

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEMBER VISIONING WORKGROUP

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 16, 2013

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Ben Hartig	Dr. Michelle Duval
Jack Cox	Mel Bell
Charlie Phillips	Lt. Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans	John Jolley
Anna Beckwith	Chris Conklin
Dr. Wilson Laney	Zack Bowen*
David Cupka	Rob Beal
Jessica McCawley	

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood	Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins	John Carmichael
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin	Amber Von Harten
Kim Iverson	Dr. Mike Errigo
Julie O'Dell	Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin	Dr. Brian Chevront
Myra Brouwer	Julia Byrd

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello	Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith	Phil Steele
Doug Boyd	Pres Pate
Dr. Marcel Reichert	Lt. Mike Mastrianni

Additional Observers Attached

*Appointed but non-voting or sworn-in until October 25, 2013

The Visioning Workshop of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Blue Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, September 16, 2013, and was called to order at 9:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Welcome, everybody, and welcome to our new members. I'm actually going to be turning things over to staff to run through I think the majority of our agenda. We're going to start out a little recap of the things that we did. Back in June there were a number of decisions that we made and items that we ran through, and then we're going to go through just a little bit of an update on August public hearings.

Remember we sort of introduced the concept of a visioning process to folks at those meetings. Amber is also going to run us through a logic model, which is something we had in our briefing packet last time. I think we just went through it really very briefly at the end. We didn't actually have time to sort of process that. Then we will have a discussion of the Mid-Atlantic Council's five-year strategic plan.

Remember we had asked folks if they could read through that draft plan and provide any thoughts that they had to staff about the applicability of some of those goals and objectives to the snapper grouper fishery here in the South Atlantic. The Mid-Atlantic Council has since finalized that plan. They did that just at their August meeting, I believe.

Then we will get into a review of the FMP objectives. Staff has gone through the input we provided at the last meeting and made some suggestions to sort of clean things up a bit. Then we will get into discussion on the planning for port meetings, which I think we're going to have to make some decisions about how we'd like to see those structured here today. So with that, I'm going to turn over to Amber and Myra to kind of briefly run through what we accomplished last time.

MS. VON HARTEN: Good morning, everybody! So just a brief recap from our June Workshop; as you recall we kind of had a discussion about trying to come up with a draft vision statement, which we walked through with our little Wordle Diagram to kind of see the vision statements that you all submitted, kind of what some of the key themes were for developing that draft vision statement and have a discussion about some of the key words that came out of that.

You all developed this draft vision statement right here: "The Snapper Grouper Fishery is a healthy, sustainable fishery that balances and optimizes benefits for all citizens." I do want to mention that someone brought up that perhaps we need to edit that – I believe it was Anna – to maybe say "all U.S. citizens". I don't know if you want to comment on that, Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: My initial thought was "citizens" is not only who our stakeholders are. We certainly have visitors that come to this country and non-permanent and permanent residents, so I think citizens is a little bit constrained. If someone has an idea for another word – we keep talking about stakeholders. I don't know if that would be an appropriate addition; but for the benefit of all stakeholders, I think that would be more encompassing. I do feel that we manage these fisheries for more than just U.S. citizens. It is just my thought.

MS. VON HARTEN: Any thoughts on that? We can change that at any point, but just keep that in mind. Then Kari came up and went through the existing snapper grouper objectives with us to kind of get you thinking about what is currently in place in terms of objectives and how perhaps this could be revised for this visioning project.

We also got you to come up with this kind of overall theme or goal statements here. This is kind of important because I took these goal statements and kind of incorporated them into the revised snapper grouper objectives to kind of see which objectives met some of these broader goal statements, so keep that in mind when we go through that later.

We went through each objective and you made some suggestions if those were still applicable. Some of them were already mandated under MSA, so you recommended to remove them. We got through almost all of them. The last I think three or four – yes, from 12 to 15 we didn't get through.

You will see in the notes from that the revised objectives' document, that those last three four were actually ones that the Snapper Grouper AP had recommended going ahead and removing because we were already doing those or they were already mandated, but we can discuss that when we go through the exercise. That is our overview from the last time.

The next thing I wanted to do was just give you kind of an update about the August public hearings, because that was kind of the first time we rolled out any public information about the visioning project. Between the June meeting and the public hearings, staff worked on developing kind of an overview document about the visioning project.

The workgroup reviewed all of this along with staff and others to kind of just come up with a general overview of what the project is about, why the council is pursuing it, and then a timeline of what the council has accomplished so far. In this document we also put the draft vision statement and some of the decisions you came up with in terms of how to evaluate these objectives and then proposed kind of a timeline for the visioning roadmap in terms of having these port meetings, what we're calling them, and how the input from the port meetings would be evaluated and eventually, hopefully, turn into some kind of strategic plan.

Here again are the key concepts that came out of our discussion from the June workshop and the draft goal themes and then an explanation to the public of what the next steps are and how they can get involved. We described kind of some suggestions for the port meeting structures that might happen in the organization of the structure, so I will pull this back up when we have our discussion of the port meetings.

We do have this new e-mail address here that people can submit general comments and ideas about the visioning project to council staff. We've only received a handful of kind of broad postcards and blanket statement so far from folks, so we hope that people will start using that. Again, we wanted people to talk to us at the public hearings, so we gave them information at the public hearings, encouraging them to attend the council meetings because these workshops are open to the public, and we definitely welcome people coming and joining and listening.

We also wanted to encourage folks to volunteer to help organize a port meeting or possibly just help promote the port meetings, so we're still looking for those. Then, of course, we listed the members of the visioning workgroup in that. Obviously, the public hearings' information will come out, and we will just keep adapting this as we get further along in the process; but if you have any suggestions or things that you might see missing, please let us know and we can make the edits to that.

Then kind of a more pocket-friendly, you can put this in your back pocket, one-pager that is a little more colorful, talking about the components of the visioning process and the ultimate goal of kind of coming up with these goals, objectives and strategies for the future of the snapper grouper fishery all on one page. This has been pretty well received. There are copies of that on the back table as well; and we can get more color-printed copies if you as council members would like to take some of these back to your constituents and pass this information out. Are there any questions on the outreach document so far?

DR. DUVAL: I just wanted to thank you, Amber, and Myra and Kari and Mike. This was an incredible effort by staff to put together these documents for the August public hearings. I think they did a fantastic job, so thank you very much for that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Sure, and we did talk with folks at the public hearings. Again, it was more of just getting people aware about the visioning project and talking informally. We had a lot going on at the public hearings, so it was really just to bring some of these informational materials to folks and getting the word out.

Our main goals for today that we really need for you guys to work on are two action items, which are trying to come up with some information that we can take to these port meetings to get feedback from stakeholders. We're hoping as we go through these next couple of exercises by looking at the Mid-Atlantic Plan and then discussing our revised snapper grouper objectives, that we can come up with more solid goal statements, whether they're strategic goals and objectives, so that we can actually have some kind of a framework to take out to the port meetings to get this input that we need; and then, of course, trying figure out how we want these port meetings orchestrated, the format and structure and the timing of all of them as well.

What I would like to do next is – as Michelle indicated, we didn't have a chance to go through this logic model presentation at the last meeting, and I just want to go through this. You have seen this before. Kari gave a presentation. Everybody remembers the example she gave about getting fit and my pants are too tight and they don't fit anymore and how to resolve that issue.

This is another run-through of that, but also to get you in the frame of mind of thinking of what goals are versus objectives versus strategies. Your vision statement you've already come up with; and again that is a declaration of where you're headed or your future state, but it also considers your current state. Now we need to determine which direction based on your past, present and future you want to go with your goals and objectives.

Here again is your vision statement, and we can modify that to say "all stakeholders", whatever you guys decide you prefer. What are logic models; what are they and how do they work?

Essentially they're a process of thinking through and planning and communicating your objectives and accomplishments so that you can actually implement what you're saying in your plan.

It links to outcomes and actually takes your plan and starts from the back end, so you'd want to talk about your long-term outcomes first and then you work backwards down to your midterm, your short term, and then you figure out what activities and outputs and resources you need to make those outcomes happen. This is what it looks like.

Again, you start down here at the very back end with your long-term outcomes, so that is almost like your vision, like the vision that we have created. Then the next step would be your midterm outcomes and then short term. The midterm and short-term outcomes could also kind of be viewed as your goals and then objectives. The strategies would be the activities and inputs that you need to meet those different outcomes.

Outputs and products are the different resources and things like the port meetings that would happen to get you to those different outcomes. The resources would be staff time, council time, funding, things like that. Here is another example, and it is kind of our overall long-term outcome is we want a well-behaved dog. You kind of read these logic models in a series of if-and-then statements, so I want a well-behaved dog.

If I want a well-behaved dog, then my dog has to learn and obey commands. If I want my dog to learn and obey commands, then I have to figure out how to make that happen, which has to happen through improving communication skills with the dog, through training. Then my outputs and products to make that happen are obedience school, practice, behavior change in the dog with or without treats.

Then the other activities and inputs to make that happen would be to teach the dog behavior commands and practice in different settings, treats and praise. Then, of course, the resources would be the time and the money for training and dog treats. So kind of think of this as just this long process of trying to figure out all the different steps you need to get to that long-term outcome of a well-behaved dog.

That is what I want you to think about in terms of the snapper grouper fishery is you've got your vision statement, which we will go back and read: "The Snapper Grouper Fishery is a healthy, sustainable fishery that balances and optimizes benefits for all citizens." What are all the different goals and objectives that you need to develop to make that happen?

Again, we can model it after the Mid-Atlantic Council, what they did with their strategic goals, and kind of have these broader themed areas like science, communication, governance or have them a little bit different, like we have them in the current snapper grouper objectives. The last slide I wanted to leave you guys with was kind of a description of what strategic goals are.

They're the changes or human actions that will result from this project, so what human changes or change in the fishery that will result from you going through this visioning project and coming up with these strategic goals? There can be a lot of different strategic goals, but it just depends

on kind of the framework that you guys want to put on the strategic plan in general. Then objectives kind of establish the standards of achievement in terms of – this is from the NOAA Coastal Services Center, of course, and they help you develop SMART objectives.

That is an acronym for specific, meaning they're bound by some specificity of what you're trying to accomplish. They're measurable so they have some kind of evaluation component so you can actually measure the objective. The audience is issue-directed. They're realistic and ambitious and they're time-bound, so there is some kind of timeframe of when you're trying to accomplish this objective.

The strategies in my mind are kind of what we're asking from the stakeholders. We're asking for them to come up with the specific strategies to address whatever management objectives you're trying to accomplish or whatever science objectives you're trying to accomplish. That is kind of what I'd like for you guys to be thinking of as we have these next couple of discussions about the Mid-Atlantic and our objectives.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Amber about the logic model or how to get your dog to behave really well? Okay, if not, we'll go ahead and run through the next item.

MS. VON HARTEN: Everybody should have a copy of the Mid-Atlantic Strategic Plan, five-year strategic plan. As Michelle indicated, they just finished this. We asked the council to do was to kind of go through the strategic plan and look at it in the sense of do you like the format and content and structure of it but also look at how they kind of framed it to see if there was anything that could be applicable to our visioning project exercise that you'd like to see transferred into our visioning project.

I appreciate everybody taking the time to go through that. Overall, everybody seemed to like the format and content and structure of the plan and liked the rationale of the plan particularly. It specifically says improving input from partners, promoting sustainability in the fisheries and establishing a more proactive process and management. That really resonated with a lot of folks.

Again, you all noted that a lot of the objectives and strategies are either already mandated or that our council is currently implementing very similar objectives and strategies. You guys also felt that it kind of lacked the specificity needed for our visioning project, because ours is specific to the snapper grouper fishery whereas theirs was specific to how the council would operate. Also keep that in mind as we go through this.

Also, the objectives and strategies weren't really time-oriented. Even though this is a five-year strategic plan, typically when you do strategies you try to give them some kind of time orientation so that you can actually evaluate whether or not those things get implemented. You felt that the goals and objectives were broad enough to allow council flexibility. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Couldn't you have a general strategy that we use as we develop amendments that come before us? The strategy wouldn't have a time-certain element to it. It would be a strategy we use as a basic – how we address basic things that come through visioning in our

amendment processes, so you wouldn't have a time horizon, per se, in that case. You would have a strategy that you use generally in each amendment as they come forward.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, I think so. The Mid-Atlantic Council Plan was kind of divided into these four strategic goals. Communication was the first one. A lot of these you agreed that currently through our outreach programs and things like that, that we are already accomplishing. There was some interest in Objective 2, to actually do a stakeholder analysis to identify different target audiences. I think that's always evolving in this process, so perhaps we need to look at that.

Also, for Objective 3, looking at increasing stakeholder trust and facilitating greater stakeholder engagement in the process; looking at a consistent process for collecting, analyzing and incorporating public input into the decision-making process, several of you felt that was pretty important.

Objective 4, increasing stakeholder involvement in the development of fishery management actions, you all definitely supported the use of workshops, informal meetings and other non-traditional forums of gathering public input, which we're kind of starting to do with the webinars and things like that before the public hearings, so that was encouraging.

The last one, increasing awareness about fishery science and management, definitely a need is for us to do more outreach on data collections, SEDAR and the stock assessment process. Also, the Marine Resource Education Program, which several staff are involved in, could be incorporated into our outreach efforts. That is something that we will have on our new website is some information about that program and also some of the presentations that are being given at those workshops. Are there any other comments or thoughts about the communication aspect of the plan?

MR. HARTIG: Just one thing; I'd really probably turn it over to Jessica; but in the communications aspect, when we went out for the South Florida Workgroup, I think it was a great lead-in for the visioning. I will let Jessica talk a bit about that. It really was a rewarding experience from the public and the manager perspective.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, those workshops – and I'm going to talk about it more during the Executive Finance Committee. I saw that it was on the agenda, but I thought that those workshops went really well. I think they were advertised fairly well. The way that we set up a panel-type discussion with the participants I think encouraged more participation. We could either talk about it now or we could talk about it when we get to Day 2 or 3, you know, when we're going to talk about the South Florida Workshops; whatever you would like.

DR. DUVAL: I think probably when we get into talking about the structure of the port meetings, that input is going to be pretty valuable because we've tossed around several different formats and ideas in terms of how they could be structured; having council members there but not participating; having council members there and participating. There are a different number of different ways we could do that; so I think bringing that forward when we have that discussion would be great.

MR. BELL: I was going to say maybe this occurs in the workshop or in informal discussions; but if we could kind of ask folks in sort of a standardized fashion something like where we are right now, what are three things the council is doing right, what are three things we're doing wrong; just sort of a three up, three down. That's easy for them.

I know we've had informal discussions and they kind of ramble on about this or that; but if you can get them all to answer to those questions; just give me the top three things we're doing right that you like about the process now or give me the top three things that you don't like. Then you can kind of collect that in a standardized fashion and that might be useful in kind of helping us assess where we are and where we might need to be going.

DR. DUVAL: Mel, that is a great suggestion; and that is what we're trying to get out of these port meetings would be directed, focused input, so I think that's great. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Even prior to the port meetings, I had thought about would we be able to send a letter or a note to each permit holder, the for-hire, the dealers, the commercial guys, and really kind of try and get them to provide us an e-mail address where it is easier to habitually communicate with them and ask them specifically if they would be interested in participating in one of these port meetings; and if so, in what area and how they would like to receive communication from us, be it e-mail, mail or phone calls, and just kind of get an organized group. I think having folks pre-committed to these port meetings is going to be pretty imperative to the success of them.

DR. DUVAL: All great comments and I think we'll come back to those definitely when we talk about the port meetings and how to structure those and advertise them. Amber.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, the next section was governance, and you all agreed that most of these objectives are currently in practice. One that stood out for me was that somebody made the note that we need to incorporate perhaps local governments and coastal advisory councils in the list of management partners just because of the fact that these are the entities that are regulating a lot of the coastal water quality and ecosystem health, which are, of course, lots of nursery areas for many of the species that we're looking at with snapper grouper.

Also, a process for incorporating – a more formal process, I guess, for incorporating stakeholder input and consistency and the process for developing amendments as well. Science was the third strategic goal. Of course, there are lots of suggestions here. Kind of Objective 9 was the collection and analysis of accurate and timely scientific data.

You all supported continued evaluation and improvement of those data collection, monitoring and reporting programs; also, considering a risk assessment to identify the potential threat of invasive species in the marine ecosystems. I think there was mention of lionfish and things like that.

Objective 10 was looking at the social and economic dimensions of the Mid-Atlantic fishing communities, and you all wholeheartedly supported the further collection of economic and social data that would support the future and current analyses needed for the snapper grouper fishery.

Also, the council's transition to a ecosystem approach to fisheries' management; you suggested that this was important to the snapper grouper fishery, but unclear how to fit them into the context of the actual fishery.

The last two objectives you felt were relevant, and that is the effective stakeholder participation and data collection analysis and efficient and accurate methods of monitoring and reporting and felt that they were currently being discussed in many of the amendments that are before the council right now. The last was management. These objectives listed were ones that you all felt were relevant; more specifically the last one, develop innovative management strategies for recreational and commercial fisheries.

You felt that all the objectives had some relevancy to the snapper grouper fishery. In particular several of you expressed interest in evaluation of the fishery management plan process; social and economic analyses; development of multi-year management approaches; innovative gear designs; and measures to reduce regulatory discards.

So, lots of information there and kind of a different way of looking at kind of organizing it by these strategic goals, and that is kind of the question I had for you guys before we get into looking at the snapper grouper objectives is would you like to organize what we're trying to do in this realm, by these larger strategic goals, or would you rather than be based on some of those goal statements that we developed from the last meeting, which are a little bit more specific? You can chew on that for a minute, if you'd like.

Here are those draft goal themes that you came up with the last time. You'll notice that a lot of them could be couched under these broader strategic goals like the Mid-Atlantic did; and then also some of these could be combined to reflect the South Atlantic's kind of goals more specifically.

Again, like I said, the Mid-Atlantic Plan is really focused on how the council should operate versus what we're trying to do is trying to figure out what you all want for the future of the snapper grouper fishery, so it is a little bit different. I don't know if things like governance are really going to have a role for what we're trying to do here.

DR. DUVAL: Do folks have any immediate thoughts about sort of which direction you would like to take? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm inclined to stay with our draft goal themes and keep it a little more focused. It is going to be so wide, anyway, that I'd like to kind of keep it narrowed a little bit and still – I think it would be more functional that way.

MR. HARTIG: I like both of them. I like that short one, the way it is put in that summary, and I like the more broad explanations.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say the organization they came up with in the Mid-Atlantic, it seems logical and it makes sense that we might come up with the same sort of things and the same sort of organization. Something to keep in mind with this is I know we're focused on the

snapper grouper fishery right now; and one thing that strikes me when I look at what they came up and what we have is they were dealing with 13 species across the whole spectrum of things they have to deal with. We've got 60 just within snapper grouper.

But, at some point in time we may take what we've done with snapper grouper and roll it into maybe a larger, overall strategic plan, in which case whatever we come up with, you want it to be able to kind of just naturally slide into that organizational structure for a larger plan, perhaps. What they have is the overall thing; so if you kind of started out mirroring something like what you might – and this may be way down the line and I'm getting ahead; but in the future if we come up with something that is overall, it might look like what they have.

I guess it makes some sense to sort of start out organizationally so it will blend into something on a larger scale, perhaps. I like what they came up with. Those are logical areas and I like the pattern of working down into the strategies into more details. That is just something to keep in the back of our minds as while we're working on just snapper right now, at some point in the future we may wish to roll that into a larger plan, so it would be nice to structure it so that it does that kind of seamlessly.

MS. McCAWLEY: I like the way that the Mid-Atlantic had it organized. I think that we could take this list here and group them into broader themes. The reason I suggest that is I think it might be a little bit easier for fishermen and stakeholders when they're trying to figure out exactly what they want to comment on, these are pretty far down in the weeds. Maybe if it was grouped into science, management or some other big-picture ideas, it might be a little bit easier for them to organize their thoughts and their comments.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think that could be helpful as well and certainly not lose some of the specificity that Charlie was talking about with regard to the fact that we're focusing on a single fishery if we were to group things like that. Do other folks have comments? Do any of our folks who participated in the Mid-Atlantic's process have any comments? Pres, I don't know if there is anything that you would want to say in regard to how the Mid-Atlantic decided to make their groupings around these four major goal themes. Do you have any advice you'd want to offer?

MR. PATE: Do good! (Laughter)

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that. Bob.

MR. BEAL: I was on the Mid-Atlantic Planning Group as well. They went around and around and around and meeting after meeting after meeting before they got to this point. They kind of wandered through the woods and had a lot of very good thoughts, but they were really disorganized.

I think the only way they could put any organization or structure on it was to come up with categories and then break those down into individual objectives. I think they went through at least a half a dozen meetings before they got to this point. I think borrowing this saves you guys a lot of time and a lot of money.

DR. DUVAL: And that was one of the reasons why we asked folks to look at that was it was like what can we take from the process that has already occurred and apply it to what we're trying to do here. I'm glad to hear you say that, and it certainly is a lesson for us here today to try to capitalize on that as much as possible.

I think nobody is under any illusions that this process is probably going to take a little bit longer than what we originally thought just based on some of the other items we have on our plate. Are there any other thoughts on sort of major categories of goals? It sounds like there is support around the table for copying these major goals.

Perhaps governance is not one that might be as strong of one for us; although I think just looking at sort of the statement of the governance goal that the Mid-Atlantic put together ensuring that the council's governance structures and practices fairly represent stakeholder interests and are coordinated with the council's management partners and include a clear and well-defined decision-making process – while we sitting around this table right here might feel like we've sort of addressed this, that doesn't preclude some constituencies out there from making some suggestions to improve those processes. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I agree and I think that's where Mel's suggestion might have some merit; because if you ask the stakeholders what are the three things the council does well and what are three things they don't do well, we might get some feedback on the governance part that then we could use.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so everyone is good with that sort of a rough approach for moving forward?

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, the next document was the Snapper Grouper FMP Objectives that we discussed at the last workshop. Based on our discussions from that last workshop, we went ahead and kind of made some proposed edits to those goals or objectives. What I did when I was looking at each of the objectives, I kind of tried to see which of these goal themes that we were just discussing, these fit under.

Maybe that's what we need to figure out is if these different goal themes that we've kind of developed at the last meeting fit under those three main categories of communication, governance, management and science and then get into the actual nitty-gritty of the goals and objectives.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that definitely sounds like a logical way to move forward to me; and just to make sure everybody is on the same page, I believe this is Attachment 7 in the Visioning Workshop Folder within the briefing book.

MR. HARTIG: When we have these different goal that are mandated by MSA, we may just list them in an MSA Category within these documents somewhere so the public is aware that these things we are doing. It is just that we have to do those; they're statutory and we have to take those into consideration.

DR. DUVAL: Ben, you're just suggesting having like a separate category for those MSA goals?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Under communications, it seems to me that the themes that we have listed that would go under the communications category would be the public involvement and cooperation and the stakeholder diversity. Under our management overall category, our themes are mostly encompassed under that, minimal waste, healthy ecosystems and habitat, adaptive management, stable and resilient fishing communities and economic efficiencies all fall under the larger management goal; and clearly sound science falls under science. I think we can pretty quickly divide these up into the larger themes.

DR. DUVAL: This is just my thoughts. I think healthy ecosystem and habitat could probably fit under either management or science, probably both.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, can we go through again so I can type it in here?

DR. DUVAL: I think Anna said sound science is obviously a science piece. Minimal waste would be management. Healthy ecosystem and habitat could probably fit under both management and science. Adaptive management, obviously a management goal; public involvement and cooperation was communication; stable and resilient fishing communities, that was a management goal; the same with economic efficiency; and then stakeholder diversity I believe, Anna, you said was communication. Are there any thoughts about that? Is there anything that we're missing or might need to be recategorized or belongs in maybe a couple different categories? Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say we didn't hit governance anywhere in any of those; but I guess public involvement and cooperation, that could be governance. Some of them could be management and governance; but it's okay. I don't know that we like governance necessarily; but based on how they defined it, some of those would hit into governance as well.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, do you all want to look at some of the things that the Mid-Atlantic included in their governance to see if maybe there are some larger goal statements that you want to include under governance besides what we have up here?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, maybe we could just – if you could pull up that plan again and we could just do sort of quick run-through at least with the major objectives that were included there.

MS. VON HARTEN: The goal for governance reads “ensure that the council's governance structures and practices fairly represent stakeholder interests, are coordinated with the council's management partners, and include a clear and well-defined decision-making process.”

DR. DUVAL: I think our decision-making process is fairly well defined and it is pretty formalized how we go about making decisions. It may not necessarily be clear to someone until they observe the process how we make our decisions. I think some of the other objectives that are underneath that goal like develop and strengthen partnerships; I think those are things that

we're always working on as a council. Certainly some of the efforts that staff is involved in right now with regard the Marine Resources Education Program, that is one of those examples of how we're always trying to strengthen that relationship. I don't know if anyone has any other thoughts on that. Me.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say some of that is what we're describing in communication, so some of it just overlaps into communication if we're comfortable just calling it all communication. Typically, we know how we operate, we know how things are set up, and sometimes the public just quite understand that.

That is where we get some feedback about whether how they're notified of the process or they didn't know this or they didn't that. Then they kind of question the governance, but it is really about communication maybe is probably the issue. There is probably good overlap with governance and communication, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that sounds good. Part of that communication about our governance piece might be here is a one-pager on generally how the council decision-making process works; an issue comes up, discussion ensues at council meeting, draft amendment created, it goes out to the advisory panel, something like that might be strategy that we come up with for dealing with that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, on our new website we have a whole section on getting involved and there is a section on the management process that has diagrams and it is great. You will see that soon.

DR. DUVAL: As usual, staff is five steps ahead of us, and I'm not surprised, so thank you very much.

MS. VON HARTEN: So I guess what I'm hearing is perhaps we don't need to have governance as one of the larger goals and just keep it to the three, management, science and communication, because the governance will come out in the communication.

MS. BECKWITH: How do we take into consideration Ben's question? Would that not fall under governance, the kind of MSA requirements; is that not part of our governance?

MS. VON HARTEN: Myra was just saying does it really need to be part of the strategic plan or kind of just like a side note of these are some of the other objectives that we're already mandated or currently in practice; and just have like a subsection that states that.

MS. McCAWLEY: I still kind of think that governance is needed. If we don't have a category like that available for the public to comment on, it kind of looks like we're not open to thoughts on how we run our meetings. I know that we do have some flexibility in what we do, so I'm wondering if we should keep that category.

DR. DUVAL: Excellent point. Maybe at this point we say communication/governance, and we might include just a general statement that at this point we may not have any specific goal

statements that we feel are really honing in on the governance question but obviously are open to input in that regard. How do folks feel about that? Okay.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, one thought, if you look back at the Mid-Atlantic Plan, it talks about building partnerships. I know that kind of goes with public involvement and cooperation, but to me that was more about public cooperation and public involvement and also had to do with compliance and law enforcement. Perhaps you could just have one that talks about building relationships or partnerships, rather. Then the other one was their Objective 6 was talking about evaluation of management actions. That could be a governance type theme.

MR. HARTIG: The partnership also goes with science as well and the cooperative research, building those types of things into, you know.

DR. DUVAL: Just getting back to one of the things that we discussed at previous sessions in terms of the difference between the process that we're undertaking here and the process that the Mid-Atlantic Council engaged in, the Mid-Atlantic Council's process was very much also about rebuilding those stakeholder relationships that had been pretty severely damaged, and so there was a big effort on that.

We agreed that a visioning or strategic planning process and a stakeholder rebuilding process are complementary but two different things. While we don't want to lose sight of opportunities to constantly build upon and enhance our stakeholder relationships and our partnerships, what we were really focused on was what do we, the grand "we", meaning all of our constituents and the council, want the snapper grouper fishery to look like and soliciting input from our stakeholders with regard to strategies for managing it.

I just don't want us to go down the road of creating an entire stakeholder rebuilding process but acknowledging that we need to take advantage of those opportunities to enhance the partnerships that we have, to improve the communication that we have with our stakeholders. I think that is something that we're always trying to do.

I think we have a lot of communication with our advisory panels. Maybe there are some new tools/strategies for improving that communication that we can employ in order to get to better management of our fisheries. Am I just talking in a circle; do people understand what I'm trying to say? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: No, you're right on, and we do need to rebuild some of the credibility we lost under MSA. And what we've done with red snapper, absolutely in Florida it is critical that we try and do that, but it doesn't have to be a stated explicit part of this. It is something all of us I think do now as we go through the public hearing process and we try and engage stakeholders more and have them ask questions and things of that nature. I think it doesn't have to be explicitly stated but I think it should be part of what we try and do in this, for sure, because we have a problem in parts of our jurisdiction, for sure.

DR. LANEY: I think you're right on target, Michelle, and I agree with what Ben said. I was going to ask the question, but I think you just answered it. Certainly, advisory panels are part of

the governance process for the council, and to me that's the primary – along with public hearings is kind of the primary entry point for stakeholder comment.

If I was involved in the snapper grouper fishery, I would certainly want to know who my advisory panel members are and use them as a conduit along with the public comment opportunities. To me, again, it is both; it is governance, and the governance question would be are our advisory panels working effectively, do they feel like they're working effectively, do they meet often enough. Those are all the kind of governance questions; and the communications' piece is certainly a big part of that because the council has to communicate effectively with the advisory panels and vice versa. I think you're right on target.

MS. BECKWITH: But to follow up on that thought, if one of our major end goals is to really solicit new strategies for management, I would personally not necessarily want to get bogged down on some of these other goals or themes. Our focus with our stakeholder is new kinds of intuitive strategies for management that we haven't considered.

Having discussions on communication or our advisory panels or how often they meet, that is important but with the limited amount of time that we're going to have these guys in a room really giving us new fresh ideas on how to solve the world's problems, I don't know that – I just want to keep us really focused on what our end goal is.

DR. DUVAL: Sort of what I'm hearing is it is important to keep governance as a goal because I think these are some governance questions that governance impacts our ability to communicate with our stakeholders. Ben, I would say throughout the region there is a credibility issue I think with some of our – it is not just limited to Florida and red snapper.

I think the issues differ depending on which area you go to. Perhaps we do need to not necessarily combine that with communication but pull it out and note that we are open to suggestions to improve that structure such as, you know, how the advisory panels operate, how frequently there is turnover in the advisory panels, et cetera, things like that. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: On the issue with getting out to our stakeholders and trying to rebuild the credibility we have lost, I sit on a couple of different boards. One of them is a Chamber of Commerce that has kind of gotten a bad wrap over the years and now we have a new kind of crew. One thing we developed is an ambassador program, because there certainly are people who are willing to speak up and do right and believe in what we're doing here.

Maybe we could identify somebody like that who would be willing to – that way we're not leaving this communication just up to staff and mailers and stuff like that and just do a small training course or something like that and get people who are kind of at the grassroots' level, who know the fishermen, know the stakeholders and can get them together and sort of facilitate what we're trying to do before we get there for these port meetings.

DR. DUVAL: Great suggestion. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say in my discussion of combining governance and communication was really when we were looking at these FMP objectives, and that is how they – what we came up with there has just sort of fit like that. I agree with Jessica and others, I think governance needs to stay in there somehow in some form.

The point that Bob made about we may go around and around and around and it is going to settle out the same way, and you can go through a lot of additional effort and we may end up right back where we started because that's sort of the logical way. If you think about it, the Mid-Atlantic Council deals with the exact same stuff we deal with, the fishermen, the fisheries, the habitat.

They went through a lot of effort and this is how it settled out. It is probably logically going to settle out the same sort of organizational pattern for us. I would leave governance in there and we can see what kind of catches under there.

I agree with you; we're in a slightly different position from where they were in terms of dealing with relationships with the fishermen as they described it. I think we have got good communication and we have got some things going for us that they were struggling with, but on the other hand they had fewer species to deal with and they had a lot of rebuilt fisheries. But I would leave it in there, for sure.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we're leaving it in.

MS. VON HARTEN: Separate?

DR. DUVAL: I think separate. There is certainly overlap in some of those broad goal statements, but I think Mel's point is well taken; we could go around and around the horn on this and settle out in the same places that the Mid-Atlantic Council did, and I think just acknowledge that there can probably always be improvements to our governance structure. Just because it might be working fairly well for the most part right now, it does not mean that it will always work well down the road.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, Mel is right, and I also want to remind you that this was just in the context of these Snapper Grouper FMP Objectives. There may be some that you all want to add, and that is totally fine, and under any of these strategies goals, so don't think that we're bound just by pre-existing Snapper Grouper FMP Objectives.

With that, if you'd like we can kind of go through each objective and kind of discuss the proposed edits and if you like them or not or you want to change them. If you follow along in Attachment 7, the first one is prevent overfishing. The proposed edit based on our discussion was that – I said "remove", but that's one of those ones like Ben said that is mandated by MSA, so maybe we can just move that under that category. Is there agree to that?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think silence is agreement at this point.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, number two was just simply collect necessary data, and then the full-length objective was collect necessary data to develop, monitor and assess biological, economic and social impacts that management measures design to prevent overfishing, obtain desired SPR levels and address the other stated problems – pretty wordy. We kind of pared it down this goal statement of obtain the best quality data to monitor and assess biological, economic and social impacts of management measures. That is pretty broad.

DR. DUVAL: I like it but I want to know how other people feel. To me fewer words are better. If we can say what we mean in fewer words, I think that serves us well in our communication.

MR. HAYMANS: Then I would strike the word “best” because if it is not quality data, then it is – I just think it is “obtain quality data”.

MR. JOLLEY: And how about dropping “measures” and just end with “management”, period.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think that works, so it would read, “Obtain quality data to monitor and assess biological, economic and social impacts or management.”

MS. VON HARTEN: And, again, that would go under the science strategic goal?

DR. DUVAL: Is there anything else on that one?

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, number three is “promote orderly utilization of the resource,” and the theme that I put that under was minimal waste/healthy ecosystem and habitat, so I guess that would be management now. The proposed edit was we weren’t really sure what “orderly utilization” was really defined as, so we said, “Promote efficient utilization of the resource. The objectives underneath were kind of giving some context to the efficient utilization; so management strategies that result in predictable fishing seasons, management strategies that minimize discards and waste in the fishery, and then management strategies that result in habitat protection were some of the proposed objectives.

DR. DUVAL: So promote efficient utilization of the resource; I imagine that folks are going to ask what we mean by “efficient”. I’m thinking that “efficient” means different things to different people. “Efficient” may mean you have a full-retention fishery with nothing thrown back. “Efficient” may mean you spend the least amount of money to get out to where you want to go to the fishing grounds. “Efficient” can mean a number of different things to different people. I guess I’m just wondering how folks feel about that. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, the first thought I had when I read that was what about the efficient versus legacy fisheries and at some point do we have to have that discussion. Certainly, some of our legacy fisheries aren’t the most efficient fisheries, so it goes back down to our fishing communities and what do we want to maintain and are those really the most efficient ways of utilizing that resource. I’m sure what “efficient” means.

DR. DUVAL: Good points. Are there other suggestions? I think we all have a sense of what this might mean, but it is finding the right words to describe that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I will just throw a real monkey wrench in here. Some folks might even have trouble with utilization. If we're talking about only extractive uses, there are there other ways you can use the resource particularly related to healthy ecosystems and habitat. Some people might look at that as extractive is not everything for all stakeholders.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, this is a tough one. Is there anything from the Mid-Atlantic that we could steal for this one? Actually I'm going to put Bob Beal on the spot. Bob, is there anything in the ASMFC's Strategic Plan that sort of speaks to this kind of goal that you can recall off the top of your head?

MR. BEAL: Not that I can recall. We're going through a strategic planning process right now to rework ours as well. Even though I just endorsed the way the Mid-Atlantic grouped theirs and they made a lot of sense at the time, the ASMFC has done it differently where there are goals. One goal is management; the next is science; the next is law enforcement, habitat and so on. We've grouped ours a little bit differently. Minimizing waste and effective and efficient utilization is in there, but it is not captured in one specific spot. It is kind of scattered out across a couple different goals. That's not much help.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, but it sounds like – well, I do think it helps a bit. It is something that the commission is working on as well and sort of dancing around that. I do agree with Mel that utilization is probably a slightly confusing work as well. I have a colleague who hates the word “utilize”. He said you just need to use it is not utilized; it is a nonsensical word. I just looked back under the Mid-Atlantic's approved plan, and the management goal is develop fishery management strategies that provide for productive, sustainable fisheries. I don't know if there are some words in there that we could use such as “productive” or “sustainable”. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say I think a better word than “utilization” would be “stewardship”. I mean you could promote efficient and effective stewardship, because stewardship implies that you can have extractive uses, you could have non-extractive uses. It is the whole thing. You're just taking care of public trust resources. I like “stewardship” better than “utilization”, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: I like that, too. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: What about promote consistent and sustainable use of the resource? Is that too simple?

DR. DUVAL: No. Consistent and sustainable use – let's make sure we've got a list of candidates – effective stewardship; consistent and sustainable use. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I was going to say that I have concerns about the word “sustainable”. I think that we know what it means, but I think there are members of the public that might think that sustainable doesn't include extraction.

DR. DUVAL: Good point. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I like Mel's stewardship. It covers it; it gives you an ownership connotation with an ownership toward sustainability. I like stewardship.

DR. DUVAL: Efficient, effective, consistent stewardship; too many words. John Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: I think too many words. Any place we can shorten it in the long run, because we have a lot of documents and we have a lot of pages, and I would just encourage everybody to think about brevity because there is so much to comprehend. If the general public gets stuff and if it's too lengthy and complicated, they lose interest. It is government.

Now, under Objective 1 and 2, as an example of shortening something, I would say "promote predictable fishing seasons". I think that captures that kind of thing. That may not be exactly what the council wants, but I just think there are a lot of ways to make things simpler with fewer words that will get the point across.

We're not going to be able to satisfy every understanding and let's don't try to do that. I do think brevity and conciseness is going to be very important in all of these documents. You have heard enough from me on this subject.

MS. McCAWLEY: My comments were about the word "stewardship" and not the word "sustainable"; I apologize.

DR. DUVAL: So what is your pleasure? We have "promote efficient utilization of the resource" as a proposed edit. There are suggestions for "promote effective stewardship of the resource" with concerns expressed about whether or not stewardship still allows for extractive uses or at least the perception that it may not allow for extractive uses. We have "promote consistent and sustainable" – I would say "use" rather than "utilization of the resource". Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, I was reading through one of the objectives, and they have "enable efficient use", so that is another option, "enable efficient operation of commercial and recreational fishing businesses," but it could be "enable efficient use of resources".

DR. DUVAL: Were you looking at I think Objective 16?

MS. BECKWITH: Right.

DR. DUVAL: So the suggestion is "enable efficient use of the resource". Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: I think one of the reasons why we're struggling with this a little bit is because we have different users of the resource; and what may be efficient for one group may not be efficient for the other, and we're trying to encompass all of that in one area. I think part of it is because we have different users and to them the way they use that resource may be different, and we're trying to include all of that in one statement.

Somewhere along the line it would be good recognize that the resource is used by different stakeholders and that how one stakeholder group wants to utilize them, and to them what is

efficient may not be for another group of stakeholders. I don't know how you capture all that in there, but I think that is part of the reason why you're having a problem of trying to deal with this.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, one thing to think about is this either going to be your goal or objectives, so you can address the different users of the resource in your strategies. Whatever one you choose, promoting effective stewardship, you can address each of the users in your strategies.

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to make a quick suggestion. I was going to say "promote effective use and stewardship of the resource"; would that maybe get at both things? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, recognizing the different stakeholders, I was going to suggest the goal is simply to enable use of the resource, and with the objectives we would identify how that would be done to the different stakeholders.

MR. BELL: "Stewardship" does that. My agency, we consider ourselves the stewards of this state's natural resources, and that doesn't matter whether you like to go shoot deer or whether you like to take pictures of deer. It covers all uses, so "stewardship" is a good word.

MR. JOLLEY: I agree with Mel; I think "stewardship" is fine. We're not going to get everything. My point a minute ago, when I went Objectives 1, 2 and 3, and I just did this, I went through – and I'm not trying to solve this predicament entirely, but I want to get my point across clearly. If we look at those three objectives, there are 39 words in all three of them, and I just modified them to where there are nine words. That is the example I'm trying to use.

I think we're getting too deep in the weeds here with some of these things. Stewardship of the resource seems to me is all you have to say; isn't it? If we came down underneath the objectives and said things like "promote predictable fishing seasons" – four words – "minimize waste" – two words – and "encourage habitat protection", and we know that is a big item that is in the news these days that has all kinds of consequences. Are we communicating well enough when we talk about that kind of thing with all the people involved in habitat? Apparently not. But we've gone from 39 words to 9 words, Madam Chairman, and I think there is some value in that.

DR. DUVAL: Voice of wisdom. So, with that said and understanding some of the concerns about use of the word "stewardship", if we said "promote effective stewardship of the resource" and can clarify that in the objectives that this includes extractive uses; would folks be okay with that for a draft? I mean, this is something that we're drafting. This is not the final version.

Just to move us off the dime because I'd like to get through at least a few more of these, take a quick break, and then get through the rest of these so that we can talk about the port meetings, because we're going to need a little bit of conversation on that. All right, if everyone is okay with that, moving on, Amber.

MS. VON HARTEN: I think we can come back to the objectives. Let's just get through these goals first. Number 4, "Provide for a flexible management system" and the rest of that says "that

minimizes regulatory delays while retaining substantial council and public involvement in management decisions and rapidly adapts to changes in resource abundance, new scientific information, and changes in fishing patterns among user groups.”

In the words of John Jolley, very wordy, so the proposed edit was “provide for a flexible management system”, and then take those components of the rest of that goal statement and develop them into objectives.

DR. DUVAL: Comments, thoughts, objections? I like it. It is short and sweet.

MR. JOLLEY: You can drop “system”.

DR. DUVAL: So just “provide for flexible management”. We’re really getting into this like tossing out extraneous things. I like it. Bob.

MR. BEAL: Not on that, but as you go down into the objectives, it talks about adapting quickly to changes in resource abundance, I think there is the potential for some criticism there as sort of over-promising to the public how quickly the system can move. I think there are some realities of the council process and then the subsequent National Marine Fisheries Service process. I think the wording is probably okay now. It is just something that you may be on guard for at these public meetings.

DR. DUVAL: Point well taken. I mean as quickly as we would like to do things, sometimes the process just simply doesn’t allow for that. There are times when taking a little bit longer to get through the process is actually a benefit.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 5, “minimize habitat damage due to direct and indirect effects of recreational and commercial fishing activities, as well as other non-fishery impacts.” The proposed edit is just to “minimize habitat damage due to recreational and commercial fishing activities”.

MR. HARTIG: We don’t have any goals or objectives to address non-fishery impacts.

DR. DUVAL: So we need to come up with some, then, for the non-fishing activities. I think that’s a great point is that there are other activities out there besides fishing that impact fisheries’ habitat. John.

MR. JOLLEY: My comment, I go back to my earlier brief comment, as you know, we’re dealing with a big controversy and have been for over 50 or 60 years with regard to water management. I don’t think we ought to get too far into this; but when we talk about the Indian River Lagoon and the problems we’re having with freshwater discharges, are we communicating as a fishery management organization with the right people about these complex problems? I know FWC does but is the council involved in that communication; and if not, why?

DR. DUVAL: I think Wilson, who is our habitat guru here, probably has something to say about that. We have a Habitat and Environmental Protection Advisory Panel which has developed a

number of policies over the years to speak to some of those non-fishing related impacts. Wilson could probably speak a little bit more as to sort of the process by which we've done that. I'm not disagreeing with your point, John. I think it is extremely valuable. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Yes, John, I think we do, through the Habitat and Environment Protection Advisory Panel, you know, we have representation on there from some of the state agencies that do have the regulatory authority. Also, the council has developed policies, and we're in the process, remember, of revising those flow policies as we speak.

One of my colleagues, Alice Nichols, has been working on some of that, and she is involved with the advisory panel. I think we do to a certain extent. One of the things that we may want to consider here is one of the things the ASMFC Habitat Committee has tried to do is to improve our communication with the three east coast federal fishery management councils on habitat issues. I think we could probably develop some habitat-specific kinds of objectives to stick in here to address the points you made.

We do it to a certain extent, but it could certainly be improved. As somebody pointed out earlier in terms of re-establishing relationships with stakeholders, I would say it needs to be not only the fishermen stakeholders in all the sectors but also stakeholders – I think we could broaden that definition to include those folks at the local level who are making those decisions that affect fishery habitat, because that's where the rubber meets the road from the habitat perspective. We can put all the federal laws that we want to out there, but unless they get implemented at the local level, it doesn't effect the change that we want to see in habitat improvement.

DR. DUVAL: Point well taken, Wilson. I certainly define stakeholder very broadly to include those kinds of folks. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: We have in the past, John, when people have brought situations like that to our attention, and generally it is brought to our attention through members of our advisory panel, but we have on occasion written letters in regard to those situations as a council. We have commented on those, but we probably have done nearly as much as we could have or should have.

A lot of times it is left up to the local people on our advisory panel to bring these things to our attention. Then if it goes against our habitat and environmental protection policies that we have in place, we will write a letter and send it to the appropriate people. Like I say, we probably haven't done that as much as we could have or should have in the past, but on occasion we have submitted letters on behalf of the council commenting on these local issues.

MR. JOLLEY: I certainly appreciate that, and I know everybody on the council is concerned about these kinds of things. I am concerned that there isn't enough communication; and as we go forward, we know if there is no habitat, there are no fish. If there is not good quality habitat, there is less fish. That goes for water quality as well.

I just think as a body, this institution needs to be on the forefront communicating that we're trying to manage fish and people; and habitat is so important that maybe if we don't

communicate enough clearly with the powers that be – we’re talking about money, politics and all kinds of power, and we’re there at the table like we should be.

I would encourage the council to consider – as we go forward, these things are only going to get worse in some respects because more people are going to come to Florida, for example, to live here, and that means probably dumping more water in the long run.

I just think that the councils need to be there when we’re having these discussions all over the United States about habitat and water quality, and we may not be there as often punctuating those things that concern us and affect fish and sustainability.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say when I read the goal originally, we can’t just limit habitat impact to recreational and commercial fishermen, which would include divers and everybody else. Then tying with John’s point about other impacts, one of the things that I do is every year I get to talk to folks in leadership training session in South Carolina.

These are people from all over the state, and I ask them this question at the beginning of my little talk about do they know the connection between a gag grouper and a K-mart parking lot. Then I explain this and basically what I’m talking about is gag grouper, which are harvested offshore – and even if there is somebody from upstate and they like a grouper sandwich, and that’s what they think a gag grouper is, a grouper sandwich, but they understand what at the end of this that grouper, even though they’re harvested offshore at some point in their life history recruit to oyster reef habitats and things inside the estuaries.

Then I show them a picture of a K-mart parking lot, which is flowing into one of our creeks there, which can impact water quality and habitat. There are decisions we make or decisions that are made at the municipal, the county, the state level, upstream or locally, that have impacts on the resources that we manage, even though this particular habitats aren’t necessarily in the EEZ. They just need to understand those connections. It is the connect-the-dots thing.

To John’s point, somehow even though we don’t regulate those certain things ourselves or have authority for that, we need to make sure the decision-makers understand those connections. That’s probably the best we can do, and that could actually be a separate objective in there talking about other impacts or something.

Our role would be to simply make sure they understand those connections, and then the decision-makers can make whatever decisions. I try each year to try to get South Carolinians to understand that things that they might be doing at a local level or a state level or county level can actually have an impact on fisheries’ resources offshore. Somehow we’ve got to get that across I think better.

MR. PHILLIPS: I totally agree. Storm water, point discharge, non-point discharge, when they consider it, it is almost lip service that it affects habitat, but we don’t have any outreach to let people know how it really affects it; or, if you have a spill from a plant, when they go to considering the fines and what they should do about it, there should be some way that they can understand just how that affects everything downstream and offshore. Often it is just not there or

at best it is some lip service, but there is no touch, there is no really connection there, and we really need to work on that connection.

DR. DUVAL: So what I'm hearing is that this is a communication issue. I mean it is a habitat issue, but it is a communication issue. I think in the interest of moving this conversation along and settling on some draft language for this particular issue, I think we can probably add a placeholder for an objective dealing specifically with non-fishing impacts and how those are communicated. That can probably be something that we send to our Habitat and Environmental Protection Advisory Panel to deal with. I feel like we're getting a little bit into the weeds of how we should actually do that right now. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I agree, Madam Chairman, I think we could probably proceed in that fashion. I just wanted to say I think probably the way it was worded the way it was is because the council does have some regulatory authority through NMFS for regulating habitat damage due to fishing activities; but as we've heard with regard to the discussion that just took place, it goes well beyond that.

While David is correct, we have written letters – I think Bob can speak to this as well – we've had these discussions at both the ASMFC level and the council level about the need to balance staff time with the council's ability to review and comment on things that may adversely affect habitat for council-managed species. It is always difficult to achieve that balance.

The concept, though, we kind of followed in the past is that there are state and federal regulatory agencies out there that are responsible for commenting on that; and in those cases where something rises to the level at which the council feels the need to weigh in, the council will send a letter based on the science developed by those state and federal colleagues out there and all those other agencies with which we partner.

Maybe we could add that objective like you said to not only consider the strategies that reduce gear interactions with snapper grouper habitat, but also improve the council process for encouraging habitat conservation and sustainability and restoration as well, because there are plenty of places where we know restoration needs to happen. Again, the council has been involved in that or at least the council partners have been involved in that process.

MR. PUGLIESE: I didn't want to take up a lot of time, but our habitat directives at the South Atlantic have been probably the best in the country. I think one of the most significant issues that gets a little bit lost is that the council's directive and mandates are being addressed every day. The permit review process that is in place; we have such a close coordination with the Habitat Conservation Division that the active permit letters and policy letters are developed based on the council's EFH designations and the policy statements.

There are some very specific requests. As Wilson said, the updates of those to make them more active and integrate into comments, that I think you're really in the trenches already with the council's highlights. What has happened in the past is when we really come up to very significant activities that NOAA Fisheries doesn't feel like they – feel like they plus other

partners need even more support is when we've stepped forward and then had a council in addition to a NOAA Fisheries comment on policy or permit activities.

I think we right now are engaged in trying to refine and expand that capability, especially with the policy revisions. Those are all being done. We have a November Advisory Panel Meeting so they can very specifically address this type of activity, so they can take on that next level that is already essentially mandated by Magnuson.

Magnuson does say we have to look at non-fishing activities. We regulate the fishing activities but also provide policy guidance, and we are setting the stage with what we've done so far and the AP has already committed very significantly to look at in, say, not only this policy development in the future iteration of the next Fishery Ecosystem Plan even more refined capabilities of working with the state, local and federal partners.

I think everybody has hit it on the head; that is where the rubber meets the road, and I think we've got a good network to get that done. Also, our collaborations with a lot of other activities that is going in the background with the Governors Alliance, with the Landscape Conservation Cooperatives, with some of these other activities, they are keeping the council in and tapping on some capabilities that get to some of the issues that have been raised on specifically connectivity, things that I think as we refine our information, it is going to really re-emphasize how important those habitat connections are with – you know, if you're looking at managing this resource, our essential fish habitat designations inshore and all are vital to looking at how the long-term sustainability of the systems are.

We do have a fairly complex network that I think we can refine even further, as well as the policy guidance, as well as the information needed to understand how important the connectivity of all these systems are. It is a lot of years that we've been building this in our region, and I think we're at a pretty good stage to even go further with this and with the directive of the council and the committee to look very specifically at that, and we can take that to the next step.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that synopsis, Roger. I think it is much appreciated, and these are all good points here that have been brought up. The council I think has been very proactive and has been a leader in addressing these types of issues with those policy statements. The Habitat Committee is actively working on taking that sort of to the next step by getting to those decisions that are made at the local level.

I want to just kind of bring the conversation to a point here and go back to the proposed edit to this goal statement with regard to habitat. I just suggested to Amber that perhaps we could take out the words "due to recreational and commercial" in there and just simply say "minimize habitat damage from fishing activities". I mean that is what we have in our purview. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: I don't see a problem with that, but the goal needs to be broader because of some of the objectives we discussed, so I think we need to say "fishing and non-fishing activities" if you want to include those other objectives.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, “minimize habitat damage from fishing and non-fishing activities”; noting that we have a mandate from the Magnuson-Stevens Act to do so. All right, let’s go ahead and take just a quick ten-minute break.

DR. DUVAL: All right, folks, just a few more things to get through before we go to lunch here, so I am going to turn it back over to Amber. We have finished up with our goal statement regarding habitat, minimize habitat damage from fishing and non-fishing activities, so the next one, Number 6, has to do with public compliance.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 6, promote public compliance and enforcement; and I think that will now go under our communication strategic goal. The proposed edit was “promote public comprehension and compliance with enforcement if fishery regulations”, because that was kind of based on our discussions we had in June that you had about compliance and concerns with law enforcement and things of that nature. That is the proposed edit.

MR. HARTIG: It may be just me but I just wanted to add “promote comprehension of and compliance with enforcement of fishery regulations”. To me it just read a little –

DR. DUVAL: I completely agree with that, Ben, it is hard for people to comply with something when they don’t understand what it means so ensuring that people understand what we’re talking about is pretty key. Unfortunately, the language that we have to use sometimes in the regulations doesn’t always do that. I know it adds more words. John, it looks like you might have a suggestion here, but I do think the comprehension piece is key.

MR. JOLLEY: I like that, Ben, and then I think we can drop “fishery” and just say with “with regulatory enforcement”. Everything we’re doing here is about the fishery.

DR. DUVAL: Do we even need “regulatory” in there?

MR. JOLLEY: Maybe not.

DR. DUVAL: So “promote public comprehension of and compliance with enforcement”.

MR. PHILLIPS: I’m not so sure I like “comprehension”. I think “education” might be a better word. I don’t know that we want to tell the public they’re not comprehending something, but we can tell the public we’re helping to educate them.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, would a better word be “understanding”, “promote public understanding of”?

MR. PHILLIPS: Either, yes.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, because I do think – I understand what Ben is getting at, that sometimes there are regulations that are enacted that on the face of them, when they are read in the regulatory language, can be difficult to understand.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, I have an edit. It is under public understanding of enforcement; how about “promote public understanding of and compliance with regulations”.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, is it management or communication or all two, three – you guys tell me. I’ll put it there so you can see it. Communication?

MR. BELL: It is also management I think in that sort of our job is when we’re coming up with all these great ideas and things that we want done in the fishery and how we want it regulated, we’ve got to make sure that it is something that can be comprehended and it makes sense and is enforceable. That is our job, but there is a communication piece to communicate to the public so they have an understanding of what it is we’re trying to do; but our job, which is part of the management piece, is how we come up with those things and the ideas we try to put in place.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other thoughts on how to categorize this? It seems like it crosses a few lines. We could put it under management and communication? Why don’t we just put it both places for right now.

MS. VON HARTEN: Unless you want just to split that into two separate – you could leave the “promoting public understanding or regulations” under communication and then “promote public compliance with regulations” under management and have it two separate ones.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that sounds good to me; rather than having this sort of – I mean, there are two ways we could split it, either put it under two different broad goals or we could split up the statement. It is up to you. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I could go either way. It is logical to split it but I would point out under communication the council has already developed that application for regulations. To me that promotes both public understanding and also compliance, because now you have it on your smart phone and you can look at it while you’re out there.

DR. DUVAL: Well, Anna doesn’t have a smart phone, so she can’t see the regulations.

MS. BECKWITH: It’s downloaded.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, never mind. Amber.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, I think regulations could be defined as not just size limits and bag limits. It is also the amendments that come through and the management measures that are put in place, and that is what Kim and I spend a lot of time explaining to people, so that could be considered regulation.

DR. DUVAL: So the question remains do you want to split those two things up, “promote public understanding of regulations” under communication and then “promote public compliance

with regulations” under the management? It may not be our job to promote public compliance, but we could certainly support public compliance with regulations if that is OLE’s job. Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, leave something in there as a placeholder if you don’t do anything else, that’s fine, but I’m not sure of the exact wording. The piece that we do under management isn’t so much that – we just need to make sure that the regulations are enforceable and are understandable and it makes sense. However we want to describe that function, that is what needs to go in management; but for right now if you want to just leave that in, we can wordsmith it later or something.

DR. DUVAL: Sounds good.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 7, mechanism to vest participants, and this was related to controlled access systems. I think it was related to wreckfish, perhaps. The suggested edit was “utilize mechanisms to vest fishermen in the snapper grouper fishery”. It is pretty broad.

DR. DUVAL: I think from a lay perspective, I almost don’t know what that means, a mechanism to vest participants. I think looking at the wordier version, if we want to do something where participants feel they have a stake in conserving the resource, that almost is more plain language and understandable to me than a mechanism to vest participants. This is something that I think we always want to make sure that our constituents have a stake in conserving the resource and using it responsibly. Do we need to have an explicit statement in that regard?

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think your wording that you substituted was better than the “vest”. The “vest”, it goes basically to IFQ systems. That was where that comes from, and that was the gist of the discussion in the wreckfish fishery, the vesting. I don’t know how you can get it – I guess you could get it by limiting permits and things of that nature to a degree. In black sea bass, when we limited it to 33 people, they have a more vested interest in the fishery because there are only 33 of them in that fishery. It will do that. I mean it has the potential; I’m saying it will; it can. I think your wording is better.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps modify that to say “ensure participants have a stake in conserving the snapper grouper resource”. Staff is telling me that is the same thing as stewardship, which I tend to agree. Maybe this is something we could eliminate. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we as a council have decided numerous times that we want to professionalize our industry. Some way, shape or form, if you’re going to have a professional industry, you want the fishermen to feel like some sense of ownership, whether it is through endorsements or whatever mechanism we use.

I understand “vest” came from ITQs originally, but now we have got longline endorsements and pot endorsements, so we’ve got two different fisheries that fishermen are vested into the fishery. I’m not so sure it is a bad word now. If we’re still wanting to professionalize fisheries, we’re going to have to look at options on how do it. I’m inclined to leave it in there and maybe some

wordsmithing but actually what you've got is probably okay for a larger goal; not objective but the goal.

DR. DUVAL: You mean the "utilize mechanisms to vest participants" – I don't like the word "utilize". Could we "promote mechanisms to vest fishermen in the fishery"?

(Response of "explore")

DR. DUVAL: Explore, promote, consider – okay, "consider". Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The only reason I – "vest", a lot of people don't know what that means. This is a public exercise we're going to, so I think we should explain it in terms that they're going to understand. "Vest" means something to me and Charlie, but I don't know that it means that much to the public at large.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with that, Ben. Chris, get us out of this.

MR. CONKLIN: If I'm not mistaken, anyone who makes a living off of the water in our fishery right now is already vested. Maybe we word it to say "further vest" or "invest"; you know, explore ways to further give fishermen and charter captains, as well, and commercial fishermen further vested interest in the fishery and maybe look at your common recreational fishermen and figure out how to give he or she some sense of ownership or whatnot and get them vested, per se.

MS. BECKWITH: For the commercial guys, they're already vested with the limited entry; and recognizing that is already a limited entry fishery and using that word "vest" screams IFQs and I don't know if that's – I don't like it; I don't feel comfortable with the word "vest". I'm more leaning towards ensure participants have stewardship, stakeholder or eliminate this and revisit it later.

MR. BELL: When I originally read this it says a controlled access system, so what I was thinking of is ITQs, IFQs, limited access, something like that. That is a strategy or a tool you can use in itself, and that should be on the table. I don't know that it needs to rise to the level of a goal, but then we're kind of now talking about vesting everybody.

Chris' point is you have an interest in the fishery, whether you're recreational, charter, commercial, whether you're non-consumptive, you've got an interest in the fishery, so that's a little different from the way this was originally worded, I think. It looked like it was maybe in there to specifically bring options for limited access kind of things to the table as a tool. That should stay in there, but I don't know that it needs to rise to the level of a goal necessarily.

DR. DUVAL: In consideration of your comments, Mel, perhaps "consider mechanisms to vest fishermen in the snapper grouper fishery" is something that belongs more as an objective under our earlier goal statement of "promoting effective stewardship", the earlier one – I think Number 3 – so does that sound like an objective that could fit underneath that goal? Does anyone have a problem if we move that as an objective under that earlier goal statement? Okay, I'm not seeing any objections. Again, this is just a draft so we can certainly modify things down the road.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 8, promote stability and facilitate long-run planning – the long part of that is “Participants in the fishery will have access to the resource based on certain criteria to be determined by the council after reviewing public comments. This would give participants the flexibility to employ the most profitable way to fish and also fish when it is most profitable in terms of market conditions. Such a system will promote stability in the fishery by providing a regular supply of fish throughout the fishing year, and maintain stable prices. Both fishermen and fish dealers will have the incentive to engage in long-run planning and investment activities.” This to me seems more business-oriented, market-driven type of goal, so the proposed edit was “Provide a management regime which promotes sustainability and long-range planning”.

DR. DUVAL: How do folks feel about that? To me that is a much more succinct means of stating that particular goal. I think that’s something that we would like to strive for a little bit more – so that we can have something where participants in the fishery can plan with a little bit more dependability for their businesses.

MR. HARTIG: Not only that, yes, it was couched in the terms of market-driven utilization, but recreationally it is very important for people to be able to plan on when they can have their trips, and maybe if we get down to a season some time – a snapper grouper season for the recreational fishery or something of that nature; I mean, the planning for the recreational is equally as important.

DR. DUVAL: And I was certainly talking about everybody in terms of planning. Are there any other thoughts on the proposed edit to this particular goal statement? Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I think we should include the word “recreational” somewhere in that Number 8 – somewhere.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps we can include that level of specificity in the objectives that would go below that statement. I think everybody would like a management regime that promotes sustainability and long-range planning. Perhaps we could say “for all sectors of the fishery” if you wanted to make sure that was clear.

MS. VON HARTEN: Myra and I were just talking – and I know there is some hesitation about this word “sustainability” and we are using in our vision statement, I believe – would “stability” be a better word, “promote stability”, because I think that is kind of – yes – more of what we’re talking about.

MR. PHILLIPS: Reading up in the original eight, it talks about regular supply of fish, the fishing year, maintain stable prices. That is different from sustainability. I think what she is saying is correct; we want market stability and accessibility for recreational fishermen long term. I think that is what we’re for and not sustainability but market stability, economic stability and accessibility for the recreational fishermen.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I would agree, I think stability is a better choice of words in that regard, and we can certainly address in objectives the specificity of that. What Amber has up on the screen

right now is “provide a management regime which promotes stability and long-range planning in all sectors”. Does that seem inclusive enough? Okay, moving on.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 9, create market-driven harvest pace and increase product continuity. It is kind of the same thing, yes, as the previous one. The edit, if you even want to keep it, is “create opportunity for market-driven harvest and continuity in the availability of product”. I remember us having the discussion that “product” meant whether it was a fishing trip for for-hire or a fishing trip for a recreational person or commercial, but we may not need it.

DR. DUVAL: And I tend to think that what we’re getting to here in Number 9 are really objectives that address what we mean under the previous statements, so I think you can get to the fact that a product could be a fish that is sold for consumption versus a product being a charter trip or a headboat trip. I think you can get to that level of specificity within the objectives that you would develop under the previous statement. Those are just my thoughts about that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I would agree with that. I’d say at this point you’re kind of down at the objective level and that should be included in the previous goal that we worked on.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 10, minimize gear and area conflicts among fishermen, this is kind of addressing that stakeholder diversity theme, so we said, “Manage the fishery to reduce conflict among stakeholders”, whether that was gear or area.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I know stakeholder conflicts are something that we have had some considerable experience with in North Carolina. How do folks feel about this statement? Do you want to keep it in; do you want to take it out; do you think it fits better under something else as an objective? Mel.

MR. BELL: You might be able to put it as an objective under three, which will end up being promoting stewardship, utilization, whatever we use there, but you’re kind of down into promoting – well, I can’t remember; did we take “efficient” out? But that would seem to fit under that. It is something that obviously we deal with and it needs to be addressed, and it certainly could be captured I think at an objective level; maybe under number three.

MR. PHILLIPS: And I agree; that basically is – stewardship is management and this is management, so we could condense that easily enough.

MR. BOWEN: The words “minimize gear”, will that also move up to number three or will that be taken out completely?

DR. DUVAL: I think what Amber has shown up here as a proposed edit to that statement, “minimize gear and area conflicts among fishermen”, is a little bit broader – has been edited to be a little bit broader, say, “manage the fishery to reduce conflict among stakeholders”, so that would be an objective, so it wouldn’t necessarily refer – you could be specific within there to refer to either gear conflicts or area conflicts. Your question is just do you want to maintain that reference to gear if it gets moved up under Goal Number 3?

MR. BOWEN: Well, my concern is constituents out of Georgia, there are some gear conflicts and it needs to be addressed, in my opinion.

MS. VON HARTEN: Could it be addressed in maybe a strategy. If this is going to be an objective, “manage the fishery to reduce conflict among stakeholders,” could it be a strategy that specifically addresses gear? I’ll just make a note that we want to make sure that we include a strategy that addresses gear conflict.

If you look at the objectives, the objectives that we came up with under that goal, the first was addressing regional differences in the fishery that result in user conflict, and then the second was management strategies that address differences in temporal and aerial distribution of the resource. That is kind of what we were trying to get at was this whole state-by-state concept that everybody keeps talking about. I don’t know what you all think about that.

DR. DUVAL: And I think at least certainly Objective 2 could be – well, I know it uses the word “strategy” in it, but it could be a strategy in and of itself. David.

MR. CUPKA: The gear and area conflicts is one thing, but I think Objective 2 really is a major area that we’ve seen a lot of problems in. As I tell people all the time, we’re at kind of a disadvantage, for example, over the Gulf. Where their resources are pretty much spread out on the same latitude, ours goes this way; and because we do have such a variation in latitude, we try and fix everything with one fix cures all, and it doesn’t work.

We see differences in species that occur throughout that latitudinal difference. We see differences in spawning times. Some of the biggest conflicts we have had I think are when we don’t recognize some of these regional differences and try and deal with them. I don’t want that to get lost in there, because to me that is an even bigger issue than, say, a gear conflict.

DR. DUVAL: So I think the point is we don’t want to lose that Objective Number 2 as a stand-alone objective.

MS. VON HARTEN: And perhaps it doesn’t belong under this goal; it belongs under one of the other management goals; perhaps the one about accessibility, even, that we just talked about. Under management, “provide for flexible management”; it could be an objective under that?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that sounds to me like a good place for that. I understand completely what is saying. That is a lot of the complaints that we hear is that we’re trying to use the same strategy throughout the region when we have a lot of differences in the species’ distribution. What I’m hearing is that this edited goal statement of manage the fishery to reduce conflict among stakeholders is perhaps an objective that could be moved up to Goal Statement 3 about effective stewardship, but that Objective Number 2 could move up into the goal statement about flexible management. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, with the conversation, do you think it is appropriate to move Objective 2 as a goal statement? Given the amount of attention we have given this over time, given that

we're trying to actually do that with king mackerel and Spanish mackerel in the latest amendment – it is not in the snapper grouper, but I mean it can go either way.

It just seems David's points are very well taken about how important this is. I have had extensive e-mail messages talking about regionalization since this last council meeting, between the two meetings. It something certainly that is going to be important.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, your point is well taken, Ben. I'm looking at the goal statement to provide for a flexible management system, which was I think the fourth one that we looked at. Does not "adopt management strategies that address differences in temporal and aerial distribution of the resource"; do you not see that as a piece of a flexible management system?

MR. HARTIG: Absolutely, I do.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, because that is kind of where I was thinking that objective would go is under there. Okay, Mr. Chairman, does that work for you? It doesn't that objective; it doesn't diminish it; it just moves it up to probably a more appropriate goal area for flexible management.

MR. CUPKA: It works for me; I just didn't want to lose it because that is a big issue.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, are we ready to move on?

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 11, decrease incentives for overcapitalization; and before I even read the whole lengthy rest of that, it was suggested that we move this as an objective under Goal 3. That was the one that formerly said "orderly utilization of the resource", so that now says "stewardship". If you guys keep it at all.

DR. DUVAL: What do you all think; do you want to keep it; do you want to move this under the Goal Number 3, which would be effective stewardship of the resource? Do we need to include this? I'm seeing at least one head shake around the table. If we keep this, I do agree that moving it under Goal 3 would be the most logical. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would think it could probably go under Goal 3, and then we can talk about how to do it or if we want to do it, but put it under Goal 3 possibly as a placeholder at least for now.

DR. DUVAL: It sounds good to me. We're not going to dump it so let's just move it.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, the last four I believe were ones that were already addressed or mandated. Number 12 was "prevent continual dissipation of returns from fishing through open access", and that was proposed to just be completely removed.

MR. HARTIG: You can look at this in a number of ways and not just the commercial fishery. We have a for-hire fishery that could be impacted by this. The Gulf has a limited access system for their for-hire and we do not. Even in the terms of recreational fishing, although we haven't had that happen since 2008 with the decline in the economy of the country, again you could have

these situations like we had in black sea bass when the bag limits were so low, your dissipation of return from your going fishing, you can't go fishing because the fisheries are closed. This has some appeal to me for other fisheries, whether or not you want to leave it in or put it somewhere else.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think again this is something that you could either leave in here or put it under three, because that would be part of your flexible management strategies. But, yes, it is something that definitely needs to be considered as we go through this, because it is definitely happening on both sides.

MR. BELL: I was going to say when we were talking about sort of limited access a while ago and we sort of moved that up to Goal 3, the remedy for open access maybe is limited access. You've already kind of captured it, but it needs to be in there. It is all part of the discussion of limited access and how you might use that. You'd use it as a solution to deal with problems associated with open access. It is definitely captured. I think it is up under three.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, when we spent so much time on that mechanism to vest statement, that we then moved up under Goal 3, this limiting access could be a strategy under there. I mean, I agree with Ben; it needs to stay in. I know there has been some discussion about other fisheries, perhaps the for-hire fishery, so it should probably stay in there for consideration at this point; so perhaps move it up under that goal.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, Number 13 was evaluate and minimize localized depletion. These are the ones we didn't get to at the last workshop, but the Snapper Grouper AP had suggested that this is something that could be addressed by the states or through consideration of regional quotas. I'm not sure if it belongs here.

DR. DUVAL: What is your pleasure on localized depletion? I think localized depletion is very much a perception place-based issue. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Bob may want to weigh in on this, but – no, he is shaking his head – but it is something that the ASMFC has struggled with relative to menhaden in the Chesapeake Bay. It all depends on how you define what the carrying capacity of the ecosystem is and then how you measure whether or not it is depleted relative to some carrying capacity.

Those are hard things to do from a science standpoint, I think. You certainly can do them but it costs a lot of money to determine what a carrying capacity could be or should be or even what it is desired to be based on your desire to increase the population of some more desirable species versus decreasing the population of a less desirable species.

I don't know; if we decide to evaluate it, the first thing we've got to do is define it before you can evaluate it. Then if you decide it is happening somewhere, you have to have the science to say, well, it is happening here, and then you have to decide how you're going to minimize it. I don't know; it seems to me this one would be a very complicated thing to do.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I would tend to agree and that's why I said that I think there is a lot of perception that goes into that. Bob, if you want to enlighten us with your wisdom on the menhaden experience, that would be great.

MR. BEAL: Stay away from it! (Laughter) Wilson is right, the ASMFC has spent a lot of time wrestling with localized depletion, and we get hung up on the duration and the scale of localized depletion. The menhaden industry, they set up purse seine nets and scoop up a school of menhaden and clearly there is localized depletion there.

But fish move in and out of that area and they mix with other stocks and we never really have gotten past that notion of the scale of the event and the duration of the event. And then menhaden is charged with a lot of politics, as you mentioned, Michelle. Getting past all that has been tough and we really haven't been able to define it.

MR. HAYMANS: We have enough problems supplying data for a region-wide assessment as opposed to getting down to localized, so I don't see the need for this; or, if we want to keep it, I think it needs to be – number 13 itself reduced to an objective and put under Number 2. As we collect necessary data, that necessary data gets down to a localized level; and I just think if we're going to keep it, move it to two.

MR. CUPKA: I think we have an example of at least this perception in our snapper grouper. One of the reasons why we set up SMZs, besides the fact that the recreational guys didn't like the commercial guys fishing on artificial reefs that had been built with recreational money, was the fact that they could in with commercial gear and pretty much knock down populations of snapper grouper species on these artificial reefs. Mel may want to speak more to that, but I know that was part of the reason why we addressed SMZs. I think SMZs are a good thing, and I want to be careful that we don't toss those out or something, because that was of the justification for establishing SMZs.

MR. BELL: David is right; that was really all about very, very specific localized depletion, and it wasn't so much commercial versus recreational as it was gear type versus gear type. I think you could keep this open as an objective either under two or three because it kind of also ties – when you start into three, when we were talking about things that David mentioned about latitudinal or regional differences; you could find yourself discussing it at that point – or as Doug mentioned, the science because really the science is what is going to drive this, but keep it as an objective, either under two or three. I would be okay with either, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's a good suggestion on Doug's part. I would think that because the science is going to drive it, that it might fit a little bit better under Objective 2 dealing with collecting the necessary information. My only concern with this statement is that it says "minimize localized depletion", and I think depending on perception, depending on, as Bob indicated, the duration and scale of something like that, that may not be within our purview to actually do something about it. I just throw that out there. Bob, to that point.

MR. BEAL: At the beginning of my last comments, I kind of jokingly said stay away from it, but menhaden move around a lot more than some of the critters you guys are talking about here.

There are a lot more structure-oriented animals and site fidelity, so it probably is worth exploring. But as Doug said, you've got to walk before you can run. If you can't assess these critters on a coast-wide or regional basis, you can have a real tough time doing it on one reef or even a lot smaller scale.

DR. DUVAL: Excellent points. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, going back to what Doug said, if we absolutely do not have the science to form a decision on it; do we want it in there at all and possibly bring it back when we might have the science or the resources to do the science? Do we want to leave something in there that we absolutely just cannot do at this point in time?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think it depends on the words that you choose to define this. I tend to think that the words "evaluate and minimize" overreach our ability to do anything about it. I'm looking for another verb and struggling right now in terms of – I do agree that we should probably keep this in because it is a perception, and I think there are stakeholders who are going to come forward and say that this is a problem in my area. It is just what is the verb that you use. Mel and then Wilson; and it is about twenty minutes twelve, so I would like to kind of wrap this up in the next five minutes so that we can spend some time talking the structure of port meetings.

MR. BELL: I just again mention was David was talking about; and again given that these are snapper grouper species and as Bob said they do show good site fidelity, you can and we have demonstrated and we know because we have seen it, whether it was from trapping – and I can remember coming before the council years and years ago when we were talking about issues with bang sticks on these small sites, and I plopped down a bag of spent .38 shell casings and showed video.

So we have documented localized depletion again on a small area, so I would leave it in there. It is something that because of the nature of the animals we're talking about, they are very clearly associated with these habitats. It is not like menhaden where they are really moving around or even dolphin or something, which is a whole 'nother management plan.

DR. LANEY: I certainly agree with what Mel just said and Bob's point about the nature of these species versus something like menhaden is very good. I would advocate keeping it in as well and maybe change it from "evaluate and minimize localized depletion" to say "consider localized depletion and how to address it" or something along those lines.

DR. DUVAL: Good suggestion, "consider and address" – well, no, I would just say – what was that again, Wilson, "consider how to address"?

DR. LANEY: Yes, I suggested "consider localized depletion and how we might address it," something along those lines. We have "evaluate and minimize". The "evaluate" part certainly belongs under Objective 2 for science, and then the "minimize" part or how to address it kind of belongs under the management goal. Again, you could split this one up into two different pieces if you wanted to.

DR. DUVAL: Amber has got up there a couple of revised bullet points as per Wilson's suggestions to "consider localized depletion" and then "consider strategies to address localized depletion" and put the first one under science and the second one under management, I believe. How do folks feel about that? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, the strategies to address localized depletion, as David said, we've already used them in the SMZs and management, so it is not strictly a science – okay, sorry.

DR. DUVAL: So the science piece would be considering it and the management piece would be how do you address it.

MS. VON HARTEN: And the last two are mandated already; "end overfishing of snapper grouper stocks undergoing overfishing" and "rebuild stocks declared overfished". Those will get move to that category that Ben suggested.

DR. DUVAL: Sounds good. I think we have done quite a bit of work today between wordsmithing and considering whether certain things belong in certain places, whether some of these were more goal statements, whether they were more objectives.

I am a very visual creature so for me I'm going to need to see – you know, let staff clean this up and rework it before we can kind of look at it and say, well, have we sort of captured a rough universe of what we'd like to consider here, knowing that we're focused on the snapper grouper fishery. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Before we move on; can we go just really quickly back to the vision statement and have a quick conversation on "citizens" versus "stakeholders" or "constituents" as an acceptable terminology, please?

DR. DUVAL: Absolutely and thank you for that reminder. Previously our draft vision statement was the Snapper Grouper Fishery is a healthy, sustainable fishery that balances and optimizes benefits for all citizens. I think we did sort of talk a little bit about whether or not to use the word "stakeholder" and maybe the perception being that might indicate only fishing constituencies as opposed to stakeholders broadly that these are public trust resources. Anna, do you have a suggestion for another word?

MS. BECKWITH: Well, "constituents" might be an option as well. It certainly goes beyond just U.S. citizens as our constituents.

DR. DUVAL: So we have "constituents" as a suggestion. Mel.

MR. BELL: I'm fine with "stakeholders". We use it throughout the document. It is used throughout the document that the Mid-Atlantic Council came up with. It is a perfectly legitimate term that describes all of these people we're bringing to the table that have an interest, that have a vested interest, and it's fine. I understand "citizen"; well, citizen of what? That could be confusing.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I still think I like “citizens”. I just heard the oath administered this morning. I think they used “citizens” in the oath. I think it covers everybody. I mean, “stakeholders” seems to be narrowing out. When it is a public resource, the citizens own it and not necessarily the stakeholders. The citizens own it, so I’m inclined to be broad because it is a public resource, but that’s just me.

DR. DUVAL: So maybe Phil can confirm whether “citizens” is used in the particular statement. While he is looking that up, I am going to move to Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Well, I guess I like “stakeholders” better for the reasons Anna pointed out. It isn’t just U.S. citizens that benefit from the resource. There are a lot of tourists that come to the U.S., especially to the Florida Keys, that go diving on lots of areas that have lots of council resources in them, and pay good money to do it. Now, U.S. citizens I guess who are running the excursion tours are benefiting from that, but so are the tourists. They benefit from the experience as well, so I guess I would kind of like “stakeholders” instead of “citizens”.

DR. DUVAL: Could we be exceedingly broad and just eliminate the word “citizens” and just say “optimizes benefits for all”; ala John Jolley? Phil, was there a confirmation of the use of the word “citizen” in the swearing-in statement?

MR. STEELE: The word “citizen” is not mentioned.

DR. DUVAL: Seriously, how do people feel about just not using a word and just saying “for the benefit of all”? Okay, cool! All right, the next thing on our list of stuff to bang out before lunch is discussion of the port meetings. Amber had included, which I believe is up on the screen, some suggestions for port meeting structure. Is it in fact sheet as well as the overview? It is in the overview, okay. Okay, so this is in the overview, which is Attachment 2, for folks who want to follow along, in the briefing book. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: It says “needs input for Florida”. I thought I put Port Salerno on there. Port Salerno would be another logical place to meet in Florida, for another city. We have got a place to meet, which is great, and certainly we have people that could facilitate the meeting – not facilitate it but whatever word I’m looking for.

DR. DUVAL: I think this is kind of a two-part conversation. One of the things that we asked folks to do was kind of come up with some suggestions for locations of port meetings, but then also we really need to consider the structure that we want to use here. We’re doing this in-house so just everybody keep that mind; we’re going to use existing staff and council members to do this given our existing budget situation and some of the cutbacks we’ve had. I just ask folks to keep that in mind. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, that was really my point in that if you count the X’s up there, that’s a lot of public meetings. That’s 70-some meetings or nearly 70.

DR. DUVAL: If you look at the chart that Amber has up on the screen right now, what this does is it sort of outlines which rough constituencies you would be capturing at a particular location. God forbid that we have 70-some meetings throughout the region.

MR. HAYMANS: My apologies for misunderstanding, but we had discussed at one time about who you invite to these things and I remember one part of our conversation was sector-specific meetings. That is what confused me. I would love to get these various groups together in one location and let everybody hear all sides. If that is the direction we're going, that's great.

DR. DUVAL: I think this is where some input from Florida is probably helpful, because I think in Florida, when they did the South Florida Outreach Stakeholder Meetings, that they had multiple constituencies present at each one of those meetings, so you had folks who were commercial fishermen, you had folks who were private anglers, you had folks from the for-hire sector, you had interested members of the public.

You had some folks who thought this was about more closed areas in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, which was a little bit unfortunate. Jessica, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but I think some input from you as to the pros and cons of having separate constituencies at different meetings, and then perhaps Bob Beal and Pres Pate would want to weigh in on that as well afterwards.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think it could be helpful. We did have all those folks in one room at the meeting. One thing that I did think was interesting is that I think we had some people that maybe were at a workshop for the first time, and so they were unclear about – and it is confusing in Florida, which is why we have the South Florida Committee, but they were confused about management authorities and who did what and what the role of the council was.

I think that is something that we need to think about when we go out for the visioning process about meeting the stakeholders at their starting point. Although we do have a lot of folks that know how we operate, there are some folks out there that if we get first-timers, they don't really even understand the way the council manages or what the authority is. That was something that we noticed at those workshops. We did have all the different constituents in one room.

For the most part it worked, but I think it worked because of the way that we did the meeting. We had everyone in a single room. We had a panel at the front of the room and we made it more of an interactive process where people – we spent a lot of time at the beginning where people could just ask questions.

Then when it seemed like those questions were turning into comments, then we said, okay, now we're going to move into the comment process, and we did it that way. In that manner the people that were providing comments, they weren't just asking a question. We tried to separate those two pieces of the workshop from each other so people could ask very detailed questions and then decide after they got their question answered that maybe I want to comment later or maybe I don't.

The FWC has a formalized way that we take comments where we use these speaker cards kind of like the council does. We don't make people go to a microphone. We let them stay in their seats and they can just comment from there. A lot of times people might have something to say, but they don't want to submit these speaker cards and give the formalized comment.

After we ran through the formalized comment, we let people kind of just speak off the cuff about the topics at hand and let the discussion continue in that way for another additional hour than what we would normally run our FWC workshops. Most workshops did not go the full three hours, but we would normally – if it is just an FWC workshop and it is a very focused issue, we only do two hours; but since this was a scoping-type workshop, we went for three hours so that we could make sure people got heard on every topic that they want to get heard on.

I do like the idea of splitting it up. Since this is going to be a more open-ended process, I like the idea of splitting it up. I don't know if you talked about locations; but when you get to the locations, I have a comment on that, too.

DR. DUVAL: We hadn't quite gotten to locations yet. I think the number of locations is really going to depend on the kind of format that we want to use, and I think we just need to be conscious of the fact that we are doing this in-house. David.

MR. CUPKA: In regard to locations, when I suggested some areas in South Carolina – and we need probably to decide about this – I included a possible inland location because we have a couple of very active fishing clubs that aren't on the coast. The one that stood out to my recollection was one in Florence.

If we're going to have to cut back on them, that may be something we want to consider, but they are very active and I think you'd get good input from them. Whether they would come to the coast to comment, I don't know. Mel may want to add to that.

MR. BELL: Yes, we don't want to get bogged down in this right now, but I was actually thinking Columbia. The reason for that is we've done things before in Columbia, and you can draw people from Greenville, Charlotte, Charleston, and Atlanta. It is kind of another place to just consider that. I think there is value in having an inland location. Florence, there is a connection with Georgetown with a lot of those guys, so they may cover that. We can get into the weeds with that later, but I think an inland location would be good to keep in mind actually for other states as well if it is within reasonable driving distance.

MR. HAYMANS: I realize we're calling these "port meetings", but can we incorporate at least some of them in with the public scoping hearing process that we do each year. Quite honestly, for my fine state we have such minimal participation in my public hearings that I would almost see it as a draw to get additional people out to those meetings. To me it is a better use of our fiscal resources to try to combine meetings where we can.

DR. DUVAL: I think, first, staff has made some suggestions, and I think we're going to talk about in Executive Finance for how to modify our scoping process and perhaps use some of the web-based tools that we have available to us to cut down on costs and effort there. I'm not sure I

would suggest combining these meetings, whatever we call them, port meetings or whatnot, with our normal public hearings. I think particularly given the docket of things that are going to be going out to public hearing, I'm not sure that's such a good idea, but that is just my two cents.

MR. PHILLIPS: Listening to Jessica and when we go to consider do we want to have one big group meeting or do we want to have individual meetings, you may want to consider putting the commercial and the chefs/restaurants in a meeting together and then put the recreational private and coastal tourism, because they're going to have a lot in common, just like the chefs/restaurants/commercial. You could kind of double up probably on a lot of those meetings like that and have one scheduled for five to seven and the other one seven to nine, something like that and be a little more efficient.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think we had sort of bandied about some of those kinds of things. If you felt to need to separate constituencies, could you do two meetings in one place and just run them a couple of hours for one constituent and a couple of hours for another. That would certainly capitalize on staff time and resources. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Looking at the suggestion for locations in Florida, I noticed that they're really the same locations that we have public hearings at, and so I think one of the considerations you want to have is try to attract more people that you haven't heard from possibly. I think by stressing those same locations where we do the public hearings, you're going to get the same group of people.

There is going to be a tendency at least for that, so we might want to look at other areas for the reason you want to diversify more. I would suggest the West Palm Beach Fishing Club in West Palm Beach would be a perfect place to get at another group of people.

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to put our Mid-Atlantic folks on the spot here and just ask, Bob or Pres, did either of you attend any of the outreach meetings that the Mid-Atlantic Council had and sort of what were your thoughts on the structure that was employed?

MR. PATE: Well, I attended virtually all of them, Michelle, and we didn't segregate them in any way. We just combined them all in one – well, I forget how many locations there were, but we combined all the interest groups into one group for each meeting. Is that what you wanted?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I guess I'm just a little confused because I thought Rick had said that there was some separation of folks. I know that there was a separate meeting for the NGO groups who were interested. There was a separate meeting for that sector. Just looking at the appendix, it looks like there was some effort made to separate the commercial sessions from the recreational sessions.

It is not up on the screen; we're just looking at the appendix from the Mid-Atlantic Visioning Document, the background information. I don't know if they were billed as such, specific to a particular sector when a meeting location and time was set up or if that just happened to be sort of a nexus of commercial interests versus private recreational interests.

MR. PATE: I think it was more of the latter than the former.

MS. VON HARTEN: Another thing that we had also discussed was we feel pretty comfortable with the webinars we have been doing lately, and that is definitely going to be another option for us to do some of these port meetings or whatever we're going to call them. Keep that in mind that if there are different areas that we just can't get to or for resource-wise we just can't get to different locations or don't get a good turnout, we can attract people to those webinars, too.

MS. McCAWLEY: I was going to say that I don't necessarily disagree – I don't agree with what was stated earlier about how we should combine it with other types of public hearings to try to get more people. I actually think we should do the opposite.

MR. HAYMANS: It won't be the first time I was disagreed with.

DR. DUVAL: You are married, right? (Laughter) It is close to lunch. Unfortunately, this was the piece of conversation that I really wanted to spend the most time on, because I was hoping that we could come to some finer resolution. It is hard for staff to plan for these kinds of things unless we collectively have a better sense of how we'd like these to run.

There are a number of options. We can employ some web-based tools. We can have port meetings that are roughly separated by constituency, and maybe not formerly so but more just by default by the location in which they're being held is going to attract certain constituencies more than others.

In terms of the total number of locations, which I think will sort of fall out naturally once we decide on a format – and there were some other questions about the meetings like timing. We want to make sure that we're going to actually get people to these meetings, so we need to be very conscious of when we're holding them.

Again, sort of getting back to a comment that Chris made earlier about ambassadors when we first began this conversation, that is kind of what we were looking for is let's meet people where they are and look for folks who would be willing to kind of say, "Hey, you know, we would really like to have something here" and sort of a local host kind of concept, which is I think generally the technique that the Mid-Atlantic employed. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say this is coming up again in Executive Finance or something, but maybe that would give us a little bit of time. The states could kind of caucus amongst themselves or something and come up with what works for their particular state, and we could touch base with each other; and then by the time we get to where we need to commit to something, we will have a plan.

DR. DUVAL: Bob Mahood has indicated that we can continue this discussion during Executive Finance. I just want to make sure I get out there all of the questions I think that staff has and that we should be thinking about in order to provide some more informed input on this. We're like a family, we're probably not all going to agree on exactly what is the best format.

Something maybe in Georgia, because of the difficulty that you guys have in drawing folks to public hearings, maybe there is a slightly different model where you would want to have a combined – a meeting that attracts multiple sets of constituents. Are there any other comments or thoughts or questions that folks want to bring up about the structure of the port meetings before we adjourn? Amber.

MS. VON HARTEN: Just one thing to think about for our continued discussion is what you want us to go out with at these port meetings. We just went through this exercise of kind of developing these goals and objectives that I will pull together and have ready for that, so you can see it. Is that what you want to take out to the public and get their feedback on that to come up with strategies or like in the Mid-Atlantic they had several different ways to solicit input, including an online survey which I think we agreed we weren't going to do that.

They also had like a guideline for people that wanted to write position letters, like organizations, and they had some pretty broad, basic questions that we could take out as another way to get input; just like Mel suggested earlier, you know, tell us three things that the council is doing right and three things that they're doing wrong with regard to snapper grouper. I guess we need some feedback on do you want a mix of that; you know, the goals and objectives going out as well as some pointed questions that can help guide the discussion; so just be thinking on that as well.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for bringing us to that point, Amber. I think probably my preference would be first going out with sort of what we worked on here as well as pointed questions. I think if folks can be thinking about that over the next day or so and maybe come up with something to add to what Mel has suggested, that would great. Jack.

MR. COX: I do quite a bit of business with chefs and the restaurants, and the best time of day for those guys would be around 12:00 o'clock or so because in the evenings they're busy. Just keep that in mind, if you would.

DR. DUVAL: Good point. All right, if there are no other comments at this point, I guess we will go ahead and adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 o'clock p.m., September 16, 2013.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 24, 2013

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2013 - 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

David M. Cupka

P.O. Box 12753
Charleston, SC 29422
✓ 843/795-8591 (hm)
843/870-5495 (cell)
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Ben Hartig

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

GA Obligatory Seat (Vacant)

Robert E. Beal

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

Mel Bell

S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
✓ Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Anna Beckwith

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

Chris Conklin

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

Jack Cox

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

Dr. Roy Crabtree

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

Dr. Michelle Duval

NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
✓ PO Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

LT Morgan Fowler

✓ U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

Doug Haymans

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

John W. Jolley

✓ 4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/732-4530 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

Deirdre Warner-Kramer

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

Dr. Wilson Laney

✓ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

Jessica McCawley

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

Charles Phillips

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

ZACK BOWEN

PHIL STEELE

JACK MCGOVERN

DOUG BOYD

FRES PATE

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO

MARCEL REICHERT

LT. MIKE MASTRIANNI

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

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

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting: Council Member Visioning Workshop Monday, September 16, 2013

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Rushay Johnson	386-239-0948	2572009@aol.com	PO Box 9351 32120-9351
Emily Henrick	801-970-3397	ehenrick@penntrusts.org	PO 8522 331158
Liam Carr	843-819-8169	liamc@penntrusts.org	PO 609 Chas. SC 294102
Frank Brown	843-556-2520	scnoolins@seafood.ku.edu	815 Savannah Hwy STE 207 Charleston SC 29407
Fay Ruedes	843-209-7659	fruedes@cofc.edu	College of Charleston SC
Caitlin Winans	202-381-5378	Cwinans@penntrusts.org	411 1/2 5th St NE DC
Andrew Gorkman	202-837-1340	agorkman@penntrusts.org	901 E Street WDC
Abby Clark	202-543-6462	abclark@penntrusts.org	901 E St NW, DC
Eileen Dougherty	919-661-8518	eileen.dougherty@gmail.com	PO Box 12057 Charleston, SC 29402

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting: Council Member Visioning Workshop Monday, September 16, 2013

<u>NAME & ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
Matt Ruby	843-902-4734	warriorfishing@gmail.com	Charleston, SC 29403
Kate Quigley	843-327-1114	MichelleStMeadors@gmail.com	CHS, SC
Michelle Meadors	321-426-8403	MichelleStMeadors@gmail.com	FL
Susan Shugart	912-222-9206	SusanShugart@afl.net	GA

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

Conklin, Billie	beachbumbillie76@yahoo.co...	517 min
77	Bonura, Vincent	sailraiser25c@aol.com 412 min
53	jenkins, wallace	jenkinsw@dnr.sc.gov 7 min
52	DeLancey, Larry	delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov 143 min
48	michael, merrifield...	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com... 249 min
48	holland, jack	jack.holland@ncdenr.gov 53 min
47	Shertzer, Kyle	kyle.shertzer@noaa.gov 47 min
42	Waters, James	jwaters8@gmail.com 43 min
39	Thompson, Robert	capt.thompson@gmail.com 535 min
36	Smith, Mason	mason.smith@myfwc.com 3 min
35	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov 139 min
34	DeVictor, rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov 461 min
34	Michie, Kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov 385 min
32	Tsao, Fan	fan.tsao@noaa.gov 32 min
32	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov 457 min
32	E, A	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov 443 min
31	Williams, Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov 441 min
31	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com... 509 min
30	raine, karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov 178 min
30	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com 482 min
29	Ballenger, Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov 480 min
29	Merrifield, Jeanna...	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.c... 505 min
28	Takade-Heumacher, ...	htakade@edf.org 180 min
27	Wyanski, David	wyanskid@dnr.sc.gov 31 min
26	Baker, Scott	bakers@uncw.edu 315 min
25	sedberry, george	george.sedberry@noaa.tov 27 min
25	Gore, Karla	karlagore@gmail.com 207 min
25	crabtree, roy	roy.crabtree@noaa.gov 15 min

23	MacLauchlin, Bill	billmac@charter.net	26 min
20	L, I	captaindrifter@bellsouth...	0 min
20	Stevens, Charles	iamcstevens@gmail.com	0 min
20	Amick, Steve	steveamicks@aol.com	0 min
20	Neer, Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	0 min
20	Ponce, Charlene	charlene.ponce@gulfcounci...	0 min