAL: I think if folks have thoughts -- If there are folks sitting around the table that have thoughts on those four amendments now, that would certainly be appreciated, but I guess my question was what were the eight major amendments that we were dealing with? We have the two vision blueprint amendments, Amendment 43 for red snapper, Amendment 44 for yellowtail, Dolphin Wahoo 10, Spiny Lobster Regulatory Amendment 4, and so what were the other two?

MR. WAUGH: The way I came up with that was Spiny Lobster Regulatory Amendment 4 was one, Dolphin Wahoo 10 was two, Blueprint Recreational was three, Blueprint Commercial was 4, Amendment 43 for red snapper was five, and Amendment 44 for yellowtail snapper was six. Golden tilefish was seven, and not a major amendment, but the projections to figure out how we respond to that. That I counted as seven, and CMP Amendment 29 for Gulf king mackerel was eight.

DR. DUVAL: I don't really -- Since that's a Gulf action, I guess I would be less inclined to include that as one of the major actions, because we generally tend to sort of -- It's not something that we have to spend a lot of committee time on. We try to follow the Gulf Council's lead on items that kind of come under their purview, and that's why I was just curious where the eight came from. Are there suggestions around the table right now? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just something to think about with the ABC control rule is, instead of having to wait and amend each FMP that it would be applied to, just treat it as an amendment that would amend -- One document that would amend several FMPs, and then you would knock out the -- You would have the advantage of not having to do another amendment for each FMP. Also, it would be ready when you need it, and so you would have some of these new National Standard 1 provisions available to you.

DR. DUVAL: Excellent suggestion, as usual. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I just was wondering how the statutory stuff falls into this. I mean, that will guide certainly some of our thought patterns, and it would be nice to know which amendments have statutory timelines that we have to deal with.

DR. DUVAL: I think, for some of those, we might not be notified of any statutory guidelines until after some of our assessments go through SSC review, in order to get a status determination. In other words, if we have a species that is overfished, then we would get that notification.

MR. WAUGH: A quick check on our part is there isn't anything now that we're working on that's under a statutory deadline. Golden tile may be one that is --

DR. DUVAL: Yes, we got a golden tilefish letter. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: When does red grouper come in, because that's highly likely going to get added to this list.

DR. DUVAL: That's going to be June. We'll see that at the June council meeting.

DR. COLLIER: In addition to the amendments, there are the -- We have to review ITQ programs, there is a requirement to review the allocation policy, there is what Jack is going to be bringing up shortly, and we will have five years to do it, but it's going to be looking at bycatch, the SBRM rule. There is going to be reviews for that, and so those are some of the statutory -- There is also the system management plan review. That's an item that you guys have requested, and basically that has an annual component to it, based on the timeline that you guys had, I guess, accepted or was developed during the development for the SMPs.

DR. DUVAL: Allocation, that was a CCC directive that councils look at establishing their allocation triggers within three years, and so it's not a total revisitation of allocations, but it is a what are your triggers for revisitation of your allocation decisions that you've made. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Do we get any credit for what we're doing now in some of this stuff, where we're looking at allocations for a number of different species and how they might be changed? I mean, we are looking at that. We are moving forward with that. We haven't made any decisions yet, but we are at least exploring that, and so I think we should get some credit within that, that we're already doing that.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think so too. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: John, could you tell me roughly how many assessments we expect to be getting per year, because, as a rule of thumb, every time we get an assessment, we feel a necessity to start changing some things around and having to do an amendment to do that, and so, if we limit ourselves to four, but we're getting more than four assessments, are we getting four assessments and then we have another couple of things on the table? I am trying to figure out how we're not going to get in a logjam.

MR. WAUGH: While John is coming up, you've got that in the footnotes, the background notes, and the notes at the bottom have a list of where we expect those to come up.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's always a tough question to ask how many you expect to get. I would say, as our planning, initial planning, at the SEDAR Committee has been that we anticipate to get about four, but we have hoped to get that number up considerably. As you look ahead to the next couple of years, it's probably getting closer to six, as we have tried to fill in more of the slots.

Not every one of those assessments necessarily triggers a whole bunch of actions on your behalf, and we certainly would hope that we're getting to a point where more of those simply trigger some sort of short, rapid, whatever we call it, regulatory action that allows you to change fishing level recommendations accordingly.

DR. DUVAL: All right. So it sounds like folks want to chew on a little bit what your four priority amendments would be. I think the other thing that I just wanted to address was sort of the buffet of alternatives that Gregg mentioned. I think part of that is due to the fact that we have different concerns throughout the geography of our region. I mean, nothing is the same from the Keys to Currituck, and so that's one of the challenges.

Then I think the other one is maybe we've been too well trained in must have at least three alternatives for NEPA analysis, and so maybe we need to be a little more pushy, I think, in terms of, if we really don't think that there are any other alternatives that we need to explore, then let's just leave it at two, if we can. That would certainly help staff out, and so that's something to think about. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: One thing that they told me about and I forgot to mention was the annual review for visioning, and so that's an annual thing that comes up, and then I guess there is the biannual more in-depth review as well.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I know you guys have a lot of notes on the spreadsheet right now, and so maybe, in the next version of the spreadsheet -- Like all the assessments are listed on there, but also some of those annual review things, just so we can be aware of what those are on, and so the system management plan, the visioning annual review, and that will give us the whole big picture of what's on the plate. Great.

Let's see. Anything else on the follow-up and the 2016 to 2018 priorities at this point? Okay. Then the next item is something that we've been kicking down the road for a little while now. This is the Standards and Procedures for Participating in Council Webinar Meetings and Council Meetings Via Webinar, and so this is Attachment 5 in your briefing book.

MR. WAUGH: This is Attachment 5. What we outlined here, and I will just offer up too that we are going to have a SOPPs Committee meeting at the June meeting, and, to the extent that we can get some guidance here, that will be fine. Then we can have the SOPPs Committee weigh in on this also, but the issue is that we're conducting some meetings via webinar, and we need to have some guidance on attendance and voting, et cetera.

We have got attached here a draft communication report that provides some background on how other councils handle this, but the current approach -- We don't have any written guidance. We have held council meetings via webinar, and council members have voted during that meeting. SSC meetings are conducted via webinar, and we have talked about holding some AP meetings via webinar also, and the SEDAR Steering Committee meets via webinar.

Almost all of our meetings are broadcast. Portions of the SEDAR stock assessment are broadcast. Q&A sessions and scoping sessions are usually only broadcast on the webinar. Whenever possible, public hearings are broadcast, with some conducted via listening stations, where we've

got council members there, and we will do the presentations from the office. During those instances, public comments are accepted via webinar. The council does allow remote presentations via webinar, and we've gotten away from phones, but that is something that we do also.

A proposed new approach just highlights that the council welcomes the use of webinar meetings to increase transparency and efficiency, while reducing costs. Preliminary NOAA GC guidance was that council members can participate in a meeting via a webinar, but they can't vote if not present at that meeting, and I don't know if there has been any change to that or not. If the entire council meeting is conducted via webinar, then council members can vote via webinar.

What we're looking for initially is some guidance on which types of meetings you would like to have guidelines for conducting via webinar. This could give us guidance to help develop some more detailed options, and our goal is to try and finalize this at the September or the December meeting, and so we've got a list there, and, at this stage, what would be helpful, as I said, is to just give us guidance which meetings would you like us to be able to conduct business via webinar, council meetings, committee meetings, SSC meetings, and APs.

MR. BREWER: The way we're structured, and since our committee meetings are actually held during the council meeting itself, and also, with our committee meetings, we've got essentially council member is there to participate. I think that the first two there -- I don't really think that we need to change the procedures that are in place right now.

There is a great deal of value for face-to-face communication, certainly at the council meetings and at the committee meetings. I think it's valuable that all council members attend all the committee meetings, and so I would think that, for those, we would say that, no, you're not going to do those via webinar and you have to be present to vote. I don't feel as strongly with regard to the SSC and the AP. I think there potentially are some savings to be made there.

The SSC, obviously, are more highly technical in nature, and the AP meetings, you've got a smaller group of people, normally, and I think those could be held by webinar, and you could vote by webinar, because those are -- Particularly APs, those are recommendations to the council. It's not like there is some final vote that is taking place there.

DR. DUVAL: So our advisory panels do vote. Our advisory panels do put forth motions and vote. I might have misunderstood your comment, because it sounded like you were saying that they don't take votes and they don't make motions. They do.

MR. BREWER: No, their motions and their votes are recommendations to the council, and they are not final action.

DR. DUVAL: Exactly. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Gregg, didn't we do a council voice call or something, where we voted, in 2010 or 2011?

DR. DUVAL: It was actually in 2013, when we got the update to SEDAR 25 for black sea bass, and so we had a specific council meeting, and I don't know if we called it an emergency council meeting, but it was held via webinar, and so everybody was able to vote by voice online, because

we held the entire council meeting via webinar, and that was simply to get the revised catch recommendations in place earlier in time for that fishing season.

MR. HAYMANS: For a specific sort of action like that, I would hate to take that type of a meeting off the table by saying that we don't want to do that now. I certainly think that we can meet via webinar for any of these meetings for informational purposes and for discussion, and I would prefer in-person votes, but I would not want to take it off the table for things like black sea bass.

MR. BREWER: Just for the record, I agree. I agree. I had not thought about like emergency-type situations.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other thoughts around the table about maintaining -- I tend to agree with Doug as well that we would certainly want to maintain the option to use something like that, and not too frequently, probably, but for single-issue type of time-sensitive items, and so I think that might be something that we could include in that guidance, given the way that we are set up to do things here. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I know webinars are much, much cheaper, and it's a lot easier for a lot of people to watch them, and I think they're broadcasting all of this anyway, but I like in-person meetings, even the SSC and the AP, but, when we get to the point where there's a budget crunch, that's probably where we need to start. I would start with the AP meetings and then go to SSC meetings, if I had to.

MR. HAYMANS: I would agree with the AP meetings, although they only meet once or twice a year, but that would be a place to start. I would also ask -- I mean, I use Go to Meeting, but there is better video conferencing abilities, where you can actually -- If you're sitting in front of the computer, you can see the person speaking, and that adds something to the webinar. It adds a lot to the webinar, actually, and we don't spend a whole lot for that. I would ask if perhaps we can look into that as well. Most laptops these days have cameras. Not all, but most.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, and so folks are supportive of maintaining the option to conduct SSC and AP meetings by webinar. We have definitely used this more frequently for SSC meetings, particularly where the SSC has been considering a single issue. We have used it a couple of times for some blueline tilefish items, and we used it most recently for spiny lobster, at the end of last year, where there was a specific request, and so I think that SSC members themselves probably prefer to meet in person, but, for those specific issues, it's not a problem.

I think, for AP meetings, also, if they're very short AP meetings, where you're trying to bring folks together for just half-a-day, a webinar might be preferable. I would say that I think, for some of our AP members, a webinar might be a challenge and that they would prefer to meet in person, particularly if they are only meeting once per year, and so these might have to be situational-type of decisions, but certainly understanding, if we are in a budget crunch, then that would be a way to save money. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am glad you pointed out the SSC, and the way the SSC has tended to use webinar meetings is for a very focused topic, and I think that applies to the APs, too. If there was an amendment that you wanted to get them to give some comment on, focusing on that and making sure it would work, but one thing I wanted to point out was that I thought one of the questions

here, one of the more subtle questions, was, in a situation where you have a meeting that's an in-person meeting, if you have people participating via webinar, because they could not attend that meeting, what is their status with regard to voting?

This has come up. We have had SSC meetings where a person couldn't travel for some reason and participated, to the extent they could, over the webinar. They haven't voted, if they haven't been there in person, and I think -- Is something like that going to be addressed in here, or do we need to clarify that, or is that the existing rule and they can't vote and that won't change?

DR. DUVAL: That is a lot of the background material that you find on the remaining pages of this attachment, is what practices other councils use and the commissions, and so, at the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, all of those meetings are also webcast, but it is a listen-only thing. If you're not there in person, you're not voting. Bob, you all tend to make good use of conference calls and webinars for advisory panel meetings as well, and so there are -- Do the advisory panels make motions at the commission level?

MR. BEAL: We try to have them operate through consensus, but that doesn't always work, obviously. In that case, they do make motions and vote, and just, while I've got the mic, if the whole group is meeting via webinar, then they're allowed to vote. If the AP is a face-to-face meeting and a couple of people are on the webinar, then they're not allowed to vote, and so it just depends on the venue that we're working in.

DR. DUVAL: So, relevant question, and what are other folks' thoughts? Mel and then Doug.

MR. BELL: John covered some of it, but I think there is great value in having the normal face-to-face meetings for the SSC and the APs, and so where webinars could be handy is dealing with maybe specific time-sensitive topics or something, if you needed to have an additional meeting. Then I had the question that John was talked about, related to if you use the webinar to kind of augment the normal meeting, then how do people interact with that, but I think we just kind of answered that.

DR. DUVAL: Doug, and then I'm going to put Madam Chair Bosarge on the spot.

MR. HAYMANS: I am playing Monica for a second. Section 101.627 talks about all decisions of any council shall be by majority vote of voting members present and voting, and so I guess the definition of "present". Are you present on the call? I would tend to say yes, but that's I guess where it falls, is are you present.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's a good question, especially given the technology available today for participation, and I know, among GC, that we've talked about that, and so I will bring back, at the next meeting, whether we've got any changed advice or whether there is a group that's working on it. I will find out. I know we have discussed it on different calls, and so it's being discussed, I think, among other councils, too.

DR. DUVAL: I just wanted to ask Leann really quick, and then I've got Zack and then Chris, but I noticed, in the background material that we have here, that the Gulf Council allows remote participation by council members at a council meeting, but no voting, and that a council member can make a motion, but cannot vote on it, remotely.

It also noted that you guys have done the same thing that we've done in the past, where there is a council webinar meeting, and so everybody is participating by webinar, which means that everybody can vote, and that you're going to experiment with having SSC and AP meetings where participants can attend and vote remotely as an alternative to participating in person. Have you done that yet, to your knowledge, where you've had both in-person and remote participation occurring at the same time?

MS. BOSARGE: Yes, we do that with the SSC. I know we've had some of that go on. Now, as far as if those people that were remote and joining via webinar and participating in the conversation with the SSC meeting, I honestly would have to check and see if they voted or not. I don't know, but, me personally, I wouldn't have a problem with that. I mean, you can't always -- Especially SSC meetings, and those schedules get pretty hairy pretty quick, and you can't always physically travel to Tampa to be there, but you care enough to remote in and be available for your portion of the discussion.

The way our SSC is structured now, we all meet together, but there is still sub-panels. Like there is a Shrimp SSC and there is this and that, and so there is some specialties there, and they will participate in specific discussions, and so they could remote in for that piece of the meeting that is specific to them, if they're not on that general overarching SSC. I wouldn't be opposed to having them vote remotely, but I am not sure if they have done it yet or not.

MR. CONKLIN: As a council member, I have had twins get born one week of a council meeting, and so I participated via webinar, and I believe that Mr. Bell over here had something else, a personal type of emergency or just couldn't make the meeting, but I do believe that, as an SSC member or as a council member, you are tasked with making decisions that directly affect stuff that is very important to peoples' lives and FMPs, and so I do think that they should be allowed to vote via webinar, unless there is some other regulation, but we would have to come up with what defines a personal emergency, but I also don't want to open up a door for people coming up with reasons not to go out of town for a week and being able to stay home.

DR. DUVAL: So you would be in favor of like a limited exemption that would allow for council members to vote remotely.

MR. CONKLIN: I certainly think, since it's our job to do that, and I have walked around with my headphones on and a phone in my hand while I was changing diapers and doing all the other fun stuff, but I could still vote. There is some important stuff that could have come up that could have directly affected the fishermen that I represent primarily, and I certainly would have liked to have been a part of that.

MR. BROWN: Gregg, this new sub-committee for the cobia, there is members that are on that that are not in the South Atlantic, correct? There was Virginia people, and so I know that there's going to be a lot of discussion about that, and I was just wondering if you think that there should be any type of provision where they have some sort of a vote or a say-so in that, as far as the consensus amongst the entire AP?

DR. DUVAL: I'm not sure that I understand the question.

MR. BROWN: I mean whenever they are putting together some consensus on what type of management they're wanting to put forward and recommend it to the council and shouldn't they have some way that they are fully -- Didn't you tell me that they weren't going to be able to participate at the same level as the rest of the AP?

DR. DUVAL: No, the Cobia Sub-Panel is just as much a part of the Mackerel Cobia -- I mean, they are part of the full Mackerel Cobia AP, and it's not a -- We created the sub-panel because there was some thought that we might want or need those folks to meet a little bit more frequently to discuss cobia-specific issues, given the high-profile nature of some of those issues and not that they would not be fully-participating members of the advisory panel.

MR. BROWN: Okay. That's what I wanted to just be clear of, because the way I took it is they weren't going to be on the same level as the rest of the AP.

DR. DUVAL: This raises the issue, and John is asking, and what we're looking for guidance on, is specifically I think this combination of remote and in-person participation. Chris has put forward a suggestion to allow for specific conditions under which council members could participate via webinar and vote, and that might be something that we might need more input from Monica on, quite honestly. I mean, Gulf Council members are allowed to make a motion, and they have been allowed to participate remotely, and I think Harlon Pearce did that when he wasn't able to be there in person, but he couldn't vote.

Then also -- So it's two different topics, right? It's having folks meet entirely by webinar or conference call versus having this combined participation, and I think it's pretty clear that folks are fine with webinar meetings for SSC and advisory panels, in total, and so how about this combined participation? Leann and then Charlie.

MS. BOSARGE: I was just going to say that I kind of echo what Chris says, and I hope that one day that we will revisit the topic again, when maybe it's not such a charged topic. We revisited it at the meeting when somebody was participating via webinar, and, anyway, it was -- Red snapper is the elephant in the room, and that was what was going on, and so maybe, if we revisited it again, we might actually make some movement on it and make some changes, because I was kind of in the same position that Chris was.

It was like my second meeting ever as a council member and I gave birth about five days before it, and I participated via webinar, but that was very limited, and there is sometimes that you just cannot physically be there, but you still want to live up to your obligations and be part of the process, and so, if you're willing to do that via webinar, I think you should be afforded the same courtesy as if you were physically there, especially if you're willing to give up something like that to do it.

MR. PHILLIPS: I agree. I think they should be able to participate. What I would not do is start making a list of reasons that allows them to do that. I would like the council members decide. If we somehow think, all of a sudden, that Zack is going to be doing a webinar in the middle of his charter, then maybe we need to look at it, but I don't think it's going to be abused, and should we think that, then I would look at the list, but, otherwise, I would just say you can vote if you need to and let it go. Keep it simple. Keep the staff time down.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. I think we can look into that and just make sure that there wouldn't be anything running afoul of the Magnuson Act, and then what about mixed participation by advisory panels and SSC members? In other words, would you want to explore a similar exemption for advisory panel members and SSC members, where, if you're just physically unable to be there, but you are fully prepared to participate in the meeting, that you be allowed to do so? Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I think I was at one AP meeting where there was more council members than there was AP members at a meeting, and was that not the case? I think Zack and I counted that there was like eleven people absent at the Snapper Grouper AP or something, and maybe allowing those guys to do that would be a good thing, but, then again, maybe not, but there could have been some different outcomes had there been other opinions or interests at the table or on a webinar.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. I am getting a sense that we may need to explore just kind of a blanket approach for allowing participation and voting by webinar across the council and SSC and advisory panels. Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: Certainly, related to the listening or participating for the SSC, but the thing with us about participating and voting, is that's a -- We vote, and that's how we operate, and those votes are important, and they outcomes, but the SSC or the AP -- They may or may not make motions, and they may or may not vote on things, and so it's a little more critical for us, the voting piece and all, but I can see where it would be valuable for folks to be able to at least kind of be involved in some of the discussion and stuff at the SSC or the AP level, if they couldn't be there, but I'm not necessarily worrying about the voting part.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, what other pieces of this do we need to revisit?

MR. WAUGH: I think that's good for now. We've got the guidance on what you would like to be able to do, and we will work with Monica and bring back some more guidance in June.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Great. Then that takes us to Other Business, which we have a letter, a draft letter, concerning MRIP landings to NOAA, and I think John Carmichael is going to walk us through that, but that should be Attachment 6, I believe, in your briefing book.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We prepared this in response to -- Did we decide that it was a September request to prepare this letter regarding the concerns with MRIP? We have drafted this up for your consideration, and it addresses some of the issues that we have talked about in MRIP over the years, such as the spikes and such in the uncertainty and really, at that time, we were facing a number of species that felt like just a handful of intercepts, in some cases, were driving the estimates and leading to a number of fishery management impacts.

We drafted this letter to get them to consider some of our concerns and how we might move forward on a number of the things we've talked about related to MRIP certainly here this week, about other ways of estimating the catch when you're dealing with these rare-event species or high PSE occurrences or whatever word we've used to describe it in various situations.

Hopefully this will help get MRIP folks involved in the workshop that we talked about some, which I think fits in well with where we're going on here, and also to encourage, as we say in the end, about getting the resources to help the Center and MRIP just do a better job in general of

getting us reliable and appropriate estimates for a lot of the species that we manage, and we acknowledge one of the big concerns being that not a lot of the trips sampled by MRIP occur in the EEZ, and that strikes right at the heart of the challenges that we face, because you're dealing already with a very small subset of the overall sampling universe they deal with, which almost puts you in the rare-event species for just about everything we deal with from the get-go.

We tried to capture a number of those things and concerns raised by the council over the last year with MRIP, and I think we would just be looking for what guidance you have on the letter and if you have other items or examples that you would like to add, and then we could work those in.

DR. DUVAL: I hope everyone has had a chance to read the letter. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This was one of the points that I brought up, to have a letter like this, because we had some problems at the workshops, and that kind of spawned this discussion. I think the letter is great. I was wondering if, in the last paragraph, maybe we add a request for action by a certain timeline. In other words, respond back to us or we're looking forward to your response within the next three months or six months or whatever, but I was just looking for some kind of time certain, maybe, that we could ask for something to come back to us.

DR. CRABTREE: I have a few comments. One, the appropriate person right now would be Sam Rauch, who is the Acting Assistant Administrator. I am a little concerned that the letter is too vague, in terms of the ask, and I can tell you that everyone is asking for more resources, and I am not sure there are going to be any more resources.

We did have presentations by MRIP people to the SSC and to us about different options and things they could do, and it seems to me that we're at a time where we need to decide which one of these options we think would work for us and ask them to do it, and so I think that being more specific about what we want them to do and asking for something that can be done without significant new resources is likely to be productive.

It seems to me that there's a bunch of things that we can do, and none of them are getting done, because nobody is telling anybody what exactly they want them to do. If you want them to stratify these things over longer periods of time, then I think we ought to talk to Bonnie's folks and get more focused on what we're asking, so that something actually happens here. If it's just a general request for more resources, I am afraid that nothing may come out of it, and so that's my advice to you. I would be more focused on what you're asking them to do, and ask them to do something they can do with the resources they have now, which basically means deliver the estimates to us in a different form that brings the PSEs down.

DR. DUVAL: I am fine with that, and I think part of why we haven't asked anybody to do anything yet was because there is a great deal of ambiguity about who actually takes the first step and who has the responsibility for doing that, and so received those presentations, as you noted, Roy, which were great, but I think both the SSC and myself certainly, and I don't know about other council members, were, I think, operating under the assumption of, okay, well, what next and who does what? Is it up to the Fisheries Service to tell us which of these different estimation methods would be most appropriate for a particular species to move forward with this?

Based on, and I have brought this up before, and we talked about it in September, based on my conversations back and forth with Dr. Merrick last year, before the September council meeting, his advice was that, once the MRIP estimates are considered complete, that is best scientific information available, and so how the council uses that for management purposes is the council's decision, and so use of these alternative estimation techniques would be something that we would work in conjunction with our SSCs with.

We talked about this a bit during the SEDAR Committee meeting, about more of a joint workshop type of approach, given the fact that we have species that are jointly managed across the Gulf and South Atlantic, and working with both Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs and MRIP staff to try to do this, and I think the one thing I would say in there is that this isn't about changing the MRIP estimates.

For an assessment, the MRIP estimates are the MRIP estimates, and my goal here is to make sure that we're increasing the precision of our catch estimates, particularly for those species like cobia, like snowy grouper, like blueline tilefish, and especially for species for which we don't have in-season accountability measures, where they're post-season accountability measures, because we don't need wave-based estimates for those fish.

For cobia, it's a pulse fishery. It's mostly happening across two waves, and so some of those alternative techniques could probably increase the precision of those estimates where we wouldn't be faced with a point estimate that had high PSEs surrounding it, and so it's really about making sure that we're -- It's about using these alternative methods to track our ACLs, so that we are certain that we're triggering an accountability measure when it really needs to be triggered.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, and my impression of where this all sits right now is, so you've got MRIP people, Science Center people, SSC, and the council, and my impression is everyone is sitting around waiting on one of the others to take the first step. It's like a bunch of kids standing around a pool, and the water is kind of cold, and who is going to jump in first? Somebody needs to shove somebody into the pool, and what I am suggesting to you is that you guys -- I am trying, on my end, to get somebody to do something.

I don't need wave-by-wave numbers on very many fish. I am fine with getting an annual number, but I want numbers that have lower PSEs on it, and so, anyway, I think just be more specific, because I'm afraid that everyone is going to stand around waiting on someone else to do something, because everybody is busy, and I think you guys need to be the first ones to push someone in the pool and tell them to give us this.

DR. DUVAL: I am happy to do that. I love pushing people in the pool. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roy, we're actually trying to do that, and it will be brought up in the SEDAR Committee, about reaching out to the Gulf and hoping to hold a joint SSC meeting, and bringing in the Center and the MRIP folks to work on this, and so I see that as us reaching out and trying to push everyone into the pool.

With regard to the letter, I guess the question should be, should we just simply acknowledge that that's our intent, to work with those folks and get this workshop going, and let that be near the end of the letter, and ask that they come and participate, or would it better for us to wait until we have

a chance to talk with the Gulf folks and know more about the workshop and be a bit more specific, which means we send this letter potentially later?

I think Leann indicated that, at least from her perspective, there was perhaps some interest in holding such a workshop, and they could help work with us on that, and I know that Bonnie is interested in doing that, from the Science Center perspective, and certainly I believe very strongly that we all need to get together in our region and do this and not have us going down different paths, and so it comes down to our timing.

DR. DUVAL: Here is my thought. I agree with the broader region-wide conversation, but I think, for now, in this letter, we could say that we request that you please provide us with estimates using annual estimates of catch, and I will have to go back and look at that SSC presentation, with regard to the different techniques that they use, but please provide us with annual estimates of catch by annual estimates of effort for the following species, and I would say hogfish might be one, cobia, probably blueline tilefish and snowy grouper, which were two of the other species that were already worked up, and golden tilefish. I mean, could we even ask that this be used for red snapper on an annual basis? I don't know.

I think if we make the request to them, then, if we get that information back that is in a timely enough fashion to be provided for this group of folks who would be getting together to have a region-wide conversation about it, that might be helpful. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I think it's a good analogy or metaphor for where we are, and I think being the one pushing is a good idea. What I think would be good is, instead of -- Going from too vague to too specific is a worry. Everything we ask someone to do comes with a cost, and I want to make sure that we're asking exactly what we need.

Often, when we work with the council on these taskers, the way we get it right the first time is to sit down informally and say what should we be asking for and reach that agreement together and then formally ask for it. I am wondering if that might be a better way of doing what you just said, is, rather than giving the list and say we want annual estimates of this, boom, and then we're done and then find out that isn't exactly it or there were more species we should have asked for or fewer, that maybe we can have an informal meeting with MRIP and with the Gulf Council, a couple of representatives from the Gulf Council.

If we can't get them, then just let the Center be the proxy for that and talk through what we want and when we would want it by. If this is a precursor to a workshop sometime in the fall to tackle the broader issues, we can do that. This is just an alternative approach to saying this is what we want and then finding out that wasn't the whole enchilada and having to start all over again.

DR. DUVAL: None of the species -- I definitely appreciate that, Bonnie, and probably an informal conversation ahead of time might help clarify the ask in the letter, but none of the species that I am talking about are anything that is jointly managed, and so we don't have a joint ACL with the Gulf Council on snowy grouper, but I definitely think, for those other species, yes.

For cobia, my intent would be simply to look at the Atlantic migratory group, and so that might be a way to push the conversation forward, and we could include perhaps a paragraph in the letter that it is our intent to move forward with development of this workshop and reaching out to other

folks in the region, and so working with both SSCs and MRIP staff down the road, but we see this as a first step to help have a productive conversation. I don't know. I am talking a lot, but what do you all think? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Should we tie maybe asking for some specific species to come -- While we do all that other stuff, based on stocks that are either -- Say cobia, which has the closure, or that are in the category of things that are being monitored for persistence in increased landings, I think is how we've called it in some of the other accountability measures.

DR. DUVAL: I like that. Mel.

MR. BELL: This is nothing new, but I was just -- The way the last paragraph is worded is -- It's like Dear Sam, please make sure they have the resources to do this, and okay, but if we could very specific about things that we would like from them or specific ways that the Center could be assisted in making things better. The more specific the better, and that's what Roy was saying, I think.

DR. DUVAL: Anybody else? Are folks good with those type of additions, like a request to be a little bit more specific, just for species that are under our management purview, and that would be a precursor or informative to the future conversation? That doesn't mean we can't certainly have an informal conversation with folks at MRIP and the Science Center to say, hey, here is our intent. I guess this letter would need to be modified, and I guess come back for review in June. I am seeing some nods around the table. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: I just wonder if you want to wait that long or modify -- We can modify it and either work with you as Chair to get it out, or, if the council wants, we can send it out to you all. I don't know that we want to wait until June to see the letter again.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I really don't want to wait until June, but what is the pleasure of the committee? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's try to get it out sooner.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Try to get it out sooner. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The only thing I see missing here is just the general framing of the Southeast and how much recreational effort we have compared to the rest of the other councils' jurisdictions that make us that much different and why the problems for us are substantially different, based on the other councils' jurisdictions. That's the only thing I see missing here.

In the first paragraph, the Southeast has X amount of recreational fisheries and compare that to how many recreational fishermen are in the other council jurisdictions, and that information is readily available. It's not like you have to go searching for it, and so I mean just that we're that much different, and those differences, with the number of recreational fisheries, has substantial impacts on how we manage our fisheries and then boom, boom, boom, boom.

DR. DUVAL: I am just writing this down.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Ben, do you want to frame it Southeast or South Atlantic?

MR. HARTIG: I think you need to do it Southeast, and I see Leann raising her hand, because it is a Southeast problem, and you get a lot more numbers if you use the Southeast as well, and so it frames the problem in a bigger context, which is important.

MS. BOSARGE: I apologize, because I have not read the letter, but, building on what Ben said, to me, the other part of the problem, and you may already have this in there, is that, yes, we do have a lot more recreational effort and anglers than the other parts of the country, which is why it's important to us, and that's not the problem. The problem is, as we have -- At least in the Gulf, we have these contracted seasons. They're getting shorter and shorter, and then that just kind of - - The problem just grows, when you try and shove MRIP into that box and use it for that. Anyway, I don't know if that's in the letter already, but maybe if you could touch on it. In other words, why is this important and why do we need to get to this and have these meetings.

DR. DUVAL: I think I will go ahead and work with John to make sure that these are captured and incorporated in the letter, and we'll make a more specific ask. Then I think it would be my intent to send it around to all council members, with a week deadline for response, if there is anything else that people want added or any other concerns. Chester and then Ben.

MR. BREWER: I have a question for Leann. Do you all have sort of an Executive Committee, a smaller group than the council? What I am thinking is would it be possible for the Gulf Council to sign off on this letter as well, or would that be too much of a problem and take too much time?

MS. BOSARGE: We could send our own version or we could try and sign off on this. We have a meeting in April, the second week in April, I think it is. Anyway, I do intend to bring this to them, and I definitely want this letter in our briefing book, for sure, whether we do our own letter or sign off, but, yes, I don't see a problem bringing that to the council. Believe me, they have issues with the data, and so they will have lots of input.

MS. BREWER: Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to go to Ben, and then we will tackle Chester's question.

MR. HARTIG: I just saw in the letter that there are some examples included, which I neglected to see before, and so I'm good.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We can do more, Ben. I think I like your suggestion of putting some of that information upfront, because it really highlights how much of the MRIP effort is expended in the Southeast.

DR. DUVAL: John, the numbers that you have in there, those are just specific to the South Atlantic Region as opposed to the Southeast Region?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, that's right, and the examples, getting back to the other, the examples are South Atlantic issues, and I think that would be a concern to the Gulf. I think it might be more powerful if the Gulf did a separate letter also supporting the idea of the workshop, as we

mentioned, and the importance of getting a region-wide approach to applying these alternative estimation procedures. That might carry more weight than the single letter.

DR. DUVAL: I would tend to agree as well. I think it would be good for the Gulf to cite their specific examples too, but we can certainly make sure that this letter is available for your briefing book, so that there is something to build on, but I agree with Ben that kind of upfront framing this a little bit more broadly, in the context of the Southeast Region, acknowledging that it's not just a South Atlantic problem, but we have specific South Atlantic examples. Is that okay with folks? All right. Mel.

MR. BELL: You fine-tuned that, and so there is the amount of recreational stuff going on that we've seen growing for the past twenty years, or I've seen growing, and it's still growing. I don't think we're full-up yet, but there is a lot of people moving to the coast and a lot more recreational licenses being sold, at least in our state, every year. That's only going to get worse.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Anything else on the letter? All right. We do still have another item under Other Business, and also I think there was, on the full council meeting agenda, there was another item called Council Meeting Materials Discussion, how well are these meeting council member's needs, and it didn't make it onto just the individual agenda as well, and so maybe we can tackle that, and then our other item under Other Business was representation on the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team.

One of the things that I think came up at the last meeting was, and we touched on this earlier, was like the overview documents. Are these meeting council member's needs? Is there enough information included in them? I have had some conversations, like with Gregg and with John, about this. We have received a suggestion from staff with regard to, hey, we're going to incorporate into the overview document sort of synopsis of what was done at the previous meeting and what we need to do for this meeting, to try to make sure that we're operating a little bit more efficiently.

I mean, I find the overviews extremely helpful. That is the first thing that I read, in terms of when the briefing book comes to me. Then I follow up with all of the remaining materials, and so I think, if there are suggestions for how our meeting materials are structured and specifically things like the overview and are there additional pieces of information that you all would want to see in there, beyond what we have just discussed here earlier today. Mel.

MR. BELL: I know you mentioned -- I like that idea of kind of enhancing the overview with the previous meeting, but would you also -- Let's say this is something that tracked on for a while. Would you also kind of just keep the running history in there and it's not just the last meeting, but it's kind of a running history of what we've been doing related to that amendment? Is that possible, without getting too wordy?

DR. DUVAL: It's a fine line, I think, because you can keep all of that running history in there, but then your overview document is going to be like twenty pages. I think probably -- I know that staff keeps track of all of that stuff, and so they can pull up previous overviews and look at those, and obviously we can too, and so maybe that history is just a couple of bullets on what happened over the last two meetings. I don't know.

MR. BELL: I didn't mean a whole lot. I realize that what you were maybe thinking is just a little more detail on the previous meeting, where last we left off, and, boom, here we are, but just kind of where we started, and that could just be the chronology or something. I don't know, because sometimes things go on for a while, but I don't want to get too wordy.

MR. WAUGH: We can balance that. For some amendments that drag on and that history gets longer, we can do it as a separate attachment, so that it's there for people that want it, but the intent would be to keep the overview to a couple of pages, three pages at the max, and then we can reference the history, because there certainly are some that it runs a couple of pages longer.

DR. DUVAL: Anybody else on council meeting materials? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: In the decision document, and I brought this up before, and one of the documents had it this time, but I like, towards the beginning, when there is a little box that says how many actions are in there and then a phrase about what each action is, and so, if there's ten actions, Action 1 is to modify the ACL and then Action 2 is whatever. I like those little boxes.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Anything else? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I have asked for it a couple of times, and to varying degrees it has happened, but I noticed, like in the SEDAR document, it happened this time, but almost all of our documents are PDFs. There is a title in our table of contents of what the document is, and just put that title on the document. It can run throughout all the PDFs, and then it makes it really easy to know that I am on the right attachment when it's brought up, and it's just transferring that title to the page.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think that's something that Jessica had also brought up before as well, and so it was on the SEDAR documents, but it's like Executive Finance Attachment 4b or whatever tab the SEDAR Committee is. It's like Tab 3, SEDAR Attachment 4a as a header, at the top of the document, so that, when people pull that up, they know that they're actually on that document as well, and so it's a header. It's basically taking the title of the document and putting that in the header of each page of the document.

That way, when folks bring it up, they know that they are on the right page. We're all pretty stupid by the end of a council meeting, and so, when we pull up some of these attachments, even though we have the title in the PDF that we're looking at, sometimes it's just a little bit more helpful to make sure we're actually on the right PDF. I keep four or five council meetings worth of briefing books on my computer, so that I can go back and look at stuff, and so sometimes I might have the wrong attachment up. Are there other suggestions?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am just thinking out loud, a little bit like you were, but would it help you, in the overview, because you said you sort of go to that, if the committee members were listed there, as opposed to in the agenda? I don't know how much people are using the agendas as much to follow along now that we have the overviews or if there's a reason to have them listed there. In the document list, in the SSC overview, we list the document list there, as opposed to on the agenda. The agenda is a little briefer and just has the topics.

DR. DUVAL: How do folks feel about that, including the list of committee members on the overview, as opposed to the agenda? I am hearing positive comments on that. If folks are using

more of the overview to follow along with things, then you wouldn't necessarily have to flip back to the agenda. Okay. Jessica, you had your hand up earlier, and I wasn't sure if --

MS. MCCAWLEY: It was about those tabs that I had asked about before, if it could say 4h or 4b or whatever. The Gulf Council does that already.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Anything else on meeting materials? All right. That takes us to our last item under Other Business, which is actually -- Chip brought this up. He has been contacted by the coordinator of the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team, and so our last representative was David Cupka, and so we need to actually fill that with a representative, and so we will be looking for some volunteers. Chip, can you give us a quick rundown of the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team?

DR. COLLIER: I was contacted the other day by Stacey Horstman, in order to get David replaced on the take reduction team, and I've been in contact with her. One of the main reasons for trying to get somebody on there now is they're going to have their in-person meeting this year, in 2017, and, unfortunately, that meeting is going to be taking place at the same time as our December council meeting.

I believe their meeting is December 5 through 7, and that's going to overlap with our council meeting, but it would be good to have a council member on that take reduction team, in order to at least get the meeting materials and potentially provide some comments to their staff prior to the meeting occurring and also update our council on any issues that might be coming up as well.

DR. DUVAL: Are there volunteers? Mr. Conklin, you look like you had something to say over there.

MR. CONKLIN: Chip had talked to me about it before, but, if it's going to interfere with the council meeting, I would much rather be at a council meeting, unless you all don't want me here.

DR. DUVAL: I think you could still volunteer to be the team member. You just might not be able to participate in that meeting, because we would much rather see your smiling face here than up at the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team.

MR. CONKLIN: Then I will volunteer to be the team member for the Bottlenose Take Reduction Team.

DR. DUVAL: That is the right answer. Thank you. Is there any other business to come before Executive Finance? I would say don't forget your homework assignment, which is consideration of like which four amendments you would want to focus on at the June council meeting.

MR. WAUGH: I think Mike already sent that around to everybody. Did you, Mike? Yes, and so everybody has that.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. If there is no other business to come before the Executive Finance Committee, we will adjourn this committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 9, 2017.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
April 5, 2017

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
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

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

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
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
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
New England Liaison, Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

*Rob O'Rylie
Dr. George Sedberry
Kathryn Norton*

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

✓ Michelle Duval, Chair
✓ Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
✓ Chris Conklin
✓ Ben Hartig
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

GOLDEN CRAB

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

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Co-Chair
Wilson Laney, Co-Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
LT Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier - Coral/CEBA

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: John Hadley

*Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Monica Smit-Brunelle
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Marcel Reichart
Erica Burgess
Kristin Foss
Dr. Jessica Stephen
Leann Bosarge
Dewey Hemilright*

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2017 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.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

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

✓ 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

✓ Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

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

✓ Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

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

✓ 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

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

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

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
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)
doughaymans@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

✓ LT Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
tara.c.pray@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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – 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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Kimberly Cole
kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Fishery Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

SAFMC MARCH MTG DAY 4 THUR

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abrams	Karen	karen.abrams@noaa.gov
Anick	Steve	steveamicks@aol.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blankinship	Randy	randy.blankinship@noaa.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Bowen	Zack	fishzack@comcast.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brewster-Geisz	Karyl	karyl.brewster-geisz@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Brown	mark	capt.markbrown@comcast.net
Buckson	Bruce	bruce@buckson.net
Bush	David	davidbush@ncfish.org
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Conklin	Chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
Desfosse	Joseph	joseph.desfosse@noaa.gov
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Estes	Jim	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Fraga	Eric	captmolo68@gmail.com
Freeman	Mike	mike@twojerks.com
Geer	Patrick	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Hudson	Rusty	dsf2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Kerstetter	David	kerstett@nova.edu
L	I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Lamberte	Tony	tony.lambere@noaa.gov
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Latchford	Lauren	lauren.latchford@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov

Lewis	Beth	blewis@townofbluffton.com
MacLauchlin	Bill	billmac@charter.net
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Miller	Ian	ian.miller@noaa.gov
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Pearson	Rick	rick.a.pearson@noaa.gov
Poland	Steve	Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Rodger	Steven	spearone@bellsouth.net
Schmidtke	Michael	mschmidtke@asmfc.org
Schulze-Haugen	Margo	margo.schulze-haugen@noaa.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Shiple	Krista	krista.shiple@myfwc.com
Simons	Randall	maintenance_planner@yahoo.com
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Stillman	Karolyn	karolyn.stillman@noaa.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Waine	Mike	michael.waine@noaa.gov
Walia	matthew	matthew.walia@noaa.gov
burton	michael	michael.burton@noaa.gov
cimino	joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov

Name	Last	Email	Mailing Address	Private Recreational Angler	Charter/Headboat/For-Hire	Commercial Fisherman	Seafood Dealer/Wholesale	Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)	Other	If Other, please provide more information:
Richen	Brame	brame55@gmail.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler				Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)		
david	bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file						Other	NCFA
Lora	Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	on file					Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)		
Leda	Dunnire	ldunnire@pewtrusts.org	on file					Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)		
Jim	Estes	jim.estes@myfwc.com	on file						Other	Governmental
Bryan	Fluech	fluech@uga.edu	on file	Private Recreational Angler					Other	Sea Grant
Dean	Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org	on file					Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)		
Rusty	Hudson	dsf2009@aol.com	on file						Other	fisheries constr
Chris	Kalinowsky	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.state.ga.us	on file						Other	Govt

Bill	Kelly	EKCEA1@hotmail.com	On File		Commercial Fisherman	
travis	kemp	kempbrian6971@gmail.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler		
Kathy	Knowlton	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	on file	Private Recreational Angler		Other
Robert	Lorenz	rlorenz@ec.tr.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler		Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)
Martin	Peters	martinpeters12@gmail.com	671 Creekwood Trail, Marietta, Ga. 30068	Private Recreational Angler		
Susan	Shipman	susanshipman@att.net	on file	Private Recreational Angler		Other
susan	shipman	susanshipman@att.net	on file	Private Recreational Angler	Charter/Headboat/For-Hire	Other
Bill	Weeks	fishsaltlick@gmail.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler		