

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 4, 2020

SUMMARY MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Steve Poland
Chester Brewer

Mel Bell, Vice-Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Dr. Kyle Christiansen
Chris Conklin
Anna Beckwith
Spud Woodward

Tim Griner
Dr. Roy Crabtree
LCDR Jeremy Montes
David Whittaker

COUNCIL STAFF

John Carmichael
Julia Byrd
Kelly Klasnick
Cameron Rhodes
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson

Dr. Brian Chevront
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Christina Wiegand
John Hadley
Roger Pugliese

OBSERVERS/PARTICIPANTS

Shep Grimes
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. George Sedberry
Dewey Hemilright
Tony Dilernia
Pat O'Shaugnessy

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Clay Porch
Duane Smith
Erika Burgess
Dr. Wilson Laney
Rick DeVactor

Other observers and participants attached.

The Executive Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Wednesday, March 4, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We will call to order Executive Finance. The first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Let me remind folks who is on this committee. It's myself, Mel Bell, Carolyn Belcher, Chester Brewer, and Steve Poland are on Executive Finance. The first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. You see a couple of things under Other Business on the agenda, including a NEPA letter that we need to discuss and the next CCC meeting. Are there any other changes or additions to the agenda? Any objection to approval of the agenda? The agenda is approved.

The next order of business is Approval of the Minutes. Any changes or modifications to the minutes from our last meeting? Any objection to approval of those minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. Next, we're going to go over to Brian, and he's going to show us our giant, multi-colored sheet of council priorities and go over that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We can joke about it all we want, but it's actually working, and it's working really well. I did want to show you that there is a new document that was included in this briefing book, based on some of the requests and discussion from the past. It's a document that we have used mostly previously internally, and we just have always called it our active amendments document, and what we do is, typically, after every council meeting, we update kind of where things stand with all of the projects and amendments and things that we're working on in a sort of narrative way that just gives people that where are we with this. You would be surprised at how many times we have to walk up and down the hall and say, you know that amendment you're working on, and usually we might be able to figure out the number of it, and say, what's going on with this part of it, and we found we were doing that an awful lot.

A few years ago, we started, after each council meeting -- We created this, and we update it, and now we are seeing, because you guys are using this with the priorities, you have a very similar need to know where we are with each thing, and so that's what this document is. It includes more things than what is on the priorities sheet, but we're just basically sharing with you our internal document on what we're working on and what we're aware of in the office, and I think that will help you, but it also tells you who the council lead is, and so, if you've got an amendment that you're not sure what's going on with it, or you need more detail than what is there, you should always feel free to contact the staff lead, and one of the things that I would like to emphasize is do not hesitate to contact the staff person who is the lead on something, whether or not you are the chair of the council committee that works with that topic.

Actually, I know, in my position, when I was working on the economics side of things, or now as a Deputy, I enjoy when council members call, because I find out what's going on in your head, and we sometimes have a nice chat that we can't have at a meeting and all that, and just know what's happening, and we can sometimes fill each other in, and so it's beneficial for both of us, and so don't ever feel like, one, am I asking a stupid question or am I taking up your time or whatever, and please don't ever feel like that, and, if a staff member is not available, please leave a message, and they all know to get back to you right away, and so I'm just putting out that plea. Do it often, and do it as much as you want to. That's what they're there for. Okay. I've done that plug.

For example, we leave things on here until they have been approved by the Secretary and the final rule has been published. Once that's been done, it comes off the list, and so let me get rid of that document. We don't need it up there right now, and so let's go to our color-coded list, and so you can see the columns are labeled by which amendment number and sort of the topic, where the council prioritized the score, the last time you prioritized it in September, and the staff weight and that staff weight was something that you asked for last time, and it's based on sort of a workload issue.

Then I tried to give you a key for explaining what that weight means, and so zero is complete, and so, basically, the higher the number, the more work that needs to be done. Now, we have a three-star because some don't quite fit in, and so like there's either no -- There's just limited quantitative data, but there's a lot of work that still needs to be done, or qualitative analysis, but sometimes we find that one of our biggest hurdles is around data and either data preparation, getting it together and doing the analysis, and that sometimes is something that slows down the process, in terms of writing, but we have also found that sometimes we have similar issues, but it's not due specifically to data, quantitative data, and so we decided to call that a three-star, because, as a weighting, it's about the same, and the North Carolina and South Carolina SMZs is one of those things that fell into that category, and so Myra and I made that up. That's basically what it fell into, because we've done this since the last meeting, and so it's a work in progress, and so we decided three-star will work.

The color coding tells you who is doing what, and yellow means that's the last meeting, and this is where it's going to be completed, and black means it's being worked on, and, as you can see right now, the Spanish mackerel trip limits, this one kind of got suspended at the last minute here. Bullet and frigate mackerel got worked on at this meeting, and shrimp transit provisions got finished up at this meeting. Future allocation discussions, you notice there is no yellow showing when it ended, but we worked on it at this meeting, and we kind of thought that this was going to go on longer, and we don't know yet, and so that was just left open, and so we'll get some direction from the council as to where to go next on that.

We're getting started on the unassessed species, the ABC, ACL, and allocation issue, and, coming up in the next committee, the world's shortest Snapper Grouper Committee meeting, we'll be discussing the North Carolina/South Carolina SMZs, but I wanted to caution you. I wanted to caution you that, as nice as March 2020 has been, brace yourselves. June is going to come back and bite you hard.

You have got Dolphin 10, the mega amendment, and you've got bullet and frigate mackerel coming back to you, and this is what you've already decided, and this is with nothing new added, and probably the unassessed species, and you have four assessments coming back, three in snapper grouper, and that's greater amberjack, red porgy, and yellowtail snapper. You've got a king mackerel assessment, and you're going to finish the North Carolina/South Carolina SMZs, pick up the Oculina extension, and you have scheduled to start a wreckfish amendment, and that's all for June. That is a busy, busy June, and, to top it off, I've been keeping track of some other things that you've all said that you might like to consider doing.

Normally, this would be -- Executive Finance, if we weren't a day ahead, would be happening after we would be having a planning lunch meeting that we would be able to talk about some other

things, and some timing issues, and we're just not quite sure, but we're going to still have that meeting, and so we have some proposed things for the June meeting, and we may need to pare back some things, because I'm just suggesting that, in Key West -- I would probably just suggest that we're going to have to start on Monday morning and probably go into Friday afternoon, for sure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So just a couple of things, and the yellowtail assessment -- We were just at that meeting last week, and I felt that that, for example, needed to go to the SSC first, and so I guess it will go to the SSC's April meeting, and then, assuming that all those different -- Is that right? Then the same thing for amberjack and red porgy. The SSC would talk about those in April, and we're just assuming that all that is going to come out and there will be a recommendation, and then the council would discuss it at the June meeting.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just to clarify that, for the yellowtail, the Gulf SSC meeting will be the lead for that, and so we're sending folks, and that's like the week right after our SSC, I believe.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and that's presuming that there's no hiccup at the SSC. If there is a hiccup at the SSC, it could kick it back to the SSC wanting to see it again in October, and it wouldn't come back to the council until December, but you have two more assessments coming to you in December. You have golden tilefish and snowy grouper, and remember now, according to your allocation trigger policy, every time you have an assessment result, you're going to look at allocations again, and so you now have this added layer that gets added to every assessment result that you're going to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Brian, that brings up another question, and so I know we want to capture the discussion about allocation, but let's just say, on one of those assessments, let's pretend -- I don't know, red porgy, and let's pretend that we're going to bring in the new MRIP numbers, but maybe we don't need to change allocation, and then we don't need to start an amendment, and we would just say, hey, we had this discussion and we don't need to change anything, and I'm thinking that we would need to change, because of MRIP, but, just in theory, that would be the discussion sometimes, and we wouldn't need to continue on, because you wouldn't need an amendment, because you already had the discussion, and we just capture that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe the way the process would work would be, as a result -- If you're not changing any of the allocation or anything like that, you get a new ABC, and you're going to apply the same rule. I think through a framework amendment, you apply the new ACL, and you could state in that amendment that the council considered the allocation and found it to be adequate, the current allocation method to be adequate, and that captures it, and we capture it in our spreadsheet, and that's fine. That's all you have to do. You don't have to do anything different, but you just have to note that you actually had that allocation discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then the wreckfish modernization, I see that that has a Number 6 by it, which means I think that it hasn't been started, and I would really like to get that started before you leave, at least underway, and so I would like to definitely see that stay on the June meeting, since your time is limited here.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's fine, and I was just talking with John, and we need to be thinking about that planning and how we're going to be moving things over to other people, and we've got some new hires coming and things like that too, and so we need to work out that strategy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So do you need -- At this point, do you want to leave it like this, and then we talk about this more in Full Council, after we have discussions at the Snapper Grouper Committee and such, or do we need to make modifications right now?

DR. CHEUVRONT: My recommendation is -- Well, first, two take-aways. One is you're on target for what you said you wanted to do, and so I think this tool is working to help you stay on target, and so that's a good thing, and the other thing is fasten your seatbelts, because June is going to be really busy, and there are a couple of things that we need to discuss to make some recommendations for the June agenda that could be and should be discussed, perhaps, at Full Council. I'm not sure that there's much else that we can do right now, but, considering what's going on, I think it's working well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going to look around the table. Are there questions or comments or concerns?

MR. BELL: One of the neat things about the color schemes you're using is you can track what we're going to be dealing with in June, and you can track the council staff associated, and so you see a lot of that brown in June, and it corresponds with a lot of -- You guys are balanced workload-wise, and that's the other concern with all of this. It's sort of like you talk about, yes, we have to deal with all of this, but then, of course, staff have to deal with all of this, really, because you all are doing all the grunt work, but you're okay with that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and what we do is just -- You can't add up the number of pink lines versus the number of blue lines and say that Myra is doing a lot more work than John. Look at John's two blue lines, and it's Dolphin Wahoo 10 and Dolphin Wahoo 12, and you say, oh my god, and some of those pink line things could be very, very simple little framework amendments, and remember that we've got another FMP person coming onboard who is going to be doing some of these sorts of -- Probably some of these pink line things to start with.

Part of my job is to help balance that out as a workload issue, and I will be assigning those things, because I kind of keep track of how much work it takes for an individual to do each one of these amendments, and so, from my perspective, you guys don't need to worry about that. I will take care of that, and, if it's a problem, we'll email and let you all know.

MS. BECKWITH: Just noting that the lines along the Dolphin Amendment 12 are actually not pulled in for June, September, and December. I don't know if the recreational AM -- But it's blank for June.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions? I really like this document, and I appreciate you guys working on it being adaptive and changing it up. This time, we added the staff weighting, which I think is helpful, and you pointed out that, just because somebody might only have two items, that doesn't mean that those are two small items, but, yes, I like it. I think it's helpful, and I do think it's helping to keep us on track.

DR. CHEUVRONT: If we're through with this, I would like to say one other thing. You know we've been -- For years, I sit up here and we talk about the follow-up, and we don't really do a whole lot with it. I just do want to say that the council staff are looking into ways to deal with the cumbersome-ness of that huge document, and it's kind of mired in the thinking of the 1970s or 1980s, the idea of having a hard copy document, where you can flip through pages and find what you're looking for, and what we are trying to move towards is project management software, where we could make it -- Our ultimate goal is to make it available through our website, that people and council members and other staff would be able to go through and find the status of what's going on and get information without having to necessarily have a hard copy document.

The good thing about that is you have real-time information, as opposed to these points-of-time documents, and there will be a few things that we have to continue doing, and we do have an MOU with SERO that makes reference to this document, and a version of it will continue to exist, but, as opposed to a functional day-to-day document, we're exploring other ways, and it will be a much smaller document, though the goal is to make things more functional. It's the idea of working smarter and not necessarily harder, but then, when you work smarter, you can work harder, because you can do more things, and that's kind of what our goal is that we're trying to head towards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I appreciate that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think John is going to talk about some of that kind of stuff more later, but there's going to be some transitioning and changing over to some sorts of things like that, but it's going to take us some time to get there, and so please be patient, because we'll probably make some mistakes along the way, and we'll just back up and try again.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. I appreciate that, and I appreciate your willingness to try new things, and I appreciate this priority document. I think it's helpful.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, I think it's working really well for us now.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I am not sure if this is the right time to bring this up, but, just to put into your hat when you're considering all of these things that you've got to work on, but you asked me at the last meeting to bring back at this meeting my advice on what I thought the kind of FMP document you needed to transition the commercial sector to electronic reporting, instead of the paper logbooks, and so the two amendments and you share with the Gulf Council, spiny lobster and coastal migratory pelagics, those have built into the framework that you could change reporting requirements via framework. However, a lot of your other FMPs do not, and you would need a plan amendment.

One thing I talked about with my counterpart, Mara Levy, who advises the Gulf Council, is maybe, if it's as simple as if you report -- Everyone who is reporting now via paper, which would be all the commercial fishermen, according to the FMPs, we're going to transition you to electronic reporting, and maybe you would want just one big amendment, or one amendment, with just that action in it, that could cover, perhaps, all the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and it's an idea, and I think you did that for dealer reporting.

There was one amendment, but I think we would need to hear back from the Center. I assume that they, at some point, would want to flip that switch for everybody at the same time, and maybe they

don't. If they did, it would be kind of advantageous for you. There is pros and cons to having only one amendment, or one document, that amends all the plans, but it could also then have all those dates of effectiveness for all the FMPs be the same time, and so it's just something for you to think about.

While you would be able to do a framework amendment for two FMPs, the ones that you share, you cannot do that for the other FMPs, and so maybe you would just want to talk to the Gulf and just have one single document that is a comprehensive, omnibus-kind of amendment that amends all plans.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica, thank you for reporting back on that. All right. Are we ready to move on in the next topic? All right. Next up, I believe we have the Gulf and South Atlantic joint recreational flexibility workgroup, I believe.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, that is it. If you will notice, you have -- That's Attachment 2, is the letter from the Gulf, and so, if you recall, in December, we crafted a letter and sent it to the Gulf identifying our representative and expressing our interest in working together on this topic, the response to the Modern Fish Act provisions for the Gulf and South Atlantic.

The Gulf took this up at their last meeting. As shown in their letter, they supported working on this also, a joint working group, and they named their representatives, and they are Troy Williamson, Susan Boggs, Tom Frazer, Martha Guyas, Kevin Anson, and Chris Schieble, and they also agreed with us that we'll try to schedule a meeting sometime between April and June of 2020, and the timing is really tight to finding an opportunity, when we can get all these folks together, and we anticipate this being via webinar, and getting it noticed in the Federal Register, to NMFS and our legal advice that, yes, this meeting will be noticed in the Federal Register. I think, at this point, just if anyone has any ideas or suggestions for this group, anything that you would like them, in particular, to talk about, now would be a good opportunity to just raise a few bullet points.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will start. To me, this group, part of what that first webinar is figuring out is kind of what is the charge of that group and kind of the list of what's in and what's out, and so what they want to consider as well as what they think is either out of bounds or too unwieldy for this group to discuss, and so, to me, I saw the webinar as part of figuring that out, and so I think the folks would maybe need some of the background materials that have already come out on the Modern Fish Act.

Maybe that both our staff and the staff from the Gulf could make a list of some of the items, because, when we were at the CCC meeting, having a discussion, Carrie brought up some items that the Gulf Council had thought about trying, but then, ultimately, backed off, because there wasn't maybe a clear path forward, because it had never been done before, and so I think that's why we wanted to have this group, so we could have a discussion about, hey, maybe we were thinking about this on recreational accountability measures, or whatever it was, but both councils backed off for separate reasons, just because it was a new path, and we were unsure kind of how to forge that path, but, to me, I see this group is having the discussions about what are some new things that we could look at, what can we try, and maybe what are some pros and cons of trying those new approaches, and that's just my thoughts, based on our discussion that we had at the CCC meeting.

MR. BELL: In terms of other background, I guess we just had that discussion there, and so I can't recall how much of that was like on the record there, and I don't remember, but I just know the idea came up, and we talked about it, but I don't know that there's anything else to bring in that would have this background material or documentation of discussion, and so, like you said, just the general information about the act and stuff would be useful.

MR. POLAND: Just refresh my memory, because I haven't thought about this in a little bit. I know we've received some presentations from the agency on the Modernizing Fish Act, specifically Section 102 provisions, and have we received any type of direction from the agency as far as like a stated policy or anything like that, or was it just the presentations that we received?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I have not seen anything come in in the last few months about that, any sort of guidance or expectations. We just have the act and see its provisions, and I think this group will just have to jump into it, and, obviously, we would give them the act to look at. I think the CCC discussions were to the -- I don't recall anything about that being in the CCC report, and I think Jessica's summary of what was talked about there would be pretty helpful, and I would say we would probably reach out to the Gulf Council staff and kind of brainstorm what we can do with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: At the CCC meeting, there were three or four presentations, and so there were presentations from ASMFC and the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and others that gave presentations about ideas of new ways to look at recreational data and how other groups were thinking about it. I think that this workgroup could look at those presentations as well, to get ideas about how the council might want to do something differently.

I just don't think that there is a recipe card here for that there was some report from the Modern Fish Act that said, okay, well, you could use this data, or you could use this data this way, and think that's what is making this a little bit challenging, is it's almost like the Modern Fish Act just kind of opened the door, and then now it's up to folks to figure out how are we going to move through the door and what are the next steps, and there wasn't anything prescriptive, I think which is positive, because it didn't say you have to go do this or you have to go do that.

I think it would be up to this group to kind of figure out, in the southeastern U.S., what are some things that we're going to look at, and what are some new ways that we might want to do things, and so the presentations that we saw at the CCC meeting might be another tool in the toolbox to look at, and it's just a thought.

MR. BREWER: This is, I guess, be careful what you wish for. I mean, we have complained, or the recreational community anyway, has complained for years, and rightfully so, that Magnuson was set up in such a fashion that it was to manage commercial fisheries, and it's done a pretty good job of that, but then we would try to take a round peg and put it into a square hole and use the same techniques and methods to regulate and manage recreational fisheries.

We were told, over and over again, that, well, yes, that's the tools you've got, and you've got to do it this way. Well, the Modern Fish Act has said, okay, we're going to give you the ability to manage recreational fisheries using different tools, and that's a wonderful thing, but it's also -- As Jessica says, it's quite challenging, very challenging, but I think the overall arching charge for this

group should be how do we use -- Number one, what new tools could possibly be used, and how do you use them and be able to make suggestions to both councils about those topics.

That is very challenging, and it's going to be -- To a very real extent, it's going to be kind of uncharted territory, but we can kind of look a little bit to the states, particularly, and I will brag again, to the State of Florida, because they have been very successful with regard to managing, successfully managing, the recreational fishers, and so I see it as a huge challenge, but something that presents the possibility to fix a lot of the woes that we've seen over decades from the standpoint of managing the recreational fishery, and so that's my two-cents.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chester. That was a good way to state it, and so that's another thing. I think that one of the presentations that was at the CCC meeting talked a little bit about how some of the states manage -- It maybe alluded to how FWC manages snook or other things, but I guess that's some more background that this group could have, is maybe a presentation about how some of the states do management, and so part of what they're doing differently is timeframes, and how they're looking at SPR, and they don't have to establish hard quotas and things like that, and so I think some of those presentations from that CCC meeting, as well as maybe a couple of others, might also help this group get started.

Any more comments or questions or concerns or ideas for this workgroup that is going to start out meeting by webinar and then maybe an in-person meeting later in 2020? Are we good? Any more comments or questions or concerns? Mel and I can work with John to kind of figure out -- Pull those presentations back up and figure out what else might be needed that wasn't covered in those presentations.

MR. BELL: Yes, because, I mean, that was sort of the genesis of our thinking, so you could see what we were looking at and kind of what we got from having this discussion, but, like you said, I think the fact that there are sort of no boundaries, or a guideline, that's challenging, but the fact that there aren't is a good thing, in that we can think outside the box a little bit, but together, to kind of keep it realistic and reasonable, and so that's a good opportunity.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that part of the discussion that we had, and Mel is right that we kind of had this discussion, the Gulf folks and the South Atlantic folks, kind of off to the side at first at the CCC meeting, was how are we going to do this, and what have you all done, and what are you thinking about doing, and maybe we should talk about this, so that we're not spinning our wheels separately, and, instead, we can kind of combine our efforts and think about things that we've both started working on and maybe stopped, and what can we do next, and so just kind of to double our efforts, really.

DR. PORCH: We have struggled a lot with this internally, looking at the words of the act, and Monica can correct me if I'm wrong, but, when we look at it, it doesn't give us so much flexibility as you think. I mean, you still have to have catch limits for the recreational fishery, and so you're not going to be as flexible as the states are.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Clay. Anything else on this topic? All right, and so next up on our list is council policies and practice revisions, and I'm going to turn it over to John to talk about that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, and I appreciate the guidance there, and I think that's pretty helpful for us in getting started on that. The first topic here, and I'll go over a number of practice and policy issues, is the Award of Excellence. This was raised during the Executive Finance webinar, I think last October, and we talked about it some in December and got some guidance, and, as a result of that, we have a proposal, proposed guidelines, to go through. This was Attachment 3a, and, as you will see, there is a number of items here proposed, and then there's a few italicized bullets, where it provided some additional background as to what the thinking was, or maybe asking some questions.

I will just go through this, and the purpose of this is to recognize those who have made contributions broadly to basically the resources and the management process of the South Atlantic Council, and it's very broad in how it would be applied, and it notes that it could be a career where someone has been involved in our issues and our fisheries for most of their career, or someone who did something particularly notable at one point in time that you the council feel is worthy of recognition.

We will start with the selection process, and nominations would be in writing, and we would solicit them annually, using council processes that we have for reaching out to folks, and setting up a deadline of June 30 for them to be submitted to the council office and the ED, and so then the plan is that they would be considered shortly thereafter. We considered submitting them in April, with the idea of being that we would have them before the June meeting, and then presentation of the results in September, but that's really -- April to September is a long time between doing this, and, looking at other similar awards things, that seemed pretty excessive, and we had the idea that there would be, as noted below -- The recipient would be confidential, and so there's a bit of a surprise factor, as much as possible, and trying to keep something like that for over six months seemed pretty hard.

What we're suggesting is June 30 to submit, and the Executive Committee would then review them and select the recipient by consensus, and they would do that through perhaps a webinar or a conference call or whatever is necessary to get together, via some electronic means, and so they would get them, review them, and be ready to present the award at the September council meeting. I will just pause here, and does that timing seem reasonable to folks? I see lots of heads nodding, and so I think that's good.

The award process is it will be presented by the Council Chair at the September meeting, and September was chosen because it's usually in Charleston, and it's fairly central, and there's easy airport access, and we're thinking about allowing them to bring say a spouse or a family member or other recipients to come. The council would reimburse them for travel to the awards ceremony, which is pretty common for us. If it's a group, we would invite all the individuals and reimburse all the individuals. If it's an individual, we would support also a family member or companion that they choose to come along with them. I did note in there that do we want to have some limitations. If a group is selected, like we would reimburse up to five individuals, five representatives, if you feel it might be necessary to put some limits on that upfront.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am looking around. I think we're good.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So we're good, and so we won't have any limitations on that upfront. The recipient will receive a plaque, and there was some discussion of potentially financial awards,

maybe making a gift certificate available to them to a local restaurant or something, but that is problematic for us, in terms of doing that type of thing, and so it would just be a plaque, and then we're considering do we create perhaps a permanent plaque displayed at the council office that could list, over time, all the recipients. That's a question there of the permanent plaque.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that.

MR. WHITAKER: I was wondering if we could maybe have the presentation on the same day as our social, if that would work, and, in that case, could we give them a free meal?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We absolutely could do that. We could invite them to come to the social. That would put some obligation on our South Carolina contingent to always have a social for us.

MR. WOODWARD: I'm not on the committee, but just a question about the -- So the decision is to not limit the number of people that you would reimburse for travel?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Unless you want to, and so this suggestion was for five. If you want to put the cap on it, then just speak up.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I'm just curious, because I know, at the ASMFC sometimes, we have a lot of people that are recognized as part of a group, and it could get a little unwieldy, and then, also, that sort of goes into the plaque thing, and so do you give everybody in the group a plaque, or do you give one entity the plaque, and that kind of thing. Those are just little details that --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good question.

MR. BREWER: I had the same concerns that Spud had, because, if you're saying that if it's a group, then you're not going to have any limitations on your travel expenses.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It could be twenty-five people, right.

MR. BREWER: Whereas, if it's an individual, you're saying you get one family member or significant other or whatever, and I think that you should put -- If it's a group, put a limitation of two or three, and, if they want to bring more people, they are responsible for it, for the travel expense, just because you don't want that getting really out of hand. If you think about it, how many people could we reimburse right now that come to these meetings, and the states and -- I mean, you're talking about half a council meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Right.

MR. BELL: Well, just another idea, and I guess, when this started out, I was thinking more along the lines of individuals. I mean, if we could sort of start out in an individual mode for a while and see how that goes, and then, if we want to change it and expand it to groups or something.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just feel like, from the get-go, people are always like, oh no, I have this team that I want recognized, and so that's why I think, if we want to put a cap on it, then we should talk about that cap, and it seems like we're thinking about a cap.

MR. POLAND: I agree with that. I don't want to limit it to an individual right out of the gate, and, also, as far as plaques to a group, if it's a group, they're probably going to be affiliated with some type of organization or something like that, and so the plaque would just go to whatever entity they are from, and I don't see the need to have individual plaques.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was thinking about this from an example, and so let's say you recognized MARMAP for their many years of life history and indices and all that kind of stuff. There would be a plaque that was in recognition of the service of MARMAP, and they can put it in the trophy case there at Fort Johnson.

That's a big group, and they may choose to bring up to say five individuals from that group to come and be recognized, and, in our case, the chief scientist, like Marcel, and maybe a few other key folks that have been around for a long time, particularly if it's for recognition of long service. I think, in that case, we sort of see how it could work, and they might have twenty people working for them at any one time, and so you wouldn't want to bring all twenty, but I think a group like that could probably pick out say five folks that they think are representative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It seems like we're kind of honing-in on the number of five that was suggested in this draft document. It also seems like we're suggesting one plaque that is going to go to the recipient or recipients, and there would be one, and then so are we okay with, in addition, there would be a permanent plaque at the council office, where maybe there is name plates for either the individual or the group on that, and are we okay with that? I see some heads nodding yes, and it looks like heads nodding yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you. Moving on, the nomination process, and nominations would be made by anyone. One possibility that is looked at is nominations would only be made by council members, or perhaps AP and SSC, and so the question is everyone or council members or council members and AP and SSC.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What do we think?

MR. WOODWARD: Just, again, from the commission perspective, it goes out to commissioners and their proxies, and they're the ones that are asked to make the nominations for the commission awards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Do we want to do that? Do we want to also include APs and the SSC? What do we think? I mean, the ASMFC has a lot more commissioners than we have council members, a lot more.

DR. BELCHER: I think it would be good to go ahead and extend it down to the SSC and the APs, because you don't really know what other interactions have been there. I mean, there's a lot of support that comes from a lot of folks that the APs probably have a better handle on, as well as the SSC, and so I think it wouldn't hurt to include those two.

MR. BELL: I agree with that. I think that would give you a broader look at folks, and we don't have a huge number of APs and SSCs, and so I think that would work.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Thank you. That works. The next item is no limitations on who may be nominated, and so this gets into things like we do have another award, the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, and so someone that received that at some time may still be eligible for this award, and say they may have received that at some point in their career, and they could be nominated for their overall career contributions for this, or something like that. Then, also, SSC, AP, council members, et cetera, would all be eligible, and so this would be wide open to anyone that makes a contribution, and someone puts in the effort to nominate them and the group thinks they're worth it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Any thoughts on that? Should we go with that?

MR. BELL: The criteria speak for themselves, and so just whomever fits the criteria.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Any other comments?

MR. POLAND: Should we put in there that you can't nominate yourself? I am just thinking.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't know that ASMFC says that. I guess, if someone wanted to dare, the group could take that into account.

MR. WOODWARD: I think, if that happens, we'll just create a new award with a special name.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Awesome. Thanks.

MR. POLAND: I mean, I'm just throwing it out there, and a new award of the best in modesty award, and I don't know, but, I mean, I'm fine either way on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I mean, do we really need to state that in here? I don't know.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Like Spud said, I think you could take care of that. The nominations have to be provided in writing, and it should be brief, and it's stating not to exceed three pages. You're going to have to read all of these, and so you don't want to give someone a wide open book and they write so, so much that you have to read, and David mentioned having dealt with that apparently through the state for many years, is you do need to put some constraints.

The next one is candidates would be nominated annually, and they would not carry over into future years, and so, in some cases, different awards do say carry nominations for a single year, and so this is really just how you want to handle it, and I think, if someone gets nominated, and then they didn't get selected, if those who nominated them want to update the application and maybe add any additional information -- I think it's kind of good to go through that process, rather than just carry them over, and you could end up with a lot of nominations, perhaps, to look at in every year if they carry over.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do we like the candidates must be nominated annually? Okay. I see people saying yes. Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The general criteria would be the nomination addresses how the nominee has contributed to the science, management, and sustainability of the marine resources and habitats

under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and so this is some guidance, just to let them know what to address in that nomination. Then Number 6 gets into some of the details, again, to keep the nominations focused.

A brief bio would address the following: how has the nominee's work, research, or activities positively impacted conservation of the marine resources of the South Atlantic; how has the nominee's work, research, or activities positively impacted the South Atlantic Council's process, public awareness, or credibility; what makes the nominee's efforts unique or noteworthy; and in what ways has the nominee gone above and beyond in contributing to the South Atlantic Council's mission.

I think, in addressing these things in a three-page limitation, it's going to force the nominators to be pretty concise and write a few paragraphs on these things, and then allowing up to three letters of recommendation, and they may be provided, and they're not required, and saying the letters have to just not exceed one page, again to manage the documentation that you would be asked to review.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are we good with all of that? Any comments?

MR. BELL: It's just a question, but, Spud, does the commission just take just the nomination itself, or are there letters of recommendation, or do they allow that? I am just curious.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, we don't request letters of recommendation as part of the solicitation, but what sometimes happens is you get those as part of the package of the nomination. Oftentimes, what we get is a nomination that is co-signed by several people, and that's the typical approach when you have multiple folks that want to endorse a nomination, is they just all sign on the one common nomination submission.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So this leaves it open-ended that they could be provided, but they are not required.

MR. BELL: Right, but so, like if you don't have them, it doesn't detract from the application, the nomination.

MR. POLAND: I would just say I like the idea of at least allowing letters of recommendation, since we've kind of confined it to council staff, AP members, SSC members, and this allows other people outside of that realm to provide some input.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Is there any other points on this?

MR. BELL: Just a process question. So it's the Executive Committee that reviews the nominations and makes the selection, and so that's not done in the form of a meeting, and we're going to do that by email or --

MS. MCCAWLEY: A webinar, probably.

MR. BELL: Again, is that -- Since it's a committee, does that need to be noticed? It's a different world, and I'm just asking.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Monica, what do you think on this? If we have a webinar of the Executive Finance Committee to review the applications and select a recipient, does that need to be a Federal Register-noticed meeting? I would assume that would be a closed-session meeting, obviously.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think it would probably be both. It would be a Federal Register notice, but you could still have it closed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's interesting. You would notice that this meeting is happening, but it's a closed session, and you can't participate. But at least, transparency-wise, people know it's happening.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then maybe a motion to establish this award, as modified, or something of that nature. I am going to let you get something on the board there. All right. Would someone like to make that motion?

MR. BREWER: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Mel. **The motion is to establish the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Award of Excellence and guidelines, as modified.** Any more discussion of this? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Thanks, John. Thanks for working that for us. I'm really excited that we're going to have this additional award.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I am too, and I thank David for bringing that up and keeping this alive, and I think it's going to be a pretty nice thing to do to recognize our folks. The next item on this is coming out of the council staff leadership retreat, and I will just say a bit about that. Brian and I, along with Kelly and Chip through some portions of it, had a meeting with Mel and Jessica over a couple of days in Charleston, in late January I guess it was, and I wanted to do this just to get a sense of what they expected out of me as coming in as a new Executive Director and also just to talk about like the planning.

We went through the FMP planning, and how do we do a better job of planning, and then how do we, as staff, meet your expectations as a council, and how can we be just broadly more efficient in how we're approaching our operations and serving your needs, as well as our constituents, and really in the context of not expecting any more money to come at us in the future, and so we're going to continue to look for ways to be more efficient.

We covered a lot of ground during a couple of days. We talked about staff processes and managing staff and morale, and we talked about how we interact with the council and communication and lots of stuff, and one of the topics here, and we will work through these topics. We have a workplan for bringing these things up over the next year, and some are going to take a fair amount of work, and some are pretty straightforward.

One of the topics that we did talk about was the number of committees that the South Atlantic Council has, and so, if you go to Attachment 3b, it's a proposal to consolidate our committees, and the bottom line is we, over the years, created a large number of committees. We had twenty committees, and we have twenty committees that stand right now, and it's the largest number of committees of any council in the country, and it's the largest percentage of non-FMP-related committees, and 65 percent of the standing committees are not related to an FMP, and so they're not snapper grouper or dolphin wahoo or golden crab or those sorts of things.

We have five committees that are related to administrative activities. We have a SOPPs Committee, a Personnel Committee, an Executive Finance Committee, and what we have seen in the past is it creates some confusion about, well, who does what piece of business, because we've got all these many committees involved in it, and so we worked with Jessica and Mel to come up with this proposal that consolidates our committees down into a fewer number.

It will make it a little bit easier during the meetings, not jumping from committee to committee, and it will make it easier for us on documents, not having so many agendas and overviews and committee reports and document lists to keep up with, and then, I guess in September, when we come around to you expressing your preferences for the committees you want to be on, it will be a much simpler process, and the Chair won't have to find chairs and vice chairs for twenty individual committees, and so we think that this is just going to make the process a little simpler overall, and so I hope that everyone has had a chance to go through the proposal.

There's a couple of items here that we're suggesting for dealing with the committees, and so I will just run down them, and so the first one being combining three administrative committees into a single Executive Committee, and so that would be Personnel, SOPPs, and Executive Finance would become a single Executive Committee. That would address the overlap in these responsibilities and the confusion over who does what, and it would probably reduce the number of closed sessions and jumping up and down of Chairs during a meeting. We may end up having a longer Executive Finance Committee in some meetings, but not needing the others. I will just go through each one of these and then pause for discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me just say a little bit about this, and so I hadn't even thought about how many committees that we had, and I didn't realize, until John mentioned it, that we had so many more than any other council in the nation, but I can tell you, when we were working on some of the budget items and some of the benefits, that having a separate Personnel Committee from the Executive Finance Committee was very confusing, and the Personnel Committee was trying to have discussions, even though the Personnel Committee isn't the committee that's over the Budget, and Executive Finance is, and it was super confusing.

They do not have the same membership, and it was difficult to figure out what they were doing, and then you throw SOPPs in there, when we were thinking about editing the handbook, and it was definitely a source of confusion, and then I would say probably some frustration by council members in trying to figure out what's my charge, but I'm not on that other committee that does the budget, and I'm not sure what to do here, and so I think that this would be helpful. Mel, I don't know if you want to add anything here.

MR. BELL: No, that's great, and a perfect example is we were tripping all over ourselves at times, trying to work through it procedurally, but combining that makes so much sense, and we wouldn't have had the same challenges we had when we had those discussions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more comments or questions?

MR. WHITAKER: You can remind me, but I think I recall that most of these committees are relatively small, and so would you necessarily want to keep this combined committee small, or would you want to add a person or two to sort of distribute the workload?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that would be something that we could kind of figure out, and so, just like John mentioned, we're coming up on who wants to be on what committee, and people could put forward their wish list, and then Mel and I would talk about, with John, what is the best way to do this, and is smaller better, or is medium-sized better, in order to accomplish the task of the committee, but I agree with John that it has been kind of confusing to try to get the different chairs up here.

Sometimes these committees meet like when we get to Data, HMS, Aquaculture, Protected Resources, and sometimes the committees might go years between the meetings, and so then you're approving minutes from five or six or eight years ago, and it's just kind of a strange situation, and we just felt like we could probably do better.

MS. BECKWITH: I mean, I think the reality is that everyone sits on every committee, and so it really should just be that everyone is on every committee, and you're either engaged in that particular topic or you're sitting here sort of listening, as we often do, and we all participate in the discussion when we care to, and then we spend the whole time clarifying that I'm not on the committee or such, and so I would just -- I mean, if it were me, I would just put everybody on all the committees, and, for at least the next year, I would still like to be the HMS rep.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am going to -- Just to kind of respond to that, also, I'm going to jump ahead, and so one of the suggestions, Number 3, was to eliminate SSC and AP Selection Committees, because that would limit the number of closed sessions that are needed, but we were still hoping to -- Kind of like Anna is saying for HMS, we were still hoping that say Chester and Steve, who are the head of those now on the selection, would still be like the liaison for those and still lead the discussion, but, if you think about how some of the other councils operate, just like Anna is suggesting, they are really doing it kind of as a committee of the whole in closed session to choose people for the SSC and the AP.

MR. BREWER: Effectively, that's what we do now anyway. There may not be voting, but usually what we find is there is consensus that is reached, and so it's a committee of the whole anyway, and it might as well be Full Council. One point, or one thought, that I had though is the use of sort of liaisons to the Chair, and that's a really good idea, because you're going to be vastly expanding Full Council, and that's going to be a hell of a burden on the Chair, and they're going to need some help, and so these designated areas that we have got need to have some liaisons for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I totally agree with that, and, just like Anna is suggesting, we could have liaisons for the ones that are listed in Number 2 that are Data, HMS, Aquaculture, Protected Resources, and we could still have liaisons for that that could accomplish the same thing that

you're suggesting, because, yes, if we get into Full Council and the Chair is then say running everything for all the AP appointments, I just think it's too much, and so I think having the liaison as the lead, with the staffer, to present those things to Full Council would be super helpful. I see a thumbs-up from Steve and a thumbs-up from Mel. John, I'm going to turn it back to you, and I didn't mean to jump into Number 2 and 3 there in my examples.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I appreciate that, and so I'm thinking we're good on 1, and I like the HMS liaison, and, yes, there was -- During this, there was never any expectations to eliminate jobs like that that folks have, and so, on the liaisons, definitely the HMS, and perhaps Protected Resources, and do we need an Aquaculture or Data liaison?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think we need Aquaculture yet, but, Tony, did you have something to say here?

MR. DILERNIA: We at the Mid, just as a little guidance, what we did in the Mid is we wanted to have an Aquaculture Committee, but, because of the litigation in the Gulf regarding aquaculture, we decided to put that on hold until we get some final court decisions.

MR. POLAND: I guess my question for Aquaculture and Protected Resources is what would they liaison with? I mean, would they liaison with the agency? I mean, that's where I'm disconnected on this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with that, and so maybe just those two?

MR. CARMICHAEL: HMS, because that definitely has a role, and then the liaison -- I like the liaison idea, and I'm glad that folks recognize the value of that, and Chester hit the nail on the head, in terms of what we were talking about on the selection process, and so I would say, if something happens with aquaculture and we have a need to have a liaison, we could easily create that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that idea.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That moves into one of the interesting things, is the SSC and AP Selection Committees. I think we were the only council that has selection committees like that, and everyone else just does it through a Full Council process, and so we talked a bit about that, and we really recognized the intensity of that, at times, particularly for the APs, and so that's where we came up with the idea of having liaisons for these activities, to assist the Chair in dealing with the appointment process, and so we thought the SSC liaison could handle SSC and SEDAR AP appointments.

The SEDAR Committee, we'll retain the SEDAR Committee, and we need to have that for dealing with SEDAR process issues and scheduling, and they would continue to make the appointments to the individual workshops, and that's not something that happens really, the way we're progressing now, more than once or twice a year anyway, and that committee has gone from meeting every meeting to kind of every-other meeting now, and so that's really how -- That would be the SSC liaison's job. Then we would have an AP Selection liaison who would handle the AP appointments, much as they do now, with the Chair and working with staff, and we're suggesting that's filled initially by the current AP Selection Committee Chair.

Really, as Jessica said, it's reducing the need for all of those closed sessions, and it's giving all members equal voice in appointment decisions, which is kind of how it plays out. As Anna mentioned, everyone is around the table, and that factored a lot into our thinking on this. The council has changed a lot. There were times, years ago, when whoever was on the committee was the only people in the room when it was being discussed, and it just doesn't operate that way, and I think it was recognized that the issues are too complicated, and the information is too important, and you can't afford to miss it, and so everyone is there, and everyone is taking part, and so this really recognizes that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just have a practical question, and this all sounds fine, and it makes a lot of sense to me, but would you, for these selection sessions, the AP or the SSC or whatever, would you hold a Full Council meeting -- I mean, would you have the Full Council go into session at the beginning of the week and then announce it when they went back into session at the end of the week? I am only asking because, occasionally, you have had -- Someone has had to talk to someone in between, to see if they could do X, Y, or Z, before they could serve on a panel.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I think, very much, we -- Say a June meeting or whenever, and I'm trying to recall when it is that we do like the big round of AP selections, but we could start in Full Council in closed session, to deal with that, and folks that aren't going to be there for closed session could take that into account for their Friday plans, and then we could deal with that in closed session, and then it would be announced during regular Full Council open session later in the week, and that's actually how, logistically, we saw this playing out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica, were you suggesting that we needed two rounds of closed session, in case we couldn't resolve everything in the one earlier in the week and that maybe we need another morning of closed session, and is that what you were suggesting?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, more than suggesting, I was just kind of talking out loud and thinking that I guess that could happen, and, in that case, I guess you would just have to have that extra closed session if you needed it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I saw Chester's hand up and then Mel.

MR. BREWER: We actually have had a situation like that come up before, and there was a person who was well qualified, but got their nose bent out of joint, and so the way that we handled it was, during closed session, we said, okay, as Chair, I will call that person and see if they are willing to serve, and we called that person, and they said they were willing to serve, and so we just announced that, but the motion that was made was, if they were willing to serve, then they would be appointed, so that we wouldn't have to go back into closed session.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. BELL: That was really good that she brought that up, because I think that's the way to start out the meeting, in closed session, and then, if the contingency presents itself, then you deal with it at the end of the meeting in closed session.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Then it looks like -- I know you're taking notes over there, John, but it looks like our new committee structure, the number of committees and such, is down there at the bottom.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right, and so this would create our seven FMP committees, and then we would be down to five other committees, Executive Finance, Law Enforcement, SEDAR, I&E, and Citizen Science.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It is still a lot, but to think that we had twenty committees.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right. That's eight fewer than what we had.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Exactly. So then I think we should entertain a motion to change this up, and then this would start at the June meeting, and is that how this would work, John, and the intent would be that we would put this structure in place to do?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think we could do that.

MR. BELL: Just a question, and so we've got the seven FMP committees, and does that include Habitat?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, it includes Habitat, because there's a habitat-related FMP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Would someone like to make a motion for this committee consolidation?

MR. BREWER: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a second? It's seconded by Mel. **The motion is to approve the committee consolidation plan, as modified.** It's seconded by Mel. Any more discussion on this? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will note the modification was highlighting the HMS liaison.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, John, I think you're going to talk to us a little bit about some handbook updates?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and so we talked about the handbook topics during our retreat, and we recognize that there's a number of things to be addressed that will roll into the handbook and need to be reflected in the handbook, and the plan is to take one bite at that apple of approving the handbook, and that's the feedback we've gotten from the council, to not do this meeting after meeting after meeting, and to get all of our ducks in a row, essentially, and bring to you a handbook that's in really good shape and ready to be approved.

The plan then is to work through these various issues over the coming months and be in the position to give you a handbook that's a good document way to go, and so we've dealt with the travel reimbursement issue here this week. In June of 2020, we're looking ahead to sexual harassment training, and it's an issue that was discussed at the CCC, and it's kind of been on the horizon for a

while. What we're waiting to get the guidance from the agency is the type of training for council members versus staff and working through that, and so that needs to be part of a required thing somewhere in the handbook, and we expect to know more about that in June.

The federal government approved a parental leave policy that will affect NMFS and NOAA employees, and we're not sure how that will affect council employees, but we're expecting to know more say by September, because my understanding is that it would take effect in the next fiscal year of the feds, in October, and so we're looking forward to, perhaps in September of 2020, to having some discussion about that, and then we want to make sure that we have a good review of the handbook by all of the appropriate legal authorities, so that our language is proper and is in compliance with federal law and South Carolina law, because one of the big reasons behind the handbook is to protect us and clarify our policies, to avoid situations that could lead to say a personnel-related lawsuit or something like that.

We're going to work through the handbook and as many of these things as we can, and, when it's ready, we'll bring it in, and what we're going to do and how we view this, as these different policies that we make, the council decides when they're effective, and they are documented by your record here at the meeting and whatever documentation we've put together for that, say a memo or something, and then they become part of your policies, and they will be folded into the handbook formally at a later date.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are there questions or concerns or comments? I just want to say that I appreciate you working on these things. I know that some of them have been kind of hanging out there, and so I think it would be good to take things as they are coming in, and then ultimately have one big package with all the handbook edits, so that we're not looking at the handbook at every single meeting, just the one particular policy.

MR. CARMICHAEL: More time managing fisheries, as Mr. Poland called it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, if there is no other comments on the handbook, then I think we're on to Other Business, and so I'm going to turn it to John to talk a little bit about this NEPA commenting letter.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I sent out the background on that, and the Commission on Environmental Quality has proposed revisions to NEPA, the broad NEPA process as it affects everything, and it's been out for comment, and we requested, as well as the Gulf Council requested, that they come to us and give a presentation on this, and the decision that was made by the folks behind these changes was that they would respond and present to all of the councils at once through the CCC, and so a webinar was held just a few weeks ago, where they presented the recommendations to the EDs and the Council Chairs and Vice Chairs through a webinar, and they gave some background and tried to look at how it focused on and affected Magnuson Act issues.

In some cases, we know, and, in other cases, we don't, and one of the big issues about this is the idea of functional equivalency, which refers to whether or not management plans done under Magnuson Act provisions can be considered functionally equivalent to NEPA in which case you could do a management plan under MSA and be considered to comply with the criteria under NEPA. As it is now, we do sort of a hybrid document that does Magnuson Act provisions, as well as NEPA provisions, and so that's one of the things that is going into the comment letter.

We have been working on the letter this week, and we've been working through Jessica to get a version ready for the council, and we planned to have it ready today, so that you guys could look at it during Executive Finance tomorrow and approve it during Full Council. Obviously, we're a little ahead of that, and our letter preparation plans are right where we expected them to be, but our council meeting has gotten quite a bit ahead of us, and so I think we're to probably the last version, and Jessica just kind of has been sitting up here and has not had a chance to look at it, but, later today, we should have a version of the letter to come out to you guys, and we can talk about specific comments more in Full Council.

It's not real long, and so it's not like we're asking you to review a ten-page letter. I think it's about a page, and it hits on -- If you looked at the presentation stuff from the CCC, it hits on the functional equivalency idea, and it looks at the time and page limits and how that affects the council process, because our integrated documents have a lot more pages in them, and it comments on the commenting process, and they're being very particular about how they want comments provided through a NEPA process, you know list the page number, list the item number, state exactly what you want, and we feel it could be a bit intimidating, and maybe even pushing back a bit on fishermen that might find that sort of thing a challenge.

Then we're looking at how the effects, and that's been one of the debates going on now, is clarifying how the change in indirect and direct and cumulative effects could affect us, and then there's the Magnuson issue as well as our FMP issue as well as bigger things. There might be other government agencies that could affect us, such as say wind power, in which case cumulative effects might be a really big thing, if there is a series of relatively small projects all lined up, and so that's some of the things that we're working through, and I think we're pretty good on that letter, and we'll get it out.

The challenge is that it's due on -- I think this was due on the 13th, and so we have the Keys letter due on -- One is due on the 10th, and one is on the 13th, and so we've got two letters that are going to be due next week, and so this is the council's chance to give us some feedback on those, and so we're kind of cranking on those.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I actually thought the NEPA letter was due Friday, that it was due on the 6th, but maybe I'm wrong. John Hadley says it's the 10th.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: John, the Keys letter, the sanctuary letter, is due on the 13th.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So the sanctuary is the 13th, and this is the 10th, and so you do have a lot of letters that we'll need to wrap up tomorrow. Is there any other questions on it? Then the next item, just to give you a heads-up, is the CCC is meeting -- It's hosted by the West Pacific Council this year, and recall that we hosted last year and got to have all that great fun having everybody in our area, and it will be in Hawaii, and it's May 26 through 29, and they're currently working on the agenda, and we've been submitting comments and suggested topics, and it will be very typical to a lot of the past, and it seems a lot of the topics are ongoing updates and the kind of national-level business that we deal with, dealing with the budget and how the budget is presented, dealing with these various national policies and MSA revision and what laws are coming at us. Obviously, we're going to talk about that sexual harassment issue.

The representatives would be me, Jessica, and Mel, and nobody has said the word “coronavirus” relative to flying to Hawaii in May, and I’m kind of surprised, given the way the other EDs are at times, but it won’t surprise me if this comes up pretty soon, about the nature of this meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The one thing, and Mel brought it up earlier, is kind of the whole species moving north, and it seemed like the South Atlantic Council was the lead on the management side on that, and different people were tasked with doing different things, and I know Bob Beal was tasked with going and getting some information, and the science workshop, which we have coming up at the end of April, and so I don’t know if that needs to be brought up at the CCC or it’s just something that we work with the rest of the councils and the ASMFC along the Atlantic to plan something for later in 2020 on the management side, and I don’t know, but I will just bring that up, because Mel reminded us that we don’t have a time certain when the management side is going to talk about that again.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I made a note of that, and I think you’re right that this is sort of an Atlantic issue, or it seems to be, that we’re pushing, and it might be a good chance to talk with some of the other council leadership while we’re out there, and we can also talk with Bob, and I agree with you.

I think, once we get this science workshop and see what comes of that, that should help us then push to have something similar done on the management side, and it may be something that we as councils have to actually put forth, versus the agency is really steering the Atlantic science workshop, and so that’s on the list for an update from the Science Center during Full Council, and I think Todd Kellison has been involved in the organizing of that, and I think he will talk some more about that during his report, and that’s one that we’re also involved in the planning of, and there’s an agenda meeting next week or the week after, pretty soon, and so that’s coming along pretty nice.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more comments or questions about the CCC meeting? Any other business to come before the Executive Finance Committee?

MR. BELL: I just wanted to thank Jessica and John and other staff. The get-together we had in January was kind of a -- It was just talk and think-through, and that was very good. I mean, you guys were very open with us, and I think that was very beneficial, in terms of being able to think of things that we could do for the common good and process improvement, efficiency, all those things, and so that was very productive, and, if we could do that every year, and that’s great thing, to just kind of have leadership come together and see where we are and if there are things that we can make improvements on, and so it was very useful time that we spent, and so thanks for making that happen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree. I thought it was a great meeting and lots of good discussions, and, a lot of times, once we get to the council meeting, it’s all how can we move the council items through the process, but to kind of step away from that and talk about everything, from efficiency to how can we do some things differently, how can we save money, what can we do, and I think it’s a great idea to have one of those meetings annually, just away from the council meeting, and so, yes, I really appreciate staff bringing all those great ideas, and, just like Mel said, I thought it was a great discussion.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I thank you all for that, and I certainly feel like it has helped me to get off to a good start, and so we plan to meet again in August and touch base on where things stand and lay out a plan for the rest of the year, and I think, from that point, we'll just try to do this annually with the council leadership, and it keeps us all on the same page and lets us map out some of the behind-the-scenes tasks that we have to do, plus plan for how we bring bigger tasks to you through the year, the things that are more council business and administrative related and not so much FMP, because we do a really good job planning that side of the office, but the administrative stuff sometimes not so much, and I think it's really helped for us planning administratively, and so I appreciate the time of you guys coming in to take time to meet with us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I think we're going to wrap up the Executive Finance Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 4, 2020.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
April 13, 2020

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

~~3/5/20~~
3/4/20

Executive Director ✓

John Carmichael ✓
john.carmic@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier ✓
chip.collier@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

Dr. Brian Chevront ✓
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist ✓

Myra Brouwer ✓
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese ✓
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd ✓
julia.byrd@safmc.net

Outreach Program Coordinator ✓

Cameron Rhodes ✓
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya ✓
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas ✓
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist ✓

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

Fisheries Social Scientist ✓

Christina Wiegand ✓
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

Fishery Economist ✓

John Hadley ✓
john.hadley@safmc.net

Outreach Specialists:

BeBe Harrison - MyFishCount ✓
bebe.harrison@safmc.net

Public Information Officer ✓

Kim Iverson ✓
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Allie Iberle - Citizen Science ✓
allie.iberle@safmc.net

Administrative Officer ✓

Kelly Klasnick ✓
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators:

Dr. Julie Neer ✓
julie.neer@safmc.net

Meeting Coordinator

Tina Chrise ✓
tina.chrise@safmc.net

Kathleen Howington ✓
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2020 COUNCIL MEMBERS

~~3/5/20~~
3/4/20

Jessica McCawley, **Chair**
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E. Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Mel Bell, **Vice Chair**
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Robert Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

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

Dr. Carolyn Belcher
GA DNR – Coastal Resources Division
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

Chester Brewer
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777 (ph)
wcbsafmc@gmail.com

Dr. Kyle Christiansen
150 Cedar St.
Richmond Hill, GA 31324
(912)756-7560 (ph)
christiansensafmc@gmail.com

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

LCDR Jeremy Montes
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
(305)415-6788(ph); (305)710-4569(c)
Jeremy.J.Montes@uscg.mil

Stephen Poland
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
PO Box 769
3441 Arendell Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
(252)808-8011 (direct); (252)726-7021 (main)
Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov

Art Sapp
2270 NE 25th St.
Lighthouse Pointe, FL 33064
(954)444-0820 (ph)
artsappsafmc@gmail.com

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2020 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W. Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
(202)647-3228 (ph)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

David Whitaker ✓
720 Tennent Street
Charleston, SC 29412
(843)953-9392
david.whitakersafmc@gmail.com

Spud Woodward ✓
860 Buck Swamp Road
Brunswick, GA 31523
(912)258-8970 (ph)
swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com

Dana Smith

Pat O'Shaughnessy

Dr. Wilson Kenney

Dr. George Sedberry

Shep Grimes

Rick Devictor

Er. Ka Burgess

Monica Smt Brunello

Dr. Clay Pouch

Tony Dennis

Dancy Hemlight

J.D. Dussins

Dr. Jack McGovern

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2020 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

~~3/5/20~~
3/4/20

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Tim Griner, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Kyle Christiansen
Chris Conklin
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

AQUACULTURE

Roy Crabtree, Chair
Chester Brewer, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Steve Poland
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

CITIZEN SCIENCE

Mel Bell, Chair
Kyle Christiansen, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Steve Poland
Art Sapp
David Whitaker
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Julia Byrd

DATA COLLECTION

Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Steve Poland, Vice-Chair
Robert Beal
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Kyle Christiansen
Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Art Sapp
Staff contact: Chip Collier

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Art Sapp, Vice-Chair
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Kyle Christiansen
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Jeremy Montes
Steve Poland
David Whitaker
Spud Woodward
Mid-Atlantic Liaisons:
Tony Dilernia/Dewey Hemilright
New England Liaison: Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Jessica McCawley, Chair ✓
Mel Bell, Vice Chair ✓
Carolyn Belcher ✓
Chester Brewer ✓
Steve Poland ✓
Staff contact: John Carmichael/Kelly Klasnick

GOLDEN CRAB

Chris Conklin, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Carolyn Belcher
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
David Whittaker
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MGMT.

Steve Poland, Chair
David Whitaker, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Art Sapp
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Chip Collier – Coral/CEBA