

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Webinar

August 7, 2020

Committee Members

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Chris Conklin

Mel Bell, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
Steve Poland

Council Members

Anna Beckwith

Dr. Roy Crabtree

Staff Member

Julia Byrd
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand

Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Chevront
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Suzanna Thomas

Observers/Participants

Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern

Martha GUYAS
Monica Smith-Brunello

The Executive Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Friday, August 7, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am going to dive right in. This is a webinar of the South Atlantic Council Executive Committee. Let me remind folks who is on the committee. It's myself, Mel Bell, Carolyn Belcher, Chester Brewer, Chris Conklin, and Steve Poland.

Our meeting is set to go until noon today, and we have two main items that we want to get through, our council priorities work schedule and then starting some work on the executive order on promoting fisheries and what we might want to include, and we'll talk about that item again at the September meeting, when we need to finalize our letter. We will also do any other business that we have today.

Our first order of business is approval of this agenda. I am going to look for -- Once again, use the hand-raise feature or unmute yourself, if we're going to be making motions and seconding and all that, but does anybody, at this point in time, know of any other business that we need to discuss today? All right. Is there any objection to approval of this agenda? Hearing none, we will assume the agenda is approved.

What I'm thinking that we're going to do today is that we'll take at least one break, and we'll probably spend maybe about an hour on the priority work schedule and then move into the executive order on promoting fisheries, and so I'm just going to try to kind of keep us on track as we move through these items. John, do you have anything that you want to say before we get going here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, Jessica. That's a good plan, and, if you're ready, we'll jump into the work schedule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds great. I will turn it over to you and Brian.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Let me get my screen configured so that you can see the hands too. All right. Jessica, what we're going to do is Brian is going to kick us off talking about the first tab, June of 2020, which shows the priorities of where we left them, and it somewhat illustrates the challenge that we're dealing with right now, which is the impending workload in December and out months. Brian, if you want to begin to speak on this.

DR. CHEUVRONT: When we left the meeting in June, I updated the priorities spreadsheet based on everything that we had been left with at the end of the meeting, and we had gotten some new instructions from everybody, from things that were given from the different committees, that the council had voted on, and, as I put things together, we quickly came to realize that December of 2020 had a huge amount of things assigned to it, to start, at that meeting.

In fact, that column, which is Column G there, highlighted in yellow, had nine items that were supposed to start at that time, and you can see where we are there, that there was a bunch of different sorts of things, and some of them were things that we had already started in the past, like Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 31, which is recreational AMs, that the council had postponed from the past, as well as the unassessed species amendment, that the council said, well, we'll just start it in December of 2020, but then there were some new things that had come up that

hadn't been started at all, such as some recent assessments, like greater amberjack, the yellowtail assessment, which we'll talk about later, which is going to get moved down that way, and other things that were just sort of piling up to start at that time.

We quickly realized that was going to be pretty untenable, especially when you realize that the timeline for doing a lot of these kinds of amendments is going to put them all on the same track, having the same kinds of actions for a lot of these amendments, happening at the same meeting, on the same track, over the next four or five meetings, and that was going to create a real problem. It was a real workload problem.

As you can see, and I believe it was Jessica who asked us to give a little more detail on the kinds of actions that were going to happen at each meeting, and so, if you look below the list of the amendments that is up there, you can see, in the lower-right, starting in Column F, the key, there is the letters down there, and "D" is for data gathering and analysis, and "O" is for options paper, "S" is to send it out for scoping, "PH" is for public hearings, and "DOC" is for amendment writing and editing and reviewing, and "A" is final approval.

That gives you an idea of the kind of level of work that needs to be done by both council and SERO staff, as well as by the council themselves, to give you an idea, and so what happens is that you can see, in Column E, that those are the council staff that are having to work on it, and then who the council leads are, and, while the council leads are -- We're trying to limit the amount of the projects that any person is assigned to as a lead, but, as you can see, a lot of council staff work on a lot of amendments, due to the nature of the projects.

You also can see that a couple of the projects we have also have statutory deadlines associated with them, and some that, while they don't have statutory deadlines, they really are priorities of the council, and you've been working on them for quite a while. Red porgy, which is Snapper Grouper 50, has a statutory deadline, and the SBRM, which is the very bottom one, Row 18, has a statutory deadline of December 2021, but you've been working on Dolphin Wahoo 10 for a very long time, and that's a priority, just to finish that one up, I believe, based on what the council has been doing and working on.

You have all these things that you've been working on, and so we've been looking at this. The only thing that you're finishing right now that we can -- If we stick to the schedule, in September, you are scheduled to finish up Dolphin Wahoo 12, and I believe that that's definitely on schedule for you to finish in September, but then, if we stick to the schedule as it is now, we don't really have anything planned to finish up until June of 2021, but you have an awful lot of work, if you stick to this schedule, and you can see how it has just really grown.

It's more work than the staff can do, and it's probably more meeting time than the council is probably able to do, and so that's the dilemma that we were left with, too many projects and, really, not enough time to get it done, and the scheduling and timing of how they were going to get done, and so, John, is there anything else that you wanted to say about that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I think that's good. If there's no questions, we can move into the next steps. I am not seeing any hands yet, and so what I will go into is what we've tried to do to find a way out of this and to give the council a clear way of scheduling the projects and the workload,

and the first thing we did was to look at a way of evaluating the workload for the meeting, which also then translates back into the workload for the staff.

One thing I will note is the colors, and the orange and yellow are actually reversed in your briefing book version on this tab alone, and the orange is the one-hour, one-unit, full-unit discussion, or not one hour, but the full discussion units, and the yellow are what we have characterized as half.

Where this comes from is the prior guidance from the council about talking about six amendments within an individual meeting, and so we made the connection that, well, a council meeting that starts on Monday at noon and runs through Friday at noon, you have sort of general business on Monday, and you have Full Council on Friday, and that gives you three days during the week when you have time to talk about FMPs.

Each day is a morning and afternoon session, and so that works out into basically six council meeting discussion periods, and so that gave sort of a way to tie the six back to the actual meeting time and the workload and all that, and so then the next step is to say, well, your discussions on something, where you're deep into the options, and you've already had an options paper, and you're looking at actions and alternatives, that often takes more time than say the first look, maybe the reviewing an options paper and deciding which direction to go, or perhaps you're doing a final approval, where you've already discussed the options and are on a pretty good track.

We decided that breaking up the workload a little bit like this may give us a way to bring in some of these new projects a bit sooner than we would if we just applied a strict six FMP projects to talk about, and so that's kind of the gist of what comes into the next one, and the goal then for each council meeting, looking out into the future, was to try to keep the total of these orange and yellow at six, to manage the workload, and we have seen, over time, that bringing that much discussion to the council is really a full load for a meeting week, and it's a full load for the staff to prepare for that level of discussion, and so that work unit has kind of worked out for us over time, where we've been doing, I would say, for the last couple of years.

The next step we did was to consider what's the baseline to talk about solving that overload that starts in December, and we characterized this tab as the must-do, and so these are things that we felt like the council really feels it needs to do, and it needs to finish, and so, for example, we have the Dolphin Wahoo 10 and 12, and 12, as Brian mentioned, is nearly done, and so we certainly don't want to delay on that. Dolphin Wahoo 10, you have developed a lot of effort to, and you've been working on that for a long time, and the end is in sight, and so we felt like that was certainly a must-do, to keep that on track and not let that slip.

The next two then that came up were the red porgy, where we have a finding by the agency of insufficient progress toward rebuilding, and so we are now under a statutory deadline to revise that rebuilding plan within two years, but when did we received the letter? We received the letter at the end of the June council meeting, and so that's definitely a must-do, and that's why that's in there.

The other item is the SBRM, and so there is a deadline on that. However, and we'll talk more on this when we get the report from Sarah at the September council meeting, the plan now is that we would get a report on the SBRM status, how our bycatch reporting is performing, what we've required so far, and specific actions we may need to take in the future, and we're anticipating

getting that say early next year, and then that would push this timeline out a little bit, and we feel like we're okay with that timeline.

As I said, we'll talk about that more, and so this particular project, the SBRM, could be one that pushed into an amendment starting perhaps in June of 2021, and, of course, that's depending on us actually needing to take an amendment, and so this one will free us up a little space, I think, in our discussions today, but I just wanted to let you know that there had been some change in sort of our expectations of the timing of SBRM from the time we put this together until now.

The other item that we added on the must-do is red snapper, because we have worked very hard to get that assessment prioritized and to keep it on track, and so we felt like that council certainly wants to prioritize any actions to implement the changes that may come for that stock from that assessment, and we're anticipating getting that assessment early next year and potentially needing to take an emergency action request to get that to impact the fishery for 2021, in which case we would need to have an amendment underway so that we can get the amendment done and comply with those requirements and have it in place before the emergency action would expire, and so we prioritized that to start in June of 2021, is when we expect we would receive the assessment results, and so we felt that was a must-do.

Then the final item is the wreckfish ITQ modernization, which has been talked about for quite a while, and we need to bring that plan up to modern standards, and it's something that Brian has been very involved with over the years, and we want to get that on a good start before his retirement in December. I will pause there and see if there's any questions about the justifications and why these were chosen as the must-do, before we get into the next approach, which is how do we flesh out the remaining workload.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had a couple of questions. I think that the reason that you only have six items listed here is because, in the previous spreadsheet, we said, okay, we have kind of six units available for discussion, and that's why you chose kind of six big items here, right?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That was partially it, and it was partially because we didn't want to go so far as presuming exactly how the council may want to address the workload and this potential issue of the sums that you see say are three, and so, yes, we wanted to sort of pause here and make sure that you're on board with kind of the workload estimation, as well as not filling in all the blanks, and so, yes, this does give us a six -- If we went under the old rules and how we've kind of approached it in the past, this is probably where we would stop, and then, if you consider the orange versus the yellow in the discussion intensity, you see that we can potentially get a few more things started in December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that. I guess one of my concerns is just that there's a number of things that we're working on that aren't -- That we're talking about kind of outside of the amendment process, and one of them would be something like allocation, just kind of trying to figure out what we want to do, what data we want to see, how we want to look at this.

Then I feel like we've asked for a lot of different white papers, or we've identified particular discussions that we want to have, and it's just hard for me to get kind of a mental image of everything that we're doing, because I think that some of those items, whether it's allocation or whether it's a white paper, might be some significant discussions, and so, I mean, it's hard for me

to figure out how you would factor that in, because we can't see all of them, and there might be a white paper that I want to work on, but maybe that's not the same white paper that Spud wants to work on, and so it's just -- I am wondering if we should add more of the items that we are working on, just so we're all kind of in agreement that this is what we're bringing, and we're going to allow time slots for significant discussion on whatever the item is, and so I just want to throw that out there.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think you're exactly right. When we go to the next tab, there are some of those white papers down in the lower section, where there is projects that didn't make it up to this colorful table piece, and the allocation stuff, certainly in September, is one that was not in there, and so I think you make a very good point, and, as we use this type of approach going into the future, I think it would very much help us to make sure that we have things like white papers included in the workload and how they factor in, and so, yes, that's an improvement that I would like to make to this, and I think we need to recognize that as we say look at the full September workload and realize that we are spending a lot of discussion on a general allocation topic, and so we would really have a hard time squeezing as much other discussion into the September meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good point.

MR. BREWER: I am thinking along the same lines as you, Jessica, quite frankly, because, I mean, I'm looking at our six items here, and Dolphin Wahoo 12 will be over in, I would think, fifteen minutes at the September meeting, or at least I would hope so, and so it looks like we've gone from a situation where we're way overloaded to a situation where we may not have quite enough of a load, and I'm not sure how to go through the other items that are not on this particular screen, but I think we should take a quick look at them, to see if there are some other things that could rationally be added.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chester, that will be the next step, when we look at the assessment priority approach, and that brings in additional projects, based on addressing the assessments, and so we will get to that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess that one of my points was also that I feel like we are working on some other things, some of which, based on this color-coding, might be a two-hour discussion, or a three-hour discussion, and it's just not indicated on here, and so I agree with you, Chester, that it looks like we need to add some more stuff, but, if we actually wrote down some of the other things we're working on, maybe we are full, or maybe we're three-quarters full, for the week, or maybe there is ways that we can have more half-day webinars like this, to take care of some other items, so we can jam-pack things in during the council week, and I don't know.

MR. BELL: I am just kind of struggling with the same thing you guys were talking about, is that it's certainly heavily loaded, and then it almost looks like, okay, gee, you don't really have that much there to occupy a full weeklong meeting, but I think the important thing is to start with what you're going to have on there, is the priorities, and I would agree that those things on there are priorities and things we could hopefully make some serious progress on, or knock out, but then does it really fill an entire meeting, and that's where you need to draw from.

After you have established that this is what you definitely want to do, and you have the capacity and staff time to get you there, do you have some more things that you could add in, like you were

saying some of the working papers or different things, because, when you look at it, it almost looks like we don't have a full meeting, necessarily, but we might have a full load on staff to get to that point, and so it's sort of a balance.

Is there available time to get some other things in there that we do need to talk about, and will take some time, but, yes, it's just kind of that balance of let's start with the priorities, and, yes, those things that I'm looking at are definitely priorities, and so, yes, I think we just have to kind of work through what else can we put in there and not kill staff trying to do that each time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good point.

DR. CRABTREE: I wanted to just emphasize the issue with workload and staff, because I'm hearing from our staff that they are absolutely buried, and we just aren't going to be able to keep up with all of it. Our staff participates in the IPTs and things, but the other thing I wanted to point out is bear in mind that the Regional Office work doesn't end after you take final action and submit the document, and you would be amazed at how much time and work our staff has to put in to implement these rules and get things published in the Federal Register and respond to comments and all the other things.

Just because it looks like the council is done with a document, our staff probably has nine months more work to go before it's implemented, and so, at least on the Regional Office workload issue, there's a big time lag between what goes off of your radar screen, potentially, and when our workload ends.

The other thing is I really think we have an awful lot of work to do with dealing with allocations and the transition over to the FES survey, and that's going to take a lot of council time and discussion, and maybe not so much burden on staff, and I don't know, but it does seem, to me, that, with the things that we have that are required by the statute, like red porgy and other things, and then dealing with these transitions and allocation issues, that's enough to keep us busy for easily all of next year, it seems to me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Roy. Did you have something, Steve?

MR. POLAND: No, I wasn't going to add a whole lot more, because I agree with the points that you raised, Jessica, and the additional points that Mel raised, and I spent some time looking at the spreadsheet and kind of mulling over that very last tab, kind of down there at the bottom, where it's other amendments and activities, and, to your point, Jessica, as far as reflecting some of the other things that we've discussed, a few things pop out at me that is more broader council discussions, like the Section 102 workgroup that we're working on. Eventually, there will be some products that come out of that that will come to the council and that we'll need some time to discuss.

Then, also, the discussions that we've had with the other two Atlantic regional councils, as far as on the species moving northward, and we haven't really touched on that in a while, but I think that's something that we need to keep on our radar, especially as we move into some of these other FMPs, like the Mackerel FMP, and I know that will be a big topic of discussion for that, and so those are two things that I feel like we just -- We need to reflect it somewhere, and not necessarily

plug it on the workload, or timeline, yet, but at least have it there, so we're reminded that there are some dangling items out there for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree. Reflecting it somewhere, so that we all know that we've agreed that it's a discussion that we need to get in, in addition to these other items that we've said are our priorities I think is important. I have one more question before you go to the next tab, John. The red porgy item, I could have sworn, when we looked at it before, that it was only like three or four meetings, and now it looks like a lot of additional meetings, and that could be because we had to add in more meetings for allocation, and so it's not just about the rebuilding, but can you remind me why it's more?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, Jessica, and that is it. It's reflecting some upon the fact that we'll have to deal with allocations, and that always adds discussion, and, in the experiences of red grouper, that we recently went through this same scenario of inadequate progress and revising the rebuilding plan, and it took the entire two-year period to get that one from discussion to approval, and so we felt like that perhaps some of these amendments have been potentially overly optimistic, in terms of the amount of council meeting discussion that was necessary to get through the topics.

I think, if we reflect upon definitely Dolphin 10, and even, to an extent, Dolphin 12, things have tended to take a meeting or more longer than where they initially started, and so we felt like this was, as a starting point, an appropriate workload for red porgy. Now, looking forward, I would expect that, after we talk about the options in September 2020, run it by the SSC and the APs, that we may have a more refined plan for red porgy, and some of those out-year oranges may become yellow, or maybe we can skip a meeting somewhere along the way, if we're waiting on say some analysis or evaluation or what have you, and so this is kind of -- For red porgy, I would call that the worst-case scenario, and I would hope that we can lighten some of that workload on the council and the staff across that say December 2020 to December 2021 period.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: With that then, I will move into the next tab, and this does start to fill in some of the potential extra capacity that was mentioned in our previous discussion, and so, to walk through this, up here, above this green line on Row 10, that's the stuff that was listed in the previous tab as the must-do, and so we considered this the starting point for the consideration of what other things can we add into the system, to the council and staff workload, and I will note that the issue of allocations that we talked about for September of 2020 is not on here, and so we didn't add anything to the September 2021 topics.

Additionally, that's because we finalized the agenda this week and are working on the Federal Register notice, and so, while we may only have a three here, in terms of these topics, I assure you that the September council meeting is fully loaded. Remember that it's a webinar meeting, and we certainly learned in June that webinar discussions take a little longer than in-person discussions, and so don't worry. I think we'll have no trouble filling your time in September, and we do have extensive discussions planned, again, on the allocation topic, which will take time, and we have discussion dealing with appointments, the AP selection process, and so have events like that during the year which will occupy workload.

For example, if I look ahead to June of 2021, knowing that normally we would have SSC and AP selection in June, we may decide that we can't really handle a full six discussion units of FMP work without potentially making our meetings start at 9:00 on Monday and running until late Friday afternoon, and so those are the kind of things that we do need to factor into that, and I think, as the next step of this approach to planning, I would definitely like to include that kind of stuff in there, because it takes a lot of time.

With that said, and sort of establishing the baseline, that green line, what we decided to do, at the staff level, was to say, well, how do we decide, of all the projects that are left to be done, which ones do we prioritize, since we can't do them all, and so this brings in the assessment projects, based on the assessments we've just received and the assessments that we expect to receive within say the next six months.

We received king mackerel, and we received greater amberjack at our last meeting, and we expected receiving yellowtail snapper in September, but we're not going to receive that yet, because the SSCs were not able to complete all of that work, and they were not able to give us an ABC. The joint SSCs will have to meet again, and that will happen after our September meeting, and so yellowtail snapper would be -- Instead of saying there was an assessment report planned for here, in September, now the assessment report is planned for December 2020, and that pushes that out.

Then we looked ahead into some coming assessments, and we have the snowy grouper assessment and the golden tilefish assessment. Now, snowy grouper has been delayed by a month, because of some issues found in some datasets, and we just learned that yesterday. We got a notice from Clay on that, and so that's something we will have to talk about. What that means, in this scenario, is that this assessment report planned for December of 2020 will become a March 2021, probably, or it could become a June 2021, depending on the SSC discussion, and so, most likely, unless we want to have an extra SSC meeting, that would shift back to June of 2021.

Then golden tilefish is planned to go to the SSC in April of 2021 and come to the council in June of 2021, and I think that one is a priority, because we have been waiting on that assessment, and that assessment has a pretty big uncertainty buffer, and it's one we've been very interested in getting some new information on, and it's kind of challenging on the assessment front, and there's a lack of data on the fish, and so I think the council had prioritized that assessment a number of years ago, and I believe they would want to get that project done.

That said, the bottom line, give or take some of these assessment-related shifts, is we have a pretty full workload, if you prioritize for assessment stocks, running out through 2021. Now, that then brings up all of the other projects that have been mentioned, and so, if we roll down, and Steve talked about looking at all of these, and I agree that this really catches my attention as well, but we have a lot of things that have been talked about over the years that we just are struggling to fit into the schedule and fit into the existing capabilities and get the council to talk about it.

We set up this assessment approach as just one way of dealing with the workload issues and illustrating what is necessary just to get through the assessments that are coming at us, the new stock assessment information, the new ABCs, that we'll need to implement, and one other point about those too that makes our current situation particularly challenging is the discussion of allocations.

As you see in all of these assessments, this allocation factor is built in, and so, for example, we recently changed the ABC on blueline tilefish pretty quickly, and we've done framework adjustments and other things in the past to update ABC values, and, when that's all we're doing, is updating ABCs and ACLs, that can be done in just a couple of meetings without a lot of work.

However, with these assessments involving allocation issues, we anticipate that it's going to take more time to take those actions, to implement the ABCs and potentially changes in those allocations that will affect the ACLs. Any work the council does on a global level for our discussion of allocations that is coming up in September could greatly benefit our discussion on these assessments down the road, and so that may allow us to lighten the workload and perhaps shorten the schedule on some of these assessments, but I don't think we really know that until the council makes some more progress and can give us some more guidance on dealing with allocations and come up maybe with some options for dealing with allocations of these assessed species.

Like I said on the other page regarding red porgy, I would expect that, as time goes on and we learn a little bit more about what we're doing in each of these FMPs, we can refine this workplan and maybe see places where some window of opportunity opens up to bring in another project, or maybe to start a project sooner than we had otherwise planned, but the thought now, for us today, is to consider what the council -- Basically, what the committee feels about this proposal for starting with an assessment prioritization approach and then considering are there other projects that you might wish to swap in, as opposed to one of these assessments.

Some of these will depend, say on snowy grouper, on what the status is, and that's another one in a rebuilding plan. If it's not making progress, then we would be under another statutory deadline to deal with that, and the other one then, of course, as I mentioned, is the SBRM, which, as I said, is going to be pushed back a bit, and so that may give us an opportunity to perhaps consider the ABC control rule starting in the time that's now occupied by SBRM in the short-term future.

Then the final thing I will say about this is about the recreational amendments, and we have the accountability measures, and we have the permitting and reporting, and Steve mentioned the Section 102 joint working group, and we talked about all of those topics for the September meeting, and there was just no way to fit them into the time that we had for September, and so one of the plans that we are thinking of is to have a separate meeting, and Jessica kind of alluded to this, is have a separate council session where we focus in on these recreational topics.

That's something I think we will talk more about with the council leadership, and council members did say that was something they were interested in, when we were meeting in June, as a way to deal with the time of the webinar discussions and this workload, and so we do have kind of an idea developing to have recreational-issues-related council meeting in October, probably late October, to bring the council up-to-speed on these permitting and reporting and accountability measures and give a good report-out on that joint working group and to also talk about the future of MyFishCount, because that project is nearing its conclusion for the council stage, and it will then move over to the Angler Action Foundation and continue its life over there.

We want to make sure that we can have adequate time to report back to the council on what we've learned through MyFishCount and what the project has accomplished and where it's going from

here. It seems like the best way to do that will be kind of a recreational-topics-devoted meeting. With that, that's probably enough of me talking, and I know there's been a lot to digest, and so, Jessica, I think if you want to take it from here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. I thought that was a really good explanation of what this tab is showing us, and I still come back to that we have identified some discussions that we know are going to take some significant time, but they're not listed on here, and I would like to see those listed on here. Likewise, we talked about this, maybe that there's this separate little half-day meeting, where we get to some of these recreational topics, and I'm wondering if there's a way, in the future, that we could show that on here, and so maybe regular meeting weeks are one color, but then these half-day meetings are another color, or something like that.

One more thing that I feel like is going to throw a monkey-wrench in here is we're going to go to this discussion of the Presidential Executive Order and what items we think should go on our list, and then, ultimately, we need to prioritize those items, but the items that would require actual council work, I believe that we're supposed to have those items completed within a year, and so let me just give an example and kind of take it through the process.

Down below, you have the -- I believe you guys called it the CHAPC extension, and I would also call that the rock shrimp amendment, and so it's not just adding the additional new coral areas, but it's going back and looking at that little sliver of the one area for rock shrimp, and that's probably going to be something that ends up on our list of items that we want to work on for the Presidential Executive Order.

Well, right now, that item is what we call below the line, and it's not even listed on here, and so I just have some concerns that, one, we're not showing everything that staff is working on, and then it looks like we're going to, at least between now and December, probably have another little half-day meeting, and we would list out what we would want to cover at that half-day meeting, but then, also, this is going to get kind of blown up when we try to figure out what we want addressed with the Presidential EO, because that has timelines as well, and so that's just another nuance here, and I guess just also expressing -- I don't even know if I would call it frustration, but just so many things that we want to get to, or things that we bring up and we want to work on, and then they have to go kind of to the back burner, because we don't have time, and other things have statutory deadlines, and, like this Presidential EO, it also has a deadline, too.

It's just a lot of things for the council to work on within these meetings weeks, especially if we're going to use webinars, because it takes longer to get through the discussions, and so, yes, just I think that this is sparking a lot of different thoughts about how the council might want to run its business to tackle some of these items. It's kind of like the must-do, or the have-to-do, plus the we-want-to-do, and get them all done, considering what all needs to go to the SSC and when the SSC meets, et cetera, but I'm going to stop talking, and I'm going to go to Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Jessica. I was -- The executive order was kind of bothering me in the background, just because it does have a timeline on it, and implementation of whatever it is we come up with, and how would we do that, and would we have to -- It's kind of like when we did the visioning process.

We came up with these things, and at least that was confined to snapper grouper, but we found ourselves looking for kind of an amendment, or a conveyance of opportunity, to get some of those things implemented, and so, with the EO, would we be looking at having to engage in multiple amendments to execute those, or could that be done through some sort of omnibus amendment thing, but, anyway, that's going to take time, and, like you said, it wasn't really reflected there, but that's a deadline that's sort of hanging over our heads right now, and we're not really sure how that would be executed.

The other thing that I was going to mention is that, in this strange world we're in right now, we seem to be becoming a little more comfortable with virtual meetings and things, and so, to some degree, if we can pull off some additional half-day events, or whatever is needed, to kind of touch on some of these things that we were talking about that need to be discussed, that's great, but we still come back to the -- Even though we can sort of stretch the meeting time that way, there is still -- Whether it's our staff or Roy's staff or us, there is still the physical realities of time that we're challenged with as well, because we're not stretching real time, but we're just kind of finding additional ways to have meetings that are necessary to discuss this stuff, but I think the -- We'll know better, I guess, after we have some discussion on the EO, but that's been bothering me.

Depending on what comes out of that, it could be an awful lot of work, and an awful lot of -- In several different areas, and how do we execute that, and then, bam, all of a sudden, the workload blows up, and so thanks for bringing that up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel.

MR. POLAND: I just wanted to see if somebody could refresh my memory on when exactly is that implementation deadline around the executive order, and is it after our -- Does the clock start once we submit our letter, or was there a drop-dead date in the EO, and, if there is, can we just go ahead and put a hard line in the table somewhere that just references that deadline?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Steve, there is two deadlines. By November 2, we need to have our list submitted of our priority things, and so it's the things we intend to do, as well as the things we are asking NMFS to do, and then the other deadline is that our list needs to include an initiation plan, and so essentially timing, so that we start the items within a year of when the order was issued.

We need to have -- Essentially, what the memo from Chris said, which was Attachment 2b, is including proposals for initiating each recommended action within one year of the order, and so that's May of 2021, and so, if we have an amendment that include under this, and so we have the king mackerel amendment here, which is Line 15, that we see as -- In that amendment, we consider how to more fully utilize the available ABC and ACL for king mackerel, and that would be an executive order topic.

As long as we're planning to start that by May of 2021, then we would be in full compliance, in a strict reading of the order as it was issued, and so a lot of the topics in the next topic, a lot of the items that are council-oriented and tied to these FMPs, are linked back to these timelines, and I think we do need to make sure that anything that we put on there that we're going to do that we can conceivably get it started in time.

Some of these topics, I think like some of the area-based stuff, we have already started to talk about, and so we may be okay on those, but we just need to have some reasonable timeline for getting them in, and so, yes, it is a little bit better. We have to get started, but we don't have to be completed, and it's by May of 2021.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. I guess what would you like from us? Well, before I go into that, trying to wrap that up, let me go back to Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you for that, John. That makes me feel a little bit better, that we've got a little bit more control over our destiny, as far as getting that completed, and it was making me really nervous when we were talking about an implementation deadline, but, if it's just we need to start work by X date, I think I feel a little bit better about working that in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. John, what would you like from us for today? It seems like we've given you guys some direction to add in other things that we know are going to happen at other meetings that might be some significant discussion, whether it's allocations, Presidential EO, and, every June, we usually do AP selection, and we could add that to this list, and what else are you wanting from us today on this list, because I'm afraid to pick some specific items from below the list, from the bottom of this tab, just because, depending on what we decide with the executive order, that might throw a monkey-wrench in that, and so, if we spend a lot of time bringing stuff up from the bottom to the top here, I'm afraid that that is going to get changed.

We also talked about, to this table, adding in if we know that there is going to be a half-day meeting and to indicate that here on our timeline, and so, for example, I believe you set a goal of October for this half-day recreational-topic webinar, so that, maybe in the future, we can add that in here, so that it indicates that we are getting to some of these discussions that were below the line and that we wanted to work on. What else do you need from us right this minute, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica, for that summary, and I would say there's three questions. One is we discussed SBRM getting shifted out, and so what would the council like to put in there? I think I've heard the Oculina thing as a possibility, and then the second question would be do you agree with the section here, Rows 15 to 19, between the blue and the peach, and do you agree with the approach of prioritizing action on the stock assessments, and then the third question would be does the group support the idea of having a separate recreational topics meeting, because that will affect what we do with the items below.

I think, if we talk about those, that should give us a plan say through December, and maybe March, that we think is sustainable, and that gives us time to learn more about the upcoming projects and go into more detail and take this to the next step, and so maybe start with SBRM, and what would we like to do in place of there, knowing that we have some extra capacity? What would you like to start talking about in December?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let me see if I can facilitate that. I was actually going to start at the bottom, to support recreational -- Is there support for having this extra meeting on recreational topics, and which topics, such as the joint council workgroup topics, et cetera, but so let me go to Chester and then Anna, and so we're on the third item. Do we want to have this separate half-day webinar on recreational topics?

MR. BREWER: To answer your question, yes, and then I've got some suggestions of stuff that I think that probably need some attention, and hopefully will not take up too much time, but it's pretty pressing certainly in Florida, but I will go ahead and say that, if you want me to, or I can wait.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Chester. Throw it out there.

MR. BREWER: Okay. I have been getting a number of calls from people that are really worried about what in the world is going on with dolphin, and I am hearing it from the Keys all the way up to -- Well, certainly up to my county, which is Palm Beach, that there is a dearth of the larger dolphin, and people are hitting peanuts, but they're not seeing the big dolphin.

The guys down in the Keys are really, really worked up over it, because, as everybody probably knows, Monroe County was shut down for the COVID, and they literally put a roadblock up at Key Largo and would not let people come to the Keys unless they lived there, and so the charter guys got hammered, because it's the out-of-state people driving down there that is their clientele.

Now that, in reality, dolphin are the only kind of pelagic-type fish that we have to fish for during this time of year, and they're not there, and one of the guys told me -- He said, listen, he said, people are not going to pay me to take them out to catch peanuts. They are going to want to catch the bigger fish, and they're not here, and I can't put them on them, and so something is going on. I have heard a lot of different theories about what may be going on, but -- I have talked with John Hadley about this already, but I would really like to know if we could get some information on what is affecting, currently, and, actually, for the past couple of years, the dolphin fishery, and that might be something that we want to slide up, is just to talk about like putting together a white paper or something like that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Chester.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, can I make a suggestion on that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chester, I think it might be good, considering dolphin is a big topic in the coming meeting in September, it might be good to try to work up a specific request for information of questions to be answered, and then we could get that to the Science Center and start looking into the data a bit deeper, to try to answer some of these questions, but it sounds like we're interested in looking at certainly catches, or what we have for availability of fish by size by area, and that may take some work to get done, but I think, if we had a good request to make of the Science Center, that the council could perhaps make as a motion in September, that would get that moving.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MS. BECKWITH: I would also support, obviously, the meeting on recreational issues, and, really quickly, to Chester's point, I've gotten a lot of the similar phone calls, and, in my discussion with those folks, of course, the perception is that pelagic longlining is the main issue causing this detrimental issue with dolphin in the Florida Keys, but, as we all know, we have some of those

topics already on the table, and we pulled them out of Amendment 10, some of those discussions we've had on our own pelagic longline boats versus the HMS pelagic longline boats and such, and so I think we've thought some of this through, and I think we have a method to move some of those discussions forward.

Yes, I would be happy to go through, as John suggested, some of the data, when available, but I also think that, based on some of the discussion with the guys that I've gotten phone calls from, some of what is going on with the dolphin is certainly occurring outside of our area of control and might be due to other countries interactions with dolphin, and, fundamentally, we may not have a ton of control over what's happening, but, yes, we've been getting quite a few phone calls on that topic. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna.

MR. POLAND: First off, I'm in support of having a broader dolphin discussion and definitely looking at the research that's out there and landings trends and all that, but I just wanted to jump back to the discussion question that you posed, as far as, yes, I'm in support of having a recreational-themed, or recreational-issues, webinar in the future.

As far as things that I would at least like to talk about, certainly recreational AMs and recreational reporting, and I know both of those amendments -- We talked about this in June, and both of those amendments haven't been looked at in a while, and, if the discussion is just to reintroduce, or just refamiliarize, everybody on the council with what's in those amendments and those actions and what the issues they're trying to address are, and, also, the Section 102 workgroup.

We do have another meeting scheduled before October, but it doesn't look like we'll have a product by that meeting, and it will probably be next year, at the earliest, before we have a product out of that, and so, I mean, certainly we can talk about some of the issues that the workgroup has identified and some potential solutions, but there's not going to be anything that comes out of that workgroup that we can take action on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve.

MR. BELL: I would support the concept of having a half-day, at least, type meeting that everybody so far has supported, and I would also mention, like with dolphin, that, yes, I've gotten some of those calls as well, and, as Anna said, the folks that I have talked to just sort of jump to the assumption that it's all to do with pelagic longliners, and so, when you get into the data, the landings data, I don't know that that necessarily supports that.

One thing that, and Anna mentioned this as well, is there could be things going on in terms of an international-type fishery, and dolphin, at least those who kind of make the big loop around the pond, there may be a lot of stuff going on related to other nations, and it's almost like maybe they should belong in highly migratory, and so there are other data that could be looked at as well as our own landings data, and as well as I would still think environmental data, water temperature and water temperature patterns, and those sorts of things might actually be a driver in this, in terms of their availability in areas where they have been traditionally available, as Chester mentioned, the Keys up to his backyard.

I can remember, years ago, discussing king mackerel and where have all the king mackerel gone, like at least off of our state and all, and, well, I think it had more to do with water temperatures and things, and we used to -- We had some discussions about that a while back, and so you could -- My point is you could spend an entire day just talking about dolphin, and so it's fine to incorporate that into our half-day effort, but it might be that you need a little more time with dolphin, to touch on some of these other things that Steve mentioned, and probably some of the things we do need to touch on, if we're just going to limit ourselves to half-a-day, but certainly dolphin is a high-focus area for folks, and I understand that, but the conversation about dolphin could, in itself, take a half-day, easy, I think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel.

MR. BREWER: Let me apologize, and I don't know what happened, but I got dropped, and so I missed Steve and Anna and what they had to say, but my thought, with regard to John's comment with regard to putting together a list of questions that we have, I think that's the proper approach.

The people that have talked to me are all convinced that it is longlining off of North Carolina that is the problem, but, before we do anything about that, I would like to work on some -- I would like to have more information than these suspicions of guides and recreational fishermen, and so the idea of putting together a list of questions that we would like answered sounds like, to me, to be the right approach.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chester.

MR. POLAND: Just so I'm clear, and this is really in response to Mel's comments, I was under the impression that we would have this dolphin discussion separate of this recreational-focused webinar, because a lot of these issues -- I have also received some phone calls from fishermen down in the Keys, and I feel like a lot of these issues would be better discussed in September, during the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, to kind of have a general discussion and identify these questions, but I want to make sure I'm clear that we're not trying to combine these issues raised about dolphin with this recreational-focused webinar.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Steve, I had the same concern, and so let me try to sum up a little bit. I feel like we had support from the folks that spoke about having this recreational topics meeting, whether that's a half-day or a three-quarter-day or full-day, whatever it is, and I heard discussions about recreational AMs, the recreational reporting amendment, just like a refresher, because there's a lot of new council members that have gotten on since the last time we talked about that amendment, and then, also, if there are any discussions or updates from the Section 102 workgroup, and that's kind of the Modern Fish Act workgroup.

I agree that I did not see the dolphin as being anything related to this recreational topics meeting, and I think that they should be completely separate. There does seem to be support for this recreational topics, separate from a regular council meeting week. Like you, on dolphin, I would tend to lean towards putting that on a regular council meeting agenda, and I am not sure, and staff would have to tell us, whether we can submit a list of questions now and have that data ready for the September meeting, but, yes, I don't want to pair dolphin with all these other recreational topics in a separate meeting, but there's lots of hands up.

DR. COLLIER: I just wanted to mention that there was a lot of discussion on dolphin data and some information that you wanted for it, and I wanted to remind the council about the August 26 webinar that we're going to be having on dolphin migration patterns, and that might provide some background information that the council might be interested in, and so I think John Hadley has sent that out to the group, but, if not, then I will resend it to the council members.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chip.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, I just wanted to follow-up with you on the data question. I think you're right that, given the nature of dolphin data and the depth of the question, that it isn't the kind of thing that I would feel that we could submit to the Science Center at this point and get it for the briefing book, and so I know that John Hadley has been on the call too, and I think, if he and Chester and maybe Anna work together to come up with some specific questions, we could talk about them at the Dolphin Committee in September, and potentially that would give the Center enough time to get the information together by December.

We could talk about it again, and then I think the committee and the council could decide -- If a recreational working group works well together, or a separate meeting, maybe this is something that you do a separate dolphin meeting later on, but I think it will take more time. If we can get clear questions for the Center in September, we would be in pretty good shape.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that clarification, John.

MR. BELL: Chip brought up that other web meeting, and so that's great, and I think that would be a great thing for everyone to tune into, if you can, and I apologize, but I think I misunderstood Chester when we started the discussion on the meeting and Chester brought up dolphin, and I was assuming that he wanted to talk about dolphin at the meeting, but I might have misinterpreted that, but I totally agree that, as I said, dolphin -- That could be a whole separate meeting in itself, and the things that you did discuss, the recreational AMs and the data and all that stuff, that's what we need to focus on in this half-day effort, and so sorry about that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel.

MR. BREWER: I just wanted to clarify that, when I brought that up, I was thinking in terms of moving that issue into the council agenda for the September meeting, and I had no thought that we would be including that issue, the dolphin issues, in the meeting for the recreational folks, and that's me just not making good sense, because I think back to the closure in 2015, and it wasn't the recreational people that got hammered with that.

It was the commercial guys who got shut down in June, and so the issue that is there is across both recreational and commercial, and so I think it should be in a full council meeting, and, again, I agree with John, and I guess I will volunteer to work with John Hadley and with Anna to put together some proposed questions that could be put to the Science Center and have that discussion at the September council meeting. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chester.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to mention the August 26 meeting, and sort of my vision for this discussion would be allowing everyone to listen in to the August 26 meeting and get the update on the newest data, and I don't mind having a bit of a discussion in September about some questions to put forward and some data requests, but I'm not sure I want to make that a full topic, because Amendment 10 takes us so long to get through, and, because I sort of see this bringing up some of the same discussions that we've already had and talking about trying to bring some equity between our council boats and the HMS pelagic longlines and the concerns from the fishermen --

As Chester mentioned, the perception is that it's this pelagic longline fishery that is creating the problem, and I think that is a philosophical debate that's going to go round-and-round, and I'm not sure that that's kind of the best use of our time for this September meeting, where we really need to finish hashing out and get -- Since we're on a webinar, and we all know how that sort of has a bit of challenges, I really want the group to kind of focus and finish the bulk of the work for Amendment 10, so we can continue to move that forward.

We need to get this out to public hearings, and there's just a lot of effort that needs to go on this, and dolphin is -- You know, we've had these perception issues for so long, and this localized depletion debate that the council has had many, many times is not a new issue.

The commercial guys have not caught their quota, and the recreational folks have caught a fair bit of fish, and so I think it's going to be a much deeper debate, and I'm not sure that I want to take the September council meeting to really get into those discussions, because I feel like we've touched on some of them, but I'm okay with taking a bit of time to talk through what we learned from the August 26 meeting and maybe collecting a couple of questions at that point, but not having any debate on those questions at the September meeting, and that's just my take on it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm going to try to go to these other two questions that John asked us to address here and try to wrap this discussion up, because I feel like we're spending a lot of time on priorities, and we still need to get moving on this Presidential EO, and we need to take a break here.

I am going to go back to the question about the SBRM amendment, and I think that we can push that back. It sounds like the timeline is not what we thought it was, and I'm not quite sure what to put in its place, and I'm wondering if we have that discussion after we have the discussion about the Presidential EO and see if we can put something that we had started a little bit, or was on our list here, and see if we can bring something into the list. I am going to throw that out there. John, I don't know if you have thoughts on that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that's a good thought. I think two likely ones would be the CHAPC extension or the ABC control rule, and I think waiting until we figure out the executive order situation might be helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Then I know you're looking for some agreement on the priorities, and so it seems like we're in agreement that the -- You highlighted some items down below to go to a separate recreational webinar, and so that's, I guess, a priority, and it's going to get a separate either half-day or three-quarter-day webinar meeting.

Then, on the topics on the top of this list, I think that we're saying SBRM is going to move back some, and we will replace that, likely, with something from this Presidential EO, and you gave two examples of something that could move in there. I guess my question is, this thing that we would pick that would go in its place, does that need to be picked today, at this particular meeting, so that it comes in September, or actually it's okay that we might tentatively pick something or have a couple of items and then the council could discuss it at the September meeting, and it would come back in December?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the latter is fine. We could identify say two topics that this group thinks would be appropriate, and then we could finalize that when we look at this in September.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Another option that, if you were able to choose something now that you wanted to move forward with in that slot, a suggestion that I might make for September is that both of those two amendments that John had suggested that you consider I think were both really good suggestions, because I was thinking the same thing, before John had mentioned it, and I was glad that he had suggested those two, but what could happen in September is you know that both of those amendments had their start quite a while ago, and the council has not worked on them at all, and, just like you have suggested for the recreational meeting in October for the recreational AMs and the recreational permitting and reporting amendments, you wanted a refamiliarization at that meeting.

Whatever you choose to go in the place of SBRM, I don't think it would be that difficult, at this point, if you were able to give the council staff some direction. In September, you might be able to save a meeting, if all you had requested was can you give us a refamiliarization of where we stand with that amendment in September, not necessarily planned to do a lot of work, but give you all a little bit of a jump start and say this is kind of where we are, and then maybe you can give some direction to staff on where you want them to go for December, so you're not losing a meeting's worth of work waiting to get refamiliarized on where that amendment is. I mean, it's up to you to decide what you want to do, but this might save you some work time, and so I'm just going to throw that out there as a possibility.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that, and I think that's a great idea. Brian, do you think that it would be possible to get the refamiliarization on both the Coral 10 Amendment and the ABC control rule?

DR. CHEUVRONT: My direction to staff on both of those would probably be to go back to look at the last time they were presented to the council, and so that just takes a little research, to go back and figure out where that was, and then figure out what was done up to that point, and we have that in the active amendments document, to some point, but they would need to flesh that out, and so it's not like there's a whole lot of work that would need to be done, but it's just a matter of, okay, refamiliarize yourself, and then maybe put together a PowerPoint or something and just say to the council that this is what's been done to date, and this is what we know. We'll just say this is where we are in the process, and this is where things stand.

I don't really imagine it's going to be a huge amount of work for anybody who is going to do it. I mean, we're looking at Roger is going to be doing the coral one, and I'm looking at Mike Schmidtke coming on and doing the ABC control rule, which is the kind of a thing that he could probably do, and I don't see that that would be a problem, for him to get up to speed on that

anyway, and I was going to have him -- He starts working for us next Monday, and so I could put him on that, to get up to speed on that, and he could certainly pull that together, and I don't imagine that being too difficult for either of them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great, Brian. I like both of those ideas, just to familiarize where we were and where we left off last with both of those items and what all was included in there, and do we still want to move forward with everything that's in both of those, and so I think that's a great idea, and I really appreciate you offering that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Now my last question to you is where do you want these to appear in the agenda? I guess we don't have a Habitat Committee meeting, and we don't have really a place for the ABC control rule, specifically.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I would have to look at -- Maybe they go under the Executive Committee, because we're trying to figure out what the next priority is, and so maybe that's a possibility, that they come there, but why don't you and me and John, and maybe Mel, work on this offline, to try to figure out where it goes, after this meeting?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and, just to make sure the expectations are the same on this, I am really not thinking -- With presentation and questions, I am not expecting more than a half-hour on each one of these amendments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm in the same mental space as you, and I was thinking the exact same thing.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we're all thinking the same. Okay. That's fine.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the Executive Committee is good, given the nature of the topics, and I was thinking sort of a half-hour total for the two, and I think we can squeeze that in, but we can see how the timing goes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds great.

MR. BELL: I think you ended up in a good spot, because all I was going to say was that, at this point, if we were thinking in terms of kind of a placeholder, and then have a discussion with staff and figure out how best to proceed, but what you guys just described sounded reasonable to me, and I think Executive would be -- I mean, this is where we're having this discussion, and it is about scheduling and stuff, and so that would be the logical place, to me, to have it, and so I think you ended up great.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Excellent. Thanks, Mel. John, do you think that we have everything we need right now on the priority list?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think so, as long as -- So we'll fill in the SBRM slot, Row 7, in September. Then, as long as everyone agrees that we need to prioritize for stock assessments as sort of the next step, then I feel like we have what we need to come into September with a good plan that will carry us through say September and December, and then, in December, we'll, of course, do our normal look back and look ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think that we, in theory, want to prioritize these stock assessments, but I would love to have that discussion again in September, once we see everything added to the list, once we see that we have these recreational items that we keep asking about, coming to that special separate meeting and all that, and I would love to revisit that discussion a little bit when we see this all cleaned up in September, if that's okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I think that will be perfect. We still do need the Full Council approval on this. What we would do for September is add in a column for October and the recreational topics meeting that we agreed to, and then we would just clean this up, to make sure we've got like this section here that I added in kind of that tannish color for the extra topics that we have, and we will carry those out to other meetings, as appropriate, to flesh out that workload, and then we can look at it, in a holistic view, again in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, John, and thank you, Brian. Let's go ahead and take a ten-minute break. When we come back, we're going to be working on our next item, which is the Presidential Executive Order.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: I assume that folks are coming back here on the webinar. As folks are coming back, we are going to move into our second item on the agenda, which is the executive order on promoting fisheries, and so there's a number of attachments on this particular item, Attachments 2a through 2c. I just want to direct you to those particular items, and I believe we're going to be primarily focusing on the Presidential EO initial working list of topics, and that is Item 2c. John, are you thinking that that's the item to focus on here? Do we need to go over some of the other attachments before we jump into this item?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think this is the place to start. I don't believe we have to, and we have provided that, so you can see the language of the order, if you're interested, and then the guidance that we got from the agency, in terms of our response, and we already discussed the two major timeline issues, and they're actually highlighted here, that we need by November 2, our list of prioritized recommendations, and then we need to initiate some plans, so that we're starting on these within one year.

NMFS has provided a spreadsheet that they would like these submitted upon. In it, it asks for things like what is your timeline and what CFR section, et cetera, and so what our intention is to do is to continue to work through this in this way, which I think is more effective for the council, and then, when we get to our submission, we would put the information into the spreadsheet that NMFS has submitted, and so that's not something that we're going to get into here with the council, and staff will take care of that side of on the backend.

I think there's a couple of things to talk about here on this, and so what we're hoping for is an initial discussion at this meeting of topics, and then we'll have further discussion in September, and, at that time, we want to finalize our topics and their priority, and so, today, the questions would be are there new topics to add, are there any topics here that you think we should drop, and can we generally characterize the priority? Can we say put them in high, medium, low categories, so at least we have some sense of what the priority would be, if you think a couple of things are

definitely tops, and then let's make them acknowledged as such here, and then that will help us refine the priorities in September for our final response.

My understanding is, based on what they have illustrated, what NMFS has illustrated to us, is they really want a Number 1, Number 2, Number 3, et cetera. I think we have this broken up into a couple of different sections, and we have the changes to the council regulations here first, and then we have some general items.

We have data items, and then we have NMFS potential policy change and regulatory items, and the underlying question here for us is what changes do we need to do to promote and optimize our fisheries, and so what can make our fisheries better, and so we focused in on things like stocks that are not harvesting their ACLs, and we also focused in on data topics, because, if you think of the Magnuson Act and the precautionary principle that it imposes, the requirement to establish buffers between allowable catches and ABCs and acceptable catch limits, ACLs, annual catch limits, the data uncertainty contributes to greater buffers, which then keeps our fisheries from potentially reaching their full potential, and so we feel like the data issues are, in our case at least, our council, very important.

New topics or anything you think is not appropriate, and then, if you have a sense of what priority you would establish or assign to each of these, even if it's just a matter of high, medium, or low, I think that will help us move the ball forward for our September discussion and final approval.

Jessica, one more thing. Jessica and I talked about some other topics, earlier this week, and so, down here below, I have added, for the version we're looking at, a few new topics, and I want to highlight them here, because they are not in the version that was in the briefing book, and so they are new, and they may head off some questions.

One was the issue of permit and tag fees, mostly distribution and establishment, and so we have discussed before that tag fees and permit fees can only offset the cost of the program, and the money goes to the Treasury, and so we can't use that information to say benefit the fisheries, as many states do, and so potentially consider action to revise that and allow fees to be used for the benefit of the fishery and the fishermen that pay them.

The other is the scenario planning, and the brief background on this is it's something that's being looked at in the Northeast, through the Northeast Regional Coordinating Council, which is similar to the SEDAR Steering Committee, with the New England and Mid-Atlantic, and now we've been brought into the fold too, thankfully, and it's a way of preparing for species distribution shifts, planning for different scenarios and how they could shift.

We'll have a report on this at the September meeting. What we're looking at here is potentially asking NMFS for some funding that would support our participation in this, and this is a new thing, and it's important to get all the councils working together, and we're all kind of strapped for funding, but, seeing as how this is something that is a coastwide issue, getting some support from NMFS on this could really help us.

Then the last item is just the timeliness of distributing disaster support money, and we've talked a lot about how long it takes for states to get the money to their fishermen after hurricanes, and we've seen how long it's taken for money from CARES to make its way into the fishing industry,

despite other industries apparently getting their funds months ago, and so a request that NMFS improve this process and get efficient methods of getting money out. We can go through these from the top, but I wanted to put these on the table, in case people do think of these items, just to let you know that we have a few extra things at the bottom. With that, I will go back up to the top, and that will wrap it up for me, for now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. My suggestion would be that we just work through this list and see what people think about these items. We don't have a ton of time left here, and let's start moving through these items, and so the first one on the list is golden crab. John, do you want to talk more about it, and then I can add?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I may, and it will be a good chance to say sort of how this is, and so we have a pretty short issue statement here of just what the problem is, the action, and the actions can be brief. As I said, this is all going into a spreadsheet, and so we don't have to get into a lot of detail. In the case of golden crab, we're not achieving the ACL, and there is some issues with the permit, and so the action would be to consider permits specified by area, and then the initiation plan -- In this case, we have considered it. If we could put in more detail, like we want to start it by a particular date, that would be good.

You will see some of these initiation plans are more detailed. They will mention like when a stock assessment is going to begin and when the council is going to talk about it. Brian probably knows more about this particular issue and the topic, if someone wanted to ask a bit more about what exactly it's about.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, so I could have sworn that, the last time that we talked about this, because this was one of the items that was in the Coral Amendment 10, is my recollection, and I could have sworn that the discussion was that NOAA said that this could be done using an exempted fishing permit, but maybe that's not really where we ended up. Brian, do you remember?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and, Jessica, I think I sent you an email a little while back about this, because the discussion was particularly with the Northern Zone, and that was the concern, that we wanted to expand the Northern Zone, the allowable fishing area, and it was not related to permits, per se, and the issue was, and I think I explained it in the email, was that the one fisherman in the Northern Zone right now is not interested, because of personal reasons, for not doing an exempted fishing permit, but he's aware of it, and so he may want to consider that for the future.

The issue, action, is consider permits by area, and they already -- That's not exactly correct, because, right now, permits are by area, and there is some ability to move permits, but they can only be moved, permits, into the Northern Zone. You can't move them out of the Northern Zone, and so, when the permits were issued -- The issue, really, I think it's two issues right now, and that is you've got permits that are not being used, and we don't know why, for sure, but I think part of it is the ageing out of some of the people who have permits, and so the question should be should the council consider what to do about permits in the golden crab fishery, because you've got only eleven permits that are held by about four or five people, because you have to have a separate permit for each zone, and there is three zones, and there are at least two people that I know of who I believe have at least one permit in each zone, and so two people are holding six of the eleven permits, I believe. I would have to check now, because it's been a while since I've looked at the permit holdings. There is issues with -- We don't know if the ACL is not being achieved because

the permits aren't being used or if there's a problem with the fishery, and so there needs to be some research into that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess one of my thoughts here is this sounds -- I mean, it sounds like it meets what the Presidential Executive Order was intended to achieve, but I don't know if it's ready or doable for us to start action on this in a year. I am not sure, and so I'm not sure if we would put it in the, yes, we want to consider this under this Presidential EO list, but what does the committee think about this?

MR. BELL: Just listening to Brian's explanation there, I mean, I was thinking this doesn't seem to be something that fits real well right now, and so maybe we just pass on this one, in terms of being able, like you said, to stick within the guidelines required of timing and everything, but it just sounded like there were so many variables in the -- It's a peculiar little fishery for us, I guess, and so I don't know that it fits that well, and that's what hit me, just listening to Brian.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I'm kind of in the same place.

MR. POLAND: I agree, and we need to spend some more time really diving into the issue and seeing what's going on with the permits and the landings, and I don't think it's appropriate to include it in the list at this time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Let's move on to king mackerel. We know that they're not harvesting their ACL, and we recently had a stock assessment. John, do you want to add anything here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think this one probably fits in well, and we know we're already working on it, and so we address the timing issue, and so the question here would be where does the council put this in terms of priorities?

MS. MCCAWLEY: My guess would be medium. What do others think? I like the fact that it's already underway.

MR. POLAND: If it's already underway, we can certainly keep it, but, yes, I would say medium, at best, because I really think the issue, or not necessarily the issue, of what's going on here with king mackerel is not necessarily a management issue, and it's more of a market issue, and there has always been plenty of ACL there, and I almost wonder if it's just the market can't bear it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had the same thoughts.

MR. BELL: I was kind of going with the sort of low-hanging fruit, because it's already got a -- It's underway, but, yes, king mackerel has always been a fishery that confuses me, because of the market complexities of it, and so, I mean, we can try to fix something, but I don't know that we really have control over the real stuff that's going on, which seems to be, a lot of times, just market driven, in the way the fishery is executed, with the markets in mind, and it's just always been a real complex one for me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Spanish mackerel.

MR. CARMICHAEL: With Spanish, we have two issues, essentially. We have the recreational catch below the ACL, and we've had the early closures in the commercial sector, and both of them could potentially be considered under mackerel, and, in a sense, it is underway. We do have the assessment planned, and we have talked about the commercial sector issues in the past, and we are waiting to get the assessment information before we act on this, and so I would characterize this as underway, and it's a priority question then as well.

DR. CRABTREE: One thing that bothers me about the way these are worded is the whole fact that catches are below the ACL, and they're supposed to be below the ACL. We're never supposed to exceed the ACL, and it's a limit. We're supposed to always be below it, and so it's not clear how that's a problem. We would have a problem if we were consistently going above the ACL, right? I think we need to frame it differently.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It should be framed as they are maybe significantly or greatly below the ACL.

DR. CRABTREE: Maybe, or I would frame it that they're not achieving the optimum yield.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is probably better language. I like that.

MR. POLAND: To Roy's point real quick, I agree with him. In my mind, that's how I've been kind of categorizing these, not necessarily as far as it being below the ACL, but, based off the President's Executive Order, it's we're looking for areas where optimum yield is not being achieved, but, as far as priority for Spanish mackerel, I mean, my preference is for high priority, but we talked about these two issues extensively at the last couple of Mackerel Committee meetings, and we have decided, as a council, to kind of hold off on initiating any amendments until we receive that assessment.

In I guess 2022 we're scheduled to receive those assessment results, and so I just -- Can we count this as something that's been initiated, even though we haven't really initiated a formal action yet, or is this just us simply stating on the record that we're waiting for the assessment and we will address these, and is that sufficient for our November letter back to Chris Oliver?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the fact that you started an amendment and then decided to put it on hold probably justifies that you began, commercially.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then, if we kept it in, maybe it's low, because we said to put it on the back-burner and wait until this assessment is over, but Monica has her hand up, and so does Roy, and so let me go to Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's just -- Maybe this "optimum yield" language is okay, and it made me think that -- I just wanted everybody to be reminded that there's not a separate optimum yield for the recreational catch, and so your -- You may have situations where your current commercial catch is doing just fine, and it's reaching its ACL, but, because of the recreational sector, you're not achieving optimum yield, and so, if I come up with a little fine-tuning there language, I will shoot it to you all, but just remember that optimum yield is for commercial and recreational, and it's for the entire fishery and not a separate one for either sector.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica.

DR. CRABTREE: My read of the executive order is it's about seafood production and food security. If I was just to come in and look at this, I would say, well, you are catching the commercial quotas, and you're not achieving the recreational ones. To increase seafood competitiveness and production, you need to reallocate all of these fisheries and shift more fish over to the commercial sector, and so that's kind of -- If you want to follow the executive order, I think that's what you're setting yourself up for, but I know that's going to turn into a long, drawn-out allocation battle, and it's going to get into this whole thing about what is OY and all of the rest of these issues that we've gone round-and-round about, but, if you just want to increase seafood production, clearly, if you reallocated, the commercial guys would probably catch all these fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just my opinion, before I go to Anna, is that I don't think that we should include allocation discussions as something on our list for the Presidential EO. I do agree that it would meet the definition, but it's just a complex problem for the council, and I really don't think putting allocation on there is just a really good example of this, but that's just my opinion.

DR. CRABTREE: I am not disagreeing with you, but it's just not clear how the recreational catch below the ACL has anything to do with the executive order, because the executive order is about seafood and producing seafood, I think, and, when I look at it, it seems to be geared towards seafood production, which I think of as commercial and not so much recreational.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then maybe we can get some clarification between now and the September council meeting about that, because I was a little unclear. Was it about seafood production on the commercial side, or is it also about getting seafood in the hands of just the American public, which could be through a restaurant or also through them taking their own boat out there and getting it, but let me --

DR. CRABTREE: I think some clarity on that would be good, but, again, restaurants buy from commercial fishermen and not recreational.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, but recreational guys can go out on their own boat and get fish, and so it was a little unclear to me.

MS. BECKWITH: I was also going to voice a bit of concern with the optimum yield. I mean, that is what we should be discussing, but, in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, we pulled out that action that was going to redefine optimum yield to take into consideration the different priorities between commercial catching and the fact that the recreational wants some abundance in the water, and we were going to have that discussion in a different amendment on a broader level across all of our fisheries, because we recognize that need to better define optimum yield to not just be the ABC, equal to the ABC. I do have a bit of concern that this, like Roy said, is sort of setting us up to say, hey, if the recreational isn't catching it, then the commercial guys can catch it, because our current definition of optimum yield is inadequate to recognize the different priorities.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that. I think that we probably need to seek some clarity about the order, between now and then, and, to me, after we get clarity, then we really need to fix the wording. I think that optimum yield might not be the best way to state it here, and I think we need

some clarity first though. I note the points, and I think they're great points, and I think we need to get some clarity before we finalize this at the next meeting.

MR. BELL: Roy made me think of this, and he's right. If you go back, and remember to the CCC meeting, a couple of them, that we were at, where they were sort of -- Sort of the genesis of this was they had been working on the strategic plan and all, but, when you go to the executive order itself, I mean, it says the purpose is America needs a vibrant and competitive seafood industry to create and sustain American jobs and put safe and healthy food on the American table and contribute to the American economy.

Now, the economy part, you could bring in other things as well, but it's basically -- Remember the issue they were showing us was that we're importing 85 percent of our seafood consumed in the United States, and that was sort of the problem statement in all of that, and that's why the executive order also includes aquaculture in Section 6, which is to try to bring up America's standing in the overall seafood production world, and so the executive order really is kind of -- Sure, we can seek additional guidance on it no problem, but I remember, from both CCC meetings and how this was rolled out, is it's kind of -- I think it's heavily weighted towards seafood production and getting America's share of the world seafood production up, one way or the other, and that was, remember, through basically maximizing our wild harvest and that aquaculture component.

Roy's comments just triggered, and I looked, and you can read the purpose itself, and that's what it says, and so that maybe does take you down that road of, well, if that's what you're trying to do, then, logically, maybe you should shift some of this over, and I am not -- That, of course, would create a bit of a firestorm, but I think Roy brought up a good point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so it sounds like we're leaning towards mostly commercial-type actions. I still don't think that allocation is the best way to go, as adding that to our list, and, yes, it's something that's underway, but I just have some concerns about that, and so I'm going to keep moving down our list, and these are good thoughts. It sounds like we're focusing a little bit more on the commercial side. Next on our list is --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, Jessica, do you want to remove the Spanish mackerel recreational issue? I mean, that's a pretty straightforward solution to a number of these issues here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I'm good with that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Then we'll go down to dolphin.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We have Amendment 10 underway. Do we think that this meets, and I'm not sure that it does, but do we think that this would be something that would fall under the Presidential EO? I don't really feel like Amendment 10 increases access for the commercial sector, and so I don't really know if it actually qualifies here. If we're focusing on commercial, I don't know that it does that. I think it maintains, but I don't think it increases.

MR. POLAND: I mean, since we took out all the longline actions at the last meeting, really, the only thing that's left in Amendment 10 that really directly affects the commercial sector is I think the action where we consider adding buoy gear, and everything else I think is more recreationally-focused, except increasing the ABC and the sector ACL, but that's an allocation discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Let's move on to gag.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This may be one that we want to remove as well, Jessica, because we kind of don't know what the situation will be, and it may turn out that it has a stock issue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with that, and so it would be on my list for removal, and I don't know if anybody else has any other comments here. The assessment is coming soon, and we have heard some concerns about that, and so it probably doesn't qualify. I would say the same thing about red porgy.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think I would agree.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Is black sea bass the same, that we're just not sure about what the stock status is?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think so. They were going blazes a few years ago and discarding, what, upwards of ten million fish a year, and it's really dropped off.

MR. POLAND: I was going to say that I agree with the removal of black sea bass, on the same grounds as gag. We're going to have the assessment back soon.

MR. BELL: What we're doing, and I think what we need to do, is just take some of these out, because they really are stock issues, and, of course, if the stock is better, it will be better for everybody, but, when you go back again to the document itself, in Section 2, I mean, the clear thing that we need to focus on is anything that we can identify.

It says to identify and remove unnecessary regulatory barriers, and so restricting American fishermen and aquaculture producers, and so it's basically the things we should really focus on are where we're removing barriers, and it's barriers that we as a council could remove, or we can suggest, again, if there's things that can be done by the agency, but that's what this is really about, is removing regulatory barriers, and, if you've got a stock issue, that's not a regulatory thing, and that's just a stock problem.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, and I would say the same thing about yellowtail, and John is typing it right now. The assessment is pending, and I don't necessarily know that there are barriers there, but let me go to Roy. He has his hand up.

DR. CRABTREE: I agree with you guys. I don't think most of these stock ones really fit very well. The one that does come to my mind, that we've talked about before, is the two-for-one provision on transfer of commercial snapper grouper permits.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's in the next -- If you will just stand by, that one is coming up, I believe. If not, we can add it. I think it's under another one for the actions impacting multiple stocks or fisheries, and we're just in the species section right now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Is the wreckfish ITQ a potential barrier?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess is the question is the modernization of this ITQ -- The fact that they're still using paper coupons and stuff, and the fact that we're looking to make some changes, is that reducing regulatory burdens?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe, based on what the fishermen have told us, when we have met them in the past, they would probably definitely say yes, that does, but, also, some of the other things that are being considered could add a little bit of burden to the fishermen, such as cost recovery and things like that, but we don't know how that's going to play out.

The other thing is that there is the allocation issue also for this fishery, and there is 5 percent of the ABC, or total ACL, that is allocated to the recreational fishery, and we don't really have a handle on how much fish are taken recreationally, and the commercial fishermen say that, if they had access to more fish, they would be able to catch more fish, but all those issues are going to be addressed in the modernization of the program, and so I definitely think that the modernization plan fits this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I like that. Be thinking about whether we want to give it high, medium, or low category, and it is underway.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just that I agree with Brian. I think getting them, at their request -- The fishermen really want the ability to trade in different kinds of denominations of allocation and all that sort of stuff, and they can't do that via the paper system, and so allowing them to do it electronically would really fit in well, I think, with this EO.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica. I would give this either a medium or a high priority. I mean, it's underway, and it's something that we've been talking about, and we agree that it fits here, and what are other folks' thoughts about medium or high? I don't see any hands up. John has typed high.

MR. CONKLIN: I would -- Let's go ahead and get this knocked out, and medium sounds great, or high, and I'm a shareholder, and we're living in the past with these paper tickets, and so I sure would like to see us move over to the electronic system.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chris. Let's leave it high for now, and we'll see how many high items we have at the end, or when we get to September, to see what all is doable. Species complexes, do you want to give a little background on this one, either for John or Brian?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will. This one gets a little more complicated, because we have the complexes, and, in some cases, we have closed the complexes, and we don't have a lot of information, and certainly closing a complex is an issue in some of these, and we have the ACL issue, where they're not using them all. One thought for a proposed action is removing some species from the management unit. If we have a complex which is closing because of a species where we know very little about it, and we just have an ABC that was set as landings, and we just cannot say anything about whether or not that reflects stock status in any way, and so we just close it to be conservative, essentially.

If we remove some of those species, you may not have complexes closing, and that would certainly remove some of the regulations from fishermen as well, as far as keeping track of each species and

what they are catching, and so I think, potentially, improving the management unit in a way, or refining the management unit, does seem to fit in with this, in terms of removing some potential burdens and roadblocks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It just seems pretty complex, and we would really need to dig into this, and, after looking at the priorities, this wasn't even really on the radar for the priorities, and I guess I also have some concerns that removing things from a complex could cause a faster closure, just how the ACL is adjusted when something is removed from the complex, and so I'm wondering if this is just a little too much to tackle as part of this, but what does the committee think?

MR. BELL: I guess you could certainly argue that, the way that's set up, it's a barrier to folks, at times, but it isn't a simple fix, teasing stuff apart and all, and barrier or annoyance, and I'm not sure, but, gosh, I wouldn't even know where to begin in trying to fix it, but I can see where that does create a problem, but is that really -- Well, yes, I mean, it's created through a regulation, and so I guess it's a regulatory-based barrier, but I am not sure if it's that easy to deal with and straightforward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Right.

MR. BELL: In a timely manner, too.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I totally agree. Maybe this is just not something that we could really tackle as part of this process.

MR. POLAND: I would say just take it out, because it sounds like we need more discussion around the council table on this, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we are going to receive a white paper on the removal in September or December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's part of my discussion under the priorities, is I can't even remember what all the white papers are that we asked for or when we said they were coming back, without trying to go back to all the timing and tasks motions from all the committees, and so I have trouble keeping track of that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, I think it's okay to remove this, and I will say to remember that, just because we remove something from the executive order, it doesn't mean that we're not still looking at it or working on it. I think this one is perhaps a good example. The SSC has talked about recommending some species that be moved to ecosystem component, and that may be a good way to handle some of those, but how that fits with the EO seems to be the question, and so we don't address it here, but we are continuing to work on it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, and those are great points. As Roy mentioned, it is challenging to talk about species-specific things, and it might be a little bit easier to talk about some of these other types of actions, which is the second section here, and one of them that we've already talked a little bit about earlier, when we were talking about the priorities, is the Oculina one, and this is the rock shrimp area and evaluate the current closures. Remember that there was one area that we said that we would go back and look at. I think this falls under the order and fits in nicely, but let me go to Chester.

MR. BREWER: I think it fits in very nicely, and it would make some folks in Washington happy if we opened up some areas to fishing. This is something that we've been talking about, and I think we promised to do this years ago.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We did.

MR. BREWER: And it never got done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know.

MR. BREWER: I think that this is an absolute high priority. I mean, we promised we were going to do this, and, from what -- Even speaking as an avid recreational fisherman, the area that they want opened up doesn't have coral in it, and it's traditional fishing grounds, and they want to go out and get rock shrimp, and so this, to me, is a no-brainer, and it's a high priority.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. Let's move on to commercial permits. Here's the two-for-one. I also agree that this is something that we need to look into. I like it for this Presidential EO, and I think it's really helpful. I don't know if you want to add anything to this one, Roy, and I think it should be on the list. Do you have a priority in mind, or want to add anything else here, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: No, and I just think it's one that we should look at, and it's definitely a barrier, and I think it fits in with the executive order better than most of these things do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Roy, do you think it's high or medium or what?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, in terms of the things that fit in with the executive order, I think it's high, and it's the best one we've come up with yet, in my view.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. BELL: I would agree with Roy. I mean, it actually is a regulatory barrier to some, and it's very easily identifiable, and, also, I believe our AP, at one time, had requested that we consider removing it, or consider evaluating it and dealing with it, and I know that's one thing that I do hear from a young snapper grouper fisherman here in South Carolina, that it's definitely a barrier for him, and so, yes, I think it's a good one to have, and I don't have a problem with making it high.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, and, yes, the AP has discussed it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: In terms of commercial permits as well, I think you're going to get something from the Science Center fairly soon on commercial electronic logbook reporting, and I don't know whether you would call that, filling out the paper logbooks, a barrier or not a barrier, and I think the Gulf Council might be discussing it at their meeting later this month, but at least that's maybe something you could consider here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great point. John, do you want to add that to our list here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will, and I think, Chris, do you consider that a barrier, the current logbooks?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris has been talking about this.

MR. CONKLIN: The logbooks are a pain in the butt.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What I heard was, yes, include it, and it's high, is what I just heard.

MR. BELL: I think they use different language in the executive order, but that's the point, and I think, also, that's something that, in the past, Jack has talked about, and so it's definitely a barrier to folks, I think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Moving on our list, we're on the recreational AMs. Maybe this doesn't apply here, based on the earlier discussion.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think so.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What about the -- The next item on the list, the ABC control rule revisions, I think that this could go here, but what do you think?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think you could view -- The way it's been discussed and the need for revising it is that it's prescriptive, and it results in too much of a buffer and doesn't adequately take care of uncertainty, and so, I guess, in some cases, it may drive your buffer either way, and so it's not clear, and I think this, to me, is kind of on the fence, as to whether or not it really fits, and I don't think having it in this order or not is going to affect what we do with it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I say let's take it out, unless somebody else has a strong opinion about it, and I would get it out.

MR. BELL: Take it out, because it's not a focused commercial regulatory barrier. It's something larger scale, and it's the ABC, and it's not the commercial sector's piece of the ACL.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Here, we have the allocation issue, and so this is what Roy brought up earlier. While I do think that it gets at what is in the order, I'm just not sure how to capture this. I'm wondering if we put it on the list and we say that it's underway as part of our look at the allocations, and we're looking at it as the assessment comes out, and so maybe -- I'm wondering if we could just call it ongoing or something. Roy, what do you think here?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, while I think you could argue that it fits the executive order, at least if what you were thinking of is reallocating towards the commercial guys, I wouldn't put it in here, personally. I think you will regret putting it in here, and I think you have other things that are more straightforward. The allocation stuff is a can of worms, and it might in fact -- You don't know how this is going to come out, and so we have all kinds of guidelines and things telling us that we need to review allocations, and we're doing that, but I wouldn't pull it into this executive order.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that. I do agree it's can of worms, and, looking at the MRIP stuff, commercial allocation might stay the same, or decrease overall, in the future, depending on how you bring in MRIP, and so, yes, I do think it's a can of worms, and I would like to not put it on the list.

MR. BELL: I wouldn't put it on there, and I think Roy is right, and it could roll either way on you, and that wouldn't be what they were looking for.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that's easy enough, and so I guess, Jessica, we should probably see if anybody has any other ideas for multiple stocks, other than the few things that might come up under new topics that would probably fit here?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was wondering if there was something that we could put here about sharks, now that we've had more discussion, because sharks eating other species, like snapper grouper species and other things like that, but I just don't know what we would say about it, and maybe it goes under something that we would ask NOAA to do, and maybe we are asking NOAA to have some kind of a workshop or something to talk about this issue. I know HMS folks have been talking about it, and we've sent a letter to the HMS folks, but I just don't know what to do about this.

MR. POLAND: Would that be appropriate here or further on down the list, when we get into our opinions on potential policy changes and that kind of stuff? With all the discussions we've had with HMS and the Science Center and the Regional Office, it has really pointed more to the fact that we still have to manage sharks under the same conservation measures that we manage all of our fisheries, and so there's really no opportunity for removing from the water, and a lot of the sharks that people are having issues with are stocks that are considered overfished, and so I don't know what we can do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I mean, maybe it would go under something like actions requested of NOAA, like whether we're requesting other types of data collection or if we're requesting that NOAA, I don't know, bring stakeholders together, to have a discussion about it, but HMS has done that a little bit, and I don't know, and so maybe this isn't a good item, but there's lots of hands up, and so let me go to those hands.

MR. BELL: I was thinking the same thing as Steve, and it doesn't fit under what we're talking about, but it would fit more under our heading of data improvements and actions requested of NOAA Fisheries, and, of course, the problem is that HMS is abiding by the law, but the issue -- We hear the issue constantly, and people send me pictures and videos, and so it seems to be -- The perception from the fisheries is that something is going on with sharks, and there seems, perhaps, inadequate data to reflect this to HMS to help them in the assessments or whatever they're doing, but HMS, just like us, has got to go by the law, but what seems to be the real problem, and we can't fix it, is back to just what really is going on out there.

I mean, these fishermen are providing lots of documentation of heavy concentrations of sharks eating their gear and eating their fish and that sort of thing, and so, again, I guess, for us, that would just be perhaps a recommendation that we're hearing this, and it's a problem in a number of our fisheries, and anything NOAA can do about that, to improve the data and make sure they're working with the fishermen, maybe to see this stuff and use it, as appropriate. Now, that's about

all we can do, but HMS is up against the same laws we are, and they've got to abide by the law and do stock assessments and take the results, but I think it could be brought up in the context of perhaps improving data.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. BREWER: I may have forgotten a whole lot of stuff that I learned at ICCAT, but the HMS is found primarily by the actions of ICCAT, and the sharks that ICCAT is worried about are the pelagics and the porbeagles, and I don't know whether -- Anna, you can correct me on this, but I don't know whether the coastal large pelagics are managed by ICCAT. The sharks that really we're seeing a bad problem with are the sandbars and the bull sharks, and they're not really -- ICCAT is worried about the hammerheads and some other species that have been severely depleted, but they have been severely depleted because of the actions of certain nations and their desire for shark fins. I am thinking that we ask that NOAA explore methods of harvesting more of these sharks that are causing a problem, while keeping in place the protections for the sharks that really are in trouble. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: To me, I would put this under the Number 2 down here, data improvements and actions requested of NOAA, but let's go to Roy and then Carolyn.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know. To me, we should worry about the fisheries that we're responsible for managing, and so I guess I wouldn't even get into the whole shark issue. It seems to me that what's happening to sharks is populations have been rebuilt quite a bit over the last twenty years, and some people aren't happy with how many sharks there are, but I just don't know why we should even go there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

DR. BELCHER: I kind of feel similar. I mean, I'm kind of split, because I agree with Roy, but I also agree with Mel's view to move this elsewhere. It is difficult, because we don't manage them, and HMS does, and all we can do is provide comment to them and hope that they will act on those comments, but, to Chester's point, sandbar, they are not going to let us do more with sandbar, because that was the one that we actually pulled out and put into a research fishery, because it was depleted. Bull sharks, right now, does not have a stock assessment on it, and so I don't know how you're going to get more for either of those.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Carolyn.

MR. BELL: Roy is right that it's not our fishery, sharks, not our species, but our fisheries, our fishermen, are experiencing issues and whatever is going on with the populations of the various species, and it is a burden and a real economic loss to them, and I was thinking that more recently I have been getting pictures from my shrimpers, and having to replace nets, having to repair nets, and that sort of thing, and then there's other fisheries, of course, that are impacted as well.

Sure, sharks are not us, not ours, but our fisheries are experiencing issues, and I think, again, it's what we've been saying, and it kind of goes back to the data part and what can NOAA do to improve the understanding of what's going on out there, including maybe seeming to engage with the fishermen, and I don't want to be in the -- I am not thinking we're in the business of telling --

We're not telling another management group how to do their business, but we're just -- We're seeing, because they come to us, about every meeting and in between, and they're telling us about their issues, but it is a real impact on our fisheries, even though we don't manage those particular species.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me add more here, and those were some good points, and so we were told, at the CCC meeting, that our list can include the item that you see there at the bottom of the screen of data improvements and other types of actions that would be requested of NOAA Fisheries, and it could include NOAA policy changes, and it could also include things that we think need to be changed in Magnuson.

It's a little bit broader than just the, hey, how can we help get access to seafood and reduce burdens on domestic fishing. It's a little bit more than that. If we think about it more than that, then maybe it goes down into that next category, and then maybe we continue the discussion of sharks, and is it in or is it out, at the next meeting, and I'm not sure we're going to resolve this today, and so maybe we can run through some of these other items today, and we'll put sharks down into a different category and maybe figure out what we want to do with it next time, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that sounds reasonable, and we might need to think about this some more.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That's kind of a segue into our next category about the data improvements or actions requested of NOAA Fisheries, and so, John, I'm going to let you start with these two bullets under the general category here.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As Jessica mentioned, they said consider broadly if there are things that are preventing you from making the most of fisheries, and I think data is one area in our region where we struggle, and so one point we have noticed, and the council has commented on this many, many times, is not receiving the SAFE Reports, and so, really, the council does not know as much about many of its fisheries, particularly all of those that are not assessed, and certainly things that are assessed between assessments, and you don't know a whole lot other than the landings reports that we get from SERO. We don't know how discards are trending, and we don't know what's going on in the market, all the things of that nature.

We get very limited information from surveys as well, and we get what South Carolina DNR provides us in their MARMAP report, but, overall, we don't get a whole lot, and so one thought is that, if the council had more information, it could potentially be more aware of barriers, but it may be in a position to act on some of them, and so this is certainly an issue. Whether or not you consider it to fall under something for the executive order should probably be the point of discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What do folks think here?

DR. BELCHER: As past Chair of the SSC, where we had bangs our heads for eons about that, I support that we try and get the SAFE Reports up for our region.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. POLAND: I agree. I mean, I'm in support of doing anything we can to get more information to base management decisions on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let's give a priority, Carolyn and Steve. If we're going to include it, what kind of priority, or do we not have priority to these items that we're requesting of somebody else, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think they want a priority of everything, and so I think it's fine for us to add it. Maybe medium on this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Carolyn?

DR. BELCHER: I would argue for high, the only reason being this is something that they're supposed to be providing to us, and this isn't something that we're asking for. This is something that, technically, under Magnuson, they are bound to do it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. POLAND: I agree with Carolyn and all her reasons.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Very good.

MR. CONKLIN: So do I.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next one is increasing the data resources to support increased assessment productivity by the Science Center, and so we do know that assessments getting out of date can be an issue in the ability to take advantage to take advantage of bad year classes or appropriately control a fishery in the case of -- I mean, take advantage of good ones or control the fishery in the case of bad year classes. That can have costs down the road, as you have to pay the price to restore a stock. This was very much a big issue certainly within the Center, and we know they're trying to get to providing us the regular assessments, and even the interim analyses, so we will have timely and up-to-date assessment information.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What do people think about this one? Mel, you had your hand up a minute ago.

MR. BELL: I was just piling on with everybody else on the SAFE Reports.

MR. POLAND: I am in support of including this. I mean, anything we can do to increase the assessments, assessment productivity, and provide the Science Center whatever they need to keep up with the assessments, because these do tend to be kind of the roadblock for us in taking more actions on things, and I agree that this is a high priority.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I totally agree.

DR. CRABTREE: More resources are definitely needed, and, coming back to the SAFE Reports, that would really be something to bring up at a SEDAR Steering Committee, but I'm pretty sure, if you want SAFE Reports, you're going to have to give up assessments, because it's the same people doing all this stuff, and so that's been the thing about SAFE Reports over the years, is do you want to give up assessments in order to generate these things on, typically, less-important species, and we definitely need more resources.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. POLAND: I see here that it's specific to data resources, but these are just recommendations, and, I mean, I don't have a problem also including additional staff resources, because what we hear all the time is that everyone at the Science Center and the Regional Office is maxed out on workload, and so the only way to alleviate that is additional staff, either additional resources for staff or new staff, and so I don't see a problem including that in here.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's a good clarification, Steve. I was sort of implying data as referring to the overall Science Center's data program, which definitely includes their staff, but I think it's probably good to clarify that explicitly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. We have about fifteen minutes, and I think we can get through some of these other items on our list.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We can probably drop the recreational data issues, for the reasons discussed before.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can. Fishery-independent surveys.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The surveys was pretty similar to the issue above. I mean, surveys are fundamental to supporting assessments, but also providing you the information between assessments and supporting the idea of the interim stock assessments that would evaluate things like surveys, that they can give you a picture of what's going on in a stock, and so I think it's important to make sure that we have these, and our region seems to have suffered quite a bit, in terms of having adequate surveys for our species.

MR. POLAND: I like them, and I wish we had more of them, and we should definitely include this and rate it high, not only for increased assessment reliability, but also for other things that we've started to talk about in the Section 102 workgroup, as far as looking at other metrics, biological metrics and fishery metrics, for potentially managing fisheries, or just the recreational components of fisheries, and that's really what that Modernizing Fish Act is getting at, is trying to provide those tools that we can use at the state level, and sometimes at the interstate level, where we can consider things like that, and so I certainly -- I would put this at the top of the list of everything in this section, honestly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. BELL: I was -- The whole concept of surveys, or data, I mean, our whole world revolves around being able to have adequate data to make decisions in a timely manner, and, when we can't do things in a timely manner, or we can't make some decisions because we don't have the data,

that creates problems for the commercial fishery, and all fisheries, and, ultimately, what we're doing here is we're identifying things to the -- I mean, the Secretary of Commerce is asking us, but what all that boils down to is then, somehow, they would have to take this and say, oh, yeah, okay, we're going to reprioritize within NOAA, or somehow we're going to get them the more money they need to have the people to have the surveys and to acquire the data and all that.

It all goes back to money, but, I mean, it's fine to identify it, because it really is -- These things really are an underlying problem with the whole system, is that it requires this stuff, but, if we're not adequately supported to get what we need to make the decisions we need to make in a timely manner, it's just all for naught, and so I think it's worth identifying though, and it is a high priority, and we talk about it some form at every meeting, if you think about it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I feel like we definitely covered this one and said high, that we need this. The next category was NOAA policy changes, and so one of the items that we had talked about was do we need to look at National Standard 1 again, following the passage of the Modern Fish Act. If you were on the Section 102 workgroup, this definitely came up, and I believe we asked Russ Dunn if this was something that was going to get looked at again, and he said that it wasn't on the list to be looked at again, but it is a recreational issue, and do we want to include it or leave it off the list? Are there thoughts on this one?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Maybe we bring it up through the working group as something we would like to see done? Is that a more appropriate venue?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that, and I think that those other items we had listed above, about MRIP and other things, they could come up through the working group also, although recreational data reporting -- I don't know. I am just still torn about whether MRIP issues should go on this list or not, but I don't think we're going to figure that out today, but it's just something nagging me in the back of my mind, but Roy has his hand up, and so does Chester.

DR. CRABTREE: I think there are other avenues to ask for these things, and I don't think it fits in here.

MR. BREWER: I think it should be done through the joint working group, and, in addition to that, I hate to do this, but, with regard to policy changes, I am thinking that we might want to encourage, on behalf of our commercial fishermen, a level playing field, because, right now, they're getting beat to death by imports, and you read the numbers, and sometimes you see 85, and sometimes you see 90, and sometimes you see 95 percent of the saltwater fish consumed in the United States are imports.

Then another thought that I had is, since we're talking about revitalizing, or helping, the fisheries, is aquaculture and the suggestion maybe that NOAA think of ways to incentivize aquaculture, and these two are sort of related. I know that we've got, and Monica can probably help me, but I know that there's ongoing litigation with whether or not NMFS/the councils can regulate aquaculture, but it seems like a policy of attempting to financially incentivize aquaculture would be a very good thing to do. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Before we go -- I am going to go to Monica next, but, before we go to Monica, one thing that we could do here is I believe that part of this EO -- I have the whole

thing in front of me, and I was going to look at it a little bit more, but I believe that they were creating a seafood taskforce to look at some of those things that Chester mentioned, and so I wonder if one of the things that we add here is just encouraging or being supportive of that seafood taskforce, and so that's just one of my ideas.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just real quick, to Chester's point, and I was going to bring this up under Other Business anyway, and so this is perfect, but, on Monday of this week, we received an opinion from a three-judge panel in the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals that upheld the District Court opinion that the Fisheries Service didn't have authority under the Magnuson Act to regulate aquaculture.

Essentially, remember that the Gulf Council had an aquaculture FMP. Once we issued the final rule, a number of groups, environmental groups and commercial groups, sued the Fisheries Service, and that was back in 2016. Anyway, we lost in the District Court, and that judge said that we didn't have authority under the Magnuson Act to regulate aquaculture, and that was in September of 2018. At any rate, on Monday, August 3, the 5th Circuit said they agreed with that, and they added more language in there too, but I will send the appellate court opinion to you all, and, right now, NMFS and the DOJ haven't decided whether they are going to try to appeal further, and so, anyway, to Chester's point, I just wanted to bring this all up to you. I will forward the decision to Kelly and John, and they can send it out to everybody.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica.

MR. POLAND: I was going to comment on evaluating the National Standard, but, basically, we talked about in the workgroup meeting, and I think Russ had said that NOAA Fisheries would probably wait to see what the workgroup developed before they went back and kind of opened back up National Standard 1 guidance, and so I'm fine with removing that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

MR. BELL: Going back to Chris's letter to us, we're to provide input based on Section 4, and Section 4 of the EO is removing barriers to American fishing, and Section 6 is removing barriers to aquaculture permitting specifically, and, I mean, if you wanted to say nice things about aquaculture, yes, you could, but I don't know. I think just sticking to what's really in our wheelhouse related to what he's asking for Section 4, that we're fine. If you want to say something, great. If not, there is other folks dealing with aquaculture.

I know, right now, there's another meeting going on right now, and our Army Corps district is talking with us and other people about probably the Section 6 part of this, I think, or how we're going to deal with that on a local level, but I think, if you want to say something about aquaculture, we can, but I don't know that we need to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Then, along those lines, when we were at the CCC meeting, they told us that, even though the councils can't lobby, if they wanted to suggest some changes for the Magnuson Act that could help us complete our jobs, that we could do that, and so we have included a couple of things here on this list.

One of the things that FWC had advocated for in the past was consideration of removing the ACL for spiny lobster, because of the fact that the recruits are not necessarily in U.S. waters, and so this is one thing that, if we wanted to go this route of adding MSA changes, this could be one of them. Another one that could be considered would be removing ACL and AM requirements for data-limited species, if we wanted to go there, and so I guess part of my question is do we want to include items for Magnuson changes in our list, and so let's start there, if we want to include it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Seeing no objections, do we want to include these and consider them?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure, and, since we're running out of time, we could talk about them more in September, and so maybe the recommendation is further discussion in September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, we possibly could.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to say that I am in support of including these. I mean, it's not often we get asked for our input on policy changes, and so I certainly think we need to take this opportunity to consider if we want to put anything forward or not, but I'm fine with having a broader discussion in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think people need to come with other ideas. One place to start that you could look at would be that big CCC document about kind of how the councils feel about various policies, and so, if there was something in there that we felt strongly about, we could probably pull some previous direction and language from our regional position out of that document also, and so I think folks might need to think about this one a little bit more between now and the September meeting.

MR. BELL: I agree. Let's leave it in, and let's give it some more thought. To Steve's point, you don't get a chance very often to be asked to provide input, and so take advantage of it, maybe.

MR. BREWER: Given the information that Mel put forward on Section 6, I don't think that the aquaculture issue should be included in this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. We'll go back and fix that. Thanks for circling back to that. While John is typing, another item -- We have a few new topics here, down at the bottom, and so one of these items is about -- We have had this discussion before, a lot, about how permit fees or tag fees or other fees don't necessarily make their way back to the region, and they just go into the general fund, and so I'm wondering if we would like to include some language that we would recommend, really recommend, that some of these fees come back to our region.

DR. CRABTREE: That's fine, but this is a Magnuson Act issue and not a policy issue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. We could move it up into the Magnuson area, and I appreciate that clarification. Another thing that John mentioned earlier was this support for scenario planning to address species distribution shifts in the Atlantic, and this is the whole what we've been calling the species moving north, and we were trying to, as a council, kind of get out ahead of this and really be a leader in this area, and I feel like really the Mid-Atlantic has gotten out in front of this, and they are definitely ahead of us. I think this is just kind of requesting some additional support

for the councils along the Atlantic to do some additional scenario planning, like the Mid-Atlantic has done, and looking into this further. Any comments on that?

We're at the end of our time, and so I'm just going to try to wrap-up our discussion, and it's okay if you don't have comments on that, and we can talk about it more in September. Another item that we had on the list that I had brought up since the materials went out for this meeting is something that FWC has been talking about, and there's a bill out there that has to do with fishery disaster support and how that works and timelines and things of that nature.

If you listened to the hearing that was last week, there was some items that talked about where can we provide relief to fishermen, and this is something that FWC felt like this would really help, and it would help the timelines. Yes, we're dealing with the CARES Act right now, and that's moving faster than say hurricane funds, but we are still dispersing Hurricane Irma funds, and it's been three or four years after that, and so this is something that I would like to talk about in September also, if this is something we want to add to our list. Before we go to Other Business, Mel, did you want to say something else here on this?

MR. BELL: I would just support adding it to the list, because that is a frustrating thing, talking about it taking years and years, and so I've heard it a number of times.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can talk about it more in September. We've been working with the USDA on the lobster Chinese tariff, retaliatory tariff, issue, and their process is a lot different than the Commerce process, and so I think that it would be a good discussion.

DR. CRABTREE: In a lot of the cases where I've seen the longest delays in getting money out is because the disaster was declared and Congress took two or three years to appropriate the funds for it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, sometimes, and I would love for us to either have a general comment about this, or we could list out specifics, like you mentioned, of some places in the process where we think that maybe the timelines being shortened would ultimately help get the money in the hands of the fishermen, closer to the time of the disaster. Okay.

We've been through a lot of things on this Presidential EO, and this is not the last time that we'll talk about it, but this was just to give this committee time to dig into this issue and to think about it, and then, John, I believe, at the September meeting, these items will come back, at least the ones that we want to move forward, and I think you're going to start putting them into the high, medium, and low categories, and, ultimately, we need to give them a number ranking, before they are submitted, and so we would need to flesh any of these out and see if we need to add more, and then give them a number ranking, at the September meeting.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, that's exactly right.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else that we need to do today on this Presidential EO, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, and I think this has been a good discussion, and we have refined this list significantly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there any other business to come before the committee today? We covered one of Monica's items that she was going to cover in Other Business. Are there other things that we need to cover today? All right. I don't see any hands raised. Before we go back to John, I just wanted to thank everybody for tuning in today for this Executive Committee. I feel like we got a lot of good work done and had some good discussions outside of the regular council meeting week, and it sounds like we might be considering something like this for future topics, and I just want to say that I appreciate everybody and their good work today, and I think we're going to continue some of these discussions in September. John, I don't know if you want to add anything else.

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, and I think you wrapped it up. I think, yes, we will continue this in September, and we'll come back with the revision of the planning timeline, based on the pre-break discussions, and a revision of this, and we'll list things out based on our categorical priorities, and it will be up to the group to put actual numbers on these in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, everybody. Thank you to staff for all your work in putting this webinar together. Great work today, everybody, council members and council staff. Thank you so much. I hope everybody has a good day and a good weekend. Stay safe.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 7, 2020.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
September 10, 2020

SAFMC Executive Committee

Attendee Report:

Report Generated:

08/07/2020 01:20 PM EDT

Webinar ID

844-355-483

Actual Start Date/Time

08/07/2020 08:23 AM EDT

Last Name	First Name
BYRD	01JULIA
Bailey	Adam
Belcher	Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Brouwer	01Myra
Burgess	Erika
Carmichael	John
Chevront	01Brian
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Duval	Michelle
Errigo	Michael
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	John
Hart	Hannah
Helies	Frank
Hudson	Rusty
Iverson	Kim
McCawley	00-Jessica
McGovern	00Jack
Mehta	Nikhil
Pugliese	Roger
Ralston	Kellie
Rhodes	01Cameron
Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Spurgin	Kali
Sweetman	CJ
TRAVIS	MICHAEL
Wiegand	01Christina
beckwith	anna
brewer	chester
collier	01chip
crabtree	00Roy
poland	00steve

sandorf
thomas

scott
suz