

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **VISIONING WORKSHOP**

**SEA PALMS RESORT & CONFERENCE CENTER  
ST. SIMONS ISLAND, GEORGIA**

**MARCH 4, 2013**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **Visioning Workshop Members:**

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chairperson  
Ben Hartig  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin

Anna Beckwith  
Myra Brouwer  
Mike Collins

#### **Council Members:**

David Cupka  
Mel Bell  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Doug Haymans  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Charlie Phillips

Steve Amick  
Tom Burgess  
LCdr Scot Gibson  
John Jolley  
Jessica McCawley  
Tom Swatzel

#### **Council Staff:**

Bob Mahood  
Kim Iverson  
Anna Martin  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Julie O'Dell

Gregg Waugh  
Amber Von Harten  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
John Carmichael

#### **Observers/Participants:**

Dr. Jack McGovern  
Pres Pate  
Chip Collier  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith

Doug Boyd  
Dr. Marcel Reichert  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Martha Bademan

Additional observers attachment

The Visioning Workshop of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Frederica Room of the Sea Palms Resort and Conference Center, March 4, 2013, and was called to order at 9:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, everyone, for being here this morning. We're going to embark on the second of our Visioning Session Workshops. I just wanted to give a quick recap of what we did in December and to offer a welcome to our colleagues who are here from the Gulf Council. I think most folks are here today for the Joint Mackerel Committee Meeting that will be happening this afternoon.

Back in December we met during this time and had a facilitated discussion regarding the potential for undertaking a visioning process. There were three main goals from that that we discussed; the first being what were the overarching thought-provoking questions that would elicit stakeholder input and information needed to build or define a vision for the snapper grouper fishery, what were the desired products or outcomes and then what kind of process would we want to follow to achieve the desired outcome and within what timeframe.

We had the Mid-Atlantic Council Chairman Rick Robins come and give an overview of the process that their council has engaged in, which has been very comprehensive, very lengthy and they are now taking all the data from that data-gathering process and are putting that into a strategic plan.

Subsequent to the December meeting, Chairman Cupka formed just a visioning workgroup comprised of three council members and three staff members; myself, Anna Beckwith and Ben Hartig; and then from council staff Myra Brouwer, Kari MacLauchlin and Mike Collins. The six of us met via conference call between the December meeting and this meeting.

We tried to hash out some of the major decision points that we felt that the council would have to discuss in order to move forward on this process, and so that is the decision document that you have in your briefing book. Before we get started on that, we thought it would be helpful to have council staff just give a short presentation with regard to what exactly is strategic planning.

It is a phrase that gets thrown around a lot and I think most folks have an intuitive grasp of what strategic planning is, but really the steps and components that you have to take before you actually get to the point of building a strategic plan, and in your briefing materials, Attachment 2A, was a strategic planning workbook, a really short overview that was put together by the Coastal Services Center. I think it is a really helpful quick guide for the building blocks for a strategic plan. I'm actually going to turn this over to Kari I think who is going to run us through a presentation, which is Attachment 2B in your briefing book.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: We put this together just so everybody is kind of on the same page when we're talking about goals, objectives, strategies, and strategic planning and give everybody a refresher and just kind of go through these. You have in Attachment 2A from the Coastal Service Center, which is kind of not strategic planning but it is more planning for a strategic planning, but it is helpful with what kind of things that you need to think about when you're getting ready to do something like this.

It also has some other resources in there. We have read some of these, and I wanted to pull kind of a definition and I like this one. I thought this one was applicable to the council. It is a long-term plan to guide an organization towards a clearly articulated mission, goals and objectives. It is a process of assessing where an organization is, ascertaining the challenges and opportunities that present themselves in determining what destination is the most desirable and how to get there.

I liked this one because it kind of captures this long-term vision and then it clearly articulated mission or vision; and then looking at where are we now, what is realistic, what resources do we have and where do we want to go and how do we get there, and that is all the kinds of things I feel like the council could use in a plan for the direction.

In the Coastal Services Center Document there is this graphic of this pyramid. The bottom is basically your preparation when you're starting to do this; assess the target population, perform a self-assessment, develop a niche and develop program outcome. I feel like probably the council knows we don't have to do anything formal like that. We already know this; the target population, resource users and the public.

We are aware of what resources we have from NMFS and the science center and our APs and SSCs, what the role of the council is in fisheries management and what you guys are supposed to be doing. That is your direction from congress. We kind of know that bottom level so we are the develop a shared vision and strategic goals and objectives and a strategic plan if you want to proceed that way.

You go up and you develop an implementation plan, evaluation plan and then actually implement. So we are at – you know, I put a little arrow because what we're talking about at least for the next couple of workshops I think is just where you're headed and your goals and objectives and how you plan to get there.

Then I also found this in some of – there is tons of resources about strategic planning and some of the aims of strategic planning; you know, strategic direction, basically where do you want to go, let's go there; and if you're not headed there once you have it defined, being able to stop and say we're not going in that direction; maybe this is not the best tool to use.

Definitely guide priority use of resources I think is applicable to the council because you guys do that with your priorities for amendments; there is just so much going on. Standards of excellence, which is definitely evaluation; if you have a goal and you're headed that way and what you're doing turns out to not be the best way to do it, then being able to see that and make that change. Definitely cover the environmental uncertainty and change, which is flexible. You know strategic planning, this is not going to be set in stone. It just going to provide direction hopefully and also let the public know what you're doing and why you're doing it.

It will be a lot easier to explain I think when we can refer back to these goals and objectives that you guys have defined. Then also provide objective basis for control and evaluation; I think evaluation is a big part. Even if you are not going to be able to do this formal evaluation of some

management action, it should always kind of be set up in that way so that you know if it is working; and if it is not, then change it and be adaptive to the changing conditions.

A vision; we have talked about this; just how do you want your fisheries to look; what will the fishery look like if you are successful in the management actions that you take are the best ones for the job to reach your goal. You guys can talk about this. I think we all kind of know we want healthy stocks and habitats and we want people to make money fishing and we want recreational anglers to have these opportunities to fish.

Your goals are going to be kind of big picture; the ultimate impact of the council's work. They can be difficult or impossible to measure. They can be very broad, but you know it when you see it. If you're doing the right thing and we're heading in the right direction, how will the fisheries look in five or ten years?

Then some objectives are a little more specific with an observable outcome. This can be measurable; it can be quantitative. If you wanted to do an evaluation, we want this percentage in this many years or something, but it can also be just an observable outcome. Describe the intended impacts and definitely be realistic. I think there are lots of things that we could do, but it may either not be the role of the council in fisheries management or it just may be something that resource-wise is not realistic.

Then the objectives can be linked to an identified problem, which are actually the existing Snapper Grouper FMP objectives. In earlier versions of the FMP, there were these identified problems and then there are the objectives that would address that problem. We wanted to give kind of this really broad, general example of a vision and a goal and everything, and so we came up with this, you know, get healthy.

Maybe that was a New Year's Resolution so you can identify a problem and then you can say my goal is to get healthy, and you know what you're thinking in your head is I look great and I feel great in six months when I do all this stuff, right? I also want to point out that goals can be – they are going to maybe be different things to different people.

The council will want a shared vision and goal, but get healthy can mean different things to different people. Just like a goal of maximizing economic value may be very different in different regions or something among the councils. If your goal is to get healthy, there are a couple of things that can contribute to that, so those can be your objectives; exercise more, eat better and lower your stress.

Then we have some strategies that you could take to achieve those objectives. What I wanted to point out is jog three times week. This is a good example of maybe this may not be realistic. If you have a bum knee, you can't jog; so make sure that when you have a strategy, it is something that you can actually do. Otherwise, you're not going to exercise more if you can't jog and that is your only strategy. Then I also want to point out we have yoga in there two times a week. You can have one strategy that can contribute to achieving two different objectives, and you can do this as well.

You know that is something your management actions have economic – they can have economic benefits and biological benefits. We went through and we tried to come up with some language. I think in general most of us know what the goal is and we kind of have some common visions and goals.

We wanted to put some language to that, so here is one; sustainable, profitable, consistent fishing opportunities. I don't know; we were trying to capture like healthy fish, money-making, and then we have been talking about stability and consistency and trying to minimize the bust and boom. Goals; these are just examples and you definitely want to tweak these.

I do want to point out you do have existing snapper grouper objectives, which are kind of goals, really, some of them, and you can revise them, but they haven't been revised in a while from what I can tell from the amendments. Some of them apply to both sectors, but there are some that are very commercial-specific, but there are not really any that are recreational-specific, so you may want to talk about tweaking those to include some goals for the recreational sector as well.

We have some examples; improve the social and economic contribution of the commercial and for-hire sectors to local economies and community sustainability. I came up with this one, obviously. What I wanted was maybe something that fishing is important in helping a local community and local economies. And then enhance the fishing opportunities for the private anglers, private recreational sector. And in Example 3, an efficient, clear streamlined management process.

These are just three examples that we wanted to break down with some objectives. That first one, you have a couple of snapper grouper objectives that could fall under this if you wanted to do something like this, promote sustainability and facilitate long-run planning and create a market-driven harvest pace and increase product continuity. Those are current objectives.

And then we threw out some other ones; maintain or increase employment, we talk about jobs. When you're considering different management alternatives, you look at the impacts on employment and job opportunities. We have talked about year-round fishing, so have that in there to develop a management system to allow for year-round fishing.

The example goal of enhancing fishing opportunities; some objectives, one could be improve the ability of the recreational sector to reach their recreational ACL for underutilized species. An example of that is in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 18, removing the vermilion – the action to remove the vermilion recreational closed season to hopefully allow the recreational sector to reach their ACL; looking at things like that; and then a management system to allow year-round fishing; another example of how one objective can help achieve two goals.

An efficient, clear, streamlined management process; we have one existing objective, which is just provide for a flexible management system. I think this is technically more of a goal; it is very broad. And then develop management goals and objectives that are used in the decision-making process, which is this.

This contributes that clear part to the public when there is like council action, always referring back to we have these goals and objectives that we developed with you, and this is why we did this, this is how it contributes. And create a system to allow the most streamlined method of updating the ACLs when the SSC recommends an ABC, which you guys have talked about. Here are your current Snapper Grouper FMP objectives. They were a little longer.

When I looked back and looked at kind of the history of these, which is in your decision document, and I thought an interesting exercise for me. First of all, they were linked these identified problems in the fishery and they were revised or removed if it was no longer a problem. They were longer; they had a little more of an explanation of what exactly the intention was. Then the actions in the amendments were linked back to the objective.

I thought that was interesting and I think after you get these revised, then that hopefully will be a little more part of your conversation when you're making decisions about your different objectives. They have been kind of shortened and to me they lose a little meaning when they're abbreviated like this because they are really interesting I think for thinking objectives that could be really useful. That's it for the presentation.

DR. DUVAL: I think Kari was inside my brain when she came up with her example of I'm grumpy and my pants don't fit and I need to reduce stress in my life. That was a great example, really, because I think we need to be able – it is very easy to confuse the use of terms goals, objectives and strategies.

A lot of folks use them interchangeably and I think one of the important things that I take away from this is that we really haven't had goals for the snapper grouper fishery. We have had a list of objectives. As Kari indicated, there are some of those that are broad enough that could be goals, but we don't really have any goals for that fishery.

Hopefully, everybody has had a chance to look at the historical accounting of the goals and objectives. Those are Appendices A and B or 1 and 2 in your decision document. We did that for both the snapper grouper fishery and the mackerel fishery. Are there questions for Kari about the process? David.

MR. CUPKA: Not a question about the process, but again I wanted to take this opportunity as I did during my remarks when we started down this path to emphasize when we talk about what we want our snapper grouper fishery to look like. Ours does not refer just to the council. Obviously, the council is a part of that, but we're very much interested in input from the constituents, fishermen, the dealers, everyone involved in these fisheries as go through this process and develop some of these goals and objectives. Again, it is just not a council process. It is very important that we incorporate input from our constituents as we develop this vision.

DR. DUVAL: Very true, and I thank you for making that observation. We want to be clear that whatever process we embark upon in how we go about doing it, that one of the most important things is input from the constituents who are the users of the resource. Are there any other questions or comments for Kari on the presentation? Everybody understands the Crash Course Strategic Planning 101?

If there aren't any other questions or comments, I would ask folks to turn to the decision document, which I believe is Attachment 3 in your briefing book. I think I'm going to ask staff to kind of walk us through the decision document. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Can we ask questions as we go through each decision or are you going to go through the whole thing first?

DR. DUVAL: I don't see why we can't ask questions during each decision. I think at some point we'll probably need to take a quick break, maybe in between discussing a few of those decisions. I think there are six major decision points that we have outlined in here. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: This decision document, what we tried to do is sort of break the process up into small steps that we could hopefully discuss at this meeting and come up with some decisions that are going to then give us what we need to continue down this path. I had intended to put a little bit of background in here regarding what the council has done in the past for setting objectives and strategic planning.

There has been a lot that has been done, but there hasn't been a very focused process. Hopefully, this is going to be that more focused process. Decision 1 is one that you discussed a good bit the last time when we were having this discussion in December, and it is what fisheries to include. Decision 1 would be to determine whether you guys want to go through this exercise only for snapper grouper, mackerel, or do it for all managed fisheries?

Of course, there are pros and cons to each of those and so we have just put bullets under each of them, things that you might want to consider when making that decision. I believe the snapper grouper fishery and the mackerel fishery are the two that have probably the most well-defined goals and objectives and so those are the two that makes the most sense to begin with. What I thought we would do is just go through each one of these decision points and talk about them this morning and hopefully we can get through all of them, and we will go from there.

MR. HAYMANS: So to Decision Number 1; why is it more costly to do everything one time than to do each of the fishery management plans individually?

DR. DUVAL: I am just going to offer my opinion. There is a lot of overlap probably between some of the questions that we would be asking of the different fisheries; but if we were to focus on one fishery, snapper grouper, which clearly we have had some reactive management issues and sort of I think crisis management over the past year, so we could build a process that we could then learn from; and if there are things that need to be tweaked in that process, we could then apply it to other fisheries.

I think one of my concerns is that given the different characteristics of some of our fisheries, that we would sink under the weight of our own ambition in terms of the workload and what we're trying to do. If you are going to try to apply this to the shrimp fishery or the golden crab fishery, if we wanted to do all of our fisheries, I think you're going to have some pretty different questions for those. That is just my opinion. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess when I thought about the process, it is not a repeat of what we do at the council meetings every single council session, but it is sort of an opportunity to think beyond how we normally do things. To me that applies to all fisheries and not just to one. The cost seems to me would be the travel and hosting different meetings, and to me you could do that all at one time. I just don't think we can do one fishery. There are going to be fishermen who offer opinions about other fisheries no matter what you do.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to say that we haven't laid out the process, but one of the things we talked about, and I think is very important, are these meeting with the fishermen. I think the more fisheries we try to include in this, the more meetings we're going to have to have maybe, and that is certainly going to increase not only the cost but also the amount of time that staff has to put in on this relative to other things. Everything else can't stop.

This is like an add-on to things that we have got to continue to do. I think in some regard there is a potential there for increasing the cost the more fisheries we add in. On the other hand, we don't want to send a message that we think one fishery is more important than the other because they're all important. I do think if we include all of them, it is going to increase the cost somewhat.

MR. BELL: Sort of to both of those points; something to keep in mind is I guess a clear problem statement. For me, what kind of brought me to this and the need for it was particularly looking at the snapper grouper complex overall and the things we do related to managing individually. What I was seeing and hearing from the fishing community was when we close one fishery down, that can have an impact on another, and so there was sort of no overall high-level view of this where we're trying to fine tune or balance things to where we can perhaps minimize impacts of some of these.

I guess the problem I was feeling or seeing was related to trying to balance all these different actions that we take, because individual actions can have impacts on other fisheries. The bulk of what I was dealing with and concerned about was snapper grouper decisions and kind of fine tuning that.

I will say for us king mackerel is not a huge fishery in itself, but it is kind of a byproduct of the snapper grouper fishery, so there are linkages there in terms of things that we might do that could affect a fisherman's ability to catch something. I guess the biggest frustration I was seeing was how can we possibly adopt a process where we look at this at a higher level and try to balance things, if we have that ability to do that at all. That was sort of the problem statement that I had.

Then the second one would be related to if we are successful, what does that look like, how do we kind of manage success within the context of that? I guess choosing what fisheries you pick or whatever or how big a piece we try to bite off might have to do with really trying to define that problem statement or what it is we're trying to accomplish.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree with Mel's assessment. I also think that across our region, certainly the snapper grouper has equal concerns amongst all the states where some of our mackerel



fishermen, while it is important, it is, as Mel says, more of a byproduct, an additional fishery. It is not a mainstay in North Carolina the way it is for you guys in Florida for many fishermen. From my viewpoint, looking at this from North Carolina, I would like to see us focus on one fishery that has been managed to crisis at times and is of equal concern to all of us; and to correct some of the problems that we have in that fishery would be beneficial to the whole region.

MR. HARTIG: You mentioned golden crab when you talked about the suite of all the fisheries we manage. Golden crab, we have an AP where all the fishermen – we talk to all of them. It is pretty obvious that golden crab doesn't need to be involved in this process because we talk to all the fishermen in that fishery when we have an AP meeting.

But if you really get down to looking at not all the fisheries, but what are the important interactions, what is the interaction between the mackerel and the snapper grouper fishery? They're tied at the hips for most of the fishermen we manage. Most of the fishermen have snapper grouper and mackerel permits, so that interaction is itself a definition of how we should go forward because both of those fisheries are tied together.

A lot of our other fisheries aren't like that. I know in North Carolina some guys shrimp fish as well as do other things; but if you look at the shrimp fishery as a whole, probably shrimp fishermen migrate up from the Gulf to the South Atlantic and back and forth to target shrimp. I don't know how many of those people actually fish – although there are some guys that king mackerel fish in the Gulf but not so much on our side for king mackerel.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other thoughts or comments? You have heard points for moving forward with consideration of more than one fishery, snapper grouper and mackerel. I agree with Mel in terms of defining a problem statement and trying to look at things from a level that allows us to take a view of what are maybe unintended consequences of an action in one fishery on another fishery. This is the most critical decision before we can move forward and define what a process looks like and how we're going to include our stakeholders and whatnot. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess one of the other biggest questions in my mind that we need to address is the lack of public trust or confidence in the process, and that goes beyond the single species or a single management plan. The public has absolutely no confidence in what we do here, and we need to be about addressing that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I agree with Mel. A lot of this stuff is interrelated – and Ben – and we're going to need to target especially the species that have low numbers of fishermen, short seasons, sea bass, golden tile, vermilion, and try to figure out what we want to bite off, how they interact and work on it accordingly from that point.

DR. DUVAL: I'm thinking about what Doug said about the lack of public trust in the process. I think one of the things that I tried to communicate to folks is that there is a difference between a stakeholder outreach process and a visioning process. I know that some of the work that Kim Iverson is doing in terms of the Marine Resources Education Program, I think that folds in well to a visioning process or a strategic planning process as that is a strategy to address I think some of the lack of public trust in this process.

I am afraid of mission creep. I'm not discounting the importance of building stakeholder trust in the process, but I'm really concerned about things bleeding out such that we get so involved in the rebuilding of that stakeholder trust that we're not actually talking about our goals and objectives for our fisheries. Mel.

MR. BELL: If one of your goals was to try to achieve a process where we could sort of balance or fine tune things, I would think Step 1 would be making sure you understand what the current picture looks like. I know in terms of the fishermen I have I can tell you there are 50 snapper grouper permits; over half of them have pelagic permits; a dozen of them are also additionally permitted as charterboats, those kinds of basic facts. But perhaps the first step could be kind of an outreach type of thing where we ask or we survey – and perhaps this is something we already have the data, I don't know, but what do the fisheries look like right now; how much overlap do we have and what is their perception.

If things were balanced or fine tuned in a way that they could fish year round or they could always have something to fish on; what would that look like to them? Maybe that addresses a couple of the things we have talked about with public trust or sort of where to start is an assessment of where you are right now, just how is everything wired together and how beneficial would fine tuning be them and what would that look like to them?

I realize that fisheries in North Carolina are not necessarily going to look like fisheries in Florida and everything in between may have a little different twist, but what is the current state of things? That could be done in the form of an outreach or information collection and engaging the public from that standpoint.

DR. DUVAL: Kari wanted to offer a comment.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Just a few things just listening to this; first of all, I feel like the conversation is very heavy on commercial but there is a recreational component, and I think that everybody wants the recreational stakeholders to be involved as well. I think in a lot of cases the snapper grouper fishery will be the one that kind of encompasses both sectors in a really balanced way. Maybe that is not true?

MR. BELL: I didn't mean to seem commercial heavy. You're talking about all the sectors and all the fisheries. It is just I can spit those numbers out real quickly, and I can't tell you what a hundred thousand recreational fishermen think. But that would be part of it is that would be part of the balance is the decisions we make affect the other sector as well or this sub-sector or that sector. What I would look at is some type of way to outreach to all of them and ask them what does it look like when this is all balanced.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: The other thing in talking about working on the relationship with the public and public trust, I really feel like one thing that is hard to convey I think and the public doesn't understand is why you make some decisions that you make, and there are tradeoffs and you consider the cost and benefits across the board.

I think that if you have these and they're defined and we have this process and the public is involved and they understand how they're involved and they understand that you came up with these very clear objectives that you're working from and we can tie everything back to, it will help the trust. They will say, okay, we understand why you did that; it is contributing to this objective and we supported that objective, so now we support your action, hopefully.

The last thing I wanted to say was that we talked to Mary Clark from the Mid-Atlantic Council, and she was the lead on their visioning process. They included all the fisheries and that was helpful and they got a lot of feedback, but it was a giant project. To do something like that, it is going to take this and scale it up.

Not that the other fisheries are not important, but I do feel like even just focusing on snapper grouper will have a really broad effect because we have a lot of people who – I don't know; if you focus on snapper grouper, you're going to reach all those people that also fish for mackerel and dolphin and wahoo and even into the shellfish and lobster and shrimp. I think it will have a pretty broad impact even if you choose just to focus on it.

MS. BECKWITH: I remember seeing somewhere where you guys had listed the permits and how many snapper grouper folks had mackerel permits and so on and so forth. Where is that; I can't put my hands on it now.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I can get that to you.

MS. BECKWITH: But wasn't it in our briefing book materials, because I feel like I saw it and I just can't find it.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Well, before every meeting I do this, like break down the permits by state, but we do have these matrices that show how many snapper grouper have the other permits.

MS. BECKWITH: Because I felt like that goes towards answering Mel's question of kind at looking at what we have currently. I agree with your points that it did seem like it encompassed – the snapper grouper fishery did encompass a lot of the other fisheries, so it would offer an opportunity to have the discussions between the snapper grouper and mackerel linkages during those port meetings and to bring up some of those conversations without necessarily expanding all the way into the process for the additional fisheries.

MR. HARTIG: If we're going to dance around it, we can dance around it, but let's do it. Let's just go forward and do both of them. In my opinion I think if we focus and do that, I think we will be good. Saying that, yes, we're going to get to it through just doing snapper grouper, I don't think is a strong enough message to the fishermen that we consider both of these fisheries to be significantly important in the South Atlantic and both of them need to be considered in this process.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other thoughts? One of my concerns, Ben, I will be honest, is that mackerel is complicated. I think we're going to see that this afternoon. We manage this fishery

jointly with the Gulf and so anything we come up with through a visioning process is – and I'm not saying this is a bad thing – is going to have to be churned through that mechanism of joint committee meetings in order to implement anything that might come out of that. I have some concerns in that regard. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, to that point, yes, we have different management in both regions. We don't have to have the same management in the Gulf and the South Atlantic. We have different ways we manage mackerel in both areas. That doesn't preclude us from moving forward and doing what we want to do on our side at all.

MR. HAYMANS: This may come as a really – I guess I am confused because I didn't know that this process was actually tackling fishery management plans and coming up with alternatives. I thought we were looking at the process the councils go through in plans and visioning where we want to be and are there different ways to get there. What it sounds like to me if we're going to go consult with Gulf on the South Atlantic's vision is we're developing a joint plan again. Why do we need to go to the Gulf with the South Atlantic's vision on how to move forward?

It just sounds like we're going through a management plan process as opposed to something that from a council standpoint, the South Atlantic Council on how we see moving forward; an opportunity to think beyond what we typically do.

DR. DUVAL: Doug, all I'm doing is projecting down the road of you've gone through a visioning process of what you want your mackerel fisheries to look like in the South Atlantic. In order to get to that, you're probably going to have to chew through this process that we have set up with Gulf in order to have any strategies that we might want to implement approved.

That's all; I'm just kind of looking down the road for how would you actually get there and how long would it take to get there? We've already heard from mackerel fishermen that anything we can do to speed up the process in terms of some of the management measures that we're trying to implement would be great. I'm just projecting down the road of what might happen. What do you think; snapper grouper, snapper grouper and mackerel, all the finfish species? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I would move that we do snapper grouper and the mackerel species in this first cut of the visioning process.

DR DUVAL: I'm not really interested in motions. I'm hoping we can do things by consensus here. I would love to kind of go –

MR. HARTIG: It doesn't look like we're going to get there.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, so I would love to kind of go around the horn and see from folks who haven't had a chance to speak yet what they think about that. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I don't think I'm on this committee but I don't think we should be working on mackerel. I think we should just focus on snapper grouper. Mackerel is so confusing; it is

confusing to the fishermen. We're having issues at the state level about the regulations and how it meshes with the federal regulations. I just would rather focus on snapper grouper right now.

DR. DUVAL: This is whole thing is everybody on the council.

MS. McCAWLEY: There is a committee list at the bottom of the agenda and it just has the Visioning Committee people on it.

DR. DUVAL: That is a misnomer; that should workgroup. It is just a workgroup of a few council members and staff to try to come up with the documents that you see before you. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: I think working on snapper at this time is a big enough undertaking and try to move forward with it.

MR. BECKWITH: Well, you guys know how I feel. I think snapper grouper is important regionwide and our fishermen in North Carolina certainly would like to see us focus and fix some of the concerns and be heard.

MR. PHILLIPS: I agree; I'm thinking snapper grouper is going to be an awful lot to bite off just by itself.

MR. AMICK: As well, yes, most of the problems I see recreationally, I think if we concentrate on the snapper grouper, there is a lot of stuff to be done.

MR. BELL: I would be okay with sticking with snapper grouper. I think that would be a serious bite to take initially, anyway. Again, we need to be real clear on the problem statement; what is it we're trying to fix and that type of thing. I've already described my concept of the problem.

DR. DUVAL: I agree and that is a great point that we don't need to lose. Tom Swatzel.

MR. SWATZEL: Yes, I think it is a good idea to just limit this to snapper and grouper for right now.

MR. CUPKA: Well, again, I'm concerned about impacts on staff and all. Snapper grouper by itself I think is a major undertaking and it is going to take staff commitment. As I indicated, all these other things we're working on can't just come to a standstill, so this is an add-on to a lot of things we have got on our plate. I would be in favor of just going with snapper grouper at this time; not that the other ones aren't important, but we need to start somewhere.

MR. JOLLEY: I hate to keep bringing up negatives in these conferences, but I often see things that bother me. One of the things is that I keep seeing comments like "concise" and "efficient". The whole process of this management thing is not very concise, and I certainly don't think it is very efficient.

I know we strive to do those things, and I understand the rationale for this visioning thing, but I'm a bit skeptical because I see in bigness inefficiencies. As we add more things, I think it gets

more complicated for the general public. I think as you wade through this visioning process, somehow you don't want this to make the whole process even more complicated, because that is exactly what you're trying to overcome.

I think you have to keep in mind bigness and all these things you're trying to do – and I agree with Mr. Chairman over there – I worry about workload, but I really worry about trying to do too much. I always go back to something that I learned a long time ago, if we try to do too much we may not do anything well. I pass these comments along just for our consideration.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I accept the consensus of this group; that's fine. I'm disappointed but the consensus is to move forward with snapper grouper and that is what we'll do.

MR. HAYMANS: I agree with Ben.

DR. DUVAL: I think that there is opportunity as we go down this road for fishermen who participate in the mackerel fishery in particular to provide some input regarding what they would like to see. There is some significant overlap between those permit holders and so I think there will be opportunity for those folks to provide input on some of those things that Mel was talking about.

You push on the bubble here and you get a bulge over here in terms of some of the things that we do, so again I would hope that we would keep some of those other fisheries in mind as we go down the road. We have consensus to move forward with examining the snapper grouper fishery at this time, so that takes us to our second decision, which probably sounds a little odd, but how do we want to refer to this process? I am going to defer back to staff to walk us through what they have in this document here.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, this is something that came up in our discussion with Mary Clark that Kari mentioned earlier. She was the staff person that led the effort in the Mid-Atlantic, and she said, "You know, one of the things that you might want to consider is naming this process in a more focused manner to really convey what it is you're going to be doing."

She had suggested maybe calling it a strategic review of management objectives and performance metrics. It is a little bit wordy, but you do get away from the strategic planning window that already comes with certain definitions and preconceived notions of what that process entails. This should not hopefully be a very lengthy discussion on how are we going to refer to what we're doing.

DR. DUVAL: It seems like an odd thing to have to consider this language, and I think Mary had some great insight as to not wanting to put yourself in a box that sometimes strategic planning – referring to a process as strategic planning can put yourself in a box that maybe can be a little confining. I don't have any firm preferences on this. Mel.

MR. BELL: Again, it depends on what you're trying to achieve, but in my mind – again I'm going back to what I think one of the big problems is, is its really kind of a – it could be a shared

visioning development process or shared vision process. We have certain things that we have to accomplish in terms of the management objectives in accordance with Magnuson.

Is there a way that can look a little differently and what is the public's vision of that when it is successful or what is the public's vision of a fine-tuned series of fisheries within the context of snapper grouper that are all working together for the maximum benefit across all sectors; so what is their vision and what is our vision and what is our shared vision, so it becomes the development of a shared vision.

That is none of the options there, but that is what it is I think in my mind and it would be useful. That would also address – I think it gets to the public trust issues that Doug has talked about and I see is that if you're involving them in developing a shared vision of what success looks like, that is a good thing. It not as flowery sounding I guess, perhaps, but it is a little less complex.

DR. DUVAL: Mel, if you note, Number 3 says "other suggestions" so it doesn't have to be one of the options that is there, so I definitely appreciate that input and I think you've made some great points in terms having a shared vision. That's really what we're aiming for, I think. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I was just going to say I wasn't quite in love with the strategic review of management objectives and performance metrics. I'm not sure that would resonate well with our commercial and recreational fishermen. It is a bit much.

I kind of like Mel's idea of just saying it is a shared vision and strategic review because we are looking for new strategies to solve some of these – or get to some of our goals, so we're definitely going to be reviewing our strategies and I like the idea of the shared vision.

DR. DUVAL: So maybe a shared vision and strategic review of the snapper grouper fishery; that could be an option. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I don't think we tied to everything that is implemented in strategic planning. I don't think we're tied to that. We just had a sequester that doesn't fit a definition in the government of what a sequester is, so I don't think we need to limit ourselves in the strategic planning.

That should be applied to how we want to move forward in our strategic plan. I don't think we have to check every box to go down through the strategic plan. Yes, you've mentioned something; finding a way forward, vision and strategic planning for the snapper grouper fishery, something like that, something simple. I think that's good.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think we want to put more than just review in there. We want to put planning in there because review implies we're just looking at something and we're not necessarily going to do anything, but I think planning does need to be part of the statement. Whatever we title it, we're going to define it ourselves. It is not going to define us; we're going to define it.

DR. DUVAL: Good points. Ben had suggested finding a way forward, strategic planning for the snapper grouper fishery; was it something like that, Ben?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, vision and strategic planning.

DR. DUVAL: Vision and strategic planning for the snapper grouper fishery.

MR. HARTIG: It gives the connotation that we're struggling as well as the public is, and I think that helps to some degree.

DR. DUVAL: If folks can't read what is on the screen; I was just going to read a couple of the alternate suggestions that we have; one, shared vision and strategic review of the snapper grouper fishery; and visioning and strategic planning for the snapper grouper fishery, finding a way forward. Tom Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: As we're discussing this, I'm thinking of the people that I deal with on a daily basis, the full-time commercial fisherman, and when he receives something in the mail about what is going in the council as far as this process and how he is going to interpret what he reads. I think maybe something in there about the future and where we want to go; and earlier on I read something in here about three things, sustainability, profitability and a year-round fishery.

Sustainability, I think everybody has a pretty good idea what that means; don't catch the last fish up, something along them lines. The profitability is determined differently with other people, with certain people, a very basic approach of – as I look at it and has been discussed before is if you're a commercial fisherman, being able to keep the bottom painted and your oil changed and show a profit, and it is a very general comment to maintain your position and stay in business.

I think that is what fishermen are looking for and to know that is the direction that the council wants to go in with the help of the industry, so these are just some of the things I think about. I'm kind of struggling a little bit about how to speak to these fishermen about these issues. As far as a year-round fishery goes, that is a tough one. Because of where we're at with our ACLs and everything, it seems like a pretty high goal; but maintaining a profitable and sustainable fishery seems important.

DR. DUVAL: And I think we need some title. There are a couple of options out there, but everything that you have just spoken about I can see being encapsulated in a short introductory paragraph, a few sentences regarding what this process is about and how the council would like to move forward with the fishermen's help. David.

MR. CUPKA: I don't want to make the process more wordy, but I really do like the idea of linking the word "shared" with the word "vision" because to me this carries the connotation of what we're really trying to do. It is not the council's vision; it is a shared vision with the constituents. I think just by calling it a shared vision carries that connotation and it carries that very important message in my mind.

DR. DUVAL: I agree and I think Mel was visionary in bringing forward that word of "shared". I agree whatever title we give this needs to have the word "shared" in there. I think that is very important. Another option we have up here is "shared visioning and strategic planning of the



snapper grouper fishery”. How folks do feel about that? I’m seeing some heads nod around the table. It sounds good. Okay, “shared visioning and strategic planning of the snapper grouper fishery: finding a way forward”. All right, I’m getting thumbs up from Ben. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I would even throw in “finding a way forward” at the beginning.

DR. DUVAL: So basically flip-flopping those two phrases; “Finding a Way Forward: Shared Visioning and Strategic Planning for the Snapper Grouper Fishery”. I think as we all know words are important and the order of words is very important as well. Are there any other thoughts on that? If not, that will be the title of what we call this. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to Tom’s point, I suppose we’re going to have a statement of what our goals – I guess what he was goals of sustainability, profitability, year-round fisheries. Even though we may not be able to reach all those goals, we’re going to have a statement under this of what our goals are?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, those were examples that staff put together for us to consider. I think they’re great examples in terms of the kinds of goals we should have for the fishery and that hopefully those would be shared goals with the fishermen. I would certainly see an introductory paragraph that encapsulates some of that and then goal statements.

I think if folks had the opportunity to look through some of the other strategic plans that were in the briefing book, the examples that were given, there is a title of the process, a short two-to-three sentence blurb describing it and then some goal statements within that. Those are the things that we’re going to have to work on I think between now and the next meeting. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I’m not on the Snapper Grouper Committee, but I do also hope that we will talk about habitat goals as well. The present list just has – the only one I see is number five, minimize habitat damage. Clearly, this council has gone way beyond just minimizing habitat damage in terms of what they’ve tried to do for snapper grouper habitat, so hopefully we can work on that one as well.

DR. DUVAL: I think we’re ready to move on to Decision Number 3. I’m wondering if we maybe just want to take a ten-minute break here.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. DUVAL: The next decision that we’re going to be looking at is how does the council want to approach evaluating our existing objectives. In the appendix to the decision document is a list of the existing objectives for the Snapper Grouper FMP, and Myra is going to walk us through some of the options that are laid out here,.

MS. BROUWER: This again focuses on just process. We’re not talking about the actual objectives or what is included; but when we spoke with Mary Clark one of the questions we asked is, well, do you think it would be better, in order to evaluate and tweak the objectives, to

go to the stakeholders first or should we do the other way around; should the council conduct an evaluation prior to that and then go to the stakeholders and ask for their opinion?

Basically that is all that we need to figure out first. It is important because if you intend to hold port meetings this year, then we're going to need to know how to structure those. That is Decision Number 3.

DR. DUVAL: There are a few bullet points regarding kind of the pros and cons of the two different options, whether we undertake an evaluation of objectives before getting input from folks or requesting input on the front end. If we were to evaluate our objectives, one of the things that might allow us to do this really get some focused public input and say here are some of the things that we think need to be revised and here are some suggestions for doing so; what do you all think?

On the other hand, that might actually kind of perpetuate the perception that the council has already made up its mind about goals and objectives. I would like to have just a little discussion from folks regarding whether you think there is greater benefit in doing some evaluating of our objectives on the front end or if you'd rather get some stakeholder input on our existing objectives and then move forward. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: The way I see this is between the council and the APs, I think we would do a good job of looking through the goals and objectives and setting those. What I would be looking for from the port meetings would be obviously if they have some additional ideas on objectives, those would be welcomed, but we would be really looking at strategies from the guys on the ground on how to achieve those goals and objectives. We're looking for the new ideas that we haven't been able to establish here, so that is kind of my view.

MR. PHILLIPS: I agree; I think it would focus a little bit more so we know what kind of input we're looking for, and it doesn't preclude them from adding stuff and giving us other ideas that we add. We're still very early in this process. I think if we're focused and know where we're shining the spotlight at would be more productive.

MR. HARTIG: Some of our objectives are dictated by law, so we should lay those out and which ones are and maybe have a little more flexibility on the other ones. I do agree that we probably should include some of the ones that we think are pretty important at the start.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps specifically note the objectives that are required under Magnuson and then have a separate list for other objectives that we all feel are necessary. Okay, I'm seeing heads nodding there. Are there other thoughts on us reviewing our objectives initially versus asking for stakeholder input on the front end? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, does the review of objectives include additional objectives; things that we think or do we want to wait for the public to come back with?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think so. If we elect to review our existing objectives before going out to the public and saying what do you all think of these and are there any others that you think we're missing, that doesn't preclude us from adding objectives or taking some away. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes, I think I'd include the Snapper Grouper AP in the initial stages.

DR. DUVAL: So include the AP in the initial review of the objectives. I think that is what Anna was getting at as well. Would there potentially be room on the AP's April meeting agenda, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: We can make some room. They have a very full agenda but we can try.

MR. PHILLIPS: While we're talking about stakeholders, we still need to figure out – and it may be useful to have some people that are restaurant people so they can explain and they can work with the fishermen and the council and explain why they need species and how they need species so it can help us again fine tune where we want to go with our goals.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, you're suggesting that like on the front end, like get some input from folks or are you suggesting after the council and AP review objectives and we go out to the public asking for input and making sure that the stakeholder input includes folks at all points in the supply chain?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if you're going to bring the AP in, they're going to have their goals. If you're going to do that, then you're going to need some people say like some of the restaurant owners that can explain what their goals might be, that they'd like to see us attain. Do you understand what I'm saying? We can talk to them that way and we can present their case, but I think they can present it much better, especially if the fishermen are going to be in the room.

DR. LANEY: Charlie's comment prompts me to also suggest that the dive community might want to weigh in here, too. Clearly, they would have some interest in seeing numbers of snapper grouper out there I guess when they go diving.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I certainly see the dive community be included both on the commercial side and the recreational side when we ask for options. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I was just kind of wondering if maybe how we're talking about this is tied to how we're going to obtain the input because I see down here that there is talk of the stakeholders maybe having their own meeting or these meetings at the ports or whatever versus more of a council/staff driven type meeting.

I think I would like to hear more discussion on that as to which one of those types we're going to use, and then that would help me determine whether we should go out with some objectives already or whether we should just hold these meetings first and become like a simultaneous track; the AP is developing the objectives and we're identifying which ones are related to Magnuson and at the same time holding these port meetings. I'm just not sure yet.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think we're certainly bleeding into that discussion of exactly how do we want to get the input. I have to think about that for a minute. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I see on here that one of the options is to hold some meetings in conjunction with the public hearings that would occur in August, and I'm just not sure if that is the best way to do this or not is to hold them in conjunction with these hearings and have council staff do them or if we're going to have the stakeholders organized prior to this time in August and then they're reacting to something. I'm just not sure what is the best process; but is the first time that the stakeholders see it, they hear it from the council at a public hearing where there are so many other topics being considered, I don't know if that is the best course.

DR. DUVAL: I will let Kari and Myra respond to this because they sort of put together this potential plan for proposed stakeholder involvement, which is under Decision Number 5. I think the thought there was that would almost be like scoping for the visioning process that we're undertaking like, hey, the council is undergoing this visioning process. We plan to hold port meetings for different constituents, but we're just sort of soliciting some broad input right now. Did I accurately characterize what you had in the document, Kari? Does that help you a little bit, Jessica?

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, it seems like what you're saying is at those meeting in August it would be informing the public that the council is choosing to go down this path; and if they have anything to add at this point, to go ahead and add it, but then there would be follow-up meetings coming in the future. Okay, I'm good with that.

DR. DUVAL: That is why we thought it might be that this decision of how does the council want to approach evaluating existing objectives might be a good one to make before which stakeholders would we want to involve various aspects in that process. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: And I guess back to my point about when you're bringing in people to talk about the general objectives, we have a bill going through the state now about red drum. The Georgia Restaurant Association with 16,000 members, 3,500 of which were on the coast, one of their representatives could speak for the restaurant association, which is how most people get their seafood. You don't have to have a lot of people; just get one or somebody like that.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to make sure that I understand you as to when you would think that particular input is needed. I'm looking at these two questions or these two options for council evaluation of objectives before soliciting input from stakeholders or request input before we go through an evaluation. I just want to make sure that I understand clearly exactly where you're suggesting those other stakeholders like the restaurant association or tourism boards or things like that have input into that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I guess I saw it as kind of a two-step process where maybe Step 1 we examine it ourselves and then we come up with whatever comes out of that, what we think, and then Step 2 is you reach out to the different communities. In my mind what we're really talking about doing is at some point putting the optimal back in OSY. What does optimal look like? That is the

thing that I keep coming back to is we can deal in the world of MSY fairly straightforward just from a standpoint of the science.

But, how do you put the optimal back in OSY? There is sort of our assessment of it and then you're going to get the public's take on it, and that is where like Charlie is saying things like restaurants. We heard a lot of that in North Carolina where they're so dependent upon the availability of product or a certain product at certain times and all, but that is all part of that fine tuning of the optimal nature of OSY, I guess.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: When we were talking about this and coming up with that potential plan, and when you're talking about stakeholder input, I think that it is – I mean, you're going to get comments on this all the time, anyway. I think at the public hearings people will speak about this; but if you go out and you say what do you guys want, you are going to get very broad, across the board, everybody has different ideas.

But if you go and you say here is what we defined, you know, some things – I mean, definitely consider what you're getting, but I think then you guys know what the public is going to say and what the different sectors and regions are going to say if you just ask them very broadly. The best input comes from when you ask the public and you say here is the problem, how do we get there, and that is when they get really creative and come up with these good ideas.

I think if you ask them – if you decide what you want from them and it is very clear and it is a little more direct and focused, that you will get better input and more creative strategies and ways to reach that. I just want to remind you of that.

DR. LANEY: Mel prompts me to go ahead and say what I had talked to you about and to Jack about a little bit, too, and with regard to optimum yield, there are factors that the council has to consider like how much can the habitat support and how much biomass can you have of all these snapper grouper species at the same time.

Clearly, I don't think you can have OY for everything at once. Jack and I were discussing how much information there might be about the biological underpinnings of how that whole system works and what sort of insights we might gain into a) how much the habitat can support and b) how much can the habitat support of each of these species at one time.

Corollary to that is which species of that whole complex does the public really want to see the council focus upon; are there some that are more important than others? Clearly, there are some that are more valuable economically than others. I don't know whether it would be of most utility for the council to have those kinds of discussions first, before going to the public, or not. Clearly, the public is going to have an interest in a lot of that information.

Jack and I were talking and we don't know how much of that information exists, anyway, for us to be able to have that kind of biological insight into how the system works and what constraints that might impose upon management. All that stuff is important I think to talk about at some point, but I don't have a clear opinion I guess as to whether it would be best to do it first internally and then solicit public input or do it the other way around. I see the concerns that staff

has listed there about perpetuating the notion that the council has already made up its mind and so forth and so on, so I guess we do need to take those kinds of things into consideration as well.

DR. DUVAL: Wilson, I think that is a very important piece of the discussion. It gets to some National Standard 1 issues. I foresee that discussion happening amongst us at least at a subsequent meeting where we are focused on reviewing specifically our objectives and maybe developing some goal statements for the fishery. I'm not sure we have that discussion now, but the point is a well-made point and well taken and something that needs to be considered as we move through this. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: And just to help you logistically to think about how this will proceed, the Snapper Grouper AP is scheduled to meet at the end of April. We have scheduled another Visioning Workshop for the June meeting. Then we will have a round of public hearings in August, and we are going to be taking out right now I think seven amendments, so those are going to be very taxing hearings. Then you will have your September meeting.

How soon are you going to be ready to evaluate these objectives and do we want – you know, this is just for you to keep in the back of your head while we're talking about this. Realistically, the next meeting are we going to have time to develop a vision statement and tweak some objectives to take out to the public in August or do you want to give yourselves more time? That sort of stuff we need to think about because initially I recall people had said, well, this process should take about a year, and I think it is going to take a little longer than that.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree and I could foresee probably devoting one of these Monday morning sessions to developing a vision statement and goals and another session reviewing the objectives. I just think that is probably what it is going to take.

I don't think there is anything – I don't think it would hurt if there is time for the Snapper Grouper AP at their April meeting to provide to them the list of existing objectives for them to take a look at as sort of the heads-up that we are indeed embarking on this process; here are some of the decisions that the council made in March with regard to how to move forward.

So a clear answer to this question; I think from some of the input that I have heard here, it sounds like folks are interested and agreed that it might be more productive for the council itself to evaluate our existing objectives for the fishery, perhaps develop some vision statement and goals and then go out to our stakeholders and ask for their input on this.

Is there any disagreement with that; do folks have other thoughts on that? Okay, silence is assent so we will do an evaluation ourselves before going out to the public with that so that we can get the most focused, useful and creative input possible. Okay, the next decision. John.

MR. JOLLEY: As long as you're going to get a little input from the AP along the way, right?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, absolutely; and like I said, I think that there is no harm in including our existing objectives for the fishery on the AP's April agenda as kind of a heads-up, almost like scoping for the process.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, the next decision we thought would be something that you need to think about is which stakeholders are going to be involved. That is a very broad question; but when we spoke with Mary, she had a lot of insight into the pros and cons of different approaches. If we go to the advisory panels and have them be the representatives for the stakeholder groups, that is one option.

The AP members are already very familiar with the management process and the issues that the council has been tackling. On the other hand, AP members may already have become very frustrated and just distrustful of the process. It also may promote the opinion that the council is too selective in how it solicits input.

What the Mid-Atlantic Council did is they had key stakeholders and then we said, “Well, what is a key stakeholder?” Mary said, “Well, you would have to define that.” If you want to go that route and maybe think about who your key stakeholders will be, then we would have to define that group of folks. There are again pros and cons to that approach.

It would time and cost-effective. It would promote focused decisions and result in some relevant input. You could be broader than that and just reach out to everybody, and again, of course, this would require more time and cost more money. It would promote more transparency and enhance collaboration, which is one of the advantages, and then creative perspectives. Then another option is to have a combination of these approaches. I think that is more or less what I’ve heard you talk about, that involving the AP is very important during the process and also reaching out to key stakeholder groups.

DR. DUVAL: And so one of the things, when we were talking with Mary and when Chairman Rick Robins gave his presentation the last time and he was talking about the value of the port meetings that they had and how they reached out to local knowledge experts to basically organize and host these port meetings so that the fishermen owned these meetings.

They were active participants in determining where and when they were going to be held and there was just facilitation at those meetings. Some of my thoughts are the Snapper Grouper is a great first cut at our local area or local knowledge experts, but it is also not entirely geographically representative.

I just think about like the North Carolina representatives on the AP; we don’t have anyone from north of Morehead City. I think a combination approach – I’m just offering my opinion – of the AP plus other key stakeholders – and we can ask the AP for some additional thoughts on who those other key stakeholders might be.

I would also say that probably there is not as good a representation not just for North Carolina but all other states’ representatives on the AP consistently between sectors, between commercial, private angler and for-hire and recreational. I think there are some gaps probably in the representation of the AP is what I’m saying and I think we will want to reach out to other folks to help us fill in with that regard. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I totally agree. There is not a Georgia representative on the AP; so we have got a gap here. Well, Zack, but I'm talking about a commercial representative. They haven't had one since I left. Yes, I would totally support some key stakeholders because then you can bring in restaurants, associations and fish markets and the people that get what the fishermen catch to the public. They can tell the fishermen it works better if you can deliver it now or then or all the time, so we can fine tune our goals.

MR. HAYMANS: I agree with sort of a mixed approach and find some key stakeholders, but I think you have got to open it to the general public as well. I think it is a matter of – I keep hearing it is going to add additional cost. Why are we going through it if we aren't willing to bear the cost? It is the way we plan it.

It may be an all-day meeting of key stakeholders, but an evening of a fireside chat or something like that without any listed objectives, what do you think, but allowing the public to speak and just talk; I mean, you hear lots of great ideas from the public at these meetings. It is being able to sort of sieve through those to pick out the ones that are truly useful or doable maybe the right word. I think we have got to have the general public involved in them in some form or fashion as well.

DR. DUVAL: I absolutely agree; and if there is any sense that there would not be any public involvement, I certainly apologize for mischaracterizing that because I think the – I mean, I see the AP members and other key stakeholders as being instrumental in saying, "Hey, Council, we want to have a port meeting here and we want to include this constituency and this is how long we want it to last. Now you guys show up so that we can speak to you and provide your public input".

I think what the Mid-Atlantic Council did is that they noticed just the process itself, that they were undertaking this and said check back on our website for dates and locations and times that we're going to be having port meetings. I absolutely agree that input from the general public is absolutely critical to the process. I have already received, as some of you may have as well, several comments from the public regarding just our discussions that we're having here today.

MS. BECKWITH: I was just going to add that in terms of the port meetings, I kind of envision having it divided up into four focus groups, commercial with some of those commercial guys having the for-hire permits as well, recreational fishermen and solely for-hire guys and then as a third group the dealers, restaurant and tourism boards; and then as a fourth group, kind of the environmental groups getting together for their input.

DR. DUVAL: I think it is really key to make sure that the port meetings are peer groups because you don't want any one constituency to feel intimidated by another, and we have lots of constituents, as Anna has just named. I think that is very important. Are there other comments on taking sort of a mixed approach, a combination of AP and key stakeholders in order to get ourselves to the point where we ensure that we are soliciting public input in both a geographically and I guess constituency representative way? Ben.



MR. HARTIG: Do we keep records of the people who give public testimony so we have that so we could peruse those? I see these same people that give good testimony time and time again, and I would to include those in this key stakeholder thing because some of these guys really do take the time to give good testimony.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that is a great idea. So, a mixed approach where we're including the AP, other key stakeholders which includes some of the constituencies that Charlie has named like tourism boards and restaurant associations, folks who consistently show up at our public meetings and always provide testimony.

Are there other thoughts? It seems like we have kind of made this decision; we're going to take a mixed-bag approach. Okay, great, because we're sort of bleeding into I think Decision Number 5; how would the stakeholders be involved. Anna has spoken to that a little bit. I'm going to let staff go through that.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, that was a good segue for this decision. Basically, it is again logistics; do we want the stake holders to be able to provide edits to objectives and things like that – of course, that is going to have some disadvantages – or do we want to rely primarily on public meetings to obtain stakeholder input. From our conversations with Mary, the Mid-Atlantic did use a consultant group, and they experienced a level of frustration with their involvement in putting together goals and objectives.

They didn't even reach out to the general stakeholder community for that sort of input. One of the things that she shared with us is that was a bit of a nightmare because it took a long time and people just wanted to express things differently. Her advice to us was to not go that route. She did mention that in their process the port meetings were the most valuable component; that is where they obtained the best input. The Mid-Atlantic Council did extensive survey work as well, but again the port meetings were the best approach.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think there is anything wrong with having the public comment on the management goals. I think once we get into the wordsmithing thing, that could be a little bit unwieldy, and I would think that the public would be more interested in commenting sort of on the appropriateness of goals that we have laid out as opposed to specifically this word in this place of thing.

I absolutely think that stakeholders should provide input on how to meet the management objectives, and I think that is some of the best suggestions that we get. I'm thinking of some of the suggestions that have come through the Mackerel AP and the Snapper Grouper AP for some of our recent amendments, with regard to some of the issues that we're facing. I think we are definitely looking for that creativity in some of those approaches. I have said my cents, but, Mel, I saw you had your hand up.

MR. BELL: Myra mentioned the surveys. I was just going to ask – I mean, that could be an option in terms of asking specific questions and reaching out to people; and if we have contact information on folks that have been good with input before. I was thinking at public meetings, sometimes when we have a hearing we will have one person show up or nobody show up

sometimes. It really all depends on what the topic is, I guess, but if we could kind of diversify the methodology in terms of how we're collecting input, maybe surveys would be one way to get some of it.

DR. DUVAL: I guess we could certainly explore the likelihood of having something like, say, a standard survey or a standing survey that can be accessed through the council's website and have it open for some period of months and just have a small focused set of questions. Again, I think that is probably key is having a focused set of questions if we decide we want to use an instrument like that.

MS. BROUWER: I guess the only issue I see with that – and I'm not very familiar with what the requirement entails, but the Office of Management and Budget does have certain restrictions on the use of surveys by councils, so you would have to probably go through a process to approve a survey through OMB before it can be used. I'm not certain how long that takes or how complicated it is.

DR. DUVAL: I think there is a customer service option. You can implement a survey to improve your customer service, basically, that might not require that. David.

MR. CUPKA: Myra, when you talked to the Mid-Atlantic Council, was that one of the issues that you discussed because it seems to me like they did have an online survey that they utilized. Of course, we know some people are hesitant to speak in a public setting, and I think they got some additional input through that. I don't know if they had to get clearance before they did that or what.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: They did get clearance for all of that, but I think they did have an exemption with the customer service exemption. It can be a lengthy process, but it is not impossible and we can do that. If you guys are going to solicit input in that way, we will need to kind of talk about timing and that, for real, will be some staff time and you may want to contract that out.

MR. HARTIG: I agree with David in that there are a number of people who aren't very good in the public settings and they would like to have an opportunity to participate through the survey, but just have staff outline for our next visioning workshop what are the hoops we have to jump through to do a survey online.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I'm thinking that we could get the same information through written comments much like we do on amendments. We list out one, two or three things we want input on and get the written comments. If they're going to fill out a survey, they will fill out a written comment and it might just make it smoother and easier. It may give them some flexibility and give us some information that we wouldn't ask for on a survey, per se. I think I would be inclined just to encourage written comments, e-mails or however.

DR. DUVAL: I think council staff could probably certainly set up an e-mail address similar to what we do for amendments; you know, visioningsafmc.net or something like that, to allow for that more directed type of input. I'm sure there are folks who would probably – they want to

provide input but they might prefer to provide input through a radio button type of survey as well.

I agree with you, Charlie, I think we can certainly get input through normal written comments like we usually do. But, as Ben had said, it might be good to know exactly what stumbling blocks there might be for us in the process to get something like that for the next meeting. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: One thing about a survey did come to mind was that you would outline some things that we're specifically looking for, and it might narrow some of the answers and keep everybody kind of on the same page possibly.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, although I think if there is something somebody wants to say, they're going to say it. Just getting back to some of the questions that Jessica asked earlier about order of process, I just want to make sure that we look through this proposed plan for stakeholder involvement one more time and get any other thoughts that folks might have on that.

MS. BROUWER: This is very simply what we came up with as an option to propose to you. We could have an initial round of meetings in conjunction with the public hearings in August like we talked about in 2013, but they would not be meetings to solicit input at that time. They would be meetings to inform the public of the process and how the council is going to approach it and what we envision the timing to be.

While that is happening, the APs would have their regularly scheduled meetings. The AP is meeting, as I said, in April and usually have another meeting in October or November, twice a year. The AP members would also be encouraged to reach out to their other fishermen in their community and sector and provide input so that they could represent larger stakeholder groups at the meetings.

Then the port meetings could be held in the fall, somewhere in there when we don't have a ton of stuff going on. I'm not sure exactly when that would be. The port meetings, what we envision would be meetings that would be facilitated to a degree in order to make sure that we get the most bang for our buck, that we get good, relevant input.

That is what we're going to be talking about next is the whole facilitator dilemma. In the spring of 2014 the AP would provide specific comments on a draft strategic plan that we would bring to you all in December. That is sort of how we envision this working. I don't if the timing is going to work out so well.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I could certainly see port meetings probably bleeding over into not just between the September and December meetings but probably between December and March meetings as well just because I think it is going to be difficult between your schedule and when the fishermen are available to help organize and participate in these meetings. It would probably bleed over, but those are just some of my thoughts. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I've been to meetings with facilitators and meetings without and they seem to keep everybody focused. You get a much better work product out of it. I would like to see a facilitator, personally, even at the port meetings.

Now, the Gulf of Maine Research, I have been up there to some of their stuff a couple of years ago. I'm really impressed with those people. Would they charge to come down here or would they be doing it on a volunteer basis if we decided to talk to them?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Yes, it would be like contract work.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think anything is free these days, Charlie, unfortunately. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I wasn't too keen on the facilitator idea until I had the meeting with 40 fishermen a couple of nights ago. It got away from me; it really did; too many people talking amongst themselves with disparate ideas. I'm kind of going back to the facilitator route.

DR. DUVAL: And just before we kind of go more down that path of discussion, which is Decision Number 6, I just want to make sure folks are okay with this proposed plan that staff has outlined for stakeholder involvement in terms of a timeline; our initial round of meetings in conjunction with the August public hearings to inform the public that we're undertaking this process, what their role is in the process.

We could certainly have I think an e-mail account or something set up on line for them to submit some broad thoughts or ideas in that regard; and then try to hold some port meetings in the fall between the September and December meetings. I don't think there is any way we're going to be able to get all the meetings we would want between September and December, so we might have to bleed over a little bit. I'm going to defer to staff to provide some input on that.

MS. BROUWER: Well, Kari and I were just chatting. There is going to be some discussion that needs to take place about budget issues before we can decide over the time that we're going to have these port meetings and whether we can afford to pay for a facilitator. All these things are going to have to be fleshed out. With that understanding, just sort of keep that in the back of your heads.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we want to specify in here that in June we will as a council be considering the visions and goals and in September kind of focusing in on analyzing our objectives so the council members start to consider it.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great idea and to let the public know that is the work that we're undertaking. I think it would be a good goal for the next visioning workshop in June to discuss a vision statement, to try to actually get some goals for the fishery. Some of the objectives that we currently have are broad enough to be goal statements. Then maybe in September we can devote an entire session to hashing through those objectives and refining them. Yes, I think it would be a good idea to include that in there. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, the timeline, thinking about the facilitator again, if we have a facilitator, that means that he or she would have to be at every meeting and that would take a long, involved process. If we could combine it somehow or maybe not use facilitators and then have meetings held concurrently in the areas; I don't know, I'm just throwing that out.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I'm confused when you say – are you talking specifically about facilitators at port meetings or are you talking about –

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Let's go ahead and move into that. Mel.

MR. BELL: Just one question about timeline; are we looking at this as a hard-in-ink timeline? Good, because you don't want to – you may get into this and find out you need a little more time or staff may be totally overwhelmed by the realities of everything else going on, so you need to have some flexibility to adjust as we get into it. You don't want to put yourself in a position where you are rushed to get something you're not happy with ultimately.

DR. CUPKA: No, I mean I think as our chairman has said, this a very important thing that we're undertaking and we need to do it right, so I think that necessitates some flexibility in the schedule, particularly given everything else that we have on our plates and staff has on their plate. I would absolutely say, yes, there needs to be flexibility in that.

Moving on to I think really the last decision that we have – and we have already sort of morphed into this – do we want meetings to be facilitated? I think there are two questions of facilitation. Do we want a facilitator for some of our next sessions that we're going to have in June and September, these Monday morning sessions, as we talk about a vision statement and goals and review of objectives? That is one question.

Then the second question obviously is facilitation for port meetings and what the options might be there. I think if you look at some of the options that Kari and Myra have laid out here, Amber VonHarten, who is our outreach specialist, who joined us just earlier last year, she has facilitation training, so that is one option.

The Gulf of Maine Research Institute, as was mentioned previously – we did talk to the NOAA Coastal Service's Center and as we mentioned the last time in December they can't host a strategic planning process and they very specifically do not engage in fisheries issues. They did state that they would be willing to conduct a strategic planning workshop, sort of an expansion of what you heard Kari outlined, for us in September, should we choose to do that.

Then Group Solutions was another group that was suggested by Roger I think for a workshop that he was at. Another option is potentially maybe the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation. Kari, didn't you also look into the Environmental Leadership Program at the University of Florida; was that –

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I didn't. There are some other options through universities. In Florida there are like these training institutes that have affiliates with the University of Florida, Florida State, and this may be something that they would be interested in or being a part of.

I mean, I think that we can – I think there are lots of ways to do this and there are lots of resources. If anybody has grad students that want to be involved, let us know, because it would be great to get some help. I think we could get students involved and universities and other people.

DR. DUVAL: You have heard from Ben in terms of the usefulness of having a facilitator, particularly if you have a lot of participants at a meeting, and that can take many forms. In terms of our sessions, I don't mind running us through a decision document here. I think that is a little bit different than doing something like debating a vision statement and goals and working through objectives.

In that case I might suggest that if Amber was willing to do so and Bob and Gregg felt like that was an okay decision, then perhaps we could use staff to help facilitate our sessions here as we think about things like that. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Well, I like that idea of having somebody more aware of what we're dealing with and educated on the subjects as a facilitator than somebody who isn't. You might lose some objectivity, perhaps, but knowledge going forward I think in facilitating whatever we're going to do might become very important. I like that idea of staff.

MR. BELL: I'll just put in a plug for facilitation. I think I liken this unto professional cat herding. Ben experienced what happens when the cats get out of hand; so if we can, however the best way to do it, if it is more affordable to rely upon staff and that is doable, I think you will get a better quality product out of the sessions or out of the meetings if you have some type of professional facilitation.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to suggest we give it a shot in June and September with Amber; and this group doesn't get too terribly unruly, maybe that is an opportunity to take her into the port meetings if that goes well. Otherwise, we've got some time between now and September to seek out some facilitators for the port meetings if we feel that would be more productive.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a good suggestion. Obviously, that is an executive director decision, but we're providing input into that. With regard to cost of looking to a different group that we would need to contract with to provide facilitation, maybe there is a little bit of room during Executive Finance this week where we could talk about that. Clearly, that is going to be an issue. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it is all just weighing the tradeoffs. John's comments are great and Mel's are good as well. I was thinking just in the terms of the numbers of people to deal with, if you pare it down to 20 or less, I think we could do it without a facilitator if we keep the numbers down. Sometimes in a facilitator – I mean, I'm going to be at these meetings. I am going to go to as many of them as can.

Sometimes we wouldn't get as involved as we would if we were facilitating the meeting. Fishermen can definitely identify with another fisherman who is able to talk to them at the level that they're talking about. If we can do that, I think that would be great. Actually, a team approach where you had a council member and then whatever people we are using to organize the key experts; we've got a team of the council member and a key expert – council members and a key expert facilitating the meeting where they can talk to each other and where the key guy can talk at the fishermen's level as well as what the council member can add. I think that would be interesting.

That is kind of how the Marine Educational Program was done. They had fisherman come in who was respected from their area during the presentations. There was feedback between the presenter and the key participant in those meetings and that worked very well. I was impressed with the way that worked.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a good idea, sort of taking a team approach like that, specifically for those reasons, having someone who has knowledge and can communicate at the same level as the constituents who are there for the meeting. I definitely like that approach. I recall when we talked to Mary Clark about their experience and asked her if council members attended the port meetings; that they had either the Council Chair or Executive Director tried to be at every one of these, which is a lot. They did like 40 different meetings or something like that. It was Mary's advice to strongly encourage council members in that state to attend these port meetings if at all possible. Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The Mid-Atlantic was meant to be very broad and that is why it took so long and that is why we are trying to scale it down for now because that may not be something that we want to embark on because it is so big. That is the difference between ours and theirs.

DR. DUVAL: I will just say it is going to be a balancing approach. If we want to make sure that we able to be inclusive of all constituents and not too inconvenient in terms of location, there is going to be some balance between having only three meetings or four meetings; one devoted to each constituency group and location; being able to actually allow people – making it convenient for them to participate, so it is going to be a balancing act. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: In that discussion of the Mid-Atlantic really made me remember the fact that we had discussions both at the table and sort of after our meeting was over about not starting this process from scratch, but looking at the results of the Mid-Atlantic port meetings. He had a sun dial of objectives that came from that, and there is a lot that are going to carry across to the South Atlantic and every other region. Maybe that will help us avoid 40 meetings and help direct some of our movement forward. I just don't want to forget to go back and look at what the Mid-Atlantic did.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great idea is looking at some of the objectives and categories of responses that came out and use that to inform the kind of input that we seek. Anna.

MS/ BECKWITH: For the stakeholder meetings, I can see still having to have quite a few meetings but maybe by – you know, in North Carolina I would like to see at least two in different locations for each of those stakeholder groups, but I think one way of potentially keeping the cost low is to make those meetings all in one day.

You might do one in the morning and one in the afternoon and one at night and try and get those groups coming in. You might have the commercial guys come in the afternoon; the dealers come during the day; but only have one day of meetings but have them in different areas. We may have three meetings, but we're dealing with four stakeholder groups. I think I may be looking at this differently than Doug.

I just see that those meetings are where we're going to get the specific strategies. It is not going to be the list of objectives and goals. And what the Mid-Atlantic has done, I think we're going to be past what we can pull in from the Mid-Atlantic's process by the time we go to these stakeholder meetings. We're going to be looking for really specific – at least in my mind very specific strategies to fix the issues that have come up.

DR. DUVAL: I understand what you're saying, Anna, that you have a morning and afternoon and maybe evening session, but you're focused on a different constituent group each time. Yes, that is good way to think about cutting down on costs. Are there other thoughts or comments on facilitation? It sounds to me like everyone is potentially interested in some facilitation. It is just a matter of what we can afford both in terms of finances, staff time, council member time. Preston Pate, who is a member of the Mid-Atlantic Council and is our liaison from the Mid-Atlantic to this council, has a few comments.

MR. PATE: The facilitator can be an important part of the process for all the reasons that have been mentioned here this morning if you choose the correct one. I would be very careful about the selection of that facilitator. I don't want to speak out of school, but we had some problems with the facilitator that we had for our process mainly because he had a couple of very verbose committee members that he let talk on to the point of distraction until I pulled all the hair that I had out of my head. That's why I don't have anymore.

I would encourage you to have a facilitator but be very careful in the selection. He started out the process that he was not going to try to dominate the process with his own ideas because he knew very much about the fisheries management process, but that still happened to some degree. But more than anything else, he keying on a couple of committee members that were overly verbose if you left them of their own accord. When you keyed them along a little bit, they were very verbose. Again, I would encourage the use of the facilitator but be very careful in who you select.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for those words, Pres, and for relaying some of the experience that you have had and apparently are still having at the Mid-Atlantic.

MR. PATE: Well, they basically disappeared. As has been said this morning, Mary Clark is the key staff person for the Mid-Atlantic Council and carrying this weight now, and she has done an



excellent job in doing so and is responsible for putting together the strategic plan. It is quite demanding on staff time.

Mary was hired specifically to do this strategic planning visioning workshop and has spent the majority if not most of her time in that effort and has done a good job. But, again, our process was much more broadly stated than the South Atlantic Council was, so demands on either a facilitator's time or staff time should not be as great.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other thoughts or comments on facilitation? John.

MR. JOLLEY: I think he just made a statement about why the team approach might benefit us here. We might forego some of that problem that he experienced.

DR. DUVAL: I agree. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to mention that one of the things we talked about was leaving it up to the stakeholders themselves to help organize port meetings and kind of presenting things to them in a way that we'll say if you can organize maybe in a town hall or something and get folks there, then we will come and help you and provide the facilitator, but put some of that responsibility on them not only to cut cost but also because that will give them a sense of ownership for the input they're providing. I think that would be a positive thing.

DR. DUVAL: I have certainly talked to a few AP members about that kind of approach, and I think it was well received that the fishermen or whatever constituency group you're reaching out to, that they have a meeting in a place that they're comfortable, at a time that is convenient for them, that works for them, that is how we're going to get I think the most useful and productive input into the process. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, I agree with all those statements quite a bit and have that ownership of the meeting and the meeting is about them and their future.

DR. DUVAL: We have come to the end of our decision document. I think we will have to kind of flesh out more some of the options for facilitation. Anna has made the suggestion that we suggest to council staff that we'd like to employ Amber for the next couple of Monday morning sessions that we have here and then we can make a further decision on facilitation at port meetings. Obviously that is going to depend a bit on the resources that we have available, so hopefully we can have a little bit of discussion about that at Executive Finance later this week. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just before you wrap up – and I should have mentioned this earlier, but I'd like to be involved at least in the survey aspect to make sure that we stay on line with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act and all that.

DR. DUVAL: That is an excellent suggestion. I think what I want to do is just sort of quickly review the decisions that we have made here today and some of the to-dos that we have set up

for ourselves. I also just want to note for the record, on the agenda, down at the bottom it listed a visioning committee.

Well, it is not a committee; it was just a workgroup of three staff and three council members who got together on a phone call and some e-mails to try to flesh out the decision document that you see in front of you think about the things that we thought would be good resources for all the council to see. There is not a visioning committee. Everybody who is on the council participates in all of this discussion. I just want to make that perfectly clear. Monica's input is welcome during these discussions; Roy's input is welcome during these discussions. I encourage you to speak up if you have something to say.

With that, I would like to just kind of run quickly back through the decisions that we made. Number 1, we decided to focus for this process on the snapper grouper fishery. Number 2, in terms of how we refer to the process, we decided on "Finding a Way Forward: Shared Visioning and Strategic Planning for the Snapper Grouper Fishery".

Number 3, how do we want to approach evaluating the existing objectives; I think we all agreed that it would be more helpful and we would get more useful focused input if the council reviewed our existing objectives so that we could ask detailed questions of the public with regard to their input.

For the June session, the first thing that we might want to look at is development of a vision statement and goals and maybe we can pull some of those goals from the existing objective list and then perhaps in September or maybe even in June, if we have time, review our existing objectives for the fishery.

Number 4, which stakeholders will be involved; we elected to take sort of a hybrid approach, a combination of AP members and key stakeholders, recognizing that there are several different constituencies besides just recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen, and for-hire fishermen. As Charlie pointed out, there are restaurant associations and boards of tourism and other stakeholders that have an interest in this process.

In terms of how would the stakeholders be involved? Staff along with Monica is going to look into what are the requirements of a survey should we elect to try to do some kind of survey; and that we would like to have port meetings as per what the Mid-Atlantic Council did. We have set out sort of a rough timeline that we all agreed needs to be flexible given demands on staff time as well as ourselves; that we would use the August public meetings as a way to inform the public that we're undertaking this process and their role in it and hopefully set up an e-mail account of some sort that folks could provide any thoughts that they might have during that time.

I think we said in April we're going to let the Snapper Grouper AP look and review our existing objectives for the fishery' at this point sort of almost like a pre-scoping thing and provide new thoughts they have on that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: It was pointed out to me earlier on the management objectives, that reducing bycatch is not in that list, so you may want to try to add that somewhere.

DR. DUVAL: I noticed that, too, that got removed as well. Yes, we should probably try to add that. Then we would try to have smaller focused port meetings in the fall between the September and December meetings, and we're going to need to work a little bit more on that, but taking sort of a team approach to facilitation, as Ben has suggested.

If you have your key contact person who has been in charge of organizing where and when the meeting is going to happen with a council member and know whatever method of facilitation we might choose and recognizing these port meetings are probably going to have to bleed over into the spring, between the December and March meetings I think is probably a little bit more realistic. Are there any other thoughts or comments or questions? Pres.

MR. PATE: I hope I can put together my thoughts so they can be easily understood on the question of whether or not to develop your objectives before you go out to stakeholder meetings. One of the benefits that our council has gotten out of the whole visioning process is that it did involve the stakeholder input right from the very start in setting out the objectives and goals.

There are some advantages to doing that, but you don't want to carry that aspect of the process too far and give the impression that the stakeholders are following suit to what the council has decided before they go out before them. You have to do it in such a way that the stakeholders have buy-in into the process and feel like they are a part of it instead of following the council's lead on those issues.

There are some advantages to having the stakeholder input before you develop the objectives, but you have chosen otherwise and in choosing otherwise you need to do it with the caution that conveying and do it in a way that is not detrimental to the goal that you're trying to achieve in the process, which is to have more stakeholder input into the process and build more confidence with the various stakeholders that come to be involved in it. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Pres, for those incredibly wise thoughts and input and the caution is well taken, and I think it is something that we want to make sure we are very careful that we don't stifle any of that kind of input that just because we might provide a strawman list of objectives for comment and consideration, that does not in any way, shape or form eliminate suggestions from the public that maybe Objective X is not a good one and the council should consider eliminating that and including Objective Y instead. Your cautionary remarks are well taken. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, very well taken. Here we have management objectives for the South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Fishery. With what you said, Pres, would it be kind of a good idea to reach out to what we feel – I mean when we use the term “key stakeholders”, I have some people in mind already and maybe taking these out to them before our next meeting and just getting an idea on what they think about them, so to speak?

MR. PATE: Yes, definitely.

DR DUVAL: I think that is exactly what we're trying to do by giving these to the advisory panel at their meeting in April. I don't think there is anything wrong with anyone sitting around this table going to any folks that they feel are key stakeholders or constituents in the process and saying, "Hey, here is the existing objectives for the snapper grouper fishery; what do you think?"

I don't think there is anything wrong with soliciting that kind of early input. I think we just want to make sure that folks know that is not the only way we're going to try to solicit input; that it is our desire to have other avenues such as port meetings or the usual public comment process to the council that we engage in. Myra and Kari, do you guys have what you need; do you feel that there are some clear direction for staff? David.

MR. CUPKA: If you're through, I was just going to say we're a little bit ahead of schedule, but I think we will go ahead and recess until our scheduled time at 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 o'clock a.m., March 4, 2013.)

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.  
April, 2013

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2012 - 2013 Council Membership

## COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

✓ David M. Cupka  
P.O. Box 12753  
Charleston, SC 29422  
843/795-8591 (hm)  
843/870-5495 (cell)  
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

## VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

✓ Steve Amick  
6902 Sandnettlles Drive  
Savannah, GA 31410  
912/429-3537 (ph)  
912/898-0361 (f)  
SteveAmicks@aol.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

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

✓ Tom Burgess  
P.O. Box 33  
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460  
910/327-3528  
tburgess@embarqmail.com

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

Dr. Michelle Duval  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
3441 Arendell St.  
PO Box 769  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)  
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

~~Lt. Mario Gil~~  
**LCDR SCOT GIBSON**

✓ U.S. Coast Guard  
Brickell Plaza Federal Building  
909 S.E. First Avenue  
Room 876/ DRE  
Miami, FL 33131-3050  
305/415-6768 (ph)  
305/415-6791 (f)  
Mario.g.gil@uscg.mil

✓ 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

✓ John W. Jolley  
4925 Pine Tree Drive  
Boynton Beach, FL 33436  
561/732-4530 (ph)  
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

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

✓ 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  
Director,  
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

Robert E. Beal  
Acting 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

✓ Charles Phillips  
Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms  
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.  
Townsend, GA 31331  
912/832-3149 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)  
Ga\_capt@yahoo.com

✓ Tom Swatzel  
P.O. Box 1311  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/222-7456 (ph)  
tom@swatzel.com

**JACK MCGOVERN**  
**DOUG BOYD**  
**FRES PATE**  
**MARCEL REICHERT**  
**CHIP COLLIER**  
**MONICA SMET-BRUNELLO**  
**BONNIE POWWETH**  
**MARTHA BADEMAN**

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

✓ **Executive Director**

Robert K. Mahood  
robert.mahood@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Executive Director**

Gregg T. Waugh  
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

---

✓ **Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Outreach Specialist**

Amber Von Harten  
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

**Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

**Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Coral Reef Scientist**

Anna Martin  
anna.martin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo  
mike.errigo@safmc.net

**Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ **Staff Economist**

Dr. Brian Chevront  
brian.chevront@safmc.net

✓ **Science and Statistics Program Manager**

John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

**SEDAR Coordinators**

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

**SEDAR Admin/Outreach**

Andrea Grabman  
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

**Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins  
mike.collins@safmc.net

**Financial Secretary**

Debra Buscher  
deb.buscher@safmc.net

**Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ **Purchasing & Grants**

Julie O'Dell  
julie.odell@safmc.net

# PLEASE SIGN IN

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

**SAFMC Council Meeting:  
Visioning Workshop  
March 4, 2013  
St. Simons Island, GA**

<u>NAME &amp; ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE &amp; PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE &amp; ZIP</u>
Mike Ray Texas Backblight	512-389-4649	Mike.Ray@spand.state.tx.us	4200 Smith School Rd Austin, TX 78744
Lenny Fee A member	910-620-5847	Lenny.Fee@gmail.com	122 NE 38th ST OAK ISLAND
Rusty Johnson	386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	PO Box 9351 DaytonaBch, FL 32120-9351
Grechen Roth Martin	252-646-5241	gmartin@edf.org	Wilmington NC
Ken Strump	202-372-1520	magpivade@gmail.com	Wilmington NC
D. Liam Carr	202-540-6864	lccarr@quatrants.org	901 E. St. NW Wash. DC
Robert Palma	305-481-0235	Robert.Palma.701@aol.com	1230 Oceanview Ave RI
Chip Collier	910-796-7211	chip.collier@ncdenr.gov	127 Admiral Dr. Wmngs NC
Susan Shipman	912-222-9204	susan.shipman@att.net	(you have)

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

# PLEASE SIGN IN

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

**SAFMC Council Meeting:  
Visioning Workshop  
March 4, 2013  
St. Simons Island, GA**

<u>NAME &amp; ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE &amp; PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE &amp; ZIP</u>
KATIE LATANICH FISHERS Forum / DUKE		calT@duke.edu	135 DUKE MARINE LAB RD BENEFIT NC 28516
Mike Merrifield	321 615 5228	mike@normannc.com	CCSC Titusville, FL
JERRON MERRIFIELD WILDCOASTMIGT	321.383.8885	Jerronm@wildcoastmigt.com	15905 S. Cypress Rd. Titusville, FL 32796
Brian Kelley	305-619-0039	FKEL2@Normannc.com	POB 50404 MARIETTA FL 33050
John Sawyer	866-786-2551 888	jsaw@bluelockeril.com	

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



## Attendee Report      GoToWebinar

Generated

Mar 11, 2013 12:26 PM PDT

## General Information

Webinar N: Webinar ID

SAFMC Co: 1.99E+08

Actual Star Actual Duration (minutes)

Mar 04, 20      651

Clicked Reg Opened Invitation

79      47

Total Attended

27

## Session Details

Attended	Interest Ra	First Name	Last Name	Email	Registratio	Join Time	Leave Time	In Session I
Yes	45	Nikhil	Mehta	nikhil.meht	Feb 15, 201	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	461.07
Yes	30	Anne	Eich	annemarie.	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	437.02
Yes	37	m	c	mec181@y	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	584.65
Yes	43	Kate	Michie	kate.michie	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	215.6
Yes	27	Carrie	Simmons	carrie.simn	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	300.5
Yes	25	jessica	stephen	jessica.ste	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	1.47
Yes	57	wayne	mershon	kenyonseaf	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	9.17
Yes	20	Samantha	Port-Minne	sportminne	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	35.73
Yes	20	Ira	Laks	captaindrif	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	571.53
Yes	48	Bill	MacLauchli	billmac@cl	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	93.8
Yes	34	BOBBY	CARDIN	finchaser3!	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	516.02
Yes	32	Anthony	Bresnen	anthony.br	Feb 15, 201	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	451.92
Yes	66	greg	davis	gcdavismar	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	267.35
Yes	29	Rick	DeVictor	rick.devictc	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	467.57
Yes	28	Anik	Clemens	anik.cleme	Feb 15, 201	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	286.1
Yes	61	phil	steele	phil.steele	Feb 15, 201	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	717.68
Yes	30	Karla	Gore	karla.gore@	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	561.63
Yes	29	Samantha	Port-Minne	sport-minn	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	495.4
Yes	57	Kate	Quigley	kate_j_quig	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	149.37
Yes	32	scott	sandorf	scott.sandc	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	254.73
Yes	52	denise	johnson	denise.johr	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	63.67
Yes	46	steve	branstetter	steve.bran	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	263.18
Yes	41	Bo	Von Harter	capt_bo@t	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	500.5
Yes	27	Frank	Helies	fchelies@v	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	383.05
Yes	30	Julia	Byrd	julia.byrd@	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	552.2
Yes	25	Rich	Malinowsk	rich.malino	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	10.58
Yes	30	jack	cox	dayboat19f	Mar 03, 20	Mar 04, 20	Mar 04, 20	116.62
No		rick	leard	cyndyleard	Mar 04, 2013	01:44 PM EST		
No		rick	leard	rick.leard@	Mar 04, 2013	01:36 PM EST		
No		Michael	Larkin	michael.lar	Mar 04, 2013	02:37 PM EST		
No		Janet	Miller	janet.l.mill	Mar 04, 2013	08:33 AM EST		
No		Matthew	Ruby	warriorfish	Mar 04, 2013	02:17 PM EST		

\*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first vis

City	State	Unsubscrib Questions Asked by Attendee
St. Petersburg	FL	No
St Pete	FL	No
mtp	SC	No
St. Petersburg	FL	No
Tampa	FL	No
St Petersburg	FL	No
murrells in	SC	No
Saint Perer	FL	No
Jupiter	FL	No
Stockbridge	GA	No
FT PIERCE	FL	No
Tallahassee	FL	No
Wilmington	NC	No
St Pete	FL	No
Saint Peter	FL	No
st Petersburg	FL	No
Sarasota	FL	No
Saint Peter	FL	No
Charleston	SC	No
st Petersburg	FL	No
st. Petersburg	FL	No
st pete	FL	No
Charleston	SC	No
Tampa	FL	No
Charleston	SC	No
Saint Peter	FL	No
morehead	NC	No
tampa	FL	No
tampa	FL	No
St. Petersburg	FL	No
St. Petersburg	FL	No
Charleston	SC	No

it.