

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

VISIONING WORKSHOP

**The Beach House Hilton Head Island
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina**

September 14, 2015

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair
Robert Beal
Anna Beckwith
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley

Ben Hartig
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Jack Cox
LTJG Tara Pray
Dr. Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Errigo
Chip Collier
Mike Collins

Gregg Waugh
Amber Von Harten
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Chevront
Julie O'Dell

Participants/Observers:

Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith

Monica Smit-Brunello
Tony DiLernia
Roy Williams

Additional Observers Attached

The Visioning Workshop of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the ballroom of The Beach House Hilton Head Island, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, September 14, 2015, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We're going to go ahead and get started. I would like to welcome everyone. I know we're starting a little bit early on the visioning session. I would like to welcome both of our different council liaisons. We have Mr. Tony DiLernia here from the Mid-Atlantic Council and we have Mr. Roy Williams here from the Gulf Council.

Similar to our last visioning session, one of the things that we heard from our online listeners was that if everyone could kind of go around the horn and just say their name and which state they're from; that helps folks to identify who is speaking. I'm going to start down here at this end with Zack Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Zack Bowen; for-hire representative, Georgia.

MR. CONKLIN: Chris Conklin; South Carolina, commercial dealer.

MR. BROWN: Mark Brown; South Carolina, recreational.

MR. BELL: Mel Bell; South Carolina, the state designee.

MR. COX: Jack Cox; North Carolina, commercial.

MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips; Georgia, commercial.

DR. LANEY: Wilson Laney; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representative.

MS. VON HARTEN: Amber Von Harten, council staff.

DR. DUVAL: I'm Michelle Duval; I'm the state representative from North Carolina.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm Anna Beckwith and I represent the resource for North Carolina.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans; state representative from Georgia.

MR. WILLIAMS: Roy Williams; Florida liaison from the Gulf Council.

MS. BURGESS: Erika Burgess; Florida FWC, staff member.

MS. McCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley; the state representative from the great state of Florida.

MR. BREWER: Chester Brewer; Florida, recreational.

MR. BEAL: Bob Beal; Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

MR. DiLERNIA: Tony DiLernia; Mid-Atlantic Council liaison.

DR. McGOVERN: Jack McGovern; NOAA Fisheries.

DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree; NOAA Fisheries.

DR. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Monica Smit-Brunello; NOAA General Counsel.

DR. DUVAL: We're going to circle back around to our great chairman, who did not have the chance to introduce himself.

MR. HARTIG: Ben Hartig; council member, Florida.

DR. DUVAL: There is just one quick agenda item that wasn't on here and that was just approval of our proceedings from our June council meeting. There was just one little typo I noted on Page 6 where we were talking about the CCC Allocation Workgroup, and it stated that they looked at time-based mechanisms, public intra-space mechanisms for allocation, and I think it should be public-interest-based mechanisms for allocations.

If there were not any other additions or corrections to the proceedings; those will stand approved. Any other modifications to the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda stands approved. The next thing we're going to do is I'm going to turn things over to Amber, and she is going to go through a little recap of our June workshop and then I think maybe take us through the public input that we received on the Draft Vision Blueprint.

MS. VON HARTEN: Just quickly, as we all remember, in June we reviewed all of the draft documents for the four strategic goals to reflect everybody's input from the council on how to tweak those before we took them out for public input. The next step in the process was for us to have the public input this summer. I have a short little presentation – it is Attachment 1 in your briefing book – that kind of just gives an overview of that public input.

Just a note to this presentation, remember these word clouds that I had done I think in June of last year; I left them in this presentation, because I thought it was kind of interesting as we go through the state input for you to see what those word clouds look like from the stakeholder input and kind of reflect on the kind of input we got during this round of public input for the draft blueprint.

As you all remember, we decided to use a variety of methods to collect public input. This go round we used webinars dealing with each of the four strategic goals to kind of introduce stakeholders to those different goal documents. Then we used comment station/webinars in each state. We also were on the road during the public hearings in August and provided an opportunity for stakeholders to provide some input, using a little bit more interactive methods. These are some of the pictures from those public hearings.

This one up here is from North Carolina in Morehead City and the one down here is from Daytona Beach. We had these posters, which I have these with us today if anybody would like for us to roll them out we can do that just so you can have a closer look at the goal documents. What I asked people to do was to – these were laminated and I had dry-erase markers.

Instead of just giving them presentations like we've been doing for the webinars, we had folks take the markers and walk around the room and spend some time reviewing each of these goal documents that were on the posters and put checks by things that they liked and exes by things they didn't like, and then also give us any new ideas that they had.

Unfortunately, we didn't get a whole lot of input that way because of the turnout in some of the locations; but we did get some input in each state and also some new ideas from each state. It was kind of just a good opportunity for me to talk more with some of the fishermen that were at the public hearings.

A lot of them were folks that had attended the port meetings in 2014, so they had been involved in the process throughout. Then, of course, we had lots of written comments, which are Attachments 7A through D. Those are all the ones that we've received to date. We organized them by states so that you guys could have a look at those by state.

Again, here is the schedule of all the different opportunities we had, including the public hearings and comment stations in the table. We had a total of 22 opportunities, which I felt pretty good about. We had 26 port meetings in 2014, so I felt like we did a pretty good job of giving the public an opportunity to comment.

Then this is the actual participation. The webinars for the four goals; they were pretty well attended. A lot of these numbers do represent people that attended multiple webinars or comment stations, so there are some duplicates there; but you'll see that the interesting thing is to look maybe at the webinar versus in person and you'll see that they were pretty close.

We had lots of folks attending the webinars or participating via webinar or the comment station and then a little bit more in person. I know that you guys are going to talk about that, this comment station format later on in one of the other committees, so maybe keep this in mind. But total we had about 360 stakeholders participate; and you remember we had about the same for the port meetings as well; and a total of 132 written comments.

I hope that you guys have at least skimmed through those written comments. You will notice that we've received a lot of form letters. There were a couple groups of those. There are some post cards as well as just a form that people were filling out that we got a lot of very similar comments about.

We definitely had a lot of participation in Florida. I think each of those comments stations had 30 to 40 people, roughly. Let's take a quick look at Florida. This is really just back of the envelope, quick kind of assessment based on the input we received. These were kind of some of the things that rose to the top as generally supported or generally not supported.

The letters beside each bullet indicate which strategic goal they fit under. Stagger spawning season closures, folks were interested in looking at adjusting that; looking at aggregate trip limits for the commercial sector; looking at effort and permits in the commercial and for-hire sector and really evaluating that two-for-one permit requirement. A lot of folks had interest in readdressing that.

There was support for this recreational snapper grouper stamp or license or permit, whatever we're going to call it; looking more closely at management of jacks and deepwater species; and then also looking at stock assessments in the SEDAR process; more outreach on fisheries science; using different formats for public hearings; and then more outreach on barotrauma.

Generally opposed were catch shares; closed areas including MPAs and spawning SMZs, electronic monitoring; and folks thought it was not a good use of time to use recorded phone messages to get information out; kind of surprised there. Again, remember these word clouds were based on the 2014 port meetings, so kind of interesting to see what stakeholders said versus the input we received.

For Georgia there was some support for state-by-state quotas for certain species. There was a lot of discussion at a lot of these meetings about red snapper because of the timing of the no season being announced, I believe. Also looking at nontraditional stakeholders in management, we heard from folks in the restaurant industry sector, chefs in multiple states; so this was definitely something that was supportive in Georgia; managing for abundance and availability, possibly considering full retention of deepwater species; improving data in reporting and then generally opposed to catch shares.

For South Carolina folks supported improved data collection and the use of citizen science; developing some type of reporting for the recreational sector; and again these staggered spawning season closures; looking at effort in permits, primarily the two-for-one permit in the commercial sector; improving fishing businesses; and generally opposed to catch shares, electronic monitoring and closed areas.

For North Carolina, lots of support for a state-by-state or some kind of sub-regional management strategy. Lots of folks talked about shifting the start date or fishing season start to allow equal access to the northern part of our region; staggered spawning season closures; bag and trip limit adjustment; support for the recreational stamp; considering market availability.

We also heard from some chefs in North Carolina. Then also looking at the nontraditional stakeholders like the chefs. Bycatch set-aside and allowances were also supported. Volunteer angler training for data collection, so that citizen science component, and then also taking a look at evaluating the decision-making process that the council undergoes.

A lot of those written comments were this idea of a stop-and-review policy that was brought forward. Then, of course, generally opposed are catch shares, closed areas, and electronic monitoring. That is quite the theme there. That is kind of a summary of all the different types of input we received. I guess if you would like, we can go through each goal now and kind of skim through; and maybe there is an explanation needed of this crazy spreadsheet that I gave you. Any questions?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; I was interested in that comment form that fishermen kind of used to send out. Who is responsible for sending that out? Was that the South Carolina Group?

MS. VON HARTEN: I think it was, yes.

MR. HARTIG: Well, it is interesting that if you are sent a comment form, of course, it is definitely pointed in its direction from that point of view. Maybe if we send a comment form out, we'll get more input, I don't know. We definitely got a lot of comment forms; I was impressed. The thing about those forms if you read through them, they weren't all the same.

Yes, they addressed the bullet points that I guess they were supposed to address; but you read through them, a number of people went ahead and actually gave more comment than just those points. It was good that we got those, because probably fishermen that wouldn't have commented went ahead and did based on getting those forms. I don't know; I guess they were sent to all permit holders, probably. I'm just looking at another way to try and engage the public. That works. Of course it worked in a way this is what you're looking at and you don't want this.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; but I do think that information was sent to all permit holders; I think maybe all snapper grouper permit holders as well as all dealers maybe. I'm not quite sure about that. There were definitely two different sets of comments forms. There was another set of forms where a lot of folks signed advocating for a stop-and-review policy as well.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say we've done some stuff at the state level. It wasn't a form, but it was a survey is what it ended up being. We kind of run into problems with surveys; don't we?

DR. DUVAL: I think it depends on what the survey is being used for. My understanding – and maybe Monica can comment on this – is that if we're using a survey to help inform development of an amendment; that we can do that. I think that it would be interesting for the council to be able to use a survey in a very pointed fashion like Ben is saying for stakeholders to say would you prefer this particular management strategy or would you prefer this particular management strategy? Would you prefer – I'm just using this as an example – shifting the season start date or would you prefer two sub-regional quotas? Things like that that we could use in a very pointed fashion to get stakeholder input.

MR. BELL: We did one of those related to cobia, and we had over 1,400 responses. They answer the questions that you ask them about, do you like A, B, or C; but then we also had over 300 some people provide written extra comments. It was a pretty useful tool or mechanism for us to get a lot of input. I think 1,400; I was pretty impressed with that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: There is something called the Paperwork Reduction Act, which kind of limits – it doesn't limit, it puts some guidelines on what you can ask people without getting certain kinds of approval from I think it's OMB, Office of Management and Budget. That was put in in the eighties, I believe.

If you want to work on – and it just kind of depends. There is some sort of rule that says if you ask more than nine people; then you've got to go through the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements; but there are exceptions to it, too. For the visioning process we were able to figure out that what you were doing fell within an exception to PRA, so we didn't have to go the extra steps of going through and getting the extra permission from OMB.

Depending on what you want to do, we may have to go through some extra steps. It doesn't mean you can't do it; it just means we have to get authorization for the survey. I'll be glad to

work with staff if that is what you think you want to do and we can figure that out. I mean sometimes those surveys are very valuable. I think you did one a number of years ago for economic data collection and other kinds of things.

I can't remember all the input that we had to go through to get permission or whether it fell within the exception or whether it was already authorized, I can't remember, but they can be valuable tools. Anyway, I guess I'm willing to work with staff to figure out what we need to do to get you the answers to the questions you want.

MR. PHILLIPS: Amber, when you added up all the comments from webinars and everything, if somebody made a comment on a webinar and then they sent in a paper, were the comments counted twice or do we know?

MS. VON HARTEN: That is what I was saying is we have lots of folks that participated in the webinars and then they also came to a comment station. In some cases, yes, they were counted twice. There really was no way to get around that very easily.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; we had some webinar participants that participated in every single webinar that we had, which is great. I think that allowed folks to hear the range of the diversity of viewpoints that there is throughout the region with regard to what might work best in a particular area.

DR. LANEY: It is no big surprise I guess that in the list of things people opposed were MPAs and electronic monitoring and catch shares. What I was wondering, given that my perception is those are all valuable and at least part of the time effective tools – I know there is science on both sides of the issue – but what I was wondering again is if we're going to do some sort of a survey, it would be interesting to me to understand more people's perceptions about those tools and why they are opposed to those.

I'm wondering if we could include some sort of questions as to try and tease out why do you oppose these tools. Obviously, my ox is going to be gored if you create an MPA in my favorite fishing hole issue; but maybe there are some other things that we as a council could do a better issue of addressing if we better understand why people are so opposed to those three particular tools.

DR. DUVAL: I think some folks – and if you had a chance to look through some of the written comments; some folks did go into a little bit of detail as to why they were opposed to things; but it would be interesting to try to tease that out.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say I think electronic monitoring, VMS tends to become what they're talking about. There are other aspects of electronic monitoring that they might actually be more prone to be willing to accept. But I think because of the VMS, as soon as you say electronic monitoring, they just think VMS and there is that immediate opposition.

In these key areas where you have so much opposition – and as Wilson said these are useful tools – it would be nice to have an understanding of, well, if you don't like that and aren't willing to allow that tool to be used, then what would you recommend; some feedback on if not that, then what? It is easy to say but we don't like it, but what else could we do?

DR. DUVAL: I agree; it would be great to have additional input of what tool instead.

MR. HARTIG: I would just like to follow up a little bit on what you had said about the webinar and having people on the webinar and being able to comment during a public hearing in another area. I thought that was really cool. It was really a neat way to bring people into the conversation and have fishermen interact in different areas of the South Atlantic.

The problem we have in some places – in Florida we had so many people. Just to try and get them to be able to get their input in, it was difficult to include all the people that were on the webinar that wanted to talk as well; but I see a great value in that and somehow we need to fit that in and make it work. There was interest in what Florida people heard from people outside the region.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; and I think it is one thing for folks to listen to council members say, well, here is what fishermen or here is what stakeholders are saying in my area; and I think it is another thing entirely for stakeholders from Florida to hear what stakeholders in any one of the other states are saying and vice versa themselves in their own words and in their own voices.

MR. BEAL: Actually Mel and Wilson have covered a lot of what I was going to say. I think electronic monitoring is this big nebulous thing. A lot of people view it differently. It's cameras on trawl boats and longline boats; it is mandatory logbooks for party and charterboats in some areas; and VMS is a nonstarter in a lot of areas.

I think there are some pieces of electronic monitoring that some fishermen are starting to accept or like – like may be a strong word – accept reporting their catch on their Smart Phone on the way in or whatever it is. I think teasing that out, what parts do you like and not like and what parts are too much “Big Brother” like I think is what people have a little bit of fear over. I think picking apart electronic monitoring, which means a lot of different things to a lot of people, would be a big help, I think.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; and that was one of the really difficult things going through these comments, was there were a lot of generalizations. We didn't get to that level of detail of, okay, they don't like VMS. We tried to outline it in some of the documents that there are lots of other tools to use. The same thing; there were lots of general comments about catch shares, but then there would be in the same comment something about sub-regional management or state-by-state quotas. It was challenging, to say the least.

DR. LANEY: Back on those opposed tools again; what is puzzling to me I guess is the regional differences in acceptance of some of those tools, because I think we've heard here before that VMS, for example, is not only tolerated but advocated for by commercial interest in some parts of the country.

I guess my question would be what was done differently in those parts of the country or maybe the better question is what was done differently? Was anything done differently in those parts of the country where there seems to be a high level of acceptance for catch shares and/or electronic monitoring tools like VMS. I know regionally there are some pockets at least where those tools

seem to be supported. I'm not sure we could say the same thing for MPAs, but certainly for those other two there seem to be some regional differences.

Was there some educational approach or process that they used in those areas that resulted in a higher level of support and endorsement for those two tools, or not? I would be interested in the answer to that question; and if the answer is yes, then maybe we could adopt or apply it here in the South Atlantic.

MR. BELL: Just kind of a little bit of Wilson said, I think if we have some fairly significant opposition to certain categories of things, we've just got to be careful how we proceed with that. I mean we can't toss the whole category out if there are useful things in there. We just need to make it clear, and it would be based on an understanding of what they do like, what they don't like. I don't know how we get that fine tuning done; but we can't just toss out whole, major categories.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's what Bob's comment was about trying to pick apart some of the electronic technologies' approaches I think, because we heard on the webinars and saw in some written comments support for the use of drones as an alternate electronic monitoring technology. We do have fishermen who are pretty vocal in their support for being able to report their catches electronically in order to reduce their workload and things like that. I do think it is pretty important to pick those things apart.

MR. BREWER: As with so many of the topics that get discussed, certain words or phrases seem to indicate that a certain comment or that are associated with a certain procedure, people will hear the word MPA and their hair catches on fire. But really with regard to MPAs, it matters what you're talking about.

I've had those discussions before, because people are not in favor of closing down 40 percent of the ocean without having some sort of idea what it is that you're trying to protect or what area you're trying to protect. But by the same token you say to people – at least in my area and my constituencies, you say, well, are you in favor of the closed area off the state of Florida that limits or actually prohibits pelagic longlining off the coast? “Oh, yes,” and they'll fight to the death for that. Well, that is a Type 2 MPA. It really, really depends on what you're talking about. You can't just have these catch phrases rule the concepts or the different options.

DR. DUVAL: Excellent reminder; thanks, Chester. Mr. DiLernia.

MR. DiLERNIA: I would like to perhaps kind of give my first-hand experience with electronic monitoring to some of the comments that individuals have made around the table. I am currently involved in an experiment in the northeast where we are using tablets on my charterboat and other charterboats.

I agreed to participate because I think it is very important with the kind of information that was being collected. As we're faced with energy and wind farms and all, one of the things they wanted to do was to track our movements; and so I have a tablet onboard that I activate at the beginning of the trip. It sees where I'm fishing. At the same time it also asks that every time I catch a fish, I run over to the tablet and record that fish. That can be cumbersome, at the least. While I enjoy the fact, I don't mind the fact – as a matter of fact, I welcome it because I want to

prove to regulators as we develop our regulations for wind farms and other types of, say, tidal energy and all; I want to be able to demonstrate exactly where I'm fishing. At the same time some of the aspects of this electronic reporting are becoming cumbersome. Some comments have been made around the table regarding overall electronic monitoring fishermen like it, we just have to be careful in how we design that; and I agree with that completely.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for sharing that experience with us, Tony; much appreciated. Are there other general comments I guess on the public input that we've received in terms of maybe the format or anything like that? We're going to have a little bit of discussion I think during Executive Finance specifically about a webinar format, but just any other general comments about this public input process level participation and things like that.

Amber, was there anything else that you wanted to say about that? I would just thank all the council members and staff for all the hard work that they put into the comment stations and the willingness of council members to take that on with their busy schedules and make themselves available and really help to manage the conversation and try to get as useful input as possible during those comment stations. I guess we'll go ahead and take a look at some of our goal matrices that Amber has lined up for us.

MS. VON HARTEN: Just a quick explanation of what this means – each of these documents is each of the goal documents and every action in it. There is a column for each state with a tallied number of comments that we received on a specific action. The red X is comments that were not in support of that action; the green check mark is comments that were in support of the action; and then the null sign are things that we didn't receive comments on at all.

As you scroll through these, I'm sure you noticed that we did not receive a lot of comments on a lot of different things. Again, this is the science one and out of the comments we received, which were very minimal, you will see some of the things that had higher support over here in the total column.

I feel like there was support for the citizen science aspect of things and cooperative research opportunities. You'll see some nines, sixes, eights down here, looking at some of the socioeconomic impact types of research that is needed. The monitoring reporting, this is where the one electronic monitoring related action received a lot of opposition.

Some general support for this recreational fishing stamp – and that was the other thing is that a lot of these actions were cross-cutting throughout several of the goal documents, so I did my best to try to match them up as best I could. But as we go through, these there are a lot of zeros, particularly from certain states on these different ideas.

Let's look at the management one just because the one probably had more. Again, the one that received the most opposition was the one about the, quote-unquote, catch shares with 125 opposed. But then you get down into the second strategy and there is more support for the different elements for quota-based types of management systems.

That was the idea of the state by state and how to do that by sub-region and things like that. If you look at the individual state spreadsheets, there are more specific comments than just trying to fit their comment into this action. Hopefully, you guys have looked at those, Attachment 7A

through D – or no, 2A through D. Step-down approaches, those were generally supported. The aggregate trip limits; yes, the spawning season closure, looking at the effort and permits in the commercial and for-hire sectors.

The other thing I wanted to maybe briefly touch on is at the end of these documents, you may not have noticed, were some of the new ideas that came out of the comment stations and webinars. As you look through these, some of them may not necessarily be new, but they could be fit into some of the existing action items in there; but they are just more specific.

Some of them are species-specific like that first one, decrease the triggerfish trip limit if you thought the thousand pounds was too high. Something that came up on multiple webinars and comment stations was support for the use of powerheads. I believe that is in relation to what is going on in South Carolina.

Also, readdressing the 225 permits, several folks talked about trying to make that transferrable again. Also the idea of permit stacking, that started from Vincent Banora. He's a fisherman down in South Florida; and he was on most of the webinars; and then as people were hearing about that, then we started getting comments in support of that.

You will see that throughout these new ideas here. If you can look at his comment, I can pull it up if you want to look at it. He gave a pretty nice, detailed description of some options that he thought would work, if you want to look at that.

DR. DUVAL: Is anybody interested in seeing Vincent Banora's sort of proposal for how permit stacking could work? He gave a bunch of options and written comments. I believe he sent comments to all council members. He sent hard copy comments as well. Again, if there are specifics that you want Amber to stop on or look at, don't hesitate.

MS. VON HARTEN: Again, we need to know what you want to do with these new ideas. Do you want to try to incorporate them into the blueprint? Do you want to address them in October after you've had time to think about them at the workshop? We need to know what to do with these.

MS. BECKWITH: I think they're fine in the format that they're in. I wouldn't necessarily need personally to have them incorporated. This material is sort of for us to review now and then to talk about in October and figure out. The ones that we particularly like, I think we can incorporate them into the process in October. I don't know that we have to incorporate it into the document now, but that is just my opinion.

MR. PHILLIPS: If we've got fishermen that are bringing forward new ideas, whether it's permit stacking or anything else, I think again the devil is going to be in the details. We could talk about it and see what the plusses are, what the minuses are. It is kind of like the electronic monitoring and stuff. A lot of things look good or look bad just to glance at them.

When we get fishermen not generalizing and giving their more detailed thoughts on what they like about a particular management and what they don't, then you may be able to find out that you can still use the management but you just tweak it. I think we can at least maybe not put it

in the document, per se, but have the discussion and have the fishermen talk to us about those options.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Charlie has got a good point. I think what I got out of this was that we need to do an educational series, do some port meetings where we talk about things such as permit stacking that fishermen are in favor of; maybe other options for limiting harvest that fishermen can come up with.

I think that would be something that we could actually get some good information directly from the fishermen on and get some education too. I don't want it to go out as a catch shares educational series, but just start with the permit stacking; something that some people seem to be in favor of and maybe add some other things in there as well. State-by-state quotas is another one where you are talking about it is limitation, it is a form of splitting up the resources we have amongst different entities. I would be willing to work on that and put that together with someone.

DR. DUVAL: I guess what I'm hearing is maybe more idea-specific type of port meetings like once we have some flesh on the bones, so to speak, of a particular idea, then perhaps consider utilizing this webinar-based port meeting where staff wouldn't have to travel, more like the comment stations that we had, to try to save on cost.

If council members are willing to meet with fishermen in a particular area where we at least have the technology to be able to do that and get some good discussion on those ideas, we could do something like that. Is that kind of what I'm hearing? I know that one of the things that we've heard in North Carolina is, well, what does this idea mean?

There weren't enough details in some of the strategies that folks saw. We said, well, we're not really sure what that means either because these all came from you. Some of the suggestions that are in the draft vision blueprint documents are directly from the port meetings, so these were the results of brainstorming that had come out there. We haven't put the flesh on the bones of those ideas at all.

MR. COX: I think the education outreach is an excellent opportunity for folks to understand exactly what is going on; that a catch share program wasn't something that was being talked about for the whole industry. I felt like it kind of sidetracked some of our visioning because some folks felt like maybe that was something that was trying to happen here.

Then again to talk about exactly what permit stacking is; I don't think a lot of people understand what permit stacking is. Then in North Carolina the way that we do our state-by-state management and how we handle our flounder fishery, I think folks would love to understand how you have the flexibility of opening and closing the seasons. I would definitely support some kind of webinar or something on those topics.

MR. BELL: When you look at this, when I went through it, and my eye was looking for big numbers – immediately you go to the big numbers, and the big numbers are where there are specific things that they understood that they didn't like. That is just a human nature thing with any kind of input that you get is folks will be glad to tell you what they don't like. And then to tell you what they like part; we're looking at fives or sixes or eights or something like that.

I think one of the challenges maybe they had is when we put all that stuff on the board or we had it all to look at, it's an awful lot of line items. If you kind of think as each one as a question of do I like that or don't I like that; it's just a lot of stuff. That is just the nature of the document at the moment as it is moving forward here.

I don't know how we would, but I think we do need to go back somehow and get more input or somehow simplify it for them a little bit or categorize or group so it is not so overwhelming. I can vision turning that into sort of a survey kind of thing where they have all this. They can sit there and think about it and then check yes, no, like, don't like, and don't care. It is not surprising what we got in terms of the people will be glad to tell you what they don't like. You can see where they keyed on certain areas. To try to get them to tell you what they do like; that is a challenge.

DR. DUVAL: I think we were trying to just remember where we started from with all this in terms of there being a lot of things in there. This was the kitchen sink. We wanted to make sure we were very inclusive of everything that came out of all of our port meetings. We were very deliberate in articulating that we didn't want to remove anything from consideration until we went through this particular round of public input.

Now that we have this input, in October our job is going to be to prioritize those strategies that at this time we would like to pursue. Just thinking back to some of the comments that we got regarding, well, what does this actually mean; I understand exactly what you're getting at, Mel, trying to reduce the volume of the strategies that we have to some level that might allow folks to provide input on what they do like.

I think we just need to keep in mind that the specificity or lack thereof might prevent us from getting the kind of input that we're seeking. I do think that there is opportunity once the council has prioritized some of these things, perhaps looked at some of the new ideas that came forward to say where within some of the existing ideas do these already fit in these broader categories of approaches.

We may be able to use a survey as a tool to say pick among these three – the council is considering one of these three approaches, which do you like best and provide a space for why, to help inform our development of an amendment that might implement one of those types of approaches. Just a few I guess cautionary notes on generalizing versus being specific and why we had the volume of strategies in there that we did.

DR. LANEY: I thought a lot of the new ideas in the science section were good and definitely worthy of us taking a further look at. I did have one question, and it may have been articulated in the written comments, which I didn't have time to go through in detail. But could someone define power-chumming for me?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think that was one of the Florida comments I think that came in. Someone wanted the council to look at power-chumming and its impacts. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Power-chumming is something that they do in the commercial yellowtail snapper fishery with these chum blocks, basically.

MR. HARTIG: It is more than just chum blocks; it is two pallets of chum, a pallet of oats. It is an amazing phenomenon that they use. I think they're building fish, I really do. I think they're putting enough energy into the system where they're actually making yellowtails to some degree.

Certainly, they're giving them energy when they need it to spawn; there isn't any doubt about that in my opinion. It is different, for sure. I read some pretty interesting comments from one fisherman in particular who thought that it was dragging fish off parts of the reef and concentrating them on others.

DR. DUVAL: Does that help you, Wilson?

DR. LANEY: Yes, ma'am, thank you.

MS. VON HARTEN: I'm hearing lots of talk of a survey. My question to you is given this input that we have here, are you all comfortable moving forward with the October Workshop and being able to sit down and really start to prioritize this information before you? If there is a survey that is done, would it be possible to move forward with the October Workshop as it is now, recognizing that we got lots of input over the last year and a half and we don't want to lose that information.

There is probably going to be some type of appendix in this final blueprint that will have everything that maybe is not going to be considered at this time but was part of the process; and be able to sit down and move forward with prioritizing some short-term and long-term items and then perhaps doing this survey of specific items that you are thinking about pursuing into an amendment.

Also keep in mind – and I know that there is a lot of stakeholder disconnect with this – is we're not going to approve the vision blueprint; we're going to adopt it. The blueprint is not an amendment; it is not necessarily part of an FMP, per se. Let's shift the language there and start talking about adopting the blueprint, because the blueprint is going to be a living document that is going to be probably changed over time and evaluated maybe on an annual basis, whatever you decide in October.

Just because you picked this short-term action item or long-term action items now; that could shift and change over time. Whatever is chosen for short-term action items would follow the council process. It would be developed into an amendment. That is where some of the details and the options that people are asking for like how is this going to work; that is when it would come out. Then, of course, that would go through the normal public process of an amendment. Just keep that in mind as we have these discussions.

DR. DUVAL: The blueprint document is meant to guide our actions over the future. It is not we are definitely going to do these things; because as we move forward with priorities from the blueprint, once we get into the nuts and bolts of something, we may realize that perhaps this is not a strategy that we do want to pursue at this time.

As Amber said, I think there are a lot of stakeholders out there for whom there is a disconnect that adoption of a vision blueprint, which we're slated to do in December, means that the strategies in that blueprint; it is already a foregone conclusion that those are the things that are

going to happen when they actually need to go through an amendment process. The amendment process is how the council actually does things. Whether it is employing different strategies to reduce discards in the fishery, what have you, the amendment process is how we do that.

MS. BURGESS: I attended all but one of the Florida comment stations and public hearings and webinars. One thing that I heard continuously – and I think it stems from the fact that this is not like your typical amendment process. There has been multiple public scoping and webinars. There is a bit of oversaturation I think among our stakeholders who have continued to show up and participate.

I think if we do not give them some sort of new document to comment on like a prioritized action list from the council, we risk losing those people participating in general. We risk losing more specific comments on those things that we don't know about such as catch share type programs or what is electronic monitoring. I think that if the council doesn't move forward with that workshop in October with some sort of prioritization, additional public comment may not be beneficial.

DR. DUVAL: That is the goal. That is the point of the October Workshop is to come out with a set of prioritized strategies.

MS. BURGESS: Right, but the question Amber had asked was is the council ready? Do they desire to continue forward with that in October; and that was addressing that question.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, we have numbers from what we got out of this exercise; but there are numbers from when we started originally about all of this. We should go back and mine all of that and add it to these different sections in here. For every comment we had in the past, when we started this project, all the way from the FWC stuff initially, when we did the stuff in Florida when we talked about that; we should go back and mine all those comments and add them to this list. I think you'll get a much different, more numbers in some of your slots than you would have had before, or we have now anyway.

DR. DUVAL: Ben, are you talking about – I realize Florida had a bunch of workshops looking at south Florida issues. I assume you're talking about the round of port meetings that we had last year; because that is where all of these items came from. I would have to turn to Amber to comment on that. But in terms of like tallying up, including tallies from the port meetings, how many times was this particular strategy mentioned; I assume that is what you're getting at.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that is what I was getting at. You could add the FWC stuff specific to some of the south Florida things that are in this document.

MS. VON HARTEN: My only concern with that is, okay, so it was brought up at a port meeting; but did every single person at the port meeting necessarily support that idea? I don't know if that is necessarily the case.

MR. HARTIG: No; and that is not what I'm getting at. Not everybody supported the different things that went out in this round as well; it is just general support. I heard in some of these meetings – and I'm thinking back to the south Florida stuff – a number of people talked about mutton snapper in particular.

As we went through the initial port meetings, there were people who talked about the same things in each area time after time after time and that. Then you will get more numbers for each of those topics. Maybe we have some where you show where there wasn't support at a particular meeting.

If this is off base, that is fine, but some way to get some more input into all these different sections. I agree with Mel. Mel had the thing that it was overwhelming to the fishermen. To me at the start of the meetings in Florida, fishermen were overwhelmed. A lot of them hadn't been involved in the process before; so to see this for the first time, they're going what in the world is all this? I said, well, these are the comments that fishermen brought to us that is what we should do. You had to explain to them what it was. It is difficult. As a fisherman to look at everything you had to comment on; it was overwhelming, to be frank.

MR. BELL: What we did is fine. I think it is the best we could have gotten. Yes, it is a lot of stuff. I think it is up to us now, moving forward to October, to try to consolidate, try to prioritize, and then maybe specifically for us as a tasking to fit the new idea stuff. You did a good job of trying to sort, well, was it already covered or is it new or whatever; but we could take a look at that as well and bring some sense of, yes, incorporate it, incorporate it here, or it is not worth it or something.

We can bring all that back in October, bring in the good stuff that we want to; and the things that are covered, they are covered. I think it is up to us to bring this down into a kind of easier to understand format and prioritize. Then we can do some sort of survey or something based on that; but I think if we just try to take this back out in this format, it is kind of large.

I think what we've got is a good start. We just need to ourselves get together and kind of condense this or sort it a little better, so then we can get back to folks with here is our take prioritized and then get their feedback on that. That is probably the best thing to do, because it is a lot of stuff. I think they did their best with it and we did a fine job. You did great. Other than just getting a lot more participation and folks checking, I don't know how we could have done any better with this.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to go back to some of what Amber mentioned earlier is that we're not going to go back out with something that looks like these spreadsheets or even the draft vision blueprint focus areas that had everything in there. We wanted to make sure that we weren't disowning any stakeholder input that we had received throughout this process thus far.

That is why there was so much information in there. I think everybody's homework is going to be to look at these new ideas and see where they already fit in among some of the broader strategies that we have in place and to go through the October Workshop and come out with a set of priorities. But as Amber said, not losing all the input that we have gained through this process, but moving those items that are not going to be considered at this time into a different appendix, so that we have all that information to refer to so we can get down to a more concise list of objectives.

MS. VON HARTEN: Of course, the way this is laid out now does not have to be the way the final blueprint looks. I agree that it is very overwhelming, because we received so much information from the port meetings. That is what the basis of these documents is. After October,

as you all go through this and start to prioritize things, the way this is going to look is going to have to be different. The strategy numbers and all of that; that is going to have to change as things get pulled out and put into an appendix or whatever. We can condense that; but we're going to need your help with that in October I think is what it comes down to.

MR. BELL: I understand what Ben was trying to get at was just to kind of plus-up the numbers, but the problem with that is it came in in so many different ways, perhaps, and you start kind of messing with the methodologies and crossing methodologies. You might skew something if you try to mix too much stuff in there.

Like there might have been a port meeting in Florida with a whole bunch of comments about one particular item, and then, boom, all of a sudden you've got a really big number somewhere. You just have to be careful how you mixed all that in, I guess; but this all followed the same methodology in terms of acquiring these data. Just a comment.

MS. VON HARTEN: I'm more than happy to go back through those port meeting notes again; that is where all this came from. I don't know how much it necessarily would up the numbers that much on some of the items other than maybe one or two people. I can even keep it separate so that it doesn't get incorporated into this necessarily, just so we can have an idea of what people were saying a year ago versus what we've got now, if that is what you want.

MR. CONKLIN: I think it's time we move on forward with this, do what we're going to do in October yet certainly welcome the new information. There are spots in this document for permit stacking and stuff to fall into, I think. We can take care of that at a later time. I think we need to stick to our schedule and put this thing to use.

DR. DUVAL: I agree. All right, other comments on the wealth of information? We sort of briefly ran through the management and science, which was where the bulk of the input that we received was. Were there highlights from the communication and governance pieces that you wanted to just touch on? We did get some input on that.

I think there were some comments about, I think especially in North Carolina, more advanced notice of impending ACL-related closures and things like that; posting of information at fish house for folks who are perhaps not receiving electronic communications. That is the one place where they are going for commercial fishermen; looking at posting information for private anglers at boat ramps and things like that. I just wanted to make sure that we didn't short change the communication and governance focus areas.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, those were pretty much the highlights, just adding on to the existing actions in there. The one thing I did want to bring up under the governance one was lots of comments about evaluating the current council process in terms of transparency and streamlining and accountability, providing information that is timely and appropriate for management actions. But then there were several comments about this stop-and-review policy to evaluate existing regulations and determine the impacts of previous regulations before implementing new ones. That was the postcard that we received lots of from North Carolina.

DR. DUVAL: We did receive some public comment in terms of the communication piece about I think overlap or perception in overlap between the council's outreach and communication

activities and those of other partners like Sea Grant and other organizations like that. It's something that we'll have to consider in terms of I think being very clear about what activities the council and council staff are actually undertaking versus what activities we would be looking to our partners to undertake and implement. I just wanted to make sure that was out there.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; that was in relation to sea food marketing. Some folks had concerns that all of a sudden the council was going to be out there doing a lot of outreach about that. That was in the actions as work with partners to provide that information with existing outreach materials that are already out there.

DR. DUVAL: All right, any other comments on public input; because if not we're going to move on and discuss the October Workshop.

MS. VON HARTEN: For the October Workshop, obviously the dates are the 14th and 15th. We'll be starting at 8:30 a.m. on the 14th, and going until 5:00. We'll have a public comment period each day. On day one there will be a public comment starting at 4:30 p.m. and then the next day it will be right after lunch at 1:30, because the workshop is open to the public.

Hotel information is forthcoming. I didn't want to bombard you with that right before the council meeting, but we are having the meeting at the Town and Country Inn, a little blast from the past. I think the reservation deadline for that is October 5th, so I'll be looking to send that out next week after you have some time to settle back home. They do not have web-based reservations, so you have to call.

Please be sure to do that so that Cindy doesn't have to remind you. This is part of the October Workshop planning. We've had a couple of staff meetings talking about how to prepare for this. We are going to have a staff retreat in another week and a half or so to start planning for this. One of the things, based on the input we received and we want to make sure that we're prepared for, is to understand where you stand on the general objectives for each strategic goal.

We are going to be sending you a survey, just the council members, in preparation for the workshop; kind of at the objective level. Let me pull up this management document to give you an idea. There is just going to be a Survey Monkey type of an online web-based one. The survey will be asking you at the objective level in terms of the level of importance – and importance can be defined as the timing of implementing something of a topic of this nature like sub-regional differences or the value to the fishery.

How do you feel about sub-regional differences versus managing for bycatch? How do you feel about access to the fishery versus considering habitat and ecosystem? It's going to be like a paired-comparison kind of survey. What we're hoping that will give us is a better idea of some of the things that are pretty clear in your mind about things that you want to address in the short term and also some things where perhaps there are still some gray area or maybe some more information is needed to help you make that decision.

Then some other ideas that perhaps you think could be left to the long term. That will help us kind of figure out how we're going to facilitate you through this process. Be looking for that survey also next week. Because of the tight timing between now and the October Workshop, we're going to ask that you get to us by the end of next week, if possible. It will be very simple.

It will just be the four goals and you'll just scroll through and click your answer and hopefully it will not take any more than 30 minutes, I would think. That will be really, really helpful for us.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to pause there and make sure everybody understands the nature of the survey, this paired-comparison type of approach, and just give folks the opportunity to ask any questions, if they had any. But this is going to be really important, so I encourage folks to wade through the volume of e-mail that you all will collect during this week and make sure that you don't miss that survey coming in your in boxes.

MS. VON HARTEN: I will put VISION SURVEY in all caps in the subject line and send it high priority. It is going to be critical for us to have that information so that we know how to kind of structure and format the facilitation for the meeting; and it is before our staff retreat. The goals of the workshop obviously are to – you all have gone back home and hopefully had some more time to kind of digest some of the input, look at the new ideas.

Like Mel said, that is your homework, try to figure out what ideas you support as including in the blueprint and where they might fit in, so that we can start walking you through a process of trying to prioritize specific items that you want to move forward with in the short term. Short-term meaning in the next couple of years; long-term meaning in the next three to five years, if that makes sense; just to kind of give you some markers.

Then we also needed to talk about at the workshop the next step for how this will be used and how to convey that to the public. It sounds like perhaps maybe you all want to do a survey of sorts, it sounds like. That is why I'm trying to understand. After the workshop and you all have your short-term action items identified, do you want to do a survey at that point of stakeholders; saying these are some of the action items that are being considered, and trying to get an idea of maybe if there is some more information stakeholders need about those topics to understand what you are proposing? That is what I'm not real clear on.

DR. DUVAL: I'm just going to take the Chairman's liberty and tell you how I view a survey; but it is akin to what I mentioned earlier. If there is a specific suite of actions; maybe it is two or three or three or four different types of actions that the council may be considering to, say, reduce bycatch in the fishery.

We're looking for a little bit more stakeholder input on which of those has more support than the other, I think. I'm just seeing like a really short, targeted survey of please rank the following four strategies; shift in season start date, bycatch allowance during spawning season. Come up with a couple of others, but things that are really specific that stakeholders can understand, where they could say I am ranking these one, two, three, four from highest priority to lowest priority.

Then maybe a little comment box for why do you prefer your number one measure, so that we're getting a little bit of specifics from them. I could also see use of a survey to determine if stakeholders themselves would like more information on how exactly do state-by-state quotas work; something like that.

I see it as being used to try to provide the council with information on which of just a few management approaches we're considering to achieve an objective have the most support from stakeholders.

MR. BELL: The survey kind of fills a couple of roles. One is we heard at our meetings that there is a desire from the public to stay engaged in this and kind of know where we are and where we're going. If the survey is like you were describing, Michelle, it's kind of reduced down to these areas. That tells them where we're going and the direction we're heading and what we're thinking, and it gives them an ability to weigh in on those key points.

It kind of covers two things. It gives us more information about what they're thinking or what their desires might be. Then maybe we can get some specifics out of them. It also does what they have asked us to do was keep them engaged in this as we move along. I think that would be a good thing to do, and the survey format might be the simplest way to do it.

Plus like if one of the questions or one of the responses can be, well, they are not clear on what it is, where you're going with that; they can let us know that. It serves two purposes; it is for them and it is for us as well. I think that would be good, but that would follow whatever comes out of October.

DR. LANEY: I am totally comfortable with what you described, and I think to me that seems to be consistent with what Mel and Erika had suggested earlier and does exactly what Mel just articulated.

DR. DUVAL: I think if you keep it short and focused; the council is considering one of these four options to do X; please rank from your most favorite to least favorite; tell us down here why that is your most favorite. That is just an example; because I think if your survey is too long, people aren't going to respond to it. You need something that they can do in a couple minutes; that's it.

MS. VON HARTEN: For this stakeholder survey, are you envisioning this happening between the October Workshop and the December meeting, because December is when you all are supposed to look at the final blueprint. Is the survey going to be only web-based? Is it going to be mailed? You talked earlier about trying to mail stuff; again, that would only target the commercial sector and the dealers.

DR. DUVAL: I'll go ahead and continue my analogy or my example; but I wouldn't necessarily see it being between October and December. I think that is something that once the council has narrowed its priorities; that as we embark on amendment development; that is something that we could use to help inform amendment development.

MS. VON HARTEN: Keep it open.

DR. DUVAL: Yes. The council is moving forward with consideration of this action in this amendment to do this thing; here are four different approaches, what is your favorite, why? Unless we're ramping up for an amendment to start between October and December – and I don't think that is necessarily what we're talking about – I would see that happening in maybe early 2016 as we get started. That was my thinking, to help inform the actual alternatives that would be in an amendment.

MR. BELL: I guess what I was hearing from the public is if in December this thing sort of gets in concrete; they just wanted I guess another ability to see where we're going and comment

before it sort of becomes concrete. If it is wet concrete and we've still got the ability – like you said, there is no pending amendment or amendments or anything that we're working on; but that is just some of the feedback I think that we got was in that staying engaged part.

I guess it really depends on what happens in December how firm that becomes; or this is it, this is the box; it's in there or it is not in there. That is what I think I was hearing from the public was that desire to kind of see what came out of this meeting and what comes out of October and then be able to kind of see where we're going. That is just what I was hearing, I think.

MR. HARTIG: As we go down this path, short term versus long term, I think we kind of need to look at like we do with SEDAR and how we have it laid out for SEDAR assessments into the future. We have our prioritized amendment list on how we're addressing the different amendments we're going to go through.

How many slots are we going to have based on the species that are going to be assessed through SEDAR in the near future that we may see problems with and we're going to have to take action on those particular items above the visioning process. You've got the red snapper assessment where you are going to have to deal with the new data from the red snapper assessment.

You are going to want to implement that in a time-certain fashion. To me, I think you kind of need to fit these into slots and have a little bit of discussion. Maybe in Executive Finance we could actually talk more about it, but some way to look at where you're actually going to have the ability to incorporate some of this vision into the council process.

DR, DUVAL: I agree; timing is going to be critical, and that is why I think we talked about long- term priorities versus short-term priorities; things that the council has the ability to do more or less quickly through, say, a framework or something like that. If we're looking at things that are really modifications of bag limits or removal of size limits and shifting of season start dates; those are items that fall within our framework process.

They could presumably be done more quickly. But longer-term items I see as things like working with our agency partners to ensure that there is more focus brought to bear on support needed for our basic data collection programs, things like that. I think those are sort of longer-term type of items that may not necessarily fit within an amendment process but should not be lost. But I agree with you we will have to talk about timing, and timing will depend on probably the suite of items that the council selects for addressing.

MS. VON HARTEN: Then the last thing that we'll need to talk about at the workshop is establishing some type of evaluation or review plan for the blueprint, how often is this going to be reviewed? Like I said, this is intended to be a living document where it will change over time as the needs of the fishery change over time.

Chip, on staff, came across this paper that talks about the use of these types of decision tree analyses for management, and we might introduce that concept to you at the October Workshop as well. It is a tool that can help you weigh different types of management tools that might work together and those that are opposed and how to figure out to prioritize those different types of tools to use as it relates to things in the blueprint.

DR. DUVAL: I'll just put both our Mid-Atlantic Council Liaison on the spot and also Bob Beal, because I know you guys have been heavily involved in the Mid-Atlantic Council Visioning Process; but the Mid-Atlantic Council has an annual implementation plan that you look at, correct, or is it like a two-year implementation plan? Tony, I don't know if you can comment on that.

MR. DiLERNIA: I was not on the council when we did our Visioning Workshop. I was appointed after that visioning was done. We look at our annual workload and we compare that. We build that around what our goals were that came out of our Visioning Workshop. We use that to guide our general development.

Then as is typical in fisheries management, things just come out of left field where all of a sudden, okay, we have to stop and we have to pay attention to this. When that occurs, we then have the policy discussion of what is going to have to slip to deal with this fire that just started; so we use it as general guidelines but we do amendment as the needs arise.

MR. BEAL: ASMFC does essentially the exact same thing. We've got our five-year strategic plan. We do annual action plans which set the priorities for the year and link that back to budget. How much can we do with the resources that we have, both budget of staff time and budget of dollars. As Tony said, things pop up and we have to deal with that; but the specifics of what is going to happen each year are in the action plan. The general ideas and direction of the commissioners in the five-year strategic plan.

DR. DUVAL: It seems like at least an annual review would be a good thing to gauge progress.

MR. DiLERNIA: Let me add that I admire you for doing this vision planning. I mentioned earlier in my last comment that I wasn't part of the council when the council was doing its visioning; and quite frankly having witnessed to that time, I was happy I wasn't. It is a very laborious process as I am looking at all the different comments.

I like the idea of the way you've organized the comments regarding, well, we've had one person say this versus seven persons saying this and people say this. I think it is a very good way of organizing it; but it was at times purgatory going through that visioning process. But once you have that product, it is well worth it. Congratulations, I admire you and I wish you lots of luck in completing this project.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Tony; purgatory I think is a good phrase. Amber, what else for October?

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, my last question is are there any other things that you all need to help prepare you for October in terms of looking at – we heard from Ben about looking at the port meeting comments; we can do that. Is there any more information you need from the stakeholder input or from the documents or more information on specific topics or issues that you need for October?

MR. COX: Amber, could you give me an idea again of what the format will look like when it is simplified and it goes back out at the end of October. Will it be a spreadsheet; exactly what will that look like that will go back out to fishermen, any idea?

MS. VON HARTEN: No. Well, I was thinking back on the presentations that we gave during the comment station webinars. Like, for instance, on this one, it took the objective which was sub-regional differences and then it took key words from the strategies; so like Strategy 1 would be something about quota-based management systems. Strategy 2 would be about the design elements.

I'm thinking that it could just be like header-specific within the specific short-term actions that you all have prioritized. It will be something a little bit more clean, more of a readable document and not necessarily a spreadsheet. Would that help? We are open to suggestions. I have some filed away that I looked at a year and a half ago, some final blueprint type documents that I have formatting ideas for; so hopefully it will be more visually pleasing.

MR. COX: The only reason I ask is because maybe that is something that we can start working on between now and then to help you with it; some ideas.

DR. DUVAL: I think also if I remember correctly, the Mid-Atlantic Council's Strategic Plan is not a long document. The strategic plan itself, I think it has the same four focus areas that we do. That strategic plan is not a long document, but the implementation plan has the specifics in it of what the council is going to be addressing.

Think along those lines as well that the blueprint itself is sort of a set of guardrails for what the council plans to or would like to achieve over the next three to five years; and then your implementation plan has the specifics of what you would actually like to do on an annual time frame.

MR. BELL: The implementation plan becomes the actionable items that we're moving forward and in some order. We have a sense of priority and I guess understanding the public's sense of priority; they may think it is more important to move in one area first than we do, but at some point it would be good to get that from them.

Maybe that is the prioritization or how we ask them in the survey, because you can only do so much. Then we have to unfortunately come back to the realities of moving forward with amendments and the whole work schedule and then stick the priorities into the appropriate process and move. But that would be good to get from them a sense of what first, because it is about making things better, hopefully. If they have a sense of what is more important right now; it may be the same as ours.

DR. DUVAL: Definitely agreed, Mel.

MR. DiLERNIA: What Dr. Duval described is right. What happens is very often our strategic plan is a general document, but fishermen want to get down into the weeds right away. It becomes difficult; and sometimes we say be careful what you ask for because you just might get it. While the general idea is good, the fishermen want to get down into the weeds right away and you can't really do that unless you first have your general stated goal.

Then you begin to develop it. The implementation plan is a little bit different than the general guidance document; but fishermen have a problem ascertaining that. They want to know how is it going to affect me right away, right now, and you can't answer that question in the beginning.

DR. DUVAL: I think using a survey to help us figure out what we can do with the resources that we have, building on Ben's comment about SEDAR prioritization, what Bob said about use of your staff resources and fiscal resources; that might be a useful way for us to sort of dot the eye and cross the tee on priorities.

MR. BELL: Tony is so right; part of our challenge will be managing expectations; because they are so used to when we deliberate on things, the next thing, you know, boom, it is in a plan, and away we go; but that is not what this is. I think there is some thinking on their part that that is what we're doing is sort of like everything else we do; but this is different.

We do need to be careful that we explain the process associated with this, and it is a little different from what they normally see us doing, but we just need to be careful to manage the expectation so we don't get a lot of blow-back from that. That will be challenging.

MS. VON HARTEN: Maybe that is what we need to do some more outreach on, explaining exactly how this is going to be used. Ideas for that would be helpful for October as well.

DR. DUVAL: I guess one of the things that Jack and Anna and I had talked about was in advance of the October meeting was to look at specifically for North Carolina all the comments that we got in from North Carolina, look at the matrices that Amber has put together and be prepared at least based on the public input that we received in North Carolina to speak about priorities that it looks like the public is most interested in for the October meeting.

I guess I would just encourage other folks from the other states to look at the input that was received from your stakeholders so that we can all speak with confidence I guess in regards to establishing those priorities when we get to the October Workshop. Is there anything else for October, Amber?

Okay, anything else that anyone would like to bring up or discuss with regards to next steps on visioning? I think we all have a little bit of homework to do and be thinking about where some of these new ideas might be incorporated in terms of at the objective or strategy level. If they are already included perhaps in the draft blueprint, but maybe these are more specific than we've received; be thinking about how we can better inform the public about how this draft blueprint would be used; and as Mel said, managing expectations for what the council will be able to do moving forward in regards to some of the left-field types of things that Tony referenced as well.

MS. VON HARTEN: And the survey.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and a survey and how we would implement that online. Yes, talking about the council member survey; please don't forget to take that survey; you've got a week to do it. Well, if there are no other comments, then, Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor back to you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 o'clock a.m., September 14, 2015.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 2015

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

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

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
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

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

ERIKA BURGESS
MARICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JACK MCGOVERN
TONY DELERINIA
BONNIE PONWETH
ROY WILLIAMS

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

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

✓ 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

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

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

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

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

✓ Jack Cox
2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.com

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

✓ LTJG Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
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

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@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

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



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
September 2015 Council Meeting
Hilton Head Island, SC**

Date: Monday, September 14, 2015

COUNCIL VISIONING WORKSHOP

PLEASE SIGN IN -

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown above.

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
Sean Meehan	<input type="checkbox"/> On File Sean.meehan@noaa.gov	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Gretchen Marhi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Leda Dunmire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Lora clark	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Jennifer Shirk	<input type="checkbox"/> On File JLS223@cornell.edu	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Researcher</i> <i>Describe</i>
Susan Shipman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Consultant</i> <i>Describe</i>

MONDAY SEPT 14, 2015

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Bademan	Martha	mlbademan@gmail.com
Bademan	Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Bresnen	Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Grubich	Justin	jgrubich@pewtrusts.org
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Herndon	Andrew	Andrew.Herndon@noaa.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Kilgour	Morgan	morgan.kilgour@gulfcouncil.org
L	I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Swatzel	Tom	tom@swatzel.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Waters	James	jwaters8@gmail.com
dilernia	Anthony	adilernia@kbcc.cuny.edu
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
Brooker	Jon Paul (J.P.)	jbrooker@oceanconservancy.org
Martin	Gretchen	gbmartin71@gmail.com
Schalit	David	dschalit@gmail.com

615104
1408
PA
DW