

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Bahia Mar Doubletree by Hilton
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

June 14, 2018

SUMMARY MOTIONS

Executive Finance Committee Members

Charlie Phillips
Chester Brewer
Jessica McCawley

Mark Brown
Doug Haymans

Council Members

Robert Beal
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner

Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Dr. Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig

Council Staff

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Kimberly Cole
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kathleen Howington
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Kelsey Dick
John Hadley
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand

Overserves and Participants

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dale Diaz
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Erik Williams
Mary Vera
Dr. Jessica Stephen
Tracy Dunn

Dr. Clay Porch
Erika Burgess
Rick DeVictor
Shep Grimes
Karla Gore
Fran Karp

Other observers and participants attached.

The Executive Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Bahia Mar Doubletree by Hilton, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Thursday afternoon, June 14, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Charlie Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: We're going to start the Executive Finance Committee. The first order of business is we're going to approve the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know if this is a change or it goes under Other Business or it comes up during council priorities, but I would like to talk about how the committee chairs look at the agendas prior to them being published for the council meeting.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Anything else?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I had something for conversation's sake to bring up about like committee members attending different APs and that sort of stuff. I know we had a conversation recently about that, and I just thought more about it, and I had some additional ideas.

MR. PHILLIPS: Could you say that one more time again? I couldn't quite hear you.

MS. BECKWITH: You know during one of the last Executive Finance Committee meetings we talked about how, in general, for APs and SSC meetings and such, really the Chair and the Vice Chair of each individual committee would be allowed to attend as well as the Chair and Vice Chair of the council. I just had some additional thoughts on that requirement, particularly because we have so many new council members coming in, and I just wanted to add a thought, and I'm not sure if right now is the appropriate time, but I can certainly vomit it out in two sentences.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We'll talk about that during Other Business. Anything else? All right. With those notes, the agenda is approved, unless there is opposition. Seeing none, then we have approval of the March 2018 minutes. Are there any changes to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

MR. WAUGH: As far as Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization, there is still some thought that this may happen. We'll see whether that shakes out or not. We have been asked to comment several times, and the council has sent letters to Chris Oliver and Senators Graham and Scott, and the CCC working paper has been sent to the Secretary of Commerce. You all have copies of this, and I'm not going to go through that in any detail.

You have the CCC working paper, and the report from the CCC meeting was emailed to you all directly and put in the late materials folder, and so that has four additional items to be added to the working paper, and so you will have the opportunity to review our regional perspectives on those and offer any input at this meeting or between now and the next meeting. That's it, Mr. Chairman, for that, and I would be glad to answer any questions.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are there any questions?

MR. HARTIG: Gregg, do you have a sense of the longer this goes is there -- Are there chances of things be changed? I mean, is there work going on behind the scenes now, further work, as we speak, about changes in Magnuson?

MR. WAUGH: Well, there is work going on behind the scenes. There is a House version out, and there is work on another Senate version. There is some talk about, when Magnuson has been reauthorized in the past, it has happened during the lame duck session, and so maybe it will happen then. We just have to wait and see, and so I don't know if Jessica has any further thoughts on that from their contacts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that's about the same thing that we've heard, although there was some movement on a Coast Guard bill that I guess there was some fractioning among the people about the Coast Guard bill. I think that that had to do with discharge water and I think Great Lakes fisheries, and that seemed to upset people enough that maybe they don't want to move Magnuson now, and so that's something that I heard when we were in D.C. a few weeks ago.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, there are no additional changes to this CCC working paper? I mean, I know it said in the overview that this is the version that is dated November 14, 2017, and I was just a little confused as to if there were additional changes or additional topics that we had not talked about subsequent to our gigantic Executive Finance Committee meeting, where we went through this in such detail.

MR. WAUGH: There are four new topics, and those have been added as an attachment to the report from the CCC meeting that was distributed, and so we have some draft language that we have put in there, and the CCC has approved those consensus statements, and so I thought we would pick that up under that topic and see, again, if there is any thoughts to change some of that language here at this meeting, and we can, and we can also do that between now and our next meeting.

DR. DUVAL: Great. Thanks.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? Then I guess that leads us to our draft budget.

MR. WAUGH: Let me just give a couple of introductory remarks and then Mike will go through this. We've got the activity schedules in there for our general fund and SEDAR. That's what we use, as we have in the past, to build out our budget. We have put this budget together based on level funding, and the overview on page 4 outlines six items that the council approved back in December, one of which is the council member travel policy, and we'll come back to this based on Anna's interest in discussing that some more, but we have used these changes to build out this draft budget.

We still don't have all the money in hand, and NMFS doesn't have its spend plan yet. We are assured that the monies that we have received last year -- That we will get those, plus Chris Oliver was able to work within NMFS/NOAA and identify an additional million dollars that gets divvied up amongst the councils according to the allocation formula, and that means we have an additional \$107,500. That would be added to the \$3.03 million that is shown in Attachment 2a.

In addition, as you all remember, we have about \$169,000 in carryover from last year, and we expect to get that \$107,500 in 2018 and in 2019, and so one change that needs to be made to both this general fund budget and the SEDAR budget has to do with staff comp. On Monday, when meeting as a committee of the whole, you all approved a cap on merit and cash awards of 2 percent

of the salary, and so that number -- A part of that we have built in, and this draft budget has 3 percent in there, and so that number will have to be backed out, and so approximately \$16,000 will need to be backed out, and the bulk of it comes out of staff comp on the general fund, and a little bit will come out of SEDAR, and then the remainder comes out of coral and our other grants.

Mike will walk you through the details of this. It's up to you all whether you feel you have enough information now to approve this budget. We've been operating under the budget, and it would be our intent to continue operating under the budget. If you all are comfortable, you can approve the budget now, with some leeway to make those modifications to the staff comp, or you can wait until September, and we should have our spend plan by then and have the final numbers. Mike, do you want to walk through the details, please?

MR. COLLINS: In addition to the staff comp number going down, of course, FICA will go down a little bit as well as retirement, because those are all part of that. I think we're on schedule to spend what we've projected. Again, what Gregg said, we used the activities schedule, and that's where we have carryover. It normally comes out of travel budget, and, so far this year, with my crystal ball that I used back in 2017, I was pretty close on the council meeting in March and the Snapper Grouper AP.

We overspent a little bit on the listening stations, the Personnel Committee, and the SSC, but we underspent my estimate on the Joint Golden Crab/Shrimp and Mackerel AP and Habitat AP and Law Enforcement AP and the SEP, and so, overall, we have underspent my estimates on travel, and so that's a good trend towards the end of the year, where, again, that's where we get some excess funds that carry over.

Right there, that's the general one, and this is the SEDAR one, and, again, it's projected slightly over level funding. On the SEDAR side, we underspent on SEDAR 51, the cobia workshops, and the Steering Committee, and so that's, again, a good trend on the SEDAR side of things for carryover. Any questions?

DR. DUVAL: Mike, do you mind running through -- You said we overspent on the Snapper Grouper AP and which other APs again? I think I saw this in the activity sheet report, but --

MR. COLLINS: You would have seen that on the activities. Let me pull that up. Actually, the one that's in there is of May 22, and so it wouldn't have shown all the TOs that have come in. The council meeting, I think we were over by \$2,000, which really isn't bad on a \$70,000 outlay. Then, for Snapper Grouper, I think we were over by about \$3,000, but, conversely, just because I looked at it recently, on the Law Enforcement, we were about \$7,000 under, and so, when we're under, there are some good chunks of change there that will, again, lend itself to some good numbers at the end of the year, I think. I can get with you with a more recent one, if you want, separately.

DR. DUVAL: I was just curious. I couldn't remember exactly, again, where the overages and underages occurred.

MS. BECKWITH: Since we're looking at the budget, I will go ahead and bring up my thought in terms of the council travel budget. When I got to thinking about the decision we had made at the last Executive Finance Committee, in terms of council travel to AP meetings, I started thinking about the fact that we've got three new council members coming in that are not sort of state

liaisons, and I remember, as a new council member, I actually learned extreme amounts by attending the Snapper Grouper AP, the Mackerel AP, and an SSC meeting.

The way we have it currently structured, with our new policy, is that only the Chair and the Vice Chair of the committee and the Chair and the Vice Chair of the council can attend APs. I think my suggestion would be to reconsider that and, depending on allowance for budgets, to assign a certain number of travel meetings that a council member could attend, two meetings or three meetings, whatever is appropriate based on the budget, to allow those new council members an opportunity to attend some of those APs, where, given the workload that we're going to have in the next couple of years, they're not going to have a lot of time to sort of play catch-up, and one of the easiest ways to play catch-up is to sit through a Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel meeting for a week and go through all those details and listen to those discussions. It's not necessarily in terms of a motion to change the policy or anything, but this would be my suggestion, and I think it would behoove us in the long run and get our new guys kind of up and running quicker.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anna, one of the new guys may be an ex-old guy, and so he would know the rhythm, and I would be inclined to leave that up to Mark and Gregg and Mike to work that out in the budgets and see who is here in September and then work it out accordingly.

MR. GRINER: I am not on the committee, but I just wanted to echo Anna's thoughts there. When I first came on, I was able to go to one AP meeting, the Snapper Grouper AP meeting, and then we instituted this policy, and so I haven't been able to go to any more, but I found it very, very beneficial for me.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Tim.

MR. HARTIG: That's a great suggestion by Anna, because not only do you get to interact with the fishermen and hear their viewpoints, but you get a review of what's going on at the council for those amendments in snapper grouper, and so it really is beneficial to get that secondary exposure, especially when you're first coming onboard.

MR. BELL: That's consistent with -- Recall we had some discussion about training for new council members or some sort of training. I mean, it is kind of a -- You get to jump in there and get trained by the fire hose sort of effect, but it's a good opportunity, and, for me personally, as a new council member, and, of course, it was easy, because I was local in Charleston for a lot of stuff, but it really helps. You don't really have a lot of training opportunities, so to speak, and so, to the degree that we can do that and support it, that would be great. The other thing is, if it comes down to sticking to the system we set up, with the Chair and Vice Chair or whatever, but, if you had room to add another person, a new person would be the person you might want to prioritize, for training opportunities.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Well, like I said, I would -- Go ahead, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Just to clarify, it seems then that you're indicating that you want to give the Council Chair, working with the ED and the Administrative Officer, some flexibility to have new council members attend some of the AP meetings even if we go over your limits, if you will, that you have indicated in the travel policy. As long as we have the money to do that, you all feel that

would be something that is within the authority of the Chair, the ED, and the Administrative Officer to do, and is that correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's kind of what I'm hearing, and I guess it would be kind of set with the priorities of do we want another SSC meeting and some of those other priorities and figure out, again, with Mark and the Executive Committee -- They can figure out how they want to spend whatever they've got extra to spend. That's what I would see happening in September.

MR. HAYMANS: I would think, depending on who the Chair and Chair and Vice Chair and Vice Chair are of the council committees, one or two of them may not necessarily want to go, and that would make room, so that we're not, all of a sudden, putting six out there, but certainly leave that to those guys to decide, but I wouldn't think that we would necessarily have to send six people.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think we need more council members there than we have AP members. All right. I think that covers that.

MR. WAUGH: Let me mention one thing that I forgot to on the SEDAR budget, if you could put that up, Mike. You will see that, at the bottom of the SEDAR budget, the total is \$630,642. Generally, we budget just a little bit over. Again, Mike does his best to estimate travel, but our intent is to not go over what we expect to receive for SEDAR funding and have received in the past, and what that is, it's \$600,337, and so that's what we will use as our ceiling and aim for that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, and I'm not sure what we might have saved by not filling that one seat earlier in the week, and maybe we've saved a little bit of money there, too. All right. What's next?

MR. WAUGH: Did you all want to have any more discussion? Did you want to approve the budgets or wait until September?

MS. MCCAWLEY: What are we going to do about the items from the Personnel Committee, that multipage document of recommendations, which was questions and responses to budget items? That was a lengthy document that included everything from SEDAR questions to things about state liaison grants and others, and we also talked about, during the Personnel Committee, that reduce the state liaison grants and reduce council staff retirement match by 10 percent, that was only a one-year. I thought that was a multi-year reduction, but I was told earlier this week that that was only a single-year reduction, and so I'm not sure how you want to handle that multipage document from the Personnel Committee and that stuff.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thoughts from the committee?

MR. WAUGH: If folks need a little more time to digest that, we can come back to that at the September meeting, but it was the intent that those reductions were for the 2018 budget, and, as you can see from looking, when we put those in place, we were looking at a potential budget crunch. We don't have that now. We are carrying over \$169,000, and we've got an additional \$107,500 in this year and next year, and so we're okay for 2018 and 2019. The question is what happens in 2020. If you all want to give some more thought to that and revisit it in September, that's up to you all. Again, we've been operating under this budget that you have before you, but it's up to you all.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess, to Jessica, do you want to somehow take that list of bullets from Personnel and, since it's not included here, either address that list at Full Council or put it into the September agenda?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It might be easier to put it into the September agenda, and so, as I mentioned, the reduce the state liaison grants and reduce the council staff retirement match -- Just to be clear, we would be -- When we approve the budget, we are approving those two items, those two reductions, for this year, but then, sometime later this year or next year, we would approve it for the next year's budget, and I'm confused.

MR. WAUGH: That's correct. Those items are in the 2018 budget. In December, we may start talking about the 2019 budget, so that we have an idea of what we're to operate on starting on January 1 of 2019. Again, we won't get our numbers until the March meeting at the earliest next year, but we would work up a draft budget for you all to look at for the December meeting, and then that's where you would look at whether you want to continue those reductions or not continue them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess, based on Doug's question, maybe I can make a list of some of these items that we've talked about, and so we've talked about things like Mid-Atlantic Council liaison and other stuff like that, and I can make a list, because I feel like the list is in a couple of different places, and I can make the list and then we can have that for the September meeting. I don't think I can have it by Full Council.

MR. HAYMANS: I would think that would be an appropriate way to go.

MR. WAUGH: We have that list. It was sent to council members, the list of recommendations from the Personnel Committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think it's saying to pare it down into a more usable list, kind of like what you have in the overview, is what he was suggesting.

DR. DUVAL: I am certainly happy to provide some input on those. I mean, I think the -- We did have some discussion about some of these in March, and I think we were concerned about the SEDAR budget and any shortfall in the money that we get for SEDAR coming out of the council's budget, and so we had concerns about that and how to address it with the other cooperators.

In terms of the state liaison grants, I understood that it was only for -- The 10 percent reduction was only for 2018, and we moved forward with that, and I'm fine with that, and so, certainly in December, when you all start looking at the 2019 budget, you all can decide how you want to handle that. I think the other items were moving forward with aquaculture, having an additional SSC meeting, and a Mid-Atlantic liaison.

In reviewing the minutes from last time and also some of the Personnel Committee discussion about that, my only concern about a Mid-Atlantic liaison, besides the cost, and my suggestion was to make sure that we're just being judicious with when we send a liaison to the Mid-Atlantic and that it is when there are pertinent items that we have a mutual interest in happening.

I think I didn't just want like the North Carolina state representative to be saddled with that duty all the time. It's not that I wouldn't be happy or whoever is going to be sitting in my seat wouldn't be happy to do that, but I just think that we need to be -- Just like we rotate amongst Gulf Council liaisons, it would be my hope that the council would rotate amongst Mid-Atlantic Council liaisons as well, and that's all. It's not that I wouldn't be amenable to doing that.

MR. BROWN: I talked to Gregg about that too, Michelle, and that I did want to go to some of the Mid-Atlantic meetings, but I only wanted to go to the ones that had something to do with the cross-management.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and I thought the state liaison grants and that 10 percent was more than a year too, but, again, it's probably look at it again come September. Gregg, that \$107,000, you said 2018 and 2019, but that's just one \$107,000 that we get between 2018 and 2019, or do we get \$107,000 two years in a row?

MR. WAUGH: The expectation is they're going to give it to us in 2018 and again in 2019, and so two times that, and so \$214,000 over the two years.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Well, that gives us -- Of course, if we start an aquaculture FMP, that will be -- That will come out of that, amongst whatever else we're going to do.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and we'll get into this a little more in the CCC report, but we had sent a letter to NMFS asking for funding to hire a person for three years to write and work with the council and develop an aquaculture FMP. The response was they don't have any additional funding, and that \$107,000 is available to be used for regulatory reform, aquaculture, or any other activity the council wishes to use it for.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I didn't want to get into it right now, but since we're talking budget, there is still going to be a lot of decisions to be made on how to split up the pie with all the priorities that we want to do. All right. Anything else?

MR. WAUGH: Okay. If we're finished with the budget, we will bring back a revised budget for both of them with the adjustments for the September meeting. We will work with Jessica to get a list of items to look at for making adjustments and revisit this in September. Then next is the council follow-up and priorities, and Brian is going to handle that.

While he's getting that up, let me just say a couple of introductory remarks here and express our thanks to Jack, Rick, Jessica, and the rest of the Southeast Regional Office staff and to Monica and Shep. There is a lot of amendments under development right now, and the regional staff -- When people are leaving, they are unable to fill those positions, and so the folks that are left there are picking up more, and more of that work is being shifted to our staff as well, but they held a workshop on Monday morning, while we were in here.

Our two staffs got together and shared information about how we can better work together, and that was extremely productive, and I would like to thank Brian and Rick for making those arrangements and the Region for sending their staff over, and I think that's very productive, and Brian may get into that some more a little later, but that's something we would like to do again in the future.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Since Gregg brought it up, I will just start off with that real quickly. Yes, it was a really, really productive meeting that we had Monday morning, and, in talking about it, we thought that, if it's possible for us to do this in the future, it makes sense to do it during the Florida meeting, so that the SERO staff typically won't have to travel very far to get there, and our staff is already going to be there anyway, and so the idea was to do it in the most cost-effective way possible, short of doing a webinar.

We really felt that there was a huge amount of value to doing this face-to-face, as opposed to spending half-a-day talking to our computer screens, and so it was really good, because a lot of it -- What it did is it allowed us to be able to get a glimpse into what the everyday working life is of our counterparts, and, in some cases, we had people who have been working with each other for a while, but had never met each other, and so there was that aspect of it, but there was just a really good sense of joint commitment to what we're trying to do, with an understanding of the constraints that we both work under, and sometimes those constraints are a little bit different depending on what are the different amendments and stuff that we're working on, but we're also -
- You guys are dealing with budget issues and all that stuff, and we as staff are, too.

We need to be able to talk about who is going to be able to pick up this burden, because we can't do it because we're short people and things like that, and so it was really a very, very effective meeting, and, if we could do it every year, it would be great. If we can do it less often that, that's still fine. I think somebody said it was about twelve years since the staff of the two organizations had actually gotten together, and it was way too long.

It was when the council was working on Snapper Grouper Amendment 13C and the council basically said you guys get together and figure this one out and come back to us, and that was the last time the staffs had gotten together, and that was way too long, but, anyway, let's get into some of the issues that we've got before us now on this next agenda item.

The follow-up is the document that we get to you at every council meeting. We give you the latest version at the time the briefing book goes out, and that's not what I am projecting right now. I just wanted to mention it, and I don't think I feel like I need to bring it up, but I just wanted to emphasize to you that this document is what keeps track of where everything is, what's been done, what's been completed, what are basically our marching orders that come out of these council meetings, and I try very hard, and I admit there is a huge amount of detail in here, but I try very hard to keep it up-to-date all the time.

If you've got a question about something and you're looking through the follow-up and you don't see what you're looking for, contact me, and, if I can't give you the answer right away, I will find it and get you that information you're looking for.

Let's now try to move into some of the priorities, and we've got -- I also wanted to try to bring up the idea of all the scoping and public hearings that we've got scheduled, and so let's go through the priorities first, and then we'll come back and pick up some of that scoping and public hearing, and I've got another document to show you about all that.

This is the document, and I have slightly updated the one that was in the briefing book, only because -- Let me show you over here. What we're trying to do is to figure out basically the

visioning issues and what is happening with Myra here, because there was some shifting of things around, and some things got dropped out of Amendment 26, but there's a couple of other things that we need to consider that have not been on the priorities.

I know that the Chairman wants to consider adding the development of another FMP, and that's not on here yet, and so we'll get to that in just a moment, but, right now, what we have to do is figure out how we're going to deal with the implications of MRIP for recalibrations for vermilion snapper, black sea bass, blueline tilefish, red grouper, and wreckfish and allocations and all that. There is an assumption that this could probably happen in an abbreviated framework, which would be Abbreviated Regulatory Framework Number 2, assuming that that's all we're going to do, but I'm not sure.

The allocation, if we actually are changing allocations, that cannot be in an abbreviated framework, but we'll have to think about how that's going to go, and I'm assuming that that is something that you will all want to consider maybe starting in December of this year, at this December council meeting, because we ought to have the recalibration numbers and have them reviewed by the SSC this fall, and so I want you to keep that in your minds. I'm putting that kind of on the list, but I'm not quite sure where it's going to go.

Another thing that was mentioned at the March council meeting, and I don't think we got real clear direction from you on, is, this year, we're supposed to be doing the visioning biennial review for snapper grouper, and there was some discussion about doing that in August of this year. You know, you've got two visioning amendments that are open right now, and you might want to consider how you want to handle that conflict of having two amendments open that deal with visioning specifically coming out of this that haven't been completed yet.

You might want to decide how you want to handle the visioning biennial review, and we brought it up because it's on the schedule. You had mentioned it briefly in March, and we just need direction on where you want to go with this at this point, and so if we could have the discussion, particularly about the visioning biennial review, that would be very, very helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would suggest postponing it, especially since we're going to look at everything that we're going to take out to scoping here in a second. I am even more concerned about that, and I would suggest postponing it for the rest of this calendar year.

MR. BELL: I agree.

DR. DUVAL: I think, given everything else that is on our plate, I would want to maybe close out a few things. I mean, we have tackled quite a few things from visioning. You know, we had webinars the year before -- Let's see. We had some webinars at the end of 2016, I think it was, just to kind of do a bit of a review. Maybe that's something we could tackle in early 2019 via webinars as well.

I am looking back to Amber back there, because I don't remember, off the top of my head. Amber or Myra, but I don't remember, off the top of my head, how we had sort of structured that biennial review. We had talked about doing it, obviously, via webinars, in conjunction with these August meetings, but, if we want to postpone that, is there an opportunity to kind of kick that back to sort of the winter?

MS. BROUWER: A few things. The biennial review actually is supposed to take place in December, and so this round of input-gathering sessions that were mentioned that you guys gave us direction to go forward with in August was simply to -- It was my understanding that it was to update stakeholders on what the council has been doing regarding visioning, and there are actually four amendments containing visioning.

There is Amendment 46, recreational reporting and then the best fishing practices, and we also have done the snapper grouper characterization that Kari did of the commercial fishery. A lot of the citizen science work has been addressing visioning, and so I think we have a lot to show the public what you guys have been up to. It could be done in conjunction with some of the scoping meetings, whichever ones end up staying on the table, and I think, if you postpone gathering input, then we will have to revise the timeline for the actual review, which, like I said, is supposed to take place in December. Does that help?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and so we're just letting -- Myra, maybe you can also answer the question of what were you all thinking about in terms of the instrument to solicit that input? Usually we have a scoping presentation for most of our amendments that we're taking out.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and so I guess what I had envisioned in the last couple of days was to sort of have like a list of all the visioning activities that the council is doing, which will encompass, like I said, a lot of the amendments that are being worked on. As far as the way that we take this out to the public, it could be a combination of things. I think we could pull off some listening stations, like I said, and combine this input, this request for input, with some of the scoping hearings that I think are going to be held via webinars.

My understanding is that some of them you guys intend to do in person, like for Amendment 47, and so I think we'll have to play around with it a little bit. It could be a combination, and also I forgot to mention that you did give us guidance that we should also go and request input during the fall Snapper Grouper AP meeting as well, and so that one has already been -- I think that's pretty clear that we will get input from stakeholders on visioning at that time. Does that answer your question?

DR. DUVAL: We did that at the end of the Snapper Grouper Committee meeting in March, and was that it?

MS. BROUWER: Correct, yes.

DR. DUVAL: Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else?

MR. HARTIG: In this process of taking this additional visioning comment, to me, we could do it several ways that have already been mentioned, but, to me, if you put an article in the *South Atlantic Update* and you highlight what we've done and you give them a comment area where they can comment about it, that seems, to me, to be another way to reach a number of different people, because that's a pretty widely-read publication. That might be another avenue to use.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Among the things that we also need to look at is the current timing for the two visioning amendments that we have, the recreational and the commercial. Right now, the timeline had shown them both being approved for sending in for secretarial review after the September council meeting, and I would like to find out if that is still your plan for what you are hoping to do, or do you think that's going to get pushed back? That will help us with planning as well.

MS. MCCAULEY: I think that the commercial one -- That plan can probably still be accomplished, but I question whether it can on the recreational one, especially since we're making a lot of changes. We will have to look at that again, but I will look over at other folks and see what they think.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other thoughts?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Myra and I were just talking about that we should be able to get the commercial visioning done in September and probably finish the recreational visioning in December. Okay. Then what it's looking like, and we have this down here with the MRIP implications, but we might also be able to change ACLs and everything all in a single amendment. We do now have vermilion and black sea bass -- You have given us direction to put that into a single amendment, and so that's going to free Myra up, probably, to then go ahead and be working on some of these MRIP implications. Myra just found that out, and so we've got that, and I will move these things over, so that they're shown together, and I will have the updated version going out.

Chip is still working on the coral/shrimp/habitat amendment that we were talking about earlier today, plus there is additional coral activities, and then finishing Amendment 46, hopefully, by the end of this year. No? When do we think it's going to be done, Chip?

DR. COLLIER: I think it's going to take a while.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so that could conceivably be going longer, and I am still doing the wreckfish ITQ review. As you had mentioned, you want it back in September, and you will have the document in September. Just to give you a reminder update, what we're doing is meeting with the shareholders next month, and then we should be able to have what we need to put together a document for you to review in September and for you to give us further direction as to whether you think this is sufficient at that time or if you have further direction for us for what we're going to do.

Right now, I have the vermilion snapper and black sea bass as one amendment over here that I was probably going to do as an abbreviated amendment, but I may have to move some of this around. I'm still working on the recreational AMs, and that's going to go on for a while. As you well know, there is a lot that needs to be done, and that's going to go well into next year.

John, of course, has the ABC control rule, and what we've got over here with Roger is Snapper Grouper Amendment 38, and I think that's going to end up being less complex than we had thought it was going to be, and so I know the Chairman was interested in talking about the idea of beginning an aquaculture FMP, and it seems likely that, if this is something that the council wishes to do, Roger seems to be the likely one to at least get this thing going. He has been involved in all the

policy that was set forth in the FEP for aquaculture, and it just makes sense that it should at least start there, and so I guess what I would look for from you all is some specific direction to begin the development of an aquaculture FMP, if that is your desire.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do you want that in the form of a motion? Okay. Is anybody from the committee willing to make that motion?

DR. DUVAL: I am confused, because my recollection was that we discussed this before, and we decided that we had a lot of stuff on our plate, and so an aquaculture FMP, while important, we agreed was a little bit of overtasking at this point. I mean, I recognize that aquaculture is a priority of the administration, and I think we've heard that we're only getting X amount, \$100,000, extra for this year and next year, and I know that a letter went from the council to NOAA Fisheries asking about, if we were to pursue an aquaculture FMP, here's what it would cost, and I remember the price tag being upward of half-a-million-dollars, and so I'm a little concerned, with everything else we've got on this table, why we would undertake that right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Well, I will explain. It's not going to be a high priority, but, in a way, it's strategic. There are bills coming through Congress that could put the councils in an advisory role or a consultation role, and, if we have started the FMP, the aquaculture FMP, and they ask us, we can say that we have started it and we really want to be part. We do not want to be consultants.

It is not -- We are not going to spend a lot of money or a lot of time, but we will start it, and so it's not like we're going to start it and plan on being through with it in a year-and-a-half or whatever. We just want to start it and start talking about it, but we realize that we have all these other things that we intend to do first, but we do want to start it and get it going, and we do have a little bit of money to do it with, but, no, we're not going to do that at the expense of the other stuff we've got to do. Does that pretty much cover it, Gregg? Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I apologize for my confusion. Obviously, our agency sent a letter, as directed by our legislature, to this council and to the Mid-Atlantic Council requesting that they both consider development of aquaculture FMPs. I just am not seeing where we had a conversation where we decided to actually -- Where this body voted to actually move forward with that, and so that's -- I feel like there's been some things that have sort of happened without my knowledge, I guess.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and I play catch-up, too.

MR. WAUGH: If I might, just to clarify, we haven't made that decision yet. That is part of what you all are talking about right now. We haven't responded to the request yet, because we need clarification from the council as to exactly what we're doing. We wrote a letter to NMFS asking for I think it was about \$440,000 over three years to do this, and the answer came back that, well, we're giving you \$107,000 in 2018 and 2019, and so now the ball is back in our court, and so we're looking for some direction from you all so that we can respond so that we know what we're doing.

I think what Charlie is trying to say is this is a very high priority for the administration, and the Wicker bill hasn't been released yet, but that's expected to come out soon, and would it be better -- As that has been discussed thus far, the only role for the council would be in a consultation role,

and so, from a strategic sense, would it be better to go ahead and initiate development of an FMP, recognizing its low priority, and we'll work on it when we can, but that's a decision for you all to make here.

MS. BECKWITH: I guess I have two questions. One, are there any other councils, the Gulf, Mid-Atlantic, or Northeast, that are also going to start working on an FMP for aquaculture?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The Gulf already has one.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and how about the Mid-Atlantic and the Northeast? Is there any interest in trying to do a joint type of FMP amongst the councils on the east coast, not only to cost-share, but also to have sort of a united front, from a council perspective, on the east coast to move this forward? I know the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission -- It sounds like they're moving forward with an aquaculture FMP that would cover the states in a united way, and so would it be prudent for us to try and present a united front amongst the councils?

MR. WAUGH: The West Pacific Council is fairly far along in developing an aquaculture FMP as well. As far as coordinating across the east coast, that is, again, up to you all. Joint plans are complex. Dealing with aquaculture is going to be complex, and we are going to be having some discussions in September with the Mid-Atlantic and New England Councils about how we deal with species as they move north.

That is an opportunity for some coordination, and, to me, the aquaculture is going to be difficult enough to deal with by area, and I think that would just be more complex if we tried to do it along the east coast. I think we should definitely coordinate with them, but I think you're getting into different NMFS regions, and there is a lot of complexity there if we were to try to do a joint plan.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I totally agree with Gregg. Consult and see what they're doing, so hopefully we're doing the same thing, but we may not do it at the same pace, and, if a joint aquaculture plan is -- I know what goes on with mackerel in the Gulf, as you all do, and so I would strongly recommend that we just do our own thing and do it at our own pace. Did you want to say something, Mark?

MR. BROWN: I just wanted to also say that it gives us the opportunity to control our destiny with this too, because, the way that this whole thing was being pursued, it was that it may take it out of our hands, and so we need to at least start an FMP, so that we can at least have some sort of control over it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mel, and then I want to kind of wind this discussion up and get a motion.

MR. BELL: I remember things as Michelle kind of remembered them, but I also remember having a discussion about whether it would be better to be consulting or whether to be kind of a player, and so it sounds like what you're saying is, for a minimal amount of effort and expenditure, we can at least initiate something, and then we could become a participant, whereas, if we don't, we may miss the bus, or have to catch up later, I guess, and so it wouldn't be a large expenditure of time and effort, but it would simply be just initiating, and we could say we have initiated it and we're making efforts, right?

MR. PHILLIPS: You got it nailed, Mel.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess this doesn't come as a complete surprise to me, because we discussed this extensively at the Marine State Directors Meeting that was in Charleston, and I guess that was maybe back in March, and so Doug and I were there, and we found out about how this was one of NOAA's priorities, and we talked a lot about the role of interstate commissions versus the role of the councils in getting involved in, I guess, formulating these FMPs or these coast-wide type policies.

I think I would suggest, based on everything I heard at that meeting and then kind of discussions off to the side at that meeting, I would suggest us doing an FMP by ourselves. I can tell you that the Gulf has been sued over their aquaculture FMP, and I wouldn't want to join the other councils along the Atlantic Coast, because I think there's going to be some litigation over aquaculture, and so I would rather us just kind of contain the plan to just our council for now.

I guess my bigger concern is I agree with Michelle that we said that this was going to be a lower priority, and I feel like we're sort of looking at priorities, but that Excel spreadsheet doesn't really help me, because, even though we say that these are our four or five main amendments that we want to look at, when get the briefing book, we're now looking at thirty amendments that are in some sort of state of getting worked on or white papers to become amendments, and I feel like, just at this meeting alone, we've probably put fifteen things on the list to go out for scoping or hearing this summer.

To come back in September, I don't know how much more I can review just to get ready for these meetings, and so I'm concerned, not just about the workload for staff and the Region in preparing it, but I don't know how much more I can review and get prepared in a two-week or week-and-a-half timeframe in looking at this book. For the state folks, it's not just us reviewing it, but we've got to go through the agency, and I've got to try to develop a position and work on these things, and it's a huge lift, and so, this time, I feel like we're up to seventeen tabs in the book, and I just feel like we're up to a really high number of items, even though I thought we were under a system of trying to look at four main amendments at one time.

I don't mind making a motion to start an aquaculture FMP, but I really want to have a discussion about how we're tackling these things. I am concerned even about the number of things we said we're coming back with in September. **I will move that the South Atlantic Council start an aquaculture FMP, but I am also saying that I want to have a serious discussion about the priorities and to prioritize all the things and not just what are the top four amendments, and I want to see the whole list of everything that's being worked on.**

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. We have a motion. It's seconded by Mark. Any discussion?

DR. DUVAL: I definitely appreciate what Jessica said. I mean, I think that was the background that I needed before we jumped into this topic of -- I wasn't at the state directors meeting, and clearly I know that there are aquaculture issues going on within the state of North Carolina. They are a little bit different and a little bit broader. They are focused mostly on shellfish aquaculture, and we brought this letter to you all in March, and it was really -- We were doing our due diligence.

I have all exactly the same concerns that Jessica does about workload. I couldn't have said it better myself, and so I absolutely agree that -- When we get to Full Council, I will support this motion, but it is with the caveat that we don't really have time to start this right now, and I think it's one thing to start, as in immediately, and I think it needs to be put on a timeline and in a list of things. I appreciate what Charlie and Mark have said about controlling our own destiny, and, based on the experience that Jessica has had in the Gulf, I am all for that, but this is a lot of material, and thank God I only have one job for the past two months, is to go through this, because if I had the usual four or five, it would have been extremely -- I mean, it was difficult enough just to get through this, and so I have all the same concerns. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think we all do, Michelle.

MR. HAYMANS: I am not necessarily going to support the motion, because I'm not in favor of starting this off right now. I guess unless there was a time certain put on it. The fact that the council is marching on -- Let me take that back. The National Marine Fisheries is marching down the aquaculture road, and they're obviously going to put some resources behind it, and I'm not sure that I am ready for the council to start a whole new FMP.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? That looks like all the discussion. **Can I see a show of hands in favor of the motion, three; against, one against. The motion passes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am very serious about looking at, whether it's an Excel or a Word document list, everything that we think is coming to September and us prioritizing that list, because I think that we have put too many things on the staff's plate that are in various stages of development, number one, and then I think that it's becoming too much for me as a council member to review and get ready for the meeting and to act in an educated manner on all of these documents. I am just going to throw that out there.

MR. WAUGH: I couldn't agree more. This workload is not sustainable with the Regional Office staff, with NOAA GC staff, with your own staff, but, more importantly, as you said, it's not sustainable with you all, and so please tell us what you want to be worked on between now and September and what you want to see in September. We have talked about this in the past. Four to five major items is what most bodies can deal with, and, if you all pick those four or five, that's what we'll bring back in September.

DR. DUVAL: I think, just looking over the things that we have going out to either public hearing or scoping, in Snapper Grouper, we approved -- Thank you, Brian.

MR. WAUGH: Maybe look at public hearings first, because that's farther along. I mean, that's - - I would presume what you have approved for public hearings you would want worked on sooner than scoping, but, if not, then let us know. There were two things that we anticipate being approved for formal review, and so those we'll work on, but that will be gone before the September meeting, and so you won't see those. The Chair will review them, but you guys won't see them.

DR. DUVAL: We were operating under the assumption that Spiny Lobster Amendment 13 and CMP Framework 6 would go to public hearings in August, and that timeframe would allow the king mackerel trip limits to be changed in time for the upcoming fishing year, and was that what we were thinking?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am not sure exactly what Michelle just asked, because we were talking about lobster over here, but I was going to make a suggestion. Spiny lobster, I assume that's going to have a public hearing at the next meeting, or maybe it has a short webinar or something between now and then, and I don't really think much more is needed on this. It's already been scoped, and we haven't made a lot of changes. The AP has met, and I just don't think that we need to spend a lot of time on that, and I assume that the public hearing would be occurring at the September meeting itself, and the Gulf Council is holding one next week as well too on this joint amendment, and so I'm just throwing that out there.

DR. CRABTREE: Since we're talking about it, I mean, I think that we do have far too many balls in the air and we're trying to do too much, and it is wearing on my staff and Gregg's staff and Monica's staff, and so I don't think it's sustainable. It seems to me that we have let our meetings get too long, and we have let our days get too long, and I think what we need to do is look at the agenda.

We probably have too many presentations, and we have committees meet that probably don't really need to meet. I don't know about you guys, but if we start at eight in the morning and we're still sitting in here by 5:30, you are not going to get any real thought out of me at that point. I'm old, and I just wear out, and so -- I think the other thing we ought to think about is it seems to me that we spend a lot of time on inconsequential actions, tweaking a bag limit, tweaking a trip limit, changing a trip limit that we just put in place less than a year ago, changing a size limit that we just changed.

I don't think any of that stuff amounts to a hill of beans in the long term, trying to push our fisheries forward, and I think we ought to think more about doing the consequential things that could really have an impact on where we're going and what we're doing, and I would urge you to think about that when you're prioritizing these things. Is this just a minor tweak that isn't going to really change the world, or is this something that could really change how we manage our fisheries and make a difference, but I do agree with Gregg that trying to do this many things is just bogging us down.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other thoughts?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I'm okay with those two public hearing items, but I don't want to leave this discussion until we go through that scoping list and somehow, whether it's now or this gets emailed to us and we pick out which things and we talk about this at Full Council, about which things we want to do, or we decide at this committee that maybe we're only going to do five or six or whatever it is, but I want this fixed before we leave Florida.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I would like to, if it's okay, to address that issue, because one of the things that we're really facing is a logistical issue. Just to give you an idea, when we have to do something like scoping or public hearing, even if we do it by webinar, if there's going to be listening stations involved or in-person locations, we have to work out all of those logistics prior to doing a Federal Register notice, and so we need a couple of weeks to work that out.

I have to say that the states that -- When we work with you all to help find places to have meetings, you're responsive and you help us out. You do everything you can to help us where we're going

to be, but the problem is that takes time, and then we have thirty days for the Federal Register notice before we can hold the first public hearing or scoping session, and so now we are really looking at the very end of July at the absolute earliest, and I forget, but our briefing book deadline is somewhere around August 20.

We basically have three weeks to get in all of the public hearings and scopings that need to get done, and you have already stated, for example, and that's fine. We will do what you want us to do, but I'm trying to help explain the logistics here. For the for-hire permit moratorium, for example, we have already said that you want to send John out on the road to do this, and that's fine. We will make that happen. You have given us some direction on where you want us to go, and John has compiled a list that I can show you on this, but we're talking probably John on the road for two weeks, because we can't run multiple things at the same time like we can when we do listening stations. We can't have multiple locations.

That is a pretty heavy lift for us just to make the scoping for that one amendment occur. It's going to involve the state people as well as a huge amount of effort on your staff, and that's okay. We'll do that. I mean, I'm not complaining about it, but it's just a timing thing, and so we need to weigh all of these sorts of things together.

If we're going to do webinars, for things we can do a webinar, by next Friday we'll have that Federal Register notice up to Washington, and that's not a problem. It's going to be when we have to start getting all these logistics things together, and so please keep that in mind as you're trying to decide which ones you want to send out now and what things -- It's okay. You can vote to send things out to scoping, but you don't have to do it before September. You can do them whenever you want to do them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I want to talk specifically on that for-hire permit moratorium. FWC has said that they want us to hold -- I am certain that you are not going to want to hold the number of workshops that we would hold along the Atlantic Coast, and so we need to supplement that, and, just like you're saying, we already have a number of workshops scheduled in the timeframe that you guys would schedule in Florida on the Atlantic Coast on other topics.

By the time that we could get workshops scheduled, we're looking at either the second week of September, when FWC could hold some of those workshops, or we're looking all the way until October. Also, and Ben will remember this, but, when we have gone out on the road before in Florida during July and August, that's been a really bad time for Florida, and the fishermen have said to please don't hold workshops during that time period and that's some of our busiest time period, and, although we want to comment, we can't come.

Then it becomes a waste of money for the council or the FWC to even hold in-person meetings during those two months, and so then, once again, we're back to September or October, and so I just want to throw that out there, that we have committed to doing additional workshops to supplement this process, but, based on shark shoreline fishing and all these other things that FWC is working on, and then based on what we know about when people would come, because we don't want to waste money either at the state level, we're looking at the first time we could do it is September or the month of October.

There's a lot of dates in October that we could do it, but that just means that that item can't be fully fleshed out and we can't bring our part that we have committed to until the December meeting, and so I mean that's just one example, and we have similar ones if we need FWC staff involved in these. There is only so much that we can do to be there in-person to help run these meetings if they are listening stations also, but I'm just telling you, on the for-hire one, we want to make sure there is plenty of coverage, and we're looking at September or October before we could do it.

MR. BOWEN: I'm not on the committee, but, just looking at the items for scoping, and Chip has said, on the record, that there's a lot of work left on Amendment 46, and I know I can't do it, because I'm not on the committee, but I don't know if the committee wants to push that one back, or if we need to do that at Full Council later today or tomorrow, but that would be one, since that amendment has a lot of work left to be done, that would be one that I would be in favor of postponing until a later date.

DR. DUVAL: I am not actually on your committee either, and so I'm just listening to what Jessica said about Spiny Lobster 13, and this is really just aligning things with the State of Florida, and it really doesn't require -- I don't think it requires a listening station, and it sounds like that could be something where we could satisfy the public hearing requirements via a webinar, if needed.

Ben already suggested, for Framework Amendment 6, that we could just do a public hearing at the September meeting and that there's already been a significant amount of public input on this. All the fishermen came to, I think, the previous meeting, and so holding the public hearing for CMP 6 in conjunction with the September meeting I think kind of takes one item sort of off the council's plate.

Jessica, I don't know if you feel like, for Spiny Lobster 13, that that would also work, that we could -- Instead of even thinking about scheduling a webinar, just having a public hearing for that in conjunction with the September council meeting, and so that would be two items off of any August webinars or listening stations.

In looking at the items that were approved for scoping, in addition to the suggestion that Zack made with regard to Snapper Grouper Amendment 46, which is the permitting and reporting amendment, that might take longer, and that might be something that council would want to boot to like January.

I think the ABC control rule as well. I mean, even though we have approved that for scoping, there is a lot of moving pieces and parts to that, and it seems like the IPT maybe is going to need to go back and chew on some of the input that we had and also given that the Fisheries Service is still working on guidance for the -- I think it's the phase-in or the carryover, and I think the Fisheries Service is still working on the guidance for carryover, and the ABC control rule could be something that could also be put off, in terms of scoping.

The sea turtle release gear, I just don't know how important that is. I mean, the public comment that we've gotten -- Not that it's not important. I should probably rephrase what I'm saying, but how urgent it is, given the number of items that are already on a list for fishermen to be able to use, since this is just a flexibility thing. It doesn't seem like, one, that needs any kind of in-person

public scoping or anything like that. That could probably be via webinar, but I just don't know how quickly that has to occur, if that's something that could be done in January.

It seems to me like some of the more important, or perhaps urgent, things are red grouper rebuilding, Regulatory Amendment 32, which is the yellowtail snapper accountability measure, because this is really a band-aid, and I am thinking best practices, and so those are three things, and I would welcome some additional input from the committee members.

I think Jessica has outlined some of the scheduling concerns and logistics about wanting to be able to align any scoping for Amendment 47, for the for-hire permit moratorium, because of the constraints that the FWC staff has and the additional items that they would -- The additional places, excuse me, that they would want to have that scoping, and so I'm going to shut up now and see what people think about some of those suggestions.

MR. PHILLIPS: I want to go to Monica. Then, after Monica, maybe Brian could tell me where the abbreviated framework for vermilion snapper and black sea bass was, because I don't see that on the list.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to remind people that under the Magnuson Act that your public hearing requirement states this, to conduct public hearings at appropriate times and in appropriate locations in the geographical area of concern so as to allow all interested persons an opportunity to be heard in the development of fishery management plans and amendments to the plans, and so it's pretty broad.

I was just going to check the Gulf Council's agenda for next week when they meet. They're going to discuss Spiny Lobster 13, and that's right in the heart of spiny lobster country, really, right? I don't know if they're calling it a public hearing, but it seems like it could function as one, but then I have a question for Jessica, just so I understand. Like for the for-hire, you talked about the commission or you wanting to hold a bunch of in-person public hearings. I just read the requirements under the Magnuson Act, and so why are you going to -- Why do you want to hold all those additional hearings, or is that something the commission says you should go do or -- I'm just kind of curious.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This is partly something that the commission has directed us to do, and I think it's partly because -- Remember the majority of the permits in the South Atlantic are in Florida, and we have run some numbers and kind of looked at some major cities and how many permits appear to be associated with addresses in certain cities.

I am guessing that, based on the South Atlantic Council's budget, that they usually have a maximum of four, or maybe five, on a really big issue in Florida, and we identified twelve major areas or cities where we think we need to go to talk to people. I think it's an important enough issue, and I guess so does the commission, that they want us to try to supplement any type of hearings that the council would have, and I don't think that the council is going to agree to have twelve hearings for anything in Florida. We have done this before on some other issues, and especially mutton snapper was the last time we did this, where we held some joint workshops, but we went ahead and held some additional ones that FWC paid for, so that the council was not bearing the entire burden of something that we wanted people to comment on.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to that point, then it's not with every council amendment or action, but you strategically target certain ones to do those extra hearings?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, the ones that the commission directs us to gather additional input on, and so they felt that way about mutton, and they have already expressed, on the for-hire limited entry, that they want us to do something additional.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: That's fine, but it does seem to me that we go overboard on this. I mean, I don't see why we need to have any more hearings on lobster. As Monica said, we had one today, very close to the fishery, and the Gulf is going to hold a hearing on the same thing, and Florida has held hearings on it, and it seems to me that they've had plenty of opportunity to comment. Bill Kelly is at all of our meetings anyway, and a lot of problems with workload are of our own creation, because we go way overboard on things, and there are reasons why everyone does that, but, at some point, it's just unrealistic to think we can do that.

I have watched councils over the years, and you see a lot of actions go through the council process because one member really wants to do it, and so everybody goes along, and all of this just kind of piles up on us, and that's where the workload comes in, because it's very difficult for a group like this to say no if one of your members or one of the states really wants us to look at something, but I certainly think, if anything, we do more -- It's not just us. The Gulf does it too. We do more hearings than we need to, because every state wants to have a hearing in every state, because they're worried if they don't that somebody will yell at them, and then the hearing is held and no one comes to it.

We expend a lot of money and effort on things that I just don't think we really have to go that far with it, because the fishermen have some responsibility themselves to comment on these kinds of things, and for us to try and go to every single place there is a fisherman and hold a hearing there, it just seems beyond our financial or staff workload capabilities to do it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Roy.

MR. HAYMANS: To sort of follow along with that, and this is specifically regarding John's workload, and I don't want to speak to John's workload, but I see Amendment 47 and 30 and then his part of the socioeconomic report. Zack, I know your reaction, but, in recognition of the fall being the busy season for you guys, and the fact that Jessica is planning to have a lot of these in late September, or the late August/September timeframe, which is still a busy part of the year for guides, what if we pushed back the public hearing on that until the wintertime, when guides aren't as busy and they don't complain as much about being able to get off the boat and get to the meetings, which may allow John more time on 30 and maybe clear red grouper out of the way before really concentrating on for-hire. I don't say that just to stall for-hire, which I wouldn't mind doing, but as a workload, and it may make more sense for the guides.

DR. DUVAL: I actually had some more thoughts myself, just because I know that August is an important time of year for our folks, and I would love to hear what other people's input is, and that's why I was struggling a little bit with this particular issue after Jessica indicated the constraints that the FWC has.

I mean, I think, in North Carolina, we are fine, and I've got the three listening stations already identified, and I have talked to John about that, and so we're ready to go ahead and reserve those things, but I'm also sensitive to the fact that folks are also working during that time, and so we're flexible. We are definitely flexible on that, but, in regard to what Roy just said about the spiny lobster amendment, cool. Awesome. Two thumbs-up, and the same with CMP Framework 6. We've already had sufficient public hearings, and so I think if anybody wants to make any more public comments, if we're scheduled to take final action in September, they've got an opportunity to do it then, and so I think we can -- That's what I had said earlier, was, great, let's just have it be one of the items that people can comment on at the September council meeting.

I mean, I think it's really difficult, if we're scoping, to do more than like two or three items, depending on how complicated they are, and so I was just trying to identify those items that seemed like they were a little bit more urgent, like red grouper rebuilding and potentially yellowtail snapper. I don't know. I will stop.

MR. PHILLIPS: We've got a draft list up, and I know Zack is up next, and I am going to interject something right here. Doug, a question. I am just going to throw out something. If we were to consider moving the scoping back until January, I guess, which would be the next scoping, the people that want to see it go out to scoping -- We know you voted against it, but, if they had your support that it would go out to scoping and they knew we weren't just sitting it back so we could possibly kill it later, I think they would feel more comfortable about letting it wait.

MR. HAYMANS: The only thing that I would agree to do, Charlie, is not to bring up a motion to kill it, but if a motion is brought up by somebody else -- I have voted the same way for the last couple of years, and I will continue to vote that way.

MR. PHILLIPS: That's fair enough.

MR. HAYMANS: But it is two things. It's looking at John's workload and red grouper and when we can anticipate getting most of the guides there.

MR. PHILLIPS: Fair enough, and I will just throw out one other thing and then I'm going to let Zack talk. We all know that that's going to take a lot of work. It's been explained to us, and we've heard Jessica talk about what FWC is doing. If we put that in the list, we're probably going to have to take at least two more things out to offset it, and that's something else for the committee to think of, and so, Zack, go ahead.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I'm not on this Executive -- Whatever committee we're in, I'm not on it, but, like Roy said a while ago, we're concentrating on stuff that really don't mean, in his term, a hill of beans about much, and this is a very important issue, and, as far as timing and keep pushing it back and pushing it back, we've got a control date in place. We heard that yesterday during public testimony, and pushing it back is not the way that I want to go. Doug, with all due respect, I just don't believe you. You know what I'm saying? So I think we need to have this in August.

MR. WAUGH: To help try and focus this discussion some, I think you all have said about six is what you think we should deal with at each meeting. You've got six up there, and so that's the

agenda for September. You don't have the recreational visioning amendment on there, and you don't have the commercial visioning, and so you've got your six slots, if you will, and so what from the remaining items do you want to put on there, recognizing that work will continue on these others, but this is the list that you're going to see in September. If you want it to be seven that you're going to see in September, tell us, but you've got to have a cutoff, and so, if that cutoff is six, then you need to tell us what your top six are that you want to see in September.

MS. BECKWITH: In terms of the for-hire amendment, here are my thoughts. I think that the guides are slammed in the summertime, but I also think that we should move forward with webinar-style scoping for that amendment and save the listening stations and the significant public hearings for a second scoping, secondary scoping or additional public hearings or whatever, and I think it is worth -- The document is ready, and we have discussed this ad nauseum.

The guys need to have at least a shot to consider this, but I do think, if we took it out to webinar scoping, at least the information gets out there. It's a first rip at the band-aid, and we will get significantly less input than we will in an in-person meeting, but the guides that are going to show up to the webinar are going to start talking about it amongst the charter industry, and so, if we webinar this for scoping in August and look at the initial comments in September, then we can also go back out, after September, and do the public listening stations in the December time period and have a second bite at this very complicated issue.

That would be my preference forward. I think we're going to get a lot less input from the charter guys if we do it in the summertime, but I do think there will be enough that at least the discussion will start amongst the charter industry and they will start looking at the document. Then we come back and look at it. Then, in the fall, we can take it out to public hearings, maybe in the same time period that Jessica has got going on in Florida for the additional hearings, and I think we'll get a lot more input that way.

MR. PHILLIPS: I've got Tim and then Michelle and then Zack, but we need to wind this up, because we've still got to go through regulatory stuff.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your committee either, but I thought we were bringing Amendment 27 back one more time at the next meeting for formal review, and approve it for formal review, and where is that on this list?

DR. CHEUVRONT: This is where we need clarification. I mean, what are we bringing back to you? That's what we need to know.

DR. DUVAL: Brian, I think you're probably misunderstanding some of the things that I was saying. I was talking about identification of things for public scoping and public hearings and not what folks see in September. Spiny lobster and king mackerel, we were just talking about the scoping and public hearing schedule, and we were saying that we only have public hearings there, and so I think I recall that they would be ready for final action then, but I think the conversation we were having about what we were going to do at August scoping/public hearings was a little bit different than the conversation about what comes back to the council in September for review, and so I just wanted to clarify that when I looked at -- When I said there were things that seemed a little bit more urgent, in terms of scoping, my suggestions were red grouper rebuilding, yellowtail, and best practices.

I like Anna's suggestion about, yes, we could take Amendment 47 out to scoping in August, and we could probably do webinar scopings that are at 7:00 p.m. to accommodate people's schedules, if we wanted, and that's simply another alternative, but the council needs to make a decision about what is going on in August for scoping and public hearings versus what the council wants to see in September.

MR. BOWEN: Here is the way I look at it, as far as this timing and the webinars and in-person. The in-person meetings usually start at six o'clock anyway, right, 6:00 to 8:00 or 5:30 to 8:00 or whatever it is. 95 percent of the guys in the areas are done fishing for the day, especially the captains. They've got the deckhands cleaning the fish or whatever and waiting until the wintertime -- The guys are fishing less, and so they don't see the guy that doesn't have the permit that's coming into the dock right beside them as much, and so they've kind of cooled-off about it.

In August, they're seeing these guys that are illegal fishing that don't have their permits and that are doing the wrong thing day in and day out, and it's weighing on their minds, and I think we will get a better turnout from the legal, for-hire, permitted vessel holders in August in-person than we do in the wintertime.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I wanted to point out something to you. When we did Abbreviated Framework 1 for red grouper, we did that with a single public hearing at a council meeting as well, and I wanted to put that out there for you as an option as well for your September public hearings, if that's the way you wanted to deal with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Make it so.

MR. PHILLIPS: Was that easy enough?

MR. BREWER: Limited entry, a moratorium, or whatever we -- I forgot what we ended up saying that we were going to call it, but that's a hornet's nest of the first order, and I think having four new council members coming into a meeting where that is going to be, as we say in the legal business, fully litigated, that's really not fair to them, and I just don't understand why we would do that.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. We need to wrap this up, because it's getting on towards five o'clock, and we need to stop in thirty minutes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I would like to do what Michelle said and what Brian is putting on the board, because I feel like these are two separate discussions that we've been trying to talk about here, what gets scoped/goes to a public hearing versus the items that we definitely want to make sure are coming back in September.

Like Michelle said, I think that the list is a little bit different. Commercial visioning needs to be on the list for items coming back in September, but it doesn't need to be on the list for scoping and public hearings, and so I think that we need to construct the second list. I think we've fully talked about the top list, but we need to construct the bottom list.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. What else have you got on that list, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The spiny lobster and king mackerel we've already said are coming, and yellowtail needs to be on there.

DR. DUVAL: I think whatever reconstructed version of Regulatory Amendment 26 for snapper grouper needs to be on there, because you guys are going to need to see that again in September, as to what it looks like.

MR. BOWEN: Two things, two points. Having the public hearings for Amendment 47 in the wintertime for Florida, when the guys are fishing, is -- That argument just doesn't hold water, to me. I think the guys in Florida are fishing more in the winter than they are in July and August, and so, just by this conversation, we have decided not to even have Amendment 47 in the top six of priorities, or am I just waiting for it to be typed up there, because I don't see it.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's what we're struggling with right now, Zack. We just identified that we've got three things that we can take public comment on at the September council meeting and not worry about doing something in August. There is a couple different options that have been identified for do we do scoping for 47 in August or do it via webinars or do it in person or wait until a little bit later, and Chester has brought up a concern about having four new council members here trying to tackle this as well. I mean, I think there is never going to be a perfect time for everybody, and we're just sort of struggling with where to put it and what time.

MR. BOWEN: Well, I mean, to that point, I hear you, but I would still like to see it on there.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I agree that it should be on there.

MR. BOWEN: The point about the four council members, I think three of those were intentionally done that way.

MS. MCCAWLEY: On the September list, and so we're talking to Myra over here, the red grouper rebuilding and that abbreviated framework.

MR. HARTIG: As we're listing these items, it doesn't seem to me like Number 2 and 3 have the same level as the others, and so, Brian, most of the work, it seems to me, has been done on both the spiny lobster and -- I may be wrong, but I'm just -- With mackerel, most of the work has been done on those, and the only reason you're bringing them back is for a final public hearing and to finalize them, and so it's not like those are of the same level of staff involvement as the other things, and so I'm just -- Realistically.

DR. CHEUVRONT: What you're saying is really basically what's going to happen is you're going to take the public hearing at the September meeting and that's basically all you were planning on doing with those, and so they don't really need to be on this bottom list at all, because you're not going to do any work on them, other than to take public comment, correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think they should be on that list, but maybe they're color-coded or listed for final action only or something, but --

DR. CHEUVRONT: So you're going to take final action at the same meeting that you're doing the public hearing on these?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: Won't that also apply for the abbreviated framework?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's going to take some work, I believe, to prepare. Those others are a fully-fleshed out amendment right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: I thought that we were just changing ACLs on those.

DR. DUVAL: That still requires work though, Charlie. You still have to prepare a document. I mean, we still saw a document for red grouper that -- I forget if it was Brian or John who prepared it, but I think Brian did it in December when we took final approval on that. There is still all the documentation that you have to do, and it's not just writing a letter. I do think we should add, in terms of the top list, the top priorities for scoping and public hearing, we should add Snapper Grouper Amendment 47 in there, which is the for-hire permit modifications, just so it's on the list, and we need to figure out when and how to schedule it.

MR. PHILLIPS: I kind of like Anna's idea of just doing a webinar and get some feedback and then coming back and scoping, and that will at least alleviate some of the workload, if the committee decides to go there. I know it's not perfect, but, then again, we have a lot of stuff to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: On that 47, remember one of the things that we asked for was that every current permit holder be contacted by a mailer, and I'm assuming that that mailer would go out prior to the webinar for this item, and I'm just throwing that out there. I don't know when people are going to send this out, but, if we're going to start this, then maybe they need this mailout prior to the webinar.

MS. BECKWITH: I guess my suggestion, Jessica, just knowing how the guys work, is they're not really going to start taking it seriously until they all start talking about it, and so, to me, the initial webinar should just be treated the same way we do all scoping, and then I think we're going to need to do a second set of scoping in-person meetings, at which point I think the individual mailouts would be better, and so I think we should save the individual mailouts for an in-person meeting rather than this initial webinar scoping.

I am just thinking that this is going to be a long process, and we're going to need multiple opportunities for feedback from the industry. To me, this first one, the only goal we're going to get out of this is letting the guys know that the document is ready, and the ten guys that go on the webinar and tell us something are going to start talking about it, and they're going to start informing the rest of the industry.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't disagree, but I guess I would add -- So a lot of times, when we go talk to these folks, they ask why someone didn't contact them directly to let them know about this

meeting, or I have a permit and why didn't they contact me to tell me that there might be changes to the permit, and I just felt like, in the case of transparency, that we would start by putting them on notice that we have the document ready, as you suggested, and we're going to start with this webinar and we might do something else in the future, but I just felt like, in the case of transparency, to just put them on notice that we're working on this, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with that, and I think it would be good to send a mailer to all the permit holders, and I don't know what level of work that involves, if it's a mail merge and a card, that we send out. Don't forget, for a major amendment, we always do a round of scoping, and then we do a round of regular public hearings, and I agree with everyone that, in this case, the regular public hearings should have at least a couple of staff members in-person, given the enormity of the issues, but I do think we could try to -- With scoping webinars, we could have those a little bit later.

We have done some of those scoping webinars -- Remember for cobia that we did them at 7:00 p.m. instead of 6:00 p.m., and that allowed guides who were running two trips to get back in time and have time to get on the webinar, and so we could do that, and I guess maybe just a question, Brian, for you and Gregg. In terms of having these webinars and scoping one or a couple of these other items, it's not inconceivable that we can have -- We don't have to do two items in a single webinar on the same evening.

In other words, I think there would probably be enough questions like if you did three 7:00 p.m. webinars on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday for Amendment 47, and you could look at having a webinar for the yellowtail AMs on a couple different evenings, or doing yellowtail AMs and red grouper rebuilding, or a couple smaller items together, and is that true?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, that's possible. We can certainly do that. We've done that sort of thing before. To be honest with you, even if we're doing the webinars for Snapper Grouper Amendment 47, I agree that it needs to be multiple evenings, and it needs to be the only item, because we don't know, really at this point, how much interest there would be really early on. There could be lots and lots of questions, and it's the kind of thing that John will have to be prepared to answer a lot of technical what-if sorts of things with this, and I can understand that, and that could drag things out, and that's okay. I mean, if that's what the public needs, that information, then let's get it to them.

Some of the other ones, like red grouper rebuilding, I think when people see what the council is really seriously considering, it's a nothing-burger, to be honest with you, from the public's perspective. You're just going to extend the rebuilding period is what it's kind of looking like. Wait a minute. You added the other actions to it, didn't you? Damn. I forgot. Sorry. So it's not a nothing-burger. It's got a little more to it, but the yellowtail AMs is going to bring out a few people, but it might be worthwhile though to do red grouper and yellowtail together or something, and I'm not quite sure, but we'll figure it out.

We could probably get these all done within a couple of weeks. We could start on Monday and go Monday through Thursday. Friday nights, I don't want to keep my staff there on Friday night, and people don't want to come to a webinar on a Friday night anyway, to be perfectly honest with you, but we can work Monday through Thursday, as we need to. We've got a couple of weeks that we'll be able to work with in August, and we can make that happen. For me, it's a very, very simple logistic thing now for just doing webinars without listening stations. We just schedule

them. We figure out what's going to be done what night, and I figure out when staff are available and not on leave and that sort of thing, and we can make that happen pretty quickly.

Doing the public hearings at the September council meeting, that's very, very easy. That is not much preparation for us, because that goes out in the council meeting Federal Register notice, that we're going to do that at the same time, and so there's nothing extra for that, and so that's okay. I mean, we could do this.

I would caution against adding much more, because the public also gets overwhelmed when we're scoping or doing public hearings on too many things. They can't follow along with what -- They don't see the distinction between all these different things the way that we do when we're working on them, and so I would caution you from adding more things unless you think it's really, really important and has to be done. We can work with what you've got here for scoping and public hearings now.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Gregg, are you good with that? Do you think you all can do that? All right. Michelle, and then we're going to wrap this up.

DR. DUVAL: I know, but the reason I suggested red grouper and yellowtail for additional scoping webinars is because of I think the urgency of the red grouper rebuilding plan and getting that in place and also, similarly, for yellowtail. The final question I had was I do think it's important to stay on the schedule that we outlined and discussed in March for the vision blueprint evaluation, but I am thinking that maybe after the September council meeting -- I mean, the schedule says we will review the input at the December council meeting, and so why couldn't we just have a couple of webinars after the September council meeting to show what we've done on the vision blueprint and do that then?

I mean, that's not -- It doesn't seem like it's going to be a lot of preparation, and I know that we have advisory panel meetings coming up, but those aren't until the end of October and the beginning of November, and that seems to me to be a more sustainable means of getting that input, and we might be able to add Regulatory Amendment 29 to that set of webinars as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know we're trying to wrap up here, and so I'm good with everything that's on the list for scoping and public hearings, but I am just going to make a suggestion, and I can try to type this out tonight. The items coming for September, I am going to suggest a system where there is like Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, maybe Tier 4, and that helps us figure out what's coming, and I could try to write out a fake agenda for September, because, to me, something like spiny lobster and mackerel, as we said, and we could call it Tier 3 or Tier 4. It doesn't need a lot of additional action.

Yes, there might be some coordination with the Gulf if they change something, but Tier 1 would be something that's in the very early stages, and it needs all this IPT work, and I think that, in the future, going forward, we could have something where, per meeting, we could have two Tier 4 and we could have two Tier 3. We could sit there and figure it out knowing the workload that's involved with those things, instead of just saying, okay, we want six items or we want seven items, because I agree with what everybody else is saying that some of these items are literally just a

rubber-stamp after this public hearing and other items are going to require significantly more staff work and IPT work and Region work and everything else. I am just throwing that out there of another system, because I just don't think our just listing it out system is working for us.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, it kind of reminds me of Clay saying we've got this many weeks to work on X, Y, and Z, and it sounds a lot the same way, and so do we need a motion, or do we want to just leave this open and confirm it at Full Council, or how do you want to do this?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I would like to get clarification on one thing first before we go that route. For bringing back to the council in September, Item Number 7, the Abbreviated Framework 2 for Vermilion Snapper and Black Sea Bass, what is your timing on that? When do you want to take final action?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think we were going to do the public hearing, and you all were going to do final action, and so hopefully those new catch levels would come in as soon as they could in 2019.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I am getting clarification that you want to finalize these in September is what you would like to try to do?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm sorry, but I can't remember, because I can't remember what was in the document, and so I don't feel like I can give you an educated response.

MS. BROUWER: I think we can do that. That's the way that we handled red grouper, and, while I'm here, I'm going to bring one thing up that I was just discussing with Monica. For red grouper, you moved the action to change the seasonal closure out of visioning, and so that action has already had public hearings, and we're beyond the scoping on that one. The other one is a rebuilding, a change in the timeframe of rebuilding, which may not need a whole other scoping hearing, and perhaps you would consider having that one also in September, and that would just remove one more topic that we need to prepare a presentation for and all that stuff.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I'm fine with that. I think I feel like, for -- The only other action that's really in there is the commercial trip limit, and those were suggestions directly from the public that we got at this last round of public hearings.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We have yet another question. You wanted to do the scoping for Regulatory Amendment 29, best practices and powerheads, this summer, but you don't want to discuss it in September?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I want it on the bottom list. I didn't know we could keep adding to the bottom, and that's why I was going to go back tonight and try to make this tiered system and figure out a way to do this differently, because I agree that we're going to scope it, and I feel like it needs to be on the bottom, but it's adding another one to the bottom.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Jessica, would it help you if I emailed you this document, if you want to work on that this evening, and then we can postpone making a motion until Full Council tomorrow.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds good.

MR. WAUGH: Jessica has got an excellent point. Spiny lobster and mackerel are very minor, and so, if you add Regulatory Amendment 29 as Number 8, you can almost think that you've got six real items there, and so I don't -- We don't need to work you overnight, and I think that's something that we can look at coming up with a system like that and work with you, but those aren't going to require much. The spiny lobster, the Gulf is the lead, and so we don't really do any of that work, and so, even though you've got eight items on that list, it's really like six that we have got a workload with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, but I'm still good to approve the list tomorrow, after people can think about this overnight, if you want to email it around, but, yes, I would love to see some kind of tiered list, and the tiers would be indicative of the workload that would be required per item, and I would also like to see some system where, based on both of you all's best guess, in one council meeting, we could do -- I don't know, but maybe four Tier 1 and three Tier 4.

Like there would be some kind of priority there based on the amount of time that it takes pre-work to get it to the meeting and then the amount of discussion time it would need at the meeting. Those would be indicative of what the different tiers are, because I agree that I don't think it's fair to folks, whether you're the public or the council members, and you have a particular item that you're working on, to just treat everything as if it requires an equal workload and then say, well, we're stopping at eight or we're stopping at six or we're stopping at four, because it just doesn't seem to be the most effective way to do this.

MR. WAUGH: I think we'll be glad to work with Jessica, and I think that would be most productive, to do that between now and the next meeting, and we've got a good list here. My suggestion for making a motion is then you've got a clear statement of what the committee's priorities are right now, and it will be a part of the Executive Finance Report that gets distributed tomorrow. Then you guys can see it, and, if you want to modify it, you modify it. I think that's just going to be a more efficient way of taking action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am willing to make that motion, that these are our priorities for scoping and public hearing and for the September agenda.

MR. PHILLIPS: Let me ask Jessica. Were you going to add that last thing?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's on there, but you just can't see it. It's on the next page.

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DIAZ: I know you all are crunched for time, but I think we can do the same thing, Jessica. We overload the staff, and we overload everything, and it just seems like it gets jammed up, but we do have a spreadsheet that we use that helps me a lot to see what we're planning out in the future, and I could share this with you.

One thing that has helped a lot is, about a year, or maybe a year-and-a-half, ago, the council started mailing out minutes to council members as soon as they came in, and so now -- Do you all do that, too? That helped me a lot, because all the minutes are done before the briefing book shows up, and that helped a lot. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Do I have a second for this motion? Mark seconds. I think we've had plenty of discussion. Is there anything else? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.** We will jump on to our next -- Whatever is next.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We have got the issue with the regulations recommended for removal or modification, and we have seen this a couple of times. Just to give you a quick rundown of what's going on here, the councils were asked to identify regulations for removal that were unnecessary, unneeded, or outdated.

Your direction to us was to bring the information to you, and we did at the March council meeting. We brought to you the council staff and SERO recommendations, and we took it out to the APs this spring, when we had the round of AP meetings, and from the direction you all have given us, the original mandate kind of got broadened a bit. It wasn't just regulations for removal, but it was also regulations that you thought should be modified.

What I wanted to do here is we have a deadline of the end of this month to send in that list of regulations that you would like to see removed. I would like to suggest that we go through this list of regulations and identify those ones which you want to have removed, and then there is some that you may want to consider later on for modifying, and there may be some that it's like, no, we don't want to consider removing or modifying anything with this.

What I was going to suggest that we could do to help move this along would be to color-code it, and that's all we're going to do. The three categories, I've got each of the CFRs that are affected by the concept, and we would color-code the CFR and the reasoning behind the suggestion, and you can tell us to remove it, it's something we want to remove, something we want to modify perhaps in the future, or we want to keep it around, or it's something we don't want to consider at all.

I will color-code those for you as we go along, if you want to do that. There is no obligation at this point to actually do anything with any of these things. The only thing we have to do is just to prepare our list of things that we recommend for removal. The modification things just may be things that we put on the back-burner and, when it's appropriate in an amendment to consider this, we can bring them up, and you can decide whether you want to modify them at that time or however you want to do it. I wanted to throw that out there as a way to try to expedite this, because this is actually a fairly lengthy document.

I will point out that there is a couple of things that were brought up that are not under your purview. There is a couple of Coast Guard things that people recommended, but I thought I will put them in there, and if you all want to send letters or whatever you want to do, if you want to consider it or weigh-in on something, you can do that, too. If that's okay with you all, let's go ahead and get started on doing that.

What I did is this document -- There was an updated version that was sent out a week or two ago, and so it was the one that was in the original late materials that you got. They are in CFR order, and so we'll just go through it, and one of the first things that is in 50 CFR 622 is definitions, and the Snapper Grouper AP talked a bit about buoy gear and the definition of it, and there is a bit of an issue that some of the fishermen were having, and it had to be -- It has to do with the drop line must be no greater than two times the depth of the water being fished.

The problem there is that, if you are fishing in 500 feet of water, for example, and you're fishing 1,000 foot of line, which is what I legal, and your gear moves, because it's not anchored, and you move into 475 feet of water and you're now out of compliance, and so the fishermen were concerned about unintentional noncompliance. They are trying to comply with the regulations, but this could actually move them into noncompliance.

The other thing is the hooks. Right now, you can have ten hooks within thirty feet of the weighted terminal end, and the problem is that means, if you have ten hooks, you have to have the hooks three feet apart, and the feeling was that's too close together. The fish can sometimes move those hooks along that line, and so they said ten hooks is ten hooks and why do we have to go with thirty feet? I mean, I think the original idea was to keep this from being looked at as being a longline, but you're limited to ten hooks, and so the fishermen wanted to know if you wanted to consider, at least consider, modification of this gear in the future. It's not like you have to debate the merits of one thing or the other, but it's just is this an idea that you would like to consider potentially looking at again in the future.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thank you. All right. There is an issue with vessels that are dually permitted, and it has to -- I say dually permitted, and that's whether they're charter or commercial, and the number of persons onboard determines whether it's a charter or a commercial vessel, and that becomes a problem for some of the people who are dually permitted, because they feel like it unnecessarily penalizes them for having both of those permits, and, if they want to be on a commercial fishing trip, but they have too many people onboard, by this definition, then they are held to the recreational bag limits, and they can't operate as a commercial vessel, and it's only the dually-permitted vessels that are affected by this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, repeal it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm sorry, but you said review it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Repeal it, get rid of it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. That's fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I mean, I'm willing to do whatever people think, but I was trying to move us along.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I understand.

DR. DUVAL: I have a concern about this. I mean, right now, we have -- I have a concern, because we have two different regulations. For guys who have a snapper grouper permit who are dually permitted, it's they can operate -- It's when they're operating with four or more people on the boat, and, for CMP folks, it's three or more people on the boat. Then I have a little concern that this is kind of a way to potentially get around the bag limits, to me.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm not ready to repeal this. This would actually require a thoughtful discussion, because I think this would lead to what the -- It's an even easier way to get to where the Gulf guys are doing, which they've got the sort of charter and commercial and they're taking six people on a commercial trip, and so I think it just has a gray area, and I think it would need a little bit more discussion, and so I would not feel comfortable just repealing this off the bat.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Fine by me. I would defer to them.

MR. BROWN: Do you know how expensive it is to rig a boat commercially? I mean, it costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of money to put all those survival suits and the rafts and everything on there, and it's a lot different than just carrying people for-hire, because some boats that carry people for-hire can use just a regular hard raft, and they don't have to have the inflatable, but you've got to have an inflatable if you're north of 32 North, and you've got to have survival suits, and that's expensive.

MS. BECKWITH: I totally get it, and that's why we have dually-permitted guys that are also commercial guys that have all the regulations to the commercial and also run charters, and that's the point of being dually permitted. You already have all that stuff, and you've already rigged your boat. These are all the reasons why this would require a little bit more discussion than just deciding to repeal it on the fly.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We have changed the classification. Next.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The next one is under 622.4, Permits and Fees, and some fishermen would like for consideration of having the length of the permits be extended beyond one year, preferably a minimum of two years, and, at this point, I don't know what else to say about that. Part of it has to do with ease of dealing with red tape, but then there is also -- There are some fisheries that that's the way they get them to turn in their logbooks and things, is, before they can renew their permits, they have to turn in the logbooks. Is this something that you just want to consider, possibly, in the future, or --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Then, under renewal, this I think is more of an internal SERO thing that they're doing. Right now, it's done by mail, and what we're trying to do is to get it so that it can be done by electronically downloading documents, and so this saves time and expense, and so this is something that would probably end up being modified, but I'm not sure that this is anything that the council will have to take any action on to make this happen.

In snapper grouper, there was a lot of discussion about eliminating the two-for-one requirement, and I've got a feeling that you probably don't want to make that decision right at this moment to get rid of it, but there are folks who would like for you to do that, and so is this something that you would like to set aside to consider at some time in the future?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Consider later.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. The next one is conservation measures for protected resources, and this has to do with the snapper grouper commercial and charter headboats, and this is sea turtle

conservation measures. Folks would like you to -- The fishermen consider them to be overly burdensome for such a rare-event thing, and they would like -- They are not against the idea of sea turtle conservation, but they find that this is overly burdensome, and they would like the council to do something about that.

DR. DUVAL: Can we even address that? I mean, I feel like that's not really -- That's a Protected Species thing.

MR. PHILLIPS: I didn't think it was something we had a choice on.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe that it was this council that set what had to be on those vessels and things. They set the required gear, and I forget what amendment that was. I think it was around Amendment 15 in Snapper Grouper. Am I correct on that, Shep?

MR. GRIMES: Well, technically, you had a biological opinion and an Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation on the continued authorization activities under your FMP, and that had a term and condition in it that talked about carrying sea turtle release gear. The precise gear that was employed is based off of what was done in HMS, and this council, along with the Gulf Council, adopted it and implemented it in your regulations.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so then maybe this is something that there is not really a whole lot then that you can do, and so this could be one that we could just simply black it out, because we're not going to do it. The next one is gear-restricted areas, which is something that you're already considering, and so for the powerhead-prohibited areas off of South Carolina, and so that's already being considered. We can put that in the list for removal, because you're considering getting rid of this now as it is.

The same thing is the case with size limits for some deepwater species. The twelve-inch size limit, you have that in your visioning amendments, and so this would probably be just one that you're already considering getting rid of anyway for those species that are marked-through on here.

Landing fish intact, there is some fishermen who were concerned that, because they're reporting that there's a lot of sharks and they're bringing fish in, they're getting fins bit off and things like that, but, the way the regulations are now, they cannot keep those fish and they have to return them, and they think that the fish are totally usable, but they're having to return them anyway, and is this something that you would like to --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Consider later.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to ask if the Law Enforcement AP had an opinion on this one. I can't remember.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I thought that -- Well, my recollection is that somebody did, because I saw something negative about don't do this from a different group that I read in the booklet somewhere, and so I'm assuming that it came from the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. I can tell you that our law enforcement looked at this and said, please no, and so I put it under the category of consider later, but I really don't want to consider it later.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I would lean towards that as well. I think it would cause some law enforcement concerns, and so I would black this one out.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. The next one is regarding circle hook requirements, non-stainless-steel circle hooks. They're required to be used when fishing with hook-and-line gear and natural bait north of 28 degrees North latitude, and the fishermen who talked about this in the APs are not in complete agreement on this requirement of the use of circle hooks in the snapper grouper fishery. Some would like it to be removed altogether, because it's not being enforced, and they believe that the use is unnecessary, but we know this is pretty controversial.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would like to see it removed, but if we need to let it go through the amendment or -- Because it's in one of those best practices, I think.

DR. CHEUVRONT: This is one that you would like to consider for later modification, potentially? Is that what I am hearing? Okay. Operator permits, we have them in several places, and one of the places that we do have them is in the shrimp fishery, and there is -- It's being considered for removing operator cards for dolphin and wahoo for-hire vessels, but you also might want to consider removing the requirement from the rock shrimp fishery.

However, the vessel owners in the Deepwater Shrimp AP saw some value in keeping the operator card, as it could reduce their liability, should a captain get cited for doing something, but, since you are considering it in dolphin wahoo, it was thought that you might want to bring it up here as well, but you can tell us what you would like.

MS. BECKWITH: If they want to keep theirs, that's great. I think the dolphin wahoo operator card, for at least the for-hire, needs to go away, and I refuse to make a determination on the dolphin wahoo for the commercial. That's up for a commercial individual to make that choice.

MR. GRINER: I would say get rid of that, too. It's of no value.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. We're still on shrimp right now, and so let's keep the discussion on -- So, basically, you don't want to consider this right now for the shrimp fishery, and is that correct? Okay. The adjustment of management measures, and this has to do with what you can do in the framework for the shrimp fishery, and it was thought that perhaps you might want to remove the idea of specifying coral HAPCs through a framework amendment. It was thought that you would probably never do that anyway, because you would want to have to go through the full framework process, because those are so controversial about where coral HAPCs are going and things like that, and so this one might be one that you might want to consider removing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, get rid of it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and the next one -- This actually runs for several pages, and I can give you a real quick rundown on what this is. I have a feeling that you may want to look at this for future modifications. In the shrimp fishery, we have a lot of different transit provisions in there based on the regions, the Northeast, South Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico, and they're not the same, and a lot of the people who participate in the federal shrimp fisheries have multiple permits, and

what they have to do with their gear onboard their vessels is different depending on where they are.

The thought was that perhaps, if you want to look at this for modification in the future, it's to work together to have basically the same definition for transit in the shrimp fishery regardless of which jurisdiction you're in, and so, basically, the idea is the need for consistency. Is this something that you would like to look at potentially in the future?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think there has been plenty of discussions at the Deepwater Shrimp AP meeting, and Charlie has brought up concerns, and other members of the public have brought up concerns about just some of the safety issues with how some of these transit provisions are written. Really, it seems to me the specific issue is stowage of gear and what is considered stowage of gear and transit, and so, yes, I think we want to consider it, but it seems like it's a bigger conversation, since it involves multiple jurisdictions.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and I agree with you, but we might be the ones who end up starting this conversation as a result of going through this, and so that certainly is fine. The next one is golden crab, and these things that are considered for removal are simply things that were applicable only when the program with the zones and everything were all set up and establishing the permits, and so this has to do with appeals for if you didn't get a permit.

The council doesn't have any intention, that I am aware of at this point, to create new permits in the golden crab fishery, and there is no appeal process, because the permits have been issued. What this is looking at is just literally getting rid of a few regulations that are outdated, because they are no longer needed. I will tell you that I know this is kind of tedious to go through right now, but I can tell you that, in going through all of the CFRs that we have, our regulations are pretty tight. They really are not bad. Okay. Anna, this one is for you. It's getting rid of the operator permits in the dolphin wahoo fishery for the commercial vessel permits and for the charter vessel/headboat permits.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, pretty please with sugar on top.

DR. CHEUVRONT: This is -- I just want to get clarification that everybody is in agreement that this should be considered for removal. Okay. Something that the Dolphin Wahoo AP comments on every single meeting is reinstating bag limit sales, and they would like for the council to reconsider the prohibition on bag limit sales of dolphin and wahoo, and is this something that you all want to consider?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think that we're going to have to talk about that some more.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so that's one for looking at later on. This one you all did basically today, and this is what you would have to get rid of if you approved CMP Amendment 31, which is removal of the Atlantic group cobia, and so that is actually one, since you voted to do that already today, you signaled your intention here that we need to remove those regulations.

We did have landing fish intact in here in two different places, and I think it exists in two different places in the CFRs, and so you had said that you did not want to consider that before, and so I'm going to come down here and assume the same thing in cobia, king mackerel, and Spanish

mackerel, that you want to do the same thing and you don't want to consider allowing folks to land fish that are not intact, and that is correct? I mean, that's what you did before, and this is under cobia, king mackerel, and Spanish mackerel.

MR. PHILLIPS: Brian, can we go back to what we decided on circle hooks again? I am not sure that I was in the right place.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. I think -- Let me get up here under the snapper grouper. Here we are. It's 622.188, and so you have it here for consideration in the future.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think, personally, I would like to just see it gone now, but, if somebody else on the committee wants to see it looked at later, then I will go with them, but I would like to just see it gone now.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Are you saying remove the circle hook requirement or just not consider this at all?

MR. PHILLIPS: I would remove the circle hook requirement. If you all want to look at it later, then we won't even talk about it, and I will just leave it in. We'll leave it in there.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think we've already got it in an amendment to look at, and so I would rather do it through there.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We'll shorten the conversation. Go ahead, Brian. What's next?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so the landing fish intact here under cobia, king mackerel, and Spanish mackerel, you don't want to consider any modifications to that, just like you didn't before under I think it was snapper grouper, and is that correct? Okay.

Then we have restrictions on sale and purchase from tournament-caught fish. At the time that this was given to us, and we didn't have the information that Christina presented about the fact that tournament-sold fish are not being counted towards the commercial ACL, and that was not what we were told at the time when we were going to instruct this, and we didn't have that information, and so it was recommended by the AP to get rid of tournament sales, but you all had some conversation on that today, and so is this something that we just want to not consider at all? Okay. I am seeing some heads nodding in that.

Spiny lobster, the ACL, ACT, and AMs, and there was some discussion about removing the ACLs for spiny lobster, due to its life cycle and all, but the Spiny Lobster AP agreed with the logic that they didn't think that removing this CFR was all that important at this time, because of the recent increase in the ACL, because they thought that that would decrease the likelihood of overages in the future. However, the Coral AP had some concerns that, also, if these spiny lobster management measures were removed, there would be more effort with traps and the recreational fishery for spiny lobster might expand as well, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I already said that that was not a valid concern.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and so this is something that we would just like to have go away, and is that correct? Am I interpreting what you're saying?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, so, I think the reason it was in there was because of the fact that this is in one of the Magnuson amendments, and so that's why -- I think it should stay in there, because, if it comes out of Magnuson, then it's okay to remove, but I am saying that what the Coral AP brought up is not a valid concern, because I don't think they understand how FWC manages the fishery.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. That's fine, and so we should have no additional consideration of this action is what I'm trying to --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think it's fine to consider it as long as it gets removed from Magnuson.

DR. DUVAL: The problem is that we've sent letters in requesting that we not be subject to the ACL requirements, and the answer we've gotten back is too bad and Magnuson requires you to be subject to it, and so I'm not sure we can just remove a regulation that the law says we have to have.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's what I'm trying to say, is you don't want to consider removing this any further at this point, correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure, because the law says we have to have it, and, since Magnuson hasn't been reauthorized with that provision in it, then we can't consider it right this minute.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. That's fine. I am just trying to make sure that I have the right clarification here. This has to do with -- This next one is 46 CFR, and it's not even one of our CFRs. Again, the fishermen also stated, in addition to sea turtle gear, but they stated that their safety equipment required for fishing vessels is overly burdensome, and they would like to see that looked at for possible revisions for other allowable gear, and so this really isn't in your purview, but I didn't know if this was something that you wanted to consider in making a recommendation and sending a letter to whoever is responsible, which I think is probably the Coast Guard.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would just look at it later, look and see if we even have a choice of doing it or not.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, and the last one -- Yes, this is the last one. It has to do with the status of seamen on a vessel, and it has to do with unlicensed seamen on a vessel. They have to be a citizen of the United States, an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or a foreign national who is enrolled in the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, but the part that people object to is that no more than 25 percent of the total number of unlicensed seamen on a vessel may be aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

They found that to be rather odd. If they are here legally, why can't they work on a fishing vessel, and why should they limit the number of lawfully-admitted aliens who can work on the vessel, and this came up as a result of somebody on one of the APs who recently had gotten cited for -- There were, I believe, four people on the vessel, and two of them were lawful resident aliens, and those two lawful aliens were removed from the vessel.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can this council really affect that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I have no idea if it's something you wanted to comment on or anything. I am just giving you the whole litany of things that we were given.

MR. PHILLIPS: At best case, we could write a letter, and I don't really think it would make any difference, and so I don't think we can do anything with this. It's above our paygrade.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. That's it for all of these things, and we've got them all categorized. This is -- I will get the ones that you have for removal, and I will get those taken care of, and we'll sit on the modification ones until you're ready to do them.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We've got ten minutes left, and so, Gregg, how are we going to run our ten minutes?

MR. WAUGH: We can start through the report from the CCC meeting and get as far as we can.

MR. PHILLIPS: That being said, I think we've already had pretty much most of our aquaculture FMP discussion, and so I'm not even sure that we need to do that, unless there's something else that I don't know.

MR. WAUGH: This was distributed to everybody, and it's in the late materials folder. In terms of the budget update, we have covered all of that. Bycatch, they are developing -- Please stop me if anyone has questions. Otherwise, we'll go through this pretty quickly. The next step is to develop implementation plans that build upon and continue to support high-quality work to reduce bycatch. NMFS is seeking input as they begin development of these plans and recommendations. I have highlighted in here where we need to take some kind of action, and so we'll comment as we get documents on bycatch.

Electronic monitoring policy directive, we looked at this and had a report on how things are working on the west coast, and their vessels are considerably larger. Anybody that is interested in this can look at the material, and we will be glad to talk to you some about this. One part of this, and I have included the draft procedural directive, and just to make clear that that procedural directive established a framework for allocating costs for electronic monitoring programs in federally-managed fisheries between NOAA Fisheries and the fishing industry. We have talked about this before, and remember that we went out and did a round of public hearings looking at VMS in the snapper grouper fishery and got a resounding no, and so how do you want us to comment on this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Gregg, is this the item that you emailed around, and do we need to comment on it right this minute, or can we take time to look at it more after the meeting and then provide comments to you after? I am just confused whether this was the thing that we were saying we had more time on or not.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and all of these you can send in comments afterwards. There is one I will give you that has a little closer timeline, but, yes, if there are no comments now, send them to me, and we will compile them and draft a letter over Charlie's signature.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We will prepare something after the meeting.

DR. DUVAL: I was just going to ask if that would also be possible like if there was any input -- We might just have a few minor comments on, should we have electronic monitoring in this region in the future, something we might think might be fair for how to allocate, and that's all.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? Okay.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of -- Again, this was email to everybody, and it is in the late materials folder, and it's Tab 15, Attachment 7, May 2008 CCC Report. We had a presentation on the data modernization plan, and this has been out for a couple of years, and it identifies areas where additional resources have to be spent for us to get up to speed.

We pointed out that our Center has three councils and has HMS and ICCAT, and so it's almost the equivalent of five councils. There are other Centers that share a council, and so we raised the needs in our region and made clear that anything that could be done to help direct some resources to our Center and Region would be helpful and certainly make the workload a little more equitable.

Again, I've got a link here so that you can find where these documents are that were presented, if you're interested in a little more detail. The next two items, electronic monitoring in the North Pacific, and we got a tour, and that's just a whole different scale of operation out there. Their vessels are larger, and they do have some that are smaller than forty feet, but, still, given the weather conditions out there, their vessels almost all have some sort of enclosure, and so we'll leave it there.

In terms of legislative update, we have attached here as Attachment 3 that the CCC approved sending a letter to Congressman Young, and that includes some language on new topics, and we approved a consensus statement for four new topics to be added to the CCC working paper, and that is included and attached to this document as Attachment 4, and that's one, if you have some suggested edits to our regional perspectives, let me know, and we can bring those back in September for editing.

Those new four topics are cooperative research, data collection, mixed-use fisheries LAPP moratorium, and aquaculture. The CCC did approve consensus statements, and so we've got those to use in letters and correspondence.

The recusal policy was discussed, and they are working on finalizing a proposed rule, and, once that comes out, we will comment. Adam Issenberg, in response to a question, indicated that, if we were interested, he would work with our regional attorneys and make sure that we had a presentation either by him or by our regional attorneys. I think this is something that we should take advantage of. They have addressed some of the concerns, or are trying to address some of the concerns, but I think it would be helpful to have a presentation either at our September or at our December meeting, and, if I don't hear any objection to that, I will work with them to schedule that.

Ecosystem-based fishery management regional implementation plans, work is continuing on that, and Roger is participating in some of the work on the regional plans, and so, when the one for the South Atlantic is ready, we will bring it to you for some comment.

Exempted fishing permits, this is something that has been used quite extensively in the Alaska region, and the Pacific Council has used it quite a bit, and we talked about those, and we talked about the procedure that they use there, and it's interesting. They get the Center involved in reviewing those requests, and they have a much more procedure for using those. We also had some discussion about the approach used to look at the lionfish EFPs and the state EFPs for red snapper.

Best scientific information available, that was discussed some, and we had a draft letter, and we raised some of those points. This is one where they're looking for council comments by July 1, and so I would suggest if folks could get comments to me say by June 27, and then I could incorporate them into a letter over Charlie's signature, and you have got that letter attached as Attachment 5.

NMFS policy directives and prioritization, this was an interesting one. All the councils raised the point that there is a lot of policies and a lot of directives that we're asked to comment on, and, quite frankly, it's a challenge to keep up with, and everybody expressed that concern, and so we made the request to the office responsible for this to develop a spreadsheet with what we're asked to comment on, the due dates and so forth, and make that available to us so we can be sure that we're not missing the opportunity, and they agreed to do that.

Allocation reviews, we got an update on that, and we explained that we were using -- The plan was to consider using the four MRIP species that are being -- The assessments that are being updated as an example to determine a method or methods the council will use to look at reallocation. We're supposed to come up with allocation triggers, and we pointed out that MRIP revisions has been the trigger, and we have already responded to that once. We did a regulatory amendment and changed our allocations. We've got more MRIP revisions, and so we're responding to that. We raised the issue of, if we go ahead and start working on actual reallocations and that delays our work on developing these triggers, would that be a problem, and they indicated that, no, it's not.

Research priorities, we talked about that, about how those are handled by the agency once they receive those, and the CCC approved sending a letter to Chris Oliver, and that's included as Attachment 6. Basically, it says we would like to see how these are used, and they should be integrated more into funding opportunities and a response to the council on how they've been used.

Aquaculture, Sam outlined how NMFS is proceeding with this, and it's their intent to try and provide a one-stop-shop for permits. In the Gulf, where there is an aquaculture FMP, they would coordinate with other federal agencies and NMFS. For other council areas, where there isn't an FMP, NMFS will do that coordination and serve as the NEPA lead, and you can see, when you look at that, there is money available this year, \$4 to \$5 million. The commissions are doing some demonstration projects, and the Science Centers are rebuilding their aquaculture programs, and I hope some of that is being sent down our way. They didn't give any indication of a breakout on that.

NMFS is exploring the question of whether aquaculture can occur in federal waters. There is some question of, if it isn't explicitly allowed, does that mean it's not allowed, and so they're looking at this, and they're going to explore a national rule to allow aquaculture in federal waters. Again, the letter we sent to them is attached there, and you have already given us guidance on how to proceed concerning development of an aquaculture FMP, and so we've done that.

International affairs and seafood inspection, that was for informational purposes, and we talked a little about WECAFC, which is an international organization, and our State Department rep will be here tomorrow to give us a presentation on that.

Regulatory reform progress report, we just went through our input for that. Mark gave a presentation on our progress with citizen science, and this was very well received. The other councils are very interested to see how we're doing on this. They want to use us as a guinea pig and let us make all the mistakes and get all the bruises, and then they'll learn from it, and I'm sorry that I skipped over the recreational fisheries overview. Russ Dunn gave a brief overview of what came out of the summit.

The New England Council had a program review done, and I have skimmed through some of that report. I would recommend that people look at that. Some of the councils were interested in perhaps considering having a program review to see how we're doing and how our structure is and how we function, until Tom said that it cost him about \$200,000 to have that done, and so I have skimmed through it, and I think there is stuff in there that we can use to look at how we're operating and make some improvements, and so you will probably see some of that come back to you, but I think that's worth a look.

NOAA Fisheries website transition, they're in the process of migrating to one website with information hanging off of it, and it's interesting that they have a four-year contract, and the cost in year-one is \$1.2 million, and then it declines in subsequent years.

CCC workshop reports, we had a Communications Group report, and Kim and Cameron participated remotely, and they function as our reps on that group. We've got a new logo that you will see on the letterhead, and they've got some best practices recommendations that we will be evaluating. The chairs of these groups rotate according to which council is hosting the CCC, and we host the CCC next year, and so Kim will be chairing this group next year.

The Habitat Committee gave a short report, and Roger will be chairing that group during 2019. The CCC directed the Habitat Committee to work on a proposal to look at how they could develop some recommendations to focus on non-fishing impacts, and so they're going to work up a proposal and bring it back to us.

The Scientific Coordination Sub-Committee is working on the report from the last National SSC Meeting, and then we had some discussions about our operating procedures, and I will leave that there for you to see, in terms of talking about timing for meetings and so forth.

In Other Business, we talked a little bit about council balance. There was some concern expressed that there are some councils that don't have sufficient recreational representation and some that may have insufficient commercial representation, and NMFS outlined the appointment process, and they indicated that they do an annual apportionment report that is released in late February of

each year, and so you can look at what the balance is. Next year, the February CCC meeting is hosted by NMFS in the D.C. area, and we will be hosting the May meeting, May 13 through 16, in Charleston at the Francis Marion Hotel. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PHILLIPS: As I indicated earlier, I think we've pretty much covered aquaculture, and so I don't really think we need to talk about that again. Is there any other business before the --

MS. MCCAWLEY: My item for Other Business is still outstanding, and so my item was I thought that the practice was so many days before the briefing book is released that the chair of the committee gets to look at the agenda, or review the agenda, and maybe that was just what Kari did for me with Spiny Lobster, but I was just wondering if that could be something that we could add in here, that the committee chair can look at the agenda however far out, so that it's ready in plenty of time for the briefing book.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, that's something we do. Generally, the staff person gets with the committee chairs and sends them the agenda to go over and makes sure that everything is on there, and, also, when you get the follow-up, the follow-up will have a fairly detailed agenda for the next meeting, less detail for the following meeting, but, yes, that's something we can do. I mean, we do it, but we can make sure that every committee chair has the opportunity to work with the staff person.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Is there anything else to come before Executive Finance? We apologize for running into the electronic reporting workshop, but we have done a lot of work today, and thank you to the staff, and thank you to the council, and we will adjourn Executive Finance.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 14, 2018.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
July 2, 2018

2018 Council Committees

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CITIZEN SCIENCE

Mark Brown, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Robert Beal
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Tim Griner
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Robert Beal
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner

(Dolphin Wahoo cont.)

Jessica McCawley
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Mid-Atlantic Liaison:
Tony Dilernia
Dewey Hemilright
New England Liaison:
Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

✓ Charlie Phillips, Chair
✓ Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
✓ Chester Brewer
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Co-Chair
Wilson Laney, Co-Chair
Robert Beal
Mel Bell
Mark Brown
Michelle Duval
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
FEP: Chip Collier – Coral/CEBA

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

Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695
(919)515-5019 (ph); (919)515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

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

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

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
(202)647-3228 (ph); (202)736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Dale Diaz
Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Erik Williams
Shep Grimes
Mary Vera
Karla Gore
Dr. Jessica Stephens
Fran Karp
Tracy Dunn

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
Gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Deputy Directory-Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
John.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Management

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
Myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/ Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
Cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
Kim.iverson@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Kimberly Cole
Kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
Roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

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

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
Cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
Mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Suzanna Thomas
Suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Kelsey Dick
Kelsey.dick@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ Amber Von Harten
Amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fishery Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
Christina.wiegand@safmc.net

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

June Council Mtg Day 4 6/14/18

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brooke	Sandra	sbrooke@fsu.edu
Bubley	Wally	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Byrd	Julia	juliabyrd@safmc.net
Cheshire	Rob	rob.cheshire@noaa.gov
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Coleman	Heather	heather.coleman@noaa.gov
Cunningham	Leda	lcunningham@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Diaz	Dale	Saltwaterlife@live.com
Ellis	Steven	steven.ellis@noaa.gov
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Fitzpatrick	Eric	Eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov
Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
GORHAM	Bill	getbowedup40@gmail.com
Geer	Pat	pat.geer@mrc.virginia.gov
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Giuliano	Angela	angela.giuliano@maryland.gov
Glasgow	Dawn	glasgowd@dnr.sc.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hart	Hannah	hannah.hart@myfwc.com
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov
Karazsia	Jocelyn	jocelyn.karazsia@noaa.gov
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Lamberte	Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov

Laney	Wilson	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
Lloyd	Victor	vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com
Morton	Ted	wmorton@pewtrusts.org
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
PUGLIESE	ROGER	ROGER.PUGLIESE@SAFMC.NET
Poland	Steve	steve.poland@ncdenr.gov
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Reichert	Marcel	Reichertm@dnr.sc.gov
Schmidtke	Michael	mschmidtke@asmfc.org
Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@ncdenr.gov
Shiple	Krista	krista.shiple@myfwc.com
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Sunstone	Cat	catrin.sunstone@noaa.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov
bowen	zack	fishzack@comcast.net
brewer	william	williechet@aol.com
brewer	chester	wcbsafmc@gmail.com
brouwer	myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
o'reilly	rob	rob.oreilly@mrc.virginia.gov
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
Exley	Gary	river92@bellsouth.net
Gore	Karla	karlagore@gmail.com
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Howington	kathleen	kathleen.howington@safmc.net
Rock	Jason	jason.rock@ncdenr.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@gmail.com
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov

dilernia	tony	tony@rocketcharters.com
----------	------	-------------------------

Thursday Public Comment Sign In 6/14/18

Name	Last	Email	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic?		
Jeanna	Merrifield				Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler
Rusty	Hudson				Fisheries Consultant
robert	palma			Commercial Fisherman	
Robert	Lorenz		Private Recreational Angler		NGO
Leda	Cunningham				NGO
Bill	Kelly				Commercial Fishing Representative
Rich	malinowski	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov			NMFS SERO