1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	OUTREACH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE
4	
5 6	Marriott Beachside Key West, Florida
7	June 25, 2014
8	
9	VOTING MEMBERS
10	Roy WilliamsFlorida
11	Leann BosargeMississippi
12	LCDR Jason BrandUSCG
13	Pamela DanaFlorida
14	Dale Diaz (designee for Jamie Miller)Mississippi
15	Corky PerretMississippi
16	
17	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
18	Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship)Alabama
19	Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley)Florida
20	Doug BoydTexas
21	Glenn Constant
22	Roy CrabtreeNMFS
23	Dave Donaldson
24	Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina)Louisiana
25	Campo MatensLouisiana
26	Harlon PearceLouisiana
27 28	Patrick Riley
28 29	Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas  John SanchezFlorida
30	Bob Shipp
31	BOD SHIPPAraballa
32	STAFF
33	Stephen AtranPopulation Dynamics Statistician
34	Assane DiagneEconomist
35	Doug GregoryExecutive Director
36	Karen HoakAdministrative and Financial Assistant
37	Morgan KilgourFishery Biologist
38	Ava LasseterAnthropologist
39	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
40	Phyllis MirandaDocument Editor/Executive Assistant
41	Emily MuehlsteinFisheries Outreach Specialist
42	Mark MuellerGIS Analyst
43	Charlene PoncePublic Information Officer
44	Ryan RindoneSEDAR Coordinator
45	Charlotte SchiaffoResearch & Human Resource Librarian
46	Carrie SimmonsDeputy Executive Director
47	Andrew SpaethIntern
48	

1	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
2	Pam AndersonPanama City Beach, FL
3	Billy ArcherSeminole Wind
4	Tom ArdOrange Beach, AL
5	Jeff BargerOcean Conservancy, Austin, TX
6	Randy BoggsOrange Beach, AL
7	JP BookerOcean Conservancy
8	Steve BranstetterNMFS
9	Jim ClementsCarrabelle, FL
10	David CupkaSAFMC
11	Tracy DunnNOAA OLE
12	Chad HansonPew Environmental Group
13	Scott HickmanGalveston, TX
14	Bill GibsonKey West, FL
15	Gary JarvisDestin, FL
16	Bobby KellyElbert, AL
17	Jennifer LeeNMFS
18	Bart NiquetLynn Haven, FL
19	Chris NiquetLynn Haven, FL
20	Kelli O'DonnellNOAA Contractor, Key West, FL
21	Dennis O'HernSt. Petersburg, FL
22	Bonnie PonwithNOAA Fisheries
23	Phil SteeleNMFS
24	Thad StewartOrange Beach, AL
25	Steve Tomeny
26	Bill TuckerDunedin, FL
27	Russell UnderwoodLynn Haven, FL
28	David WalkerAndalusia, AL
29	Daniel WillardEDF, Austin, TX
30	Bob ZalesPanama City, FL
31	
32	
33	
34	The Outreach and Education Committee of the Gulf of Mexico

35 36 Fishery Management Council convened at the Marriott Beachside, Key West, Florida, Wednesday afternoon, June 25, 2014, and was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chairman Roy Williams.

37 38 39

## ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

40 41

42 43

44

CHAIRMAN ROY WILLIAMS: If I could get the committee to turn to Tab K, Number 1, we have a proposed agenda there for the Outreach and Education Committee. Any changes to that? Hearing no changes, are there objections? Hearing none, the agenda is approved.

45 46 47

48

Then Tab K, Number 2, we have the minutes. Any changes to those minutes? Hearing no changes, are there any objections to approving it? Hearing none, the minutes are approved.

The next thing then is the Action Guide and Next Steps, which is Tab K, Number 3. I don't have it right in front of me and, Charlene, do you want to give it to them real quick?

## ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

MS. CHARLENE PONCE: Sure and I'm going to try to help you make up some time here. What we're asking for you to do today is to consider the proposed changes to the scoping workshop format and review and approve the updated strategic communications plan and give staff approval to reconvene the O&E AP early next year so they can begin working on an updated communications survey.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay and so are there any questions on the action guide? Hearing none, then we will move on to the next section, Tab K, Number 4, and I will turn it back to Charlene again.

## SUMMARY OF OUTREACH AND EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL MEETING

MS. PONCE: The Outreach and Education Advisory Panel met back in May at the council office and I will just read the summary report. Chairman Gill called the meeting to order and the agenda was adopted with minor edits. Summary minutes from the December AP Webinar were approved as written.

Emily Muehlstein briefed the panel on the logistics and outcome of the Recreational Angler Participation Sessions that we held back in January and they heard a short presentation on our current scoping format and how we would like to improve the manner in which those workshops are conducted and we want to do that so we can better facilitate input and increase the participation in those meetings.

After some lengthy discussion, the panel moved the following and we have three motions here. To recommend to the council that scoping meetings be more user friendly and that they be renamed and that motion carried with no opposition.

To consider including some of the RAP session protocols in the scoping meeting process and that motion also carried with no opposition and the final motion under this agenda item was to recommend that the council move forward with the structure of the scoping sessions as outlined in the following list.

I will read it to you. It's define a workshop culture that aims

to be more collaborative than the formal structure associated with public hearings, allow participants to speak without a formal comment card and rigid timelines, which would ensure that each -- We would ensure that each participant knows that they have an opportunity to comment before anyone else can speak twice on an issue.

Create a living document in real time as speakers contribute their comments, dissuade reiterative comments, do not attribute comments to individual speakers. Council staff should utilize informal venues that are more audience friendly and that we schedule the scoping sessions during times when we're likely to get the highest number of participants and that motion also carried with no opposition.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Charlene, can I ask a question here? What should the council do on these three motions?

MS. PONCE: Well, Phyllis, there is -- I have a suggested combination motion if you so choose to approve these three motions and so rather than approving each one of the three, you could approve a single motion and what we would like to do is to get your permission to go ahead and rename scoping workshops to something that is more -- That defines better what it is we're trying to get from people, so that we can try to get more people to attend and to approve this outline of how we want to structure the meeting and so that's what we would like from you on this particular motion.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Would someone -- You've got a motion in front of you and we will need to read it at some point, or a proposed motion, and would anybody on the committee care to make that motion?

MR. CORKY PERRET: A question. To get additional participants, are we -- Hopefully we can get new participants, people that -- Fortunately, we have some that come around and follow us around and give us good input, but additional people that we haven't heard from before, I think that's probably what we're looking for also, to strengthen our core group.

MS. PONCE: That's exactly right and that occurred during the RAP sessions and so that's part of the reason we wanted to adopt those protocols, so that we could continue down that path.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: If I could just insert here, Corky, there was a feeling that the RAP session protocol felt more like what maybe a scoping workshop should be, whereas many of our scoping

workshops are kind of indistinguishable from just a public 2 hearing.

3 4

5

6

1

They felt that the format that was used here was more collaborative with the public and that it asked them to talk about they felt about the subject and that it felt more scoping and less public hearing.

7 8 9

10

11

12 13 MR. PERRET: If I may, very rarely do we get unanimous votes on any committee, but on this one, we got three motions and unanimous votes and is that because there are one or two leaders and the others are all following the leader or did we have good participation with a good exchange of information and so on and so forth and then they reached that unanimous decision?

14 15 16

17

18

There was a fairly robust discussion about this MS. PONCE: particular issue and each state -- We asked each state to give a summary of what they do with their scoping documents and through that discussion is how they came up with this.

19 20 21

MR. PERRET: I move that we recommend to the council the motion on the board.

22 23 24

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Do we need to read that thing for the record?

25 26 27

MR. PERRET: You do probably.

28 29

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I do. Okay. Can we get a second and then I will read it?

30 31 32

LCDR JASON BRAND: I will second it.

33 34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

There is a second by Jason. CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: The motion is to recommend that the council rename and modify the structure of scoping workshops to include some of the RAP session protocols, including the following. First, define a workshop culture that is more collaborative than with the formal structure currently associated with public hearings. Second, to allow participants to speak without a formal comment card and rigid time limits and ensure that each participant is aware they have an opportunity to comment before anyone can speak twice an issue. create a living document in real time as speakers contribute. Fourth, to dissuade reiterative comments and fifth, to attribute Sixth, to use informal venues comments to individual speakers. that are more audience friendly and last, to schedule during times when greater participation is more likely.

committee have discussion on this?

DR. PAMELA DANA: I was on part of those conference calls when we were forming what would be best in bringing up ideas and dialogue and the only point there that bothers me probably is the "dissuade reiterative comments" and we all know that -- I mean repetition comes up and we do it here on this council all the time and I don't know that that's where we want to start. If we're making a motion, why would we want to have a negative point in there? I think with leaving that out, we still -- I think the rest of it is fine, but I think that's quite a negative point.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: It doesn't say to prohibit them and only to dissuade them and so -- Mara, do you -- I think Mara is on your side.

MS. MARA LEVY: I have to agree the thing that jumps out at me is the "dissuade reiterative comments". I don't know that we want to dissuade in the public process any type of comment. I understand that we hear a lot of the same thing, but I don't necessarily think it should be a policy of a council function to dissuade anybody from saying anything that's relevant and respectful.

The other thing, with regard to renaming, I don't have a problem with that, except that if we're having these meetings for NEPA scoping issues, like for that particular purpose, that whatever we do it's clear -- Whatever we call it, if it's for the purpose of complying with the NEPA scoping that that's just made clear.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay. Emily, would you like to comment to this?

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: Just to respond to the dissuading of reiterative comments, I don't think it was going to be a policy. We had a really robust discussion with the AP and also during the RAP sessions that if we end up making it sort of a more collaborative format, where we don't give people a time limit and cut them off at two minutes, the reason that we would dissuade those comments would not be because we didn't want to hear it over and over again, but what that does is sort of say if it's already up on the board, we hear it and we get the point.

That sort of helps to facilitate that type of collaborative meeting, so that it doesn't become sort of what a public hearing is, where each person sits up and wants their comment attributed to them and so that was kind of part of the logic behind that

and I just wanted to mention it.

It wasn't because we don't want to hear from you, but it's because the format of the meeting would be so different that we would actually be projecting up on the board what people were saying as they were saying it and the idea is if the point has been made, it will be going to be council and we're not voting here. If it's been made, that was kind of what we were looking for.

MR. PERRET: I think Dr. Dana and Mara have brought up a very good point and as maker of the motion, I would like to delete that fourth bullet to dissuade reiterative comments. I think if you've got a good facilitator running the meeting that they're going to take care of all of that.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Is that okay with you, Jason? Jason says it's okay.

MS. LEANN BOSARGE: I think this is a -- There was some very good things that came out of this and I especially like the renaming and I understand Mara's point. To me, scoping seems like a very painful medical procedure. That's what it reminds me of and so if you have to put that in small print under our new name, that's okay. You can still put it on there, but maybe we could find something a little more upbeat and so I like that for sure.

I also like the more informal structure and I know what I'm going to reference was public hearing and not scoping, but when we went out for Amendment 28, from a commercial perspective, some of those commercial fishermen that showed up -- Just to show up was a big deal and getting them in front of that microphone was not going to happen and filling out a comment card was not going to happen.

Their willingness to participate stopped at look, I'm here and I'm showing you that I have a problem with this and so if it's informal, I think we will get more willingness to participate if they can stay in their chair and just raise their hand and say something and so I think that would be very helpful.

 The only thing that worries me a little bit, and I don't think we need to change the motion and I just would like it stated, but when we do use informal venues that are more audience friendly, if it is an issue that is very polarized and affects both commercial and recreational, let's just make sure that the venue that we choose is going to pull in people from both

sectors.

In other words, if we were doing Amendment 28, I wouldn't want to see us have the informal venue be a commercial fish house, where you're probably not going to get recreational fishermen, nor would it want it to be a Bass Pro Shop. In other words, let's just make sure that when we do that that we are aware of that and make sure we take that into account when we pick the venue. That's all.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Leann. Further discussion on this motion?

MR. DOUG BOYD: I'm not sure it's this motion and so I will wait for just a minute.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other discussion on this motion? Hearing none, is there objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion is approved. Doug, do you want to --

MR. BOYD: I am not on your committee and so one of the things that we do, subsequent to what we call scoping meetings, which are maybe workshops, is that we report back to this council kind of the results, in quotes, of what that was.

We have been very, very cautious, since I've been on the council, to not make that report seem like a vote for one way or the other and I think we've been cautious that we lose the input almost from what the workshops or the scoping meetings are. I think we give statistical information, but not the meat of what was said in the meeting by all groups and so as you all go through this, I would like to see more real input from those meetings to the council about what was talked about and what the real feelings were and not trying to say they voted this way or that way on this process and that's just an input.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I think that's relevant and I mean I think that's what we're trying to do here. There is a feeling that the scoping process that we use, typically use, more resembles a public hearing than a scoping process.

Frequently, there's a document laid out there and it's got at least what look to be alternatives and people go through it and say I favor this one or I favor that one or I favor that one and what they're conceiving of here is trying to engage the public and get them to speak to the issue and make suggestions of what the problems and what the solutions are and I think that's what you're saying there too and so I think we're on the same page

there.

MR. BOYD: I was just saying once you get out of that meeting and we give a report back to council that it carries the same flavor.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: And be inclusive of everything that was being said, yes. Charlene has got that.

10 MR. PERRET: Charlene, is there a suggestion for the new name?

12 MS. PONCE: We are still working on that, but we're open if you 13 have something.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Charlene, I'm going to turn it back to you to proceed through the document.

MS. PONCE: I then gave the panel an overview of the stakeholder survey and resulting recommendations, both of which were presented to the council in February. The panel had a lengthy discussion and provided input on ways to implement the recommendations and that's in Tab K, Number 5.

The panel then conducted its three-year review of the five-year strategic communications plan, keeping in mind that this is a living document. They focused on incorporating the recommendations from the stakeholder survey and the plan was modified, as provided in Tab K, Number 6.

Tab K, Number 6(a) is the marked-up version and then Tab K, Number 6(b) is the final version. I don't know if you've had time to look at that. Do I need to go through it?

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** I think I would go through it quickly, if 35 you would.

MS. PONCE: I am going to use the marked-up version and so, first and foremost, it's not noted on the marked-up version, but "five-year" needs to come out of there, because this is now our strategic communications plan.

The first changes you will find under the situation analysis, I believe, and that's on page 3, under strengths, challenges, opportunities, and threats. We made a lot of changes and most of them were just wordsmithing, but if you look at I believe it was opportunities, we did make some changes.

48 We took out the government office report, because that's eight

years old, and we added in, as an opportunity, the survey results, the RAP session results, media coverage, and the Marine Resource Education Program that we've been participating in. Does anyone have any questions under that?

MR. PERRET: Charlene and I have talked about this and I have got a lot of comments and Charlene knows that and I'm going to give them to her, but just let me see if I can hit on some of the majors.

We are calling it a five-year plan, yet there is nothing in there relative to five years. The old plan had year one, year two, year three, year four, and year five. This one does not, which is not all bad. Maybe we need just a short-term plan now to overcome some of our weaknesses and I am going to skip over a lot of my comments, but hopefully they will be helpful to Charlene.

We've got goals and a council goal and a communication goal and situation analysis and we've got five strengths and then we've got six challenges. Well, the first challenge is weak community presence.

We can have the greatest communication staff and council in the world, but why do we have that weak community presence and how do we overcome the weak community presence? The challenge is misinformation and why is there misinformation out there and how do we overcome that?

 I guess our biggest weakness is we're a quasi-member of National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA and I don't know how we overcome that, but there's not a lot of trust in a lot of agencies of government, but it doesn't matter how well we communicate if we can't overcome the weaknesses and that's what I think we have to zero in on.

 Other than Charlene, you guys and ladies don't need to hear all my comments, but I will give them to Charlene. There are some grammatical suggested changes and so on and so forth, but that's my comments thus far on just the situation analysis. If we don't know why we're weak, we're not going to ever communicate that. We need to know why and then I think address that.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Okay, Charlene, do you want to continue?

MS. PONCE: Okay. Moving on to key audiences, the panel -- We had a very large list of key audiences and the panel felt that if these are truly key audiences that they needed to be narrowed

down to the key audiences and not just all-encompassing and that's not to say that all audiences are not going to be targeted or reached, but it's just they wanted to whittle down the list and so we deleted a few of those and in the external, we deleted some and we added one and does anybody have any questions about the audiences?

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Questions or comments from the committee? Hearing none, Charlene, continue.

MS. PONCE: The next section was the objective and as Corky pointed out, we originally had a five-year plan with year one, year three, and year five and the panel felt that because we were already in year three that this could become our communications plan and we would remove those objectives for year one, year five, and year three and we would come up with just a list of objectives and then periodically review the plan and update it as necessary.

They came up with four objectives, which are inform key audiences about the council process and goals, collaborate with the media to promote accurate reporting and coverage of fishery management policies and issues, build and inform an engaged public who participates in the fisheries management process, and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and tools.

We then moved on and you can see in the marked-up copy that we took out a lot of the text and basically took those four objectives and began developing tactics for each of them.

MR. PERRET: I have a couple of specifics relative to tactics, if I may. The first tactic to develop and distribute informational materials and so on and so forth, my comment on that is customized to different groups and perhaps multilingual. That's something that we may want to consider.

Identifying and implementing new methods and so on and so forth, I think we should do that based on input from our constituents. In other words, if they offer suggestions on how to improve the education and outreach, let's try and utilize their input and make those appropriate changes and that's true for some of the other things also, but, again, I will give all of this to Charlene.

**CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Corky. Are there other comments? 46 All right, Charlene. Are we at the end of it?

MS. PONCE: Yes and basically, the end of the document is just a

matrix that breaks down audience desired outcomes and delivery method, timeline, and metrics and we're still working on the metrics, but that's basically the recommendations made through the survey and what's in the plan that you've just gone through and it's sort of put into this matrix so that staff can easily follow it and that too will be updated as the AP reviews it on a one to two-year basis.

I would like to point out though that we plan -- At the very end, where it talks about evaluating the effectiveness of programs and tools, we did the first survey and when we got approval for the survey, we went ahead and asked for the ability to conduct three surveys as time goes by and so we have one planned for 2015 and another one for 2017, just so that we can measure if what we're doing is working and the AP will review that and help us along the way and so that's really all I have.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Anything else? Any other questions for Charlene? Any other business to come before the Outreach and Education Committee? Hearing none, I believe we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m., June 25, 2014.)