

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

### **Webinar**

**June 10, 2020**

#### **Committee Members**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Chris Conklin

Mel Bell, Vice Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Steve Poland

#### **Council Members**

Robert Beal  
LT. Robert Copeland  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
LCDR Jeremy Montes  
David Whitaker

Anna Beckwith  
Dr. Kyle Christiansen  
Tim Griner  
Art Sapp  
Spud Woodward

#### **Council Staff**

Myra Brouwer  
John Carmichael  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
BeBe Harrison  
Allie Iberle  
Kelly Klasnick  
Roger Pugliese  
Suzanna Thomas

Julia Byrd  
Cindy Chaya  
Dr. Chip Collier  
John Hadley  
Kathleen Howington  
Kim Iverson  
Dr. Julie Neer  
Cameron Rhodes  
Christina Wiegand

#### **Observers/Participants**

Shep Grimes  
Monica Smit Brunello  
Martha Guyas  
Rick DeVactor  
Pat O'Shaughnessy

Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Clay Porch  
Dr. Genny Nessler  
Erika Burgess

Other observers and participants attached.

The Executive Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to move into the Executive Committee, and so the folks on this committee are myself, Mel Bel, Carolyn Belcher, Chester Brewer, Chris Conklin, and Steve Poland. The first order of business is to approve the agenda. Are there any modifications or changes to the agenda? Are there any objections to approval of the agenda? The agenda stands approved.

The next order of business is approval of the March 2020 committee minutes. Any changes or modifications to those minutes? Any objections to approval of the minutes? Those minutes stand approved. The next stop here is the council priorities work schedule, and I'm going to turn it over to Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thank you, Madam Chair. What I have been trying to do is to keep up with the suggestions and changes and things that have been going on this week, as well as the meeting from what you had said you wanted to do in March, which was pre-pandemic, what you wanted to do in June, and we were not able to do everything that you had wanted to do in June at this meeting, and so that affected some changes.

I tried to indicate some of that on here as well, and so what I did is you will see now there are some red boxes for June 2020, and that's Column F. Those were things that we had planned to do at this meeting, but, because we went to the webinar format, it was less amount of meeting time, and some things were -- It was just decided that we would push them off to a later meeting, the assumption being now that it would be to say that everything that got pushed back was going to be discussed in September anyway, and so what then I ended up doing was just adding an extra meeting at the end, assuming that was the way the council was going to want to handle it, and so I just put a red "X" in a box at the end, to show that's how this amendment would be extended because of not doing it in June, and so I just wanted to show you how the timing of these amendments would be shifted because of the way the schedule got changed because of the pandemic, and so I wanted to have a way of indicating that.

Madam Chair, if you will allow me, I think maybe the best way to do this would be to sort of go line-by-line and talk through each one of these, and I've got some additions in here from what you all have discussed this week, as well as maybe some other issues that may come up along the way, and so, if that's okay with you, can we just go ahead and do it that way?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and it sounds good. Can you remind what the yellow is on the table?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Sure. That is the meeting that the council is scheduled to approve the amendment in the future.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Got it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You will see March of 2020, which is Column E, and those -- You will see that there are three things there, and those are complete, and there are no boxes to the right of that, and those three things were completed in March of 2020, and so what I like to do is to show you

that this is what you completed at the last meeting, this is what you're working on at this meeting, and this is what we show for the future.

Now, also, to remember that the council had decided, in September of each year, that you were going to look at what you have on your active list and then work on your priorities for the upcoming year, and so, in September, you're going to need to plan for a little bit longer time with this spreadsheet, and we'll do the survey, like we have been doing in the past, but now I think you all have decided that once a year is probably enough to do that survey and get the priorities together and then shift, as necessary, throughout the year to accommodate any changes and unusual things that happen. We're going to start down by the rows. Row 2 is CMP Framework 9, and that was completed in March.

MS. WIEGAND: That one was postponed in March. It wasn't completed. It was postponed until the assessment.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's right, and I'm sorry. It was postponed. Then Dolphin Wahoo 10 was -- We're still on schedule for that, and we worked on it at this meeting, but then there were some things, if you look down now to Line 6, and we now have a Dolphin Wahoo 13 with a question-mark, because, in talking with John Hadley about it, we've talked about the possibility of that would be the number for it, and we're not quite sure, but that's the dolphin pelagic longline fishery amendment that you had talked about, and it was suggested that that might start next March, when this Dolphin Wahoo 10 is expected to be completed.

You had decided that you were going to take up recreational AMs again in December of this year, and you are scheduled to complete Dolphin Wahoo 12, the bullet and frigate ecosystem species designation, and you're going to finish that up at the next meeting, and shrimp transit provisions was completed, and we had the future allocations discussion in March. We were going to have a discussion of unassessed species ABCs and allocations and start that amendment at this meeting, but we decided not to start a new amendment like that at this meeting, and so that got pushed back, and presumably that will start in September, and that would be completed in June of 2021, but, of course, these can all change, depending on how things go.

You have talked about, this week, the greater amberjack assessment and management measures and allocation, where you're going to change the ABC and the ACL and all that, and then there was a discussion of red porgy, and red porgy, as I understood it, the way you have it, is you wanted to have that as two amendments, and one would be a framework amendment, I believe, to deal with the overfishing, and then another amendment to deal with the rebuilding schedule and the allocation issues, but was there some additional discussion that wanted to happen here? Was that the case, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It can happen here or it can happen when we get into Full Council and look at the motions regarding red porgy. I think, in the essence of time, it might be better to talk about it then, but I guess the core question is getting into the rebuilding and ABC amendment immediately, as opposed to the framework and making sure we're consistent with the Magnuson Act, mainly because this assessment includes the new MRIP information, and that does affect the outcomes of the allocations, and that makes this framework a little different than what we did recently for red grouper.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so, yes, we'll pick that up then later. Yellowtail, originally, we had thought the council was going to see the yellowtail assessment at this meeting, and the SSC did not see it in April, but I believe it was scheduled that our SSC was going to see it with the Gulf SSC in July, so it would be ready for the council to see the assessment in September, and am I still correct on that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's the current plan.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so that would then just get shifted by one meeting, but that wasn't really specifically due, I don't think, to the pandemic, but I am showing that that is being shifted. You're going to be getting -- The committee after this one is Mackerel Cobia, and you're going to be getting the results of the king mackerel assessment, and so the assumption is that you will probably have an amendment to deal with the changes as a result of the ABC recommendations from there.

The golden tilefish assessment, you will notice that it got shifted. The stock assessment got shifted, and it will be coming to the council in June of next year, and so I shifted any amendment that would come out of that to that time period. It's expected that the SSC will review the snowy grouper assessment in October, and so that will be coming to the council in December.

It was also -- The Snapper Grouper Committee recommended that the Regulatory Amendment 34, the North Carolina and South Carolina SMZ designation, move final approval to the September of this year, and so I just added that extra meeting on there, and both the Oculina extension and the wreckfish ITQ modernization -- Both of those were going to be considered at this meeting, but, for the sake of time, they got taken off the agenda for this meeting, and an extra meeting was added on to the time period at the end of each one of those.

That's kind of where we stand right now, and I didn't know if there was anything else, Madam Chair, that you all wanted to discuss or any other changes and things that you wanted to make or were aware of.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Brian. I had a couple of points that I wanted to throw out there, and so, the document that's the Oculina extension, that includes the golden crab item as well, correct?

DR. CHEUVRONT: No, and golden crab was removed from -- Remember, originally, it was the shrimp transit, golden crab, and Oculina, and the council, last fall, removed the golden crab from the Oculina, and it basically separated the three of them, and, because there was only one fisherman who was involved in the golden crab, there was discussion of trying to get -- Sorry, but the term has escaped me.

DR. COLLIER: Exempted fishing permit.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thank you. An exempted fishing permit for that one fisherman.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So what I was really driving at is this is the rock shrimp extension area, and is that right? The reason I was asking is because this is one of the items that I was going to bring up in the discussion in Full Council about one of the items that I think could fall under the

President's EO that we could possibly complete within a year, and we could add it to our list of items that we're working on, and so that was one point.

Another point I wanted to bring up is I want to make sure that the wreckfish ITQ modernization that we pushed off of this meeting is definitely going to come in September and December, because I think December is your last meeting, and you were the one that worked on this project, and I want to make sure that we have this well underway before your retirement date, and so I want to make sure that definitely comes to September.

Then one more thing that I wanted to throw out there is, in the joint workgroup, the Modern Fish Act Workgroup that's a Gulf and South Atlantic Council, we've just had one meeting so far, and Steve is the Chair of that group, and so he's going to give us an update on that, but one of the things we kept talking about in that group was the ABC control rule amendment, and it's below our line here, and so I just want to throw it out there that I'm wondering if that needs to come above the line.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Madam Chair, I'm just wondering -- Do you want to do that now, or do you want to wait until September, when you reorganize everything, because that's when you're going to be looking at everything in the full context.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think I would go ahead and move it above the line, especially since we have some things that were either finalized in March or postponed in March, and just think about when this ABC control rule item can come back. We also had some discussion at that joint committee about the recreational permit and reporting, and so I will throw that out there for committee and council discussion as well while you're making edits to this table.

MR. POLAND: I am glad you mentioned that, and I was going to raise that same point as well, and so not only the ABC control rule and the recreational reporting, but we also had some discussion that related to the recreational AMs, and I feel like -- I would prefer all three of these be above the line, but, you know, I certainly understand that that's a lot above that green line right now.

If I had to prioritize, I would definitely say the ABC control rule, because not only did we have discussions at the joint workgroup, but the SSC has also expressed some desire to rework that ABC control rule, and Genny touched on it a little bit on Monday when she was giving us the dolphin and wahoo ABC recommendations, a little bit of the concerns that the SSC has over ORCS, and so I really feel like it would be a good idea to keep that ABC control rule up there above that line.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Steve, what was the other one that you had mentioned?

MR. POLAND: Jessica and I both had mentioned the recreational permitting and reporting, and I had added the recreational AMs amendment, and it's already up there. We're not slated to talk about that again until December, and that's probably appropriate.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know Spud has been talking about the recreational permit and reporting amendment.

MR. GRINER: I was going to say the same thing. The recreational permit and reporting was our highest score of what we keep pushing off, and, with these allocation issues we've got coming, that really needs to be a high priority now, and I would also like to see this Dolphin Wahoo 13 question-mark -- It can go below the green line, and we've got bigger issues right now than that, and getting our hands on this recreational permitting and reporting and trying to get our arms around these allocation issues are going to be what's more important than that, as far as I'm concerned. That's been dragging on for a long time, and it's something that is very important.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. Those are both great ideas, and so that was moving the recreational permit and reporting, and so, if you wouldn't mind, Brian, while you're talking, if you wouldn't mind putting that above the line, and then I really like the idea of the dolphin pelagic longline stuff coming down below the green line there, but maybe Chester or Anna could comment on that as well, but, first, I'm going to go to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Madam Chair, I'm not on your committee, but thank you for calling on me, but Tim pretty much stole my thunder. I was just going to make my every-meeting plug for recreational permitting and reporting, and it sounds like we're moving it up, and so I do appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Spud.

MS. BECKWITH: I understand Tim's suggestion to move a potential Amendment 13 down below the line, but I will just have to speak to the fact that I'm gone in June, and so I will lose much opinion on this anyway, but this is a request that came from HMS many, many years ago, and it's been kicked down the road, because we were waiting for the new ABC, and we didn't want to work on this, and so this request has come from the HMS folks years ago, and so, if we put it below the line, what we're basically saying is that it's just not going to get done, and, if that is the will of the council, then so be it, but I would certainly speak against that, and I would like to at least see it started, and I think it's going to be a difficult discussion, and, if we can either bring fairness to council boats versus the HMS tri-pack guys or move forward with just not allowing pelagic longlines, but I think there just needs to be some resolution to this in the somewhat foreseeable future, given that this has been on the table for years.

MS. MCCAWLEY: 10-4. Thanks for those comments, Anna.

MR. BREWER: If I had my druthers, there would be no such thing as a directed longline fishery on dolphin, period, and so I would just as soon see this proposed 13 just go away.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. GRINER: I understand Anna's point that this has been kicked around for a long time and that it came from HMS, but, you know, back at that time, we didn't really understand the pulse of this fishery, as far as what boats we were talking about, and now we've seen that we're talking about four boats, and so I really can't see that it's that pressing of an issue, if we're talking about trying to bring four boats into parity with the tri-pack boats.

As we all saw in that table, this fishery is whittling down and whittling down, and it's dropping by 30 percent every three or four years, and so I really am not sure that the issue might not take care of itself, and I also would hope to think that everything below the green line can't be considered that it's never going to get done. I certainly hope that's not the case.

Someday I would love to see a commercial electronic logbook, and I feel like I'm in the stone ages here, but I really do think that, as we prioritize these things, what we've really got to focus on is getting our arms around this recreational fishery, so that we can get some stakeholder input and make some rational allocation decisions, and, like I said, the pelagic longline fishery is going to take care of itself. It's not a growing fishery, and, in fact, it is the commercial dolphin fishery, and so that's kind of how I feel about it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. I have a couple of points here for Brian, who is editing the table. The recreational permitting and reporting, which looks to be Row 19, could you make all those things blank, and so it wasn't scheduled to come to this meeting, and so I just wanted to throw that out there. Then, between Brian and maybe John, if we could put a tentative meeting, or what is our idea of when the recreational permit and reporting amendment could feasibly come back, or when the ABC control rule could come back, and so let's talk about the ABC control rule for a minute.

Steve mentioned that Genny had mentioned it earlier in the week, but doesn't that need to go back to the SSC first, for them to look at some additional things on that, and so then, if that's the case, then the soonest it could come is December of 2020, and I'm just trying to figure out if we need to see that again or it actually just maybe goes to the SSC next and then the council sees it, and I just can't remember what state it was in the last time we saw it, and then, the recreational permitting and reporting, I feel like there's lots of things that need to be updated on that, but I was just wondering if we could put some tentative things on there, and so I'm going to turn it back to either you or John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, I will jump in on the control rule. I agree with you that I think the next step on that is to bring it up to speed a little bit and dust it off and take it to the SSC next, and they have raised some questions. They have raised some questions about ORCS, as noted, and ORCS wasn't something that was really being revised within this control rule, and it was making the ORCS-type process essentially available to FMPs outside of snapper grouper, and the other thing we were waiting on on this was the guidance on carryover and phase-in from NMFS, which should be forthcoming later on this year, and so I think we should slate that for the SSC in October and then to the council in December. Really, it's been a while, and so I think the council is going to take kind of a fresh look at that and decide where we want to go.

I think the recreational permitting and reporting is probably much in the same way it's been for quite a while, and we probably would just need to take a fresh look at that one too and see what was in it and what we think needs to be in it, what comes out of the working group, like you mentioned, the recreational working group with the Gulf, and maybe that's another one for December, or not before December, and maybe in March. Maybe we need to see where the working group goes, and I would say, just conceptually, I would bring it up after the working group has come up with its recommendations, whenever that is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like the idea of putting the ABC control rule on this schedule and putting it for December, knowing that it needs to go to the SSC at their October meeting. The recreational permitting and reporting, I'm find just marking that December, but you're right that I feel like we need at least a couple more meetings, if not more, of this joint working group before we can really dig back into this recreational permit and reporting, and so, to me, December is tentative, but, really, maybe it's more feasibly March, but let me see what Steve says.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Jessica. I am kind of torn on that timing, because, from the joint workgroup perspective, I really don't foresee us having more than maybe one more meeting this calendar year, just with everyone's schedules and the added issues with COVID and everything, and so I am fine leaving that to December, or maybe even March, from the workgroup perspective, but, from another perspective, we have not discussed this amendment since I have been on the council, and I don't think it's been discussed since I think it was December of -- Was it 2016 or 2017, and so, either way, there's a lot of new faces on the council, and so it might be worth our time just to have a quick discussion on it in December, regardless of where the workgroup stands, just since there are so many new faces on the council now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve.

DR. MCGOVERN: Probably this is a question for Brian, but I wanted to just point out that it looks like we have ten amendments now for the September council meeting, and that's a pretty heavy workload for council staff, and also SERO staff, and I know Brian has, in the past, looked at what he considers to be feasible for his staff to do, in terms of a council meeting, and I don't know if we're going beyond that now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good question. Brian, if you want to answer now, that's fine. Otherwise, I was hoping that you could take some of this discussion and the rest of the discussion that's going to happen today and tomorrow, and then we could talk about this more in Full Council, and you could give us that kind of input about what you think could feasibly be done. I still have my fingers crossed that maybe we can complete the SMZ amendment at this meeting, and I was hoping that what was left on bullet and frigate wasn't a lot of work, and so things like that.

MR. CONKLIN: The stuff underneath the green line, I kind of agree with Tim, and we need electronic logbooks for the commercial sector, and we need -- You know, the recreational reporting is something that came out of visioning, and we still haven't finished all of our visioning, and I don't really see where taking on a bunch of new ideas for four fishermen -- I think we ought to stick to our original workload, and we've deviated from it enough, and so I would like to see us get this recreational reporting in and make that sector a little bit more accountable, so we can make better management decisions. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris.

MR. WOODWARD: You have already mentioned it, but I was just going to put in a good word for maybe just clearing the deck of the SMZ amendment, so to be one less cell that we have to worry about in this spreadsheet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Any more discussion on this priority document? Brian, do you have anything else that we should talk about right this minute?



DR. CHEUVRONT: Right now, I am going to go ahead then and tentatively put the recreational permitting and reporting for December. I think, if nothing else, even if you all aren't ready to really jump into it, and ] I hope you don't mind me just stating an opinion here, but I think Steve made a really good point about everybody needs to be brought up to speed on what this is about and the past history, and so, if nothing else, just bringing that up in December would probably be helpful, to just give everybody a history lesson what has happened, so folks can start thinking about what they want for the future.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds good. While you're drawing on the spreadsheet, I'm going to go to Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: One other thing to consider with regard to the workload is that we haven't even gotten into what emergency rules might be requested, and that's going to further contribute to what needs to be done this summer and fall.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The other issue also is the format of the meeting in September as well, and that could have an impact on how much can get done and how much work the council can do in September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There's an executive order we have to address.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good points. I say that maybe we -- Well, let me get Steve in before we leave the spreadsheet.

MR. POLAND: I hate to even bring this up, but, since it seems like we'll be working via webinar for the foreseeable future, what's the possibility of maybe squeezing in a special meeting somewhere to take care of some of these more low-hanging fruit things, or at least to get a little bit more done? I know we'll need to hear from staff on that, as far as where these various amendments are in completion or in work, but that's always a possibility, I guess, to have a special one or two-day meeting here or there to work on some of these things.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I like the thought process, and so, once again, maybe that's something that Brian and John can think about, and even speak to possibly Mel or I about that before we get to Full Council, and I agree with Jack that we might have some emergency actions that we want to add here, and maybe this extra meeting that I think would likely be a webinar -- Maybe we could knock some of these items off this list as well as emergency-type actions that we might talk about tomorrow, but let me go to Chester.

MR. BREWER: I think Steve has a wonderful idea, and that would be a one or two-day meeting, or maybe two of them, but, when we use this format, we do save a considerable amount of money. We don't have travel expense, and we don't have hotel expense, and so having an extra meeting or two I don't think would have enough of an adverse economic impact, a financial impact, that we would get thrown way off of our budget, and we do have a hell of a lot of stuff to go through, and some of it we don't even know about yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Right, and so I'm not disagreeing with you about the financial impact, but it's just that staff, council staff and NOAA staff, they have work to do between the meetings to get

the various documents ready, so that the council can consider actions on it, and so I don't want to overload staff with a whole bunch of webinars, because they just need to be able to get the documents ready, and so that's why I wanted John and Brian to have a conversation outside of this committee meeting to figure out what might be feasible that we could do at some type of webinar meeting, maybe between now and September and/or between September and December, but let me go to Mel.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was just going to agree with what you said, is that certainly that is an interesting concept that Steve pointed out, and it might help us to potentially improve our timing and efficiency, but, yes, we really need to let John and the staff scratch their heads about that a little bit, because, even if it's a web meeting, there's still all the hoops you have to jump through and necessary things that have to take place, and it's additional work and all, but it certainly is an appealing idea, and we've done it before, at least once in my tenure, where we had an extra small meeting that was focused on something, and so let's let them get back with us when they can on that idea.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It sounds great, and I'm glad that everybody is excited about it, and I'm glad that you guys are liking this webinar approach, but let's let staff talk about it and see what might actually be feasible, and so I don't know if we need to have --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, I have a suggestion here to just move us along, and I think we've gotten good feedback on the priorities and what the council wants to get into and some possibility, willingness at least, to hold another meeting, and the logistical challenges are certainly far greater than the financial challenges, if we're talking about meeting over webinar.

What I think might help is if we continue to keep a list of things that we're going to need to work on through the Full Council as we get into emergencies, as we get into the executive order situation, which we have to deal with in September to meet the timeline of that order, and then perhaps we have an Executive Committee meeting after this meeting to just go through this stuff in detail and try to come up with a plan forward to best balance all these priorities, and then, at that point, we can consider do we need an extra council meeting, when would it be, do we spread out September a little bit or what have you, and I think we put everything on the table, but we just give ourselves a chance to have the Executive Committee get together and talk about it and how we proceed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds like a great idea, John, and so I like that it also takes the pressure off of us rushing through this table tomorrow, especially right there after we might have piled on some emergency actions and some items relative to the Presidential Executive Order there at the last minute, and so I think that's a great idea, and we can figure out more about that in the coming weeks. I think we might be good with this discussion on this priority table for right now, but I'm going to check back with Brian, just to make sure.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Jessica, I'm fine with what you all have here right now, and what we can do, actually, when you get to Full Council tomorrow, once you have your emergency action discussion, and you're going to have some discussion of the EO and all that, and we can pull all that up as well, and we can add it above the green line if we need to, whatever we need to do.

I already, while you were talking, was jotting down some things that I think that may be good, that low-hanging fruit I believe that Steve was talking about a couple of things, and I don't want to put

staff on the line, because I obviously haven't talked to staff, but there might be a couple of things that we could get knocked out pretty quickly, and I was thinking about potentially the Regulatory Amendment 34 for snapper grouper, and that might be one that could be done quickly, and Myra is probably going to kill me for saying that, but we'll find out, and I don't know about Dolphin Wahoo 12 and how much more -- I haven't talked to John about that, and so I haven't checked with my staff, but those two are things that we're expecting to finish in September, and those are really, really close to being done, and so we could find out, and maybe those could be knocked out quickly, and we could spend the rest of the time dealing with the emergency actions and EO stuff outside of the regular meeting schedule. I was going to suggest that maybe we can look at some of those sorts of things, depending on what you all came up with tomorrow, and so, anyway, I am trying to work on a couple of things.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great. Thank you.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Now I will probably get some nasty emails from my staff, but I will find out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel, did you have something else on this?

MR. BELL: I was just going to ask Brian, and you can provide us with an updated version of what you've been tinkering with there at the end of the day or before the meeting tomorrow, I guess?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and what we'll probably do is, once we get this worked out tomorrow, I will be able to send a list to everybody on this, but what we have typically done is that, in the report, the final report for Executive, we will say this what we will be bringing back to the council in September, versus whatever else we're going to do, and we'll just have that specifically in that, and so you will know specifically then, plus you'll have this spreadsheet to refer to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Brian. I am going to move on through our agenda. Next up is the CCC meeting update, and I'm going to turn it over to John, and I'm not sure if this is where we were also going to cover the update on the joint working group.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The CCC meeting update is the next topic, and the CCC met via webinar, like all of us are doing, May 27 through 28, and, no, it was not in Hawaii, and it was two afternoon meetings, and there was a lot of updates on various things that are underway within NMFS, and I will just hit on a few of them.

There was, obviously, discussion of the executive order promoting seafood that came from the President, and we'll talk about that in Full Council, and so I won't give any details there, and you do have a document in the Other Business under Full Council, if you want to go take a look at that and be prepared for that discussion.

If you recall, back in early March, I guess, there were comments on NEPA revisions that we submitted letters on, and that's underway, and some of the revisions are making progress. What's most important to us is the determination of the Magnuson being functionally equivalent to NEPA, and that will greatly impact how we're affected by these NEPA revisions, and, so far, NMFS has not made a determination, or whoever is going to make the determination has not yet, and so we're standing by and waiting on that.

We talked about a number of technical working groups which NMFS has had underway for quite a while dealing with National Standard 1, and this is the overfishing requirements, and so there's one working on reference points, one working on the carryover and phase-in, and one working on data-poor situations. They're all at different stages of development, and carryover and phase-in should be pretty close to being released, and we hope to have that guidance probably this fall, and the other two are running a bit farther behind than that, but, as they become available, we'll let the council know and keep you informed, and they will affect how we approach some of these things within our FMPs.

There was discussion of policy directives, and these are just ways that NMFS defines how it will approach various situations, and there's one on the emergency rules, for example, that's in the Full Council business as an example, and they've been working on one on changing stock status from known to unknown, and it was presented at the CCC, and some of the councils raised a number of questions about the policy, and not specific concerns, but more just the opportunity to review it, and NMFS had hoped to just say the CCC meeting would be the review, and the document came in late with the materials, and nobody on the council had a chance to pass it around to staff or the SSCs or anything, and so we requested more time to review.

NMFS granted that, and so that will be another bit of Other Business for Full Council, and we put it out to the SSC, and they were given until I think noon today to give comments, and so their comments are probably being compiled as I speak, and they will come out to the council later today or first thing tomorrow morning, once they're all put together.

For the most part, this deals with things where maybe an assessment gets old, or a review panel takes a new assessment and doesn't accept it, and there's some issue, so that you had a stock that had an assessment, and it provided status, and maybe, for some reason, the new assessment, or the new information, no longer supports say an overfished determination, or it doesn't give enough money to judge the overfished status, and so how would NMFS handle that, and so there's a couple of conditions that they approach, and so that will be one we'll comment on.

Then, otherwise, it was various reports of some things that are going on and are underway, and they talked about the budget for 2021, and there's been a presidential budget that came out pre-COVID, and it was favorable. Where that ends up at this point is anybody's guess, and we have not gotten any type of numbers or anything, obviously, for a congressional budget, given the operations that they're under right now, but we're keeping our ears to the ground on that, and, of course, as we know stuff, we'll pass that on as well.

The next meeting will be in September, and it's scheduled for the week after our council meeting, and it's in D.C., and the recommendations that have just gone around earlier this week is that that should be planned to be as a webinar meeting as well, and so we'll probably have to further pare down the business, and, along those lines, there is also council member training for our new council members, and that normally happens, I guess, around the August window, and so that will likely be webinar training as well, just to pass that on, and so, as soon as we know more about that and the dates, we'll let folks know, and I think, David Whitaker, you still need to get that training, and, if we get any new council members, they will need to get that, too. That's a quick rundown on the CCC, and I will pause here to see if we have questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John, I thought that was a great update, and so the workgroup, the Modern Fish Act workgroup, are we going to do an update on that in this committee, and should we do now or under Other Business?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is scheduled for Full Council, and Steve is on tap to give that update for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Sounds great. Anybody have any questions about the CCC meeting? Then, John, I'm going to turn it back to you to talk about the policies.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. One of the things we have been working on is changes to some things that are within the handbook and changes to policies. For just a quick rundown refresher, we are trying to work through these policies individually at this committee, manage our workload that way, and then make one set of changes to the handbook later in this year, and our plan has been to make those handbook changes in December, and, obviously, that's going to be dependent upon the progress for these different policies and timing concerns and our workload, but that's still the plan.

We'll have some more things to talk about in September, along the lines of different policies, but the next one we want to talk about is what's called Discretionary Project Selection and Funding, and so folks remember that I have mentioned before that we had a staff retreat in February of 2019, and then we had a leadership retreat with council staff leadership in January of 2020, and this was one of the topics that came up, and there is really two aspects to this.

One is potentially making some funding available within the council budget that would be available to staff to support small-scale, short-term projects is really the intent, and so it might be things like working with a graduate student to help cover project expenses, and maybe, in some cases, stipends. It certainly wouldn't be the scale of say supporting full-on research assistantships and that kind of stuff. It's not that kind of money, but it could help support projects, or it may provide some funding to a student who maybe is already covering their tuition through other ways, and it would also give us a way of figuring out when there's funding opportunities that we can go after in the research realm, and there aren't many, but there are some.

The FIS system came out, the Fisheries Information System, and what is open to us, and so this is a way of figuring out what projects we would actually go after, because, even though we may be getting outside funding, it can require staff time, and so we just want to come up with a process that makes sure the projects that we're looking at meet the council's needs, consistent with our stated research needs, and that we have some way of evaluating them and making sure they are valid projects and they are worth the staff's time and they're going to give us some useful information.

That is where we're headed on this, and I just wanted to run through this policy document, and the intent here today would be to approve this general outline of a policy, and then this would be something that would be officially moved into the handbook at a future time.

The first part on this is to go through the review -- There isn't a real straightforward way in which you go about this sort of process to divide up the different components, and so what we did was start with just a review committee and talk about selection and review. We would like to have a

review committee that represents staff and the council, and so the suggestion is the ED, the Deputy Director for Science and Management, and then the SSC liaison to be a council member role, and what they would do is they would review proposals that staff submits that outline the project. They are pretty brief, and there is more below about the contents of that.

They would meet biannually, and it would be webinars, and there is no meeting required, and we're also thinking though of scheduling them around the SSC meetings, April and October, because the SSC liaison will usually be available and in town at that time, at least under normal, non-COVID situations, and that also gives us a chance to make this compatible with the council budget. By April, we should know what we're getting for the year. By October, we might know if we have say some extra money building up in the budget, and maybe we want to make it available, and doing it twice a year gives us some flexibility when you're dealing with various RFPs for outside funding that we can get, so that we can be timely in reviewing them.

Some of them, like to use the ACCSP example that Julia talked about for citizen science, you may have just a few months between the project RFP coming out and needing to get it in, and so we would want to have those projects reviewed, and, of course, we could also review things in advance, when staff has an idea, so that they're kind of pre-charged and enabled to go after it.

Additional review could be scheduled if needed, and this kind of reflects a philosophy here of not making this process be overly prescriptive, so it stands in the way of a good idea or it limits an opportunity to go after say some funding that we are eligible for and to put a good project on the table, and so that's the general gist of where we're going, and, despite these different review times, again, a project could start any time after they are reviewed and accepted, because the money is in the council budget and it's available.

The staff just needs to work through the timing that they have to get things when reviewed, when they have an idea and they talk to a student, and then, essentially, if they are approved for funding, their amount would be unencumbered and available, and they could start the day after it's approved, or maybe it's six months. Again, it's just to maintain flexibility and bring a little bit of a robust system into a place where we really haven't had a whole lot of guidance and direction in the past.

The next topic is potential funding, and so the initial proposal here is to allot up to \$25,000 of council funding annually to support these projects. A few caveats of that is that's just a starting number, obviously, and the actual amount will be up to the council and decided through the budget-setting process, and the council certainly, by adopting this, would not be obligated to fund it at all from one year to the next. It simply is an optional program that the council could support, and the amount available every year may vary, and I think that would be expected, depending on how the budget goes.

If someone has a multi-year project, just by making sure we're accountable, we would want to make sure that there is adequate progress in the current year to justify funding in later years, and so, if a project is not performing well and not meeting its objectives, then you have the option to not continue to fund it, and there are various projects that are underway, and the council might want to consider that when doing an initial allotment, to sort of bring some of those things under the umbrella of this process, because, as I said, it's not always been clear how we got into projects and why we got into projects and what they were intending to achieve.

The next part on funding is this also would apply to things we're doing with external funding, as I said, and so that would certainly be encouraged, because that's another way of getting projects funded without impacting the council's budget, but we're bringing them under it because they do require time, and we want to make sure that all staff is aware of this, and we really want to make sure that they are meeting the needs of the council, which comes up here in the next section, Section 3.

Here, we're talking about project eligibility criteria, and so what kind of projects would we look at for this process, and, first of all, it really needs to address a specific and identified need of the council. We have the research and monitoring priorities document that we update every other year, and that was mentioned earlier today, and there's also the Citizen Science Program priorities that we have in place.

Those are standing things that we have, and we go through those regularly, and so that's a list of needs, but, because things can come along the way, due to a stock assessment or an issue in an FMP or public comment, topics that have been recently identified by the council could also be eligible for consideration of a project. Then, finally, anything that's identified in an FMP or a stock assessment, and so we think this pretty well covers all the bases and gives staff a lot of areas to look to try and pursue projects that they are interested in or things that they think will help the council's process, in terms of getting us the information we need for good management.

It's intended that these projects are short duration, as I mentioned, normally not to exceed two years, but, again, that's not a hard-and-fast rule. Somebody may have a small project that doesn't take a lot of money, but maybe it takes a couple of years, and maybe they need \$5,000 a year for five years, and something like that would certainly be funding, and so it would be feasible. We don't want to say two years only and have a project that could be good for three years not be eligible, but the general guidance is that, as I said, these are short-term and relatively small funding.

Then the other part under duration is staff is often asked to fill some type of supporting or partnership role with other projects, and that would certainly be acceptable as well, and nothing in here would be intended to eliminate that or impede that in any way, but, importantly, we want this process to give us a chance to consider how these activities will impact the staff's core responsibilities, and so part of the proposal, as we're coming to next, is how is this activity going to affect the staff's job responsibilities and fulfilling the other tasks that they have.

That is certainly one part that hasn't probably always been brought up in the past when we've gotten into projects, and so the final part here is the project proposals themselves, and this is what we would be looking for to feed into the review process at the start. They're short, and so there's not a big burden for staff, and this is internal, and it's relatively informal, and so we don't need a forty-page proposal. It's just what is the research need and which of those things above is it pulled out of, how is it justified, that it meets a stated, justified council need, with goals and objectives, of course, who is the staff, what are they going to do, are there partners?

One of the intents of this is to try and leverage our partnership with other organizations. Sometimes a little seed money from us can go a long way toward other projects, and I think we saw a lot of examples of that in the citizen science discussion earlier today. What is the staff time burden?

That's one that is very important to me, and I feel like it's something we haven't always considered in the past when looking at projects.

What is the timeline? How long are people going to be engaged? What's it going to cost? What is it going to deliver? Then how do we go about reviewing findings? It could be some sort of outside review that a group is organizing, or it could be just going through the SSC, and so just to make sure we have some way of getting the science actually and whatever results are evaluated.

One of the things that we thought of in developing this is there's some work involved in doing this, and staff might want to make sure that their idea is even viable and would be allowed within the parameters of the council's need, and so they could submit a pre-proposal, and they could discuss their plans with their supervisor and the Deputy Director for Science, just to say, hey, I have this idea, and I want to research this area of the fishery, and does this fit in with the council's needs, and, if so, then they would be encouraged to go ahead and do a full proposal. This is just to try and manage the workload a little bit through this.

Then, if it's a project that's being submitted for outside or external funding, then, obviously, it needs to follow the guidelines for that program and the funding source, and there may need to be some extra information, such as, for purposes of this review, how does it address the council's research need, and how is the staff time impacted.

We added a few exclusions, just to make sure that this isn't going to disrupt any things that we're used to doing that work well, and one of those is obviously staff serving as members of graduate student committees or mentoring other students and other professionals, and so, if it's just getting involved in serving on a committee and there's no council funding involved, then there's no need to go through this process. Obviously, if you are on a committee and wanted to make some council funding available to a student, then we would run through this process.

It doesn't apply to staff serving as a partner on a project of another organization that they are paying for it, they're administering it, and you're perhaps just an advisor, and it wouldn't be affected, and then, in any case, just staff is encouraged to consult with their supervisor if they have any questions.

We are hoping that this will give staff some clear guidance on what kind of projects they can get involved in and win and what sort of projects are appropriate for them to get involved in and then give the council also some confidence that the extra-curricular-type activities that staff is getting involved in are meeting the needs that you've identified, and so that will wrap up the overview, and I think now we'll open it up for questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, John. I'm really excited about this policy, about this discretionary project that staff can do, and I think this is something that we've been thinking about and talking about informally for some time, and I'm really excited that we're actually getting a policy here. Once again, just to remind folks, this is kind of the policy for doing it. The actual handbook edits will come later. As John mentioned, we're trying to do a couple of these policies at every meeting and then do one giant edit to the handbook, and I keep forgetting that, and John keeps reminding me. Are there questions or comments on this?



MR. POLAND: Thanks for running through that, John. I share Jessica's excitement, and I feel like the policy laid out here seems to hit everything, and everything here seems reasonable and commonsense, and it's just the idea of this, offering staff that opportunity to explore some questions that they have and giving them that opportunity, through funding, to do that, and hopefully generate some type of product that we can use, and I really see that as a big plus, especially coming from my background and my personal experience.

I have also worked in a resource management agency, and I have worked as a technical staff for a while, and having opportunities to do this and not only to do your job and complete your own core job responsibilities, but to feel like you have that flexibility, and also that encouragement from your leadership staff to kind of exercise that scientific intrigue that we all have when we get to this field, and it really adds a lot to just the personal enjoyment of that job and that career, and so I see a lot of benefit to this, and not only providing us some useful information, but also very much broader, in an organizational perspective.

This is a big selling point for working for the council, and, I mean, this is not something that a lot of organizations have the time or the means to do, and I really see this -- I really see staff getting a lot of benefit out of this and us getting a lot of benefit, and so I really applaud this effort, and I like it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Steve. Any more questions or comments about this? John, what do you need from us? Just kind of a thumbs-up to move forward with this and with what's in the policy, so that you can then bring something back when we edit the handbook? You would like a motion. Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think a motion will help. It's just that we approve the process, and clearly you see it doesn't say anything about approving the handbook or anything language, and so we'll just approve the process. That shows us we have support, and it clears us to then start fitting this into the bigger picture.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That's great, John.

MR. POLAND: **So moved, Madam Chair.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Mel.

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Steve. Mel, do you have anything else that you wanted to add here?

MR. BELL: No, ma'am. I just think this is a really good thing, for all of the points that Steve went through and all. I totally agree, and I just wanted to second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I agree, and we have a motion on the table here. Any more discussion of this topic? **Any objection to this motion, which is to approve the internal research funding and project selection process as modified?** All right. **Seeing no hands, that motion carries.** Back to you, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you very much. I will hop over to our other process document. Thank you very much for that. I appreciate the support, and we are excited to do this. There's lots of ideas, and it will give us a chance to address some of them, hopefully, in the future.

This other policy is a revision of the performance evaluation plan, and so we want to make the plans a little more consistent across all of our staff and employees to formalize the mid-term evaluations, which haven't been something that's really included, and just address a few issues. The employment evaluation process has not really been looked at, certainly significantly, in my time with the council in seventeen years, and so it seemed like it was time to dust that off and come up with a better way of going about this and just make sure we're following best practices and that sort of thing.

We're also going to bring in some changes, such as doing workplans, and we're doing the plans, as we just went through on the council, and the next step of that is to then bring our individual staff workplans in to be coordinated with what the council workplan is for the year, and so that will be part of this as well, doing staff workplans that reflect back upon what the council needs to get accomplished.

Issues we're addressing here with this are a lot of our descriptions and appraisal forms are out-of-date and not always consistent, and they've just been developed over decades, in some cases, and so something we've been working on as staff, since our staff retreat a little over a year ago, was to revive the descriptions and appraisal forms, and we want to get them all consistent and up-to-date and make sure they include the content they need, so that staff and employees know what's expected of them, and so staff is working on that.

An issue within appraisals are that essentially critical and minor responsibilities often count the same, and so you may have one that is prepare FMPs and another that's do other things as necessary, and they both really rank the same, in terms of the overall numerical score that gets into there, and that's a little bit of a challenge, and then, in some cases, there may be staff that only have three or four main categories that they're rated on, and another person may have twelve, and so, obviously, one is more detailed than the other, and that can have issues when you get into just a final numerical score as well, and so staff is working on a weighting plan that will apply to our future evaluations.

That also gets into a lot of them are based on just very broadly-defined responsibilities, which don't help the staff in terms of figuring out what am I supposed to be working on and how am I going to be evaluated, and so we're going to develop more detailed workplans, as I mentioned.

Then one of the issues that has just arisen recently, and it deals with how the council has handled the merit increases and cash awards at the end of the year, is that, while the reviews go through a calendar year, we've been actually doing these say in early November, if not late October, in some cases, to meet the deadlines, and that has just raised some questions with staff about the actual timing of doing a review before Halloween and saying that it goes through December 31, and that can raise some eyebrows, and there seems no reason not to just get this thing sort of in sync with our practices and policies, and so that's the reason that we're doing it.

A couple of things that we will need to change in the handbook here is so the mid-term evaluations are not addressed, and so, if this is approved, we would add those, with some changes, and the current handbook actually specifies the January through December period, and so we need to change the handbook language to address that as well.

Because this is a change, and I will get into it, essentially of shifting the end-of-year, essentially, end-of-your-work-year review to July, instead of essentially December, that creates some change, as you shift from one timing system to another, and so what we plan to do to phase this in is that staff would be subjected to essentially a full annual review, level review, both in November of this year and then again in July of 2021, and then that will put us on track to then do the annual and mid-term spaced out during the year.

It also gives us a chance to sort of ease into this and not make a sudden change in say approving this policy today and then telling staff on July 1 that, okay, now I'm going to do a full-year review for you through June 30, and sorry I couldn't give you more warning, and this will give staff more warning and let us know what's coming.

Now I will go through some of the details of the evaluation process. One thing just to note, and it's not always clear in some of the handbook stuff, is the Executive Director is evaluated by the council, and so there's a bit of a different process, and so this applies to the council employees that are essentially in the chain of command of the Executive Director.

The first issue, as I mentioned, is we're revising personnel forms, and so updating the position descriptions, and we plan to have that complete here in the next week or so. Most of them have been done and are complete, and the next step will be to start running them by each staff person, and then a little bit longer is we're updating the appraisal forms, so that they will be consistent with the position descriptions, and that's underway and planned to be completed by July 1, and so we should have most of this process in place, and staff can start evaluating it and looking at it and make sure that we've got everything fair and consistent.

Senior staff is going to work on the performance appraisal scoring, and our plan is to have something by December of 2020, and this is certainly -- This whole process, I will say here, is one of those things that has suffered from COVID, our time out of the office, our face-to-face time, and just dealing with -- As I know so many of you guys know, so much stuff that has crept into our workday lives as we've dealt with the COVID stuff, and it has certainly impacted our progress, but we do plan to have some type of scoring approach by December of 2020, with the intent being that the most important tasks carry the most weight, and that's what really is reflected in the score, that you are doing the things that are most important to the council and are the primary responsibilities of your job position.

The third item is developing the annual workplans, as I said, and the intent here is that these reflect back upon what the council wants to achieve, and this will be a finer scale with going into what we go into here and think about. Okay, can the staff get all its work done, and, at this stage, staff would go down and think about, okay, over the course of the year, what do I have to do when, and can I get it all done, and, if there are some issues, then that's something that we as supervisors would need to decide can we put some more staff on this and how do we resolve this, and do we need to bring this to the council's attention, and is there an issue with our prioritization or what

have you, but this will give staff certainly a little more say in terms of their workplan and not just be so much responding from council meeting to council meeting about what we're going to do.

Then the SEDAR staff, which are under South Atlantic staff, but only slightly different, and their workplans will be guided by the SEDAR project plan, and we went over some of that at the SEDAR Committee, and, really, that's largely determined by the SEDAR Steering Committee, when they work with all the councils.

The next item, Number 4, is one of the bigger changes, because this is changing the timing of the reviews and adding the mid-year evaluation, and so, as I said, now the current evaluation is essentially calendar year, and it's supposed to run through December 31 and be done at the end of the year, and so what we are proposing to do is that we would shift the full review period to July 1 through June 30, and so then, by July 15, the supervisors will conduct the reviews for the previous July 1 to June 30 period, and so, come July 15 of 2021, we'll do a full review of that period that ended on June 30, 2021.

The overall approach is laid out in the handbook for how evaluations are conducted doesn't change, and one thing that does change, is a little clearer, is that these evaluation results that are done in July will be considered in the eligibility for merit increases and cash awards, and that's another bit of language that's in the handbook, that you have to be performing adequately, obviously, to be eligible for salary increases.

We will add, within the performance evaluation process, considering those individual workplans, approving the workplan for the staff for the year that's coming, and also seeing how the workplan worked out for the staff for the past year, and this will fulfill what is called an annual performance appraisal in the current handbook, and that will be the annual one done in the middle of the calendar year, and so for the July to June 30 period, and what will be called the mid-term evaluation will be conducted in December, and it's not exactly mid-term, but that does accommodate the council meeting schedule and the process we have now for dealing with the salary additives, and so we're going to retain that, and it's also just kind of a good timing to get it done there at the end of the year.

The process will be very similar to the current annual evaluations, and the employer and supervisor will sit down and go through how things have been going and discuss any issues and that sort of thing and review their appraisal form and review their workplan, and that will be very important here at the mid-term, and that's a chance to see if the workplan needs to be modified, does this particular staff person need some assistance, do they need some help with skills or what have you, and so that's the primary goal there. It's just are there any developing issues and how is your workplan going.

Then the mid-term progress will be considered in eligibility for the cash awards that we typically give out when we can and when it's earned and when there is funding, all of those contingent, at the end of the year, and so this is -- It will require some changes to the handbook, as I mentioned, that we will consider at a future time, but this is just a slight change and a phase-in plan for how we approach the evaluations, and obviously, as you will see, it doesn't get into the salary additives and all that stuff as part of the budget process, and that's a whole separate thing. This is just how we as supervisors approach evaluating the staff and bringing it in better coordination with the council's priorities, and so that's the overview, and I will pause here for questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, John. I am also excited about this policy change, and I know that you guys probably think it's crazy that I get excited about evaluations, but I think it's really important to the success of an organization to evaluate staff and talk to them about their progress and make sure that they're on track to achieve some of their own goals throughout the year, and so this is important to me, and it's definitely something that state agencies do, and I'm excited to kind of dust off some of these old position descriptions and evaluation criteria and have staff work on this policy as well.

Anybody have any comments or questions for John on this particular policy? Once again, this is just the policy, and we'll work on the actual handbook changes at a later date. I know that John and Brian especially have spent a lot of time working on this particular policy and working on this evaluation process. Any hands out there that staff can see? If there aren't any questions or comments, then I would entertain a motion to approve this staff performance evaluation process, as modified.

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. POLAND: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's moved by Mel and seconded by Steve. Any discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** I am going to turn it back to you, John, to make a couple of comments about the sexual harassment prevention training.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica, and I will make one comment about these. The motions do say "as modified", and that's reflecting that what I showed you on the screen has a few minor edits that came in from Jessica in our last-minute reviews of this stuff, and so there's some slight wording changes that are different than what was in the briefing book version, and so I just wanted to make sure that's clear.

Then the last topic is the sexual harassment prevention training, and this has been talked about a number of times, and one of the things we have been standing by for is some guidance about how we address this at the council member level and what was going to be done at NMFS for council members nation-wide, versus what our responsibilities here are as an individual council, and so there will be a meeting with Jessica and Monica and I later on -- I forget if it's June or July, but it's somewhere coming up on my calendar, and we will talk about this some, and our plan is to bring some more information back to you on this at the September meeting.

In the meantime, what we have done for staff is what's shown here in the agenda and overview, which is to bring in a training process, and it covers the sexual harassment prevention, but it also covers a number of other things as well, and it's an online training portal that we have added, and it has many, many different topics, and it has turned out to be rather timely, and they have had COVID things in there as well, and this is something that we can work into our staff workplans and keeping them up-to-date on training and that sort of thing and eligibility for increases and that sort of stuff.

We have come up with a number of courses that we're recommending staff to take for supervisors and non-supervisors, and I point these out because this is a possibility that, if we're obligated to as a council provide some sort of harassment prevention training to council members, this tool that we have and this service that we have now signed up for could be made available to council members, too. I think we're allowed to have like fifty users or so, and so it would cover staff and council members, but that's where we stand now, and I think we'll have more discussion of this, and our plan is to have more discussion in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, John. Thanks for the update on that. I think we're to Other Business. Is there any other business to come before the Executive Committee?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't have any, Madam Chair. I put them all in Full Council, it sounds like, and so nothing here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm assuming that staff are looking for raised hands, and I'm assuming that you would type that up there if you saw any. None. Okay. Thank you. We're going to go ahead and conclude the Executive Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 10, 2020.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By:  
Amanda Thomas  
July 20, 2020

# SAFMC June Council Meeting

## Attendee Report: (6/8/20 - 6/11/20)

Report Generated:

06/11/2020 07:43 AM EDT

**Webinar ID**

714-501-819

**Actual Start Date/Time**

06/10/2020 07:49 AM EDT

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
Addis	Dustin
Barr	Brice
Beal	00Bob
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bianchi	Alan
Blum	Catherine
Bonney	02Rick
Bonura	Vincent
Brennan	Ken
Brouwer	01Myra
Bruce	James
Bubley	Walter
Burgess	Erika
Byrd	Julia
Carmichael	01John
Chaya	01Cindy
Cheshire	Rob
Chevront	01Brian
Christiansen	00Kyle
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	00Robert
Cox	Derek
Craig	Nico
Crimian	Robert
DeVictor	00Rick
Defilippi Simpson	Julie
DiLernia	Anthony
Dunn	Russell
Errigo	01Michael
Exley	Gary
Finch	Margaret
Fitzpatrick	Eric
Foss	Kristin

Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Glasgow	Dawn
Gore	Karla
Grimes	Shepherd
Griner	Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Harrison	01BeBe
Hart	Hannah
Hartig	Ben
Haymans	Doug
Helies	02Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Henderson	Chanse
Howington	Kathleen
Hudson	Rusty
Iberle	01Allie
Iverson	01Kim
Jepson	Michael
Johnson	Denise
Johnson	Alison
KELLY	BILL
Karnauskas	Mandy
Keener	Paula
Klasnick	01Kelly
Knowlton	Kathy
Kolmos	Kevin
Kramer	Rob
LARKIN	Michael
Laks	Ira
Lam	Elliott
Laney	Reid Wilson
Lauretta	02Matt
Levy	Mara
Long	Stephen
Malik	Joan
Martinez	Jackson
Mask III	Tad
McCawley	00-Jessica
McCoy	Sherylanne
McGovern	00John
McPherson	Matthew
Mehta	Nikhil
Merrifield	Mike
Montes	Jeremy
Moss	David
Musick	Susanna



Nee	Shannon
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	02 Genny
O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Palmer	Vince
Peterson	Cassidy
Pfleger	Mariah
Porch	00Clay
Pugliese	01Roger
Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Records	David
Reichert	Marcel
Reynolds	Jonathon
Rhodes	01Cameron
Roberson	Kimberly
Rock	Jason
Sagarese	Skyler
Sapp	00Art
Schmidtke	Michael
Schueller	Amy
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Sinkus	Wiley
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Smith	Duane
Soss	Alison
Spanik	Kevin
Spurgin	Kali
Sweetman	CJ
TRAVIS	MICHAEL
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Thomas	Janie
Vara	Mary
Waters	James
Whitaker	David
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle
Woodward	00Spud
Wrege	Beth
Wyanski	David
bennett-martin	paulita
brewer	chester
collier	01chip
crabtree	00Roy
crosson	scott

geiger  
kraft  
poland  
sandorf  
sminkey  
thomas  
walter

george  
todd  
00steve  
scott  
thomas  
suz  
john