1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE
4 5	Hyatt Centric New Orleans, Louisiana
6 7	January 29, 2024
8	
9	VOTING MEMBERS
10	Joe Spraggins
11 12	Dale DiazMississippi
13	Dave Donaldson
13 14	Bob Gill
15	Anthony OvertonAlabama
16	Troy WilliamsonTexas
17	Troy williamson
18	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
19	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
20	Kesley BanksTexas
21	Susan BoggsAlabama
22	Billy BroussardLouisiana
23	Tom FrazerFlorida
24	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
25	Michael McDermottMississippi
26	Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut)Louisiana
27	Andy StrelcheckNMFS
28	C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley)Florida
29	Ed WalkerFlorida
30	
31	<u>STAFF</u>
32	Assane DiagneEconomist
33 34	Matt FreemanEconomist
34 35	John FroeschkeDeputy Director Beth HagerAdministrative Officer
36	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist
37	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
38	Natasha Mendez-FerrerFishery Biologist
39	Emily MuehlsteinPublic Information Officer
40	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
41	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
42	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Director
43	Camilla ShiremanAdministrative & Communications Assistant
44	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Specialist
45	
46	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
47	Kerry MarhefkaSAFMC
48	Clay PorchSEFSC
49	John WalterSEFSC

1	Ed	SwindellLA
2		
3		
4		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	
3	Table of Contents3
4 5	Table of Motions
6	Table of Motions4
7	Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and
8	Next Steps5
9	
10	Discussion of Proposed Standing and Special Scientific and
11	Statistical (SSC) Reorganization for June 2024 Appointments5
12	
13	Review and Discuss Ad Hoc and Standing Advisory Panels21
14	
15 16	Review and Discuss Proposed 2024 Activities and Budget22
17	Review Update to 2020-2024 Administrative Award Anticipated
18	Carryover
19	
20	Review and Approve Proposal Activities for Phase II Inflation
21	Reduction Act (IRA) Funding for the Regional Management Councils. 30
22	
23	Review and Finalize the Steering Committee Makeup for the
24	Recreational Initiative42
25	
26	Adjournment53
27	
28	
29	

1	TABLE OF MOTIONS
2	
3	PAGE 7: Motion that the council accept the proposed changes to
4	the SOPPs in Section 2.5 related to the SSC. The motion carried
5	on page 10.
6	
7	PAGE 20: Motion that the council accept the proposed changes to
8	the SOPPs. The motion carried on page 20.
9	
10	PAGE 41: Motion that the council approve the proposed
11	activities for Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act. The
12	motion carried on page 41.
13	
14	PAGE 49: Motion that the council approve the number of
15	recreational council members be increased from two to three (two
16	private recreational and one charter-for-hire. The motion
17	carried on page 51.
18	carried on page 31.
19	
20	

The Administrative/Budget Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Hyatt Centric, French Quarter in New Orleans, Louisiana on Monday morning, January 29, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Joe Spraggins.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA APPROVAL OF MINUTES ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

 CHAIRMAN JOE SPRAGGINS: We would like to call the Administrative/Budget Committee to order, and it's myself as chair, Mr. Dugas as vice chair, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Gill, Mr. Overton, and Mr. Williamson as the committee members. At this time, I would like to have an adoption for the agenda.

16 MR. BOG GILL: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

18 MR. DALE DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any discussion? All right. All in favor, aye. Now approval of the October 2023 minutes, and I would like it if we could get approval.

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Move approval.

MR. GILL: Second.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Any discussion? Anybody opposed? All 29 right. Then we'll move right along and turn it over to Dr. 30 Simmons.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED STANDING AND SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC & STATISTICAL (SSC) REORGANIZATION FOR JUNE 2024 APPOINTMENTS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Okay. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have a pretty full agenda, and so I'm going to suggest that we just go through the action schedule before each agenda item, if that's okay, and so the first item that staff has put together is a discussion on the proposed reorganization of the Standing and Special SSCs.

The SSCs are due for reappointment, all of them, in June of 2024, and we have a couple of special SSCs that we did not populate last time, and I believe that was Spiny Lobster and Mackerel, Migratory Species, and so we would like that to be considered to be populated, but, before we get there, we want to consider going through this potential reorganization of the Standing SSCs.

3

4

5

6 7 If you like this, if you like this proposed restructure, then you also need to consider changes to the Ecosystem Technical Committee, because you have certain SSC members that are involved in the Ecosystem Special on that particular committee, plus other Standing SSC members that are involved, and so, if you like this idea, or some iteration, the council staff is looking for a motion, and so if we could look at that agenda item, please, Bernie, and it's Tab G, Number 4.

9 10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

8

What we were proposing is a more multidisciplinary approach to the restructuring of the SSC, and so we would integrate the Reef Fish, the Ecosystem, and the Socioeconomic SSC into the Standing SSC, and we're suggesting that would -- You would change the SOPPs to no more than twenty-one individuals, and then the SSC would include eight stock Standing assessment quantitative biologists/ecologists. The remaining thirteen appointees shall include at least four economists and at least anthropologists/social scientists five and other scientists.

202122

23

24

Then we would have that form that we send out that folks can denote their expertise, and how they recognize themselves, and what they would like to be considered for when we populate the group.

252627

2829

There are some other changes in the SOPPs that we're proposing as well, but I think this is really the meat-and-potatoes of it. We are suggesting to keep those other Special SSCs, and those are Coral, Spiny, Mackerel, Red Drum, and Shrimp.

30 31 32

MS. BETH HAGER: There are a few other editorial things.

33 34

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Mr. Diaz.

35 36

37

38

MR. DALE DIAZ: For Dr. Simmons, based on the applicants that we've had in the past, do you foresee us having any problem filling four economists and four social/anthropologist folks for those slots, if we put a minimum on it?

39 40 41

42

43

44

45

46

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: We have had some issues like that in the past, but, when we had the one open slot for the economist last time, the way we went about it, and how staff was involved, and I think we had a much greater number to choose from, and so I think we should try that process again. We could have an issue, but hopefully not, based on our recent interaction with populating that economist seat.

MR. DIAZ: So it says "at least". If it said "up to", and if we don't meet that minimum number we're still within our SOPPs, and so I don't know if that's -- I know what you all are trying to do, and "up to" might actually not accomplish what you all are trying to do here, but I'm just trying to figure out, if we don't have enough of one category, if that would be a problem for us.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: So are you suggesting that we have a minimum number?

MR. DIAZ: Well, right now, it says "at least", and so, I mean, if we was to follow our SOPPs to the letter of the words that's down here now, I mean, we have to have, no matter what, four economists, and four social scientists/anthropologists, and, if we don't have that many to pick from, or that many that we feel is qualified, then I don't think we're following our SOPPs, and I don't know what we do at that time.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and there's another aspect to that, and that is numbers. You know, at these suggested, we could have more than eight, and say that we do have a lot of applications, and so then we would have nine or ten, and they would presumably come from the five others, but do we want that kind of ratio, and I think the answer is no. We want that input, but we don't want it to be overwhelming, because most of the questions that the addresses are of a biological nature, and not social in nature, and so I think Dale's suggestion of either "up to" or "no more than", and either one, would be preferable to express what we really want to accomplish. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, sir.

MR. DIAZ: If we would make those changes, and I know you all are probably looking for a motion, and I read through it, and I would be willing to make a motion that we move this forward to Full Council for approval.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chair, and that would be 42 great.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: All right. We have a motion to move it to 45 Full Council.

MR. GILL: Second.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think Mr. Diaz had some suggested edits though to the text.

MR. GILL: That was with the suggested edits.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. The motion is with the edits, as Mr. Gill --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Can we get that motion up, so 10 everyone is clear?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Does this look like what we're looking for for the motion? Mr. Gill, and Mr. Diaz, are you all good with that? Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I thought we were -- Okay. I see it. "Up to", and so that reflects the changes. I don't think we need "which" in front of "will". The Standing SSC will include. Can we do that? I think -- I guess, committee, is it your intent that it will include eight stock assessment or quantitative biologists/ecologists? I think that was the intent, correct?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think you're right. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so the point I'm going to raise is not what I'm concerned about, but I wanted to get it on the table, and that is, is there any concern around the table, in terms of the relativity of the socioeconomic side to the biological side, in terms of numbers? Now, clearly we want input from both, and so the question is how much of each, right, and I have had expressed to me some concern that they're concerned that the balance is not correct, because the bulk of what the SSC does falls into the scientific realm of biology and assessments, and so I just wanted to raise that, before we locked in, to see what the sentiment of the committee is. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

everyone understands, I think we have been convening consistently with the Standing SSC, your fifteen members, plus the current Socioeconomic Special, plus the Reef Fish, plus the Ecosystem, and so twenty-four people, and, of those individuals that are on those different specials, with the Standing and your economists and social scientists that are on the Standing currently, different members participate differently, depending

on the topics, and so I feel like that's perhaps a different discussion, Mr. Gill, but maybe I'm misunderstanding your question.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so it's not different in the sense that we're setting the structure of the SSC, and, however those proportions are desired, that's what we're voting on, and so I think that's an important discussion, and, if everybody is comfortable with the current proportions, I'm good, but we ought not pass this motion without considering that and finding out whether the committee agrees with it.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think we'll go ahead and get the motion out, and then we'll get a second to it, if that's okay, and did we have another question?

MR. GILL: I have another comment to make, but --

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. GILL: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so the thing that I don't understand, Dr. Simmons, is are we going to eliminate the special SSCs that apply here? For example, if we're talking Socioeconomic, and we're talking Ecosystem, and we're potentially talking Reef Fish, and will they exist after this is done, or will they not?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So we're proposing that you would do away with those, and they would be integrated into the Standing SSC, because, right now, you're convening them almost every single time we have an issue, or, at least for half of the day, you might have a Special Shrimp SSC involved, but, for every other agenda item, those three specials have been convened with the Standing SSC.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? So we have a motion on the floor here, and it's to accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs related to the SSC, as written. Do I have a -- The motion is there, and do I have a second?

MR. DIAZ: Bob seconded it.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Bob seconded it?

MR. DIAZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Did you second it?

MR. GILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition to the motion? If not, the motion carries. Okay, Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so could we go back to the SOPPs, Bernie? Okay, and so I just wanted to go through -- We're proposing, for the other sections, that we add a "with", in that first sentence, if we go down to Objectives and Duties. Then a couple other just suggested edits For the second paragraph, "For each managed stock or assemblage of stocks, the SSC shall recommend an acceptable biological catch and overfishing limit that accounts scientific uncertainty", because it was "level" before, and it's "The SSC may also comment on scientific Then appropriateness and social and economic consequences of various alternatives or accountability measures to be implemented if annual catch limits are exceeded." We'll keep going, if there's no questions about those suggestions.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Does anybody have any comments on those suggestions?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Let's keep going, Bernie, please. Okay. For this paragraph, staff is suggesting that we add in "as requested", because it is the council's prerogative to do that. Then "including any environmental statement", and "any" in front of "environmental impact statement".

Then "The SSC will also provide a determination of whether these are consistent with the best scientific information available and may provide advice as to the effectiveness of the measures in achieving the objectives of the FMP or amendment." We'll keep going down.

 "The emphasis of the SSC will be on evaluating scientific data and rationale on which the management measures are based, rather than selecting management measures." Then, in the following paragraph, "The SSC will also advise the council on the adequacy of scientific information, the supporting analyses, and the stock assessment, whether these are consistent with the best scientific information available related to scientific documents and the content of stock assessment reports."

4 5

Then the last change is just, since we've identified the abbreviations, "The OFL and ABC advice from the SSC will be the basis for the council to set ACLs and AMs. The council may also set annual catch targets below the ACL to further account for management uncertainty."

Some of these suggested changes were based on the national guidelines that we received on best scientific information available, and also our regional guidelines, and so I will stop there, Mr. Chair, and see if there's any questions.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Is there any discussion on these changes? Mr. Anson.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your committee, but I guess, Carrie, not being familiar with that document you just said you gleaned to get this information, but there's been discussion, you know, in previous council meetings, about the best scientific information available, and I thought that was -- I thought that was the agency's direct purview, and does this kind of add another layer, or circumvent it, or somehow, you know, muddy the waters, so to speak, with the agency's role in identifying, or defining, what the best scientific information is available, because, if you leave it with the previous version, it doesn't quite do that, to the level that adding the "consistent with" language.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I may need some help from John or Ryan, but we've had numerous SSC meetings, and a discussion of these various policies, both the national policy and then, most recently, the regional policy, and my understanding is that everything that the agency bases the best scientific information available on is from either the stock assessment, and it's building the record, and it's the SSC's recommendations, and it's the council's and the public's feedback, and it's the whole shebang, and so I think that's what we were trying to reflect here, and I believe "consistent with" is the terminology that is in those policies, but I'm going to look at Ryan and John to make sure that I am correct in saying that.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Just one other thing is the ultimate determination of BSIA remains with the agency, and the SSC would

just continue to make their recommendation, but we don't intend for that to ultimately change anything else.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any further discussion? Tom.

DR. TOM FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I just want to follow-up on Kevin's comments, and so what are the implications, potentially, if the SSC doesn't determine, right, that it's consistent with the best scientific information available?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, I will start, but I think the regional framework for that suggests that the SSC, as a body, is supposed to document that, provide the rationale why, and perhaps lay out next steps for the council to consider with its staff and partners, but I'm going to look at Dr. Walter and Andy, Mr. Strelcheck, to see if that's right.

MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Well, I don't have it in front of me, but the best scientific information available document that we would be in the SSC I believe addressed this matter, and, at that point, if the SSC determined that it was inconsistent with BSIA, then the agency would have to make the determination, regardless, and, I mean, that's our authority, and we could agree, obviously, with the SSC that it isn't, or we could, obviously, proceed and say it is, and then, obviously, there is ramifications, in terms of differences in terms of the SSC advice to the council, versus the agency's guidance and advice based on the science available.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So I believe this has happened in the South Atlantic with Spanish mackerel, but, on our side of the house, the document says that our SSC will document their rationale for why they're not considering it consistent with BSIA, provide that information, ask for more information, provide some type of next steps, I believe, and whether that is forwarded to the agency at that time, and I believe it would be up to the council.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir.

DR. JOHN WALTER: Good morning, everyone. John Walter, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and I think the document that has been discussed has all of this spelled out, and I know that some of it has not always met with everyone's approval, but

I think, in this, it does spell out what would happen if there is disagreement between the agency and the SSC, that we would work together to try to reconcile that, that the SSC would put together some language as to why they don't believe the package is consistent with BSIA, and then the agency would work with them to try to address those issues.

4 5

In the case of the South Atlantic, the request coming from the SSC was for additional analyses that the Science Center could not undertake in that time, and so I do not believe there was a determination by their SSC that the existing analysis was not BSIA, and it was simply that they wanted additional analyses that could not be completed in time. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Any other discussion? Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I guess that regional framework -- I think it's close to being done, and maybe we could cite it, or put a hyperlink or something, here, and so I'm not sure it's going to live when we're done with it, and I assume the councils, and it's for the South Atlantic and the Gulf Council, and we would put it somewhere on our website, and so, if that would be helpful for this section, we could also add that here, when that's completed.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? Go ahead, sir, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Can we go back to the top of page 2 for just a second? Dr. Simmons, I know you said the very first sentence, where it says, "The SSC will advise the council, as requested, on the adequacy of scientific information and supporting analyses of the proposed management measures and alternatives in the FMPs and amendments", and I'm not reading the rest of it, and it seems like that adds a request that doesn't need to be there.

I know it's the council's prerogative, but I would always want to know if the SSC doesn't think that the information we have is adequate, and so, I mean, in lieu of that -- If that's got to be there, I would always want the staff to request them to let us know if the information is inadequate, right, and so I think we should -- My opinion is to strike that and note to the staff that the council is always concerned with the adequacy of the information.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think this is in reference to the agenda items the council wants the SSC to review and put on their agenda. It's up to the council's discretion, right, what those agenda items are. For the SSC, they can bring up ideas of things they want to consider at a future meeting, but it's still the council's discretion to decide what's on that agenda, and so there was some discussions about things, historically, that did not appear on the SSC's agenda, but people were not happy with that, because of that, and so we just want to make it clear, to members that serve, that it's as requested.

There may be things you think we should be discussing and provide recommendations on, but it's really the council's discretion, and that's what we were suggesting here, but, if you think we could try to make that more clear, or if Mr. Rindone has a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? Are you okay with that?

MR. DIAZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: All right, and so do we have any objections to the changes that we have proposed? I don't think we have to have a motion on this, do we? Mr. Anson, we don't have to have a motion, right?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, at the end, it might be good. I'm still going through, and there is a couple other suggestions.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay.

executive director simmons: Okay, and so, if there's no other questions on this section, we could go to Members and Chair under 2.5.2. There we go. Members appointed by the council to the SSCs shall be federal employees, state employees, academicians, or independent experts and shall strong scientific or technical credentials and relevant professional experience." We're suggesting to add "relevant professional experience" there.

 Then, in the paragraph below, we refer to it as "meetings", instead of "sessions", and so just being consistent with that terminology, and so "meeting" there. Then, the next paragraph down, "The Chair or Vice Chair shall preside when the SSC is

convened and will be responsible for summarizing its recommendations when advice is requested by the council." Our SSC doesn't operate by consensus.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Referring to Paragraph Number 2, and the next-to-last sentence, where it says, "SSC members serve at the pleasure of the council and may be removed at any time without cause." So I'm not sure if that second clause really needs to even be there, and I'm not sure, even more strongly, that "without cause" is meaningful.

You know, if we say "and may be removed at any time.", good enough, and the reason I say that is, if I was a prospective SSC member looking at this, I would say, man, I can be thrown off without even looking at it, with no reason at all, and I'm not sure that I want to apply, but we accomplish, in my view, the same thing if we put the period after "time", and I would recommend that.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think that was probably in here before my time, but I'm going to look at Ms. Levy, to see if that has any potential legal ramifications for the council, when they're making these appointments or removing committee members. Beth is suggesting this might have been in our template for our regional management council SOPPs, but we can look into that and bring it back to Full Council, if that's okay.

 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I don't think it has ever the intention here to say that, just because I don't like you, we'll remove you. You know, I think it has -- You know, when it says, "without cause", I don't think I've ever seen this council not do something that didn't have a cause behind it. Dr. Porch.

 DR. WALTER: I see that the first part of this action was going to be recruiting a whole lot of new scientists for the council, and so that is going to mean a lot more people. The problem is that a statement like this kind of works against that, because independent academic scientists value that academic freedom, and the ability to make their best scientific contributions, and I think the statement that they can be removed without cause is kind of chilling to that, and so I would caution the council about that, if they're trying to recruit from independent, toplevel academics. They may want to temper that and provide some rationale as to how that process would be reviewed, and I think

it's usually been in a more thorough process of reappointing people, and sometimes that means a refresh on the reappointment process, and it's not that somebody has been removed, and it's just that other people have been appointed, and that there is a process for that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Ms. Levy.

MS. MARA LEVY: So I'm not sure you need the "without cause", but I think it needs to be clear that, just because you're appointed for a three-year term, it does not mean that you're quaranteed three-year term, meaning there а could circumstances, whatever they are, in which the council decides to remove you, and the problem with articulating a process is that all of this is done in closed session, and so there's not -- I mean, because we don't want to -- You know, we discuss these appointments, qualifications, all that in closed session, and so I think, whatever we do here, you know, has to walk that line of making it clear that the council can choose to appoint or remove, you know, at their pleasure.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Ryan.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to build on what Ms. Levy was saying about all of this happening in closed session, that's also part of the reason why the council doesn't have any sort of written explanation to anyone who was not reappointed, and, though it is very rare, there have been instances, in the past, where an SSC member was removed by the council mid-term, for reasons that the council discussed during closed session, and so this situation that's being discussed is not without precedent. I will leave it to you guys to decide on the "without cause" part, but an SSC member being removed by the council mid-term has happened before.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Anson, did you have -- All right. Dr. Porch, I don't think, at any one time, that anybody on this council wants anybody on the SSC not to be able to express their opinion of what they think is the best scientific -- I think that's what we need out of the SSC, is we need the people to be able to speak freely and tell, and so I don't think it's a word that I'm going to remove you just because, without cause, and I would hope that -- I have never seen anything, in my years here, that would change that, and you would have to be -- Just like Ryan said, and it would have to be something, definitely, that would cause you to have to have someone removed. Does that make sense? Okay. All right. Dr. Simmons, anything else on this?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Let's keep going. I think we're to Administrative Provisions, I believe, 2.5.3.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: C.J.

DR. C.J. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your committee, but just clarification. Are we removing the "without cause" part of that sentence there, or are we just keeping it as-is?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I don't think we are at this time. I mean, the "without cause", I don't think it's been removed. It is? Okay. Yes, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so my question is why not? The sentiment discussed at this table, by most everybody, is that it's probably not appropriate, and we would be better served if it weren't there, and so, if I caught the sentiment of the table correctly, most folks in the committee favor removing it.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: It reminds me of an old football coach, and, you know, I got it in there without cause, and you can remove me with cause, and you can't remove me, and, you know, what's the deal here. You know, you can with, or you can't without, and I don't know. I don't have a problem, and it's up to you all. You know, I'm open to discussion. Dr. Simmons, your thoughts on it?

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, I think that staff is probably looking for another motion, after we get through all of this, and, at that time, if we want to suggest making that change, in addition to these other changes, that's probably the right time to do that, and, if you want to wait until Full Council, we can do that as well.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: I don't have strong feelings about whether it stays in or not. The council needs the flexibility that it has now. If there's an issue with an SSC member, we can remove them, and I think, if we change this language, we should have strong input from Ms. Levy, and have something here that's legally defensible, and so I don't think we should make it at the table, and we should get some legal advice on what the proper language is, to where we stand on good legal ground.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so if we could go to 2.5.3, please. We're suggesting to remove "the". Then, all the way down to 2.7.3, Ecosystem Technical Committee.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons, real quick, I think Mr. Gill has a question.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw our attention to 2.5.3, the last sentence of the first paragraph, and that reads: "(The SSC should attend and meet with the council to the extent practicable.)"

First of all, I don't understand why it would be in parentheses, and I don't understand what that does. Secondly, there is two ways to interpret this, and I think there is the right interpretation, and this suggests that we're recommending, although we control that, that the entire SSC meet with the council, and, in my view, that's probably not appropriate, but it's not clear exactly what the intent of this sentence is, and my sense is that it's something that, to my knowledge, we've never done, and the reason I have problems with it is because folks sometimes want to attend SSC meetings, and they sometimes want to attend council meetings, and doing them together makes it very difficult, and so I would recommend that at least we remove the parentheses, and, secondly, we clarify whether in fact we mean the entire SSC, and, thirdly, we control that, and so it's not whether they should or not, and it's whether request that they do, and so I think that sentence needs some work.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I believe this is in Magnuson, or the National Standards, and the reason it's in parentheses is this is what other regional management councils do, and this was what I believe we were advised to do from Headquarters staff, when we were working on our SOPPs, is, even though we don't maybe practice this, this is what other regions do, and it is still part of the standards, the law, and I believe it's where it came from, but I am going to -- This might be something we definitely would bring back, and dig into some more, but I'm pretty sure it's in the standards that it says that.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any further discussion on this? All right. Dr. Simmons.

3

4 5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Let's go to 2.7.3. Okay, and so we've, preliminarily, in committee, reorganized the structure of the SSC, and so, because the Ecosystem Technical Committee was made up of our Special Ecosystem SSC members, and then some other, two other, Standing SSC members, we would need to consider making modifications to this technical committee, based on those changes, and so what staff is proposing here is that the Ecosystem Technical Committee consists of no more than twelve people. Membership includes three staff from NMFS, one of which is from the Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Division, from the SSC, with economic, members social, biological/ecological expertise, and up to four stakeholder representatives. Members are appointed jointly by the Executive Director and the council chair.

15 16 17

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any discussion on this? Yes, Mr. Gill.

18 19 20

2122

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Shouldn't the parentheses section be moved to after "members", because that's what it is addressing. It's not addressing the SSC in general, and it's addressing the five members.

232425

2627

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think Bernie can do that, right, and so you're just saying cut "with economic, social, or biological/ecological expertise", right after -- Between "members" and "from"?

282930

MR. GILL: Correct.

31 32

33

34

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you. I don't think we need a motion, Mr. Chair, for that. Are you okay with just moving that section, between "members" and "from" in the blue text? There we go, Mr. Chair.

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. All right. With those changes, any discussion on that?

38 39 40

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: We would remove the parentheses then, or remove the "with", either one.

41 42

43 MR. GILL: Well, I waffled on that one, but I think leaving them in is appropriate.

45 46

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? Do we need a motion on this?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think on all the changes, and then, if we want to circle back on the other sticking point, we could do that at Full Council, if you would like.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: All right. Could -- We would entertain a motion for all the changes that have been made, and then we'll come back to Full Council. I'm going to get duct tape on you in a minute.

10 MR. GILL: You've told me that before, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Can I get a motion? I would entertain a motion to accept. We have a motion. Do I have a second?

15 MR. DIAZ: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: We have a second. Okay. Any discussion? 18 Any opposition? Go ahead, Mr. Gill. Your duct tape is coming.

20 MR. GILL: I oppose that motion.

22 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: We've got one opposed. Any others? Okay.
23 The motion carries. Ms. Levy. I'm sorry.

 MS. LEVY: Just so that we're -- So we don't have to come back to this point at Full Council, but so the part about the SSC holding its meetings in conjunction with the council, to the extent practicable, that language is straight out of the Magnuson Act, and so it's directing that, if practicable, and I think the Gulf Council has determined that's not practicable, but other councils, particularly Alaska and the West Coast, do that, I believe.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Dugas.

36 MR. J.D. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a clarification, 37 maybe for Bernie, and there was one opposition.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Yes. Okay. Sorry. Thank you. Anything 40 else, Dr. Simmons?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Not on this agenda item.

44 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Mr. Frazer.

- 46 DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, I'm not on the committee, but I just wanted to, you know, given the discussion
- 48 that we had on BSIA, and that Section 2.5.1, and there was a

reference to some internal document on BSIA, and I'm just asking if we could get that in the background materials, prior to Full Council.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, we could provide the draft from the SSC meeting, when it was discussed. I don't know -- I will look at Andy and John, and I don't know if there's an updated version of it to provide to the council, but we could certainly provide a link to what was discussed during that SSC meeting on the regional BSIA framework.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: We will provide a final version, and it's publicly available, so you have that link.

DR. FRAZER: Prior to Full Council? Okay. Great.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion on this? We're moving right along.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS AD HOC AND STANDING ADVISORY PANELS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay, and so Item Number V is Review and Discuss the Ad Hoc and Standing Advisory Panels. At the beginning of each year, the council reviews any ad hoc advisory panels and assesses if their charge has been met and if these advisory panels are expected to meet that year, which we'll talk about in a little bit.

The council currently has two ad hoc advisory panels, the Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data Collection AP that was just formed, and they met in January of 2024, and so an additional fall meeting is planned for that committee, and so they're still working on their charge, and the other ad hoc is the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ that was formed in January of 2018 and has met three times, and we envision also convening this AP later this year.

We do need to consider updating the charge of that group, and we're suggesting that we add that to Other Business in the Reef Fish Committee. We do have a draft amended charge for the committee, and the council, to consider in the Reef Fish Committee.

The three-year term cycles for your Reef Fish and Shrimp APs are

currently up for review, and so staff is planning to readvertise for those two, unless directed otherwise by the committee and council, and so you will review applicants, and make preliminary selections, at the April 2024 council meeting. Then, at the June 2024 meeting, the council will review any final members of those two APs. Bernie, if there's no questions on what we need to do, can we pull up Tab G, Number 5, please?

This just kind of shows you the information that I just ran through. The Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ, there is the current charge that we want to discuss with you all during Reef Fish. Again, this group was created in January of 2018, and they met in -- They've met three times. They met two times in 2018 and then in June of 2021, and then we had all the focus group meetings, you recall, and then now we're at the current stage, and so we're planning on convening this group later in the year, at least once or twice.

We know that your For-Hire Data Collection AP -- They still have work to do, and so we're going to keep them there, and so keep going down, and so the two standing APs you have that are due for repopulation are Reef Fish and Shrimp, and this lists the number of meetings we've had since they were populated. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any discussion on this? All right. I don't think we need a motion for that one. Are we good?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: No, and so we'll just proceed with readvertising for those APs, and we'll talk about the charge tomorrow for the ad hoc. Okay. All right. Now we're to you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Which one are we on now? Number VI.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED 2024 ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay, and so we have some draft of activities for 2024, and that's in Tab G, Number 6(a), and then Ms. Hager is going to go through a proposed budget, and so what I'm looking for is just any feedback that you all have on Tab G, Number 6(a), and then we'll bring the -- When we have our final funded budget back, we'll bring that back later in the year, and so you don't need a motion or anything for this, and this is really for your information and feedback at this time.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Is there any feedback on the budget? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I presume, based on our prior discussion, that the inclusions of the Special SSCs will be removed, upon approval of the reorganization of the SSC, correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Correct. Can we please pull up Tab G, Number 6(a)? We have meetings of the council, Council Coordinating Committee meetings, with the anticipated month held, or the months that are already slated for those meetings to be held, and, as Mr. Gill pointed out, if you go forward with the changes to the SOPPs, we will update this as well.

We tried to anticipate when you would convene your APs, and tried to put them -- Make them more aware of when they might be convened, and so we have some draft months there for the advisory panels. You will also notice that the SSC -- We're suggesting removing the January SSC meeting and convening them in February, May, July, and October. Technical committees, you can see when we're planning to convene them, and then summits and other meetings.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so, noting the SSC MR. GILL: change to four meetings a year, instead of five, right, which I think is probably in the right direction, did you consider three meetings, instead of four? The reason I ask that is that we have five currently, and that seems more than we really need. The South Atlantic does two, and I think, for us, that would not work, which says that three or four makes sense consideration, and I'm not in the mode of recommending three, but I just wanted to know what the discussion was and why that was not proffered as a possible alternative.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I will start, and I will get staff to help me, but, well, January is just very difficult, historically, for the Science Center, for the Regional Office staff, and for our staff, to get everything together during the holidays, and missed deadlines and everything else, and sometimes we had to discuss those agenda items again later in the year, because things weren't ready, and so January just really wasn't a good month, and so we're starting in February, May, and then October for sure, and in-person meetings is what we would like to see.

There's a potential that July is virtual, and, right now, we are

thinking we aren't going to need four meetings. We don't like to make them longer than three days, and it starts getting really hard for people, I think, in their positions, to have more than three days at a meeting, plus travel, but it's possible that we may not need one, or we may decide that July doesn't happen, but we're just budgeting that way right now.

4 5

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so that makes sense to me, and the thought of potentially one of them being a Zoom, if needed, and that also makes sense, and so it's consistent with my original question. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I think the way you have it right now is about right. I would not want to see less SSC meetings. Our process is so slow, and I would hate for us to have to wait for an extra SSC meeting to change an annual catch limit or something like that, and it could make the difference from even opening up something in one year to all of a complete other year, and so, anyway, I think the way you've got it right now, and I agree with the three-day limit. Those meetings exhaust me. I mean, they just -- It's like running a marathon going to those meetings.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. So I guess what I'm hearing here is, basically, if we want to go back to four, instead of five, and then that's what you're expecting, and then maybe one virtual, and then four, and is that right?

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, we do have -- Bernie, if you could go back to the SSC, and we do have four meetings proposed and budgeted for, with one of those four being virtual, in July, is what we're thinking right now.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: It would have the option of being either/or, and it could be virtual or in-person?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, and we're strongly recommending that our SSC members come in-person, unless there's a circumstance, but normally we have pretty good attendance in-person.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: All right. Does anybody have any other comments or discussion on this? All right, Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: All right, and so then, for the

remaining proposed activities, we have SEDAR meetings, public hearings, and outreach efforts will be discussed during the Education and Outreach Committee at this meeting, and I apologize for the highlighting. Bernie, if we could go down, and I'm not sure why Reef Fish Amendment 49 is highlighted. I think that's a typo. Those are the public hearings we're anticipating that could be completed before the end of the year. Mr. Chair, any feedback?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Any discussion on this? Seeing none, Dr. Simmons. We have no discussion on it, and so I think we can probably --

MS. BETH HAGER: They're virtual meetings, and so they have very minimal impact to cost, and I don't know why it was highlighted.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay, and so --

19 MR. GILL: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize, and it just caught my eye, and so, on the SEDAR meetings, we have red snapper, SEDAR 97, and we have six meetings scheduled there, and is that actually going to happen, given what happened with the red snapper assessment review? I am looking at Dr. Walter.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: I didn't know that red snapper was on the agenda for this meeting, but I think we probably will have to have that conversation, about what that process looks like. I don't know that we can do it right here on that calendar planning, and clearly we can't not assess red snapper, but, in terms of what that's going to look like, I think we're going to have to have some further discussion, and I think it's going to have to work its way through the SSC, because the SSC is going to get that report, I think, at their meeting, and then we probably will take it from there, in terms of whether it goes and becomes a research track or whether we can address a number of the concerns from the reviewers in an operational. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, Ryan.

MR. RINDONE: Just as a reminder, this is for planning purposes. You know, these are proposed, and so the intention of the council, at the moment, is to try to proceed with a benchmark

assessment that would begin later on this year, since we're going to have to revisit some things from the previous attempt in SEDAR 74, and, when we say "meetings", "meetings" doesn't mean that we're going to have six in-person meetings of some period of length, and it can also mean webinars and things like that as well, because those are timed events, where we're going to have some bringing together of SSC members, people from the Science Center, academia, et cetera, to discuss whatever topics it is that might need to be discussed, and so "meetings" is -- At least for SEDAR purposes, it doesn't necessarily mean in-person in a hotel or something.

4 5

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Does that clarify it? All right, Dr. Simmons.

MS. HAGER: Okay. Could we get up on the next tab, Bernie, Tab 6(b)? We have -- Staff have put together a budget, a proposed budget, for 2024. At this point, we don't have our funding at all for 2024, and we're still working with 2023 and carryover, and so we have proposed a level-funded budget, and that's what we were told to expect anyway, and some of the other councils have received at their funding at that level.

With this, we're -- In travel expenses, I have drawn it as well as we could, based on the current activities schedule, and you can see the reduction to the SSC travel that we're expecting, hopefully, but we will see. Travel costs are increasing, and so I'm not sure that we will hit this target. Things may be more expensive this year, and so, as we proceed through this, please be aware that I've adjusted where we can, where we have known increases, such as COLAs, insurance of various types, and all the insurance has gone up, you know, and so throughout, but to try and keep level-funded as well, and it's a balancing act.

This is strictly proposed, and this will change, for sure, when we get our actual funding, and as we go through the year and find out what line items are being pushed to the limits, and, you know, where we can draw in other places, and so, if you will scroll down, and, if anybody has any questions throughout, about anything in particular that is different, and we included the COLAs, like I said, in the salaries, in the current staff projections. Fringe benefits are based on the current census and the current costs.

 Our rent goes up this year. Meeting room costs, I have a small margin right now, and I expect that to actually need to increase throughout the year, because those costs are becoming higher and higher, and that's pretty much it. This is just our standard

operating stuff. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

4 5

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Beth, for this. On the personnel side, the SSC reduction of some \$13,000, is that predicated on the reorganization that we talked about, and that's being accomplished already, and so there is no further likelihood, given that we approve the reorganization, and so this one has that incorporated, and is that correct?

MS. HAGER: Yes, and, really, that was to get to the correct number at the bottom, and we needed to draw in every place that we could, and the SSC's costs, in 2023, didn't exceed that line item, and so I could draw it in some anyway, and then, proposing that July might be virtual, then we also have, you know, a bit of wiggle room on that, and so, again, this is strictly a number so that you guys can see, if we're level-funded, these are some of the lines that are going to have to come in, probably, and these are lines that we can't move, and that's what we have here, and this is nothing that is written in stone.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One final for Dr. Simmons, and so, given the rent numbers, it suggests that we're staying where we are for now? I'm sorry, and so there was some consideration of whether we could stay where we are, and my read, from this, is, okay, rent is going up, and we're not moving, and is that a fair assumption or no?

 MS. HAGER: Rent, with the current lease that we have, and we have a small increase built into it. At this point, the current owners, the new owners, have until March to pull the trigger on their option to get us out, basically to buy us out of the lease. We haven't been told that, and, after March, there's going to have to be another renegotiation if they want us to move, and so it's going to cost them more, and so likely we aren't moving at this point, but we really don't know, and, unfortunately, the cost of real estate in Tampa right now is a lot higher than what we're paying, and so, if we were to have to move, that number could depend on the negotiation, and it could depend on what funds we have available, which is the next slide that we're going to talk about.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: All right. Any other discussion? Obviously, we realize that this is fluid, and it will go up. Go ahead.

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Beth, you indicated that you guys haven't got your money yet. Do you have any indication when that might happen?

MS. HAGER: Well, before the end of March. It's a mechanical situation, is my understanding, and some of the councils, like I said, have received their funding, but there are a couple that they just can't make the pieces work with the new system and ASAP, and so, rather than break it further, they're kind of holding off until we get -- Either they get it worked out or we get to a point where they're going to have to do something.

MR. DONALDSON: We're fighting the same issue at the commission, and so I was curious if you had any clear date, which we don't.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion on the budget item? I think, if you go into Tab 7 there, which is going to explain a little bit more here.

REVIEW UPDATE TO 2020-2024 ADMINISTRATIVE AWARD CARRYOVER

MS. HAGER: If we want to bring up Tab Number 7, Bernie. This is the discussion of -- This is an informational tab, just to give you all of a snapshot of where we're sitting right now with our carryover funds, and I realize this isn't in total, and that was intentional, because I wanted to be able to see by year where we're sitting, and notice our line for 2023, and we spent almost everything we were allocated in 2023. Hard costs have gone up in 2024, and so that margin is even slimmer in 2024, as we're projecting.

We have a recreational initiative that you all have already approved to be using these carryover funds, and so where we're sitting right now is about \$595,000 in unallocated carryover costs. However, because of the unknowns that we're facing in 2024, level funding, potentially having to move, the changes that we might have to face with the IRA money, which might actually decrease our costs, if we wind up having to reprogram some activities to the IRA.

 I didn't even want to put an eye on this and have you guys starting to look at how to spend it, because it's not a solid number at this point. You know, it could be between \$300,000 and \$600,000, and that's a pretty wide swing, and so this is where it sits. This is the snapshot. I will be happy to update you as we go further on in the year, and things progress, and we know more.

4 5

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think, obviously, until you get your budget, until you know where you're at, and until you know what's going to happen with your rent coming up in March, and those are your two big factors right there, will it be level funding, or will they give you a little bit extra, and will there be an increase in your rent, and are you going to have to move? Luckily, we have a little money in the bank, so that we could be able to fall back on it, and be able to do what we need to do. Any questions on that, or any other discussion on it?

I think, obviously, you know -- Well, they will know something by March, and so, you know, by the time we do our next meeting, we'll have a good idea. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just wanted to throw this out there, and I know this will be extremely complicated, but Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission decided to buy their building, years ago, and I'm sure, years ago, that was a big expense, and it probably looked insurmountable, but I don't know -- I mean, I personally think it might be worth the council exploring if there's a way to purchase a building, and I don't know if it's even feasible, but we're paying \$200,000 a year in rent, and so, I mean, what kind of a building could you buy for \$200,000, and pay your loan costs, plus the insurance and taxes and other things, and I'm sure it's very complicated for a quasi-governmental agency to own something, and so I know that, legally, it wouldn't be an easy thing to do, but I think it should at least be explored.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, I think we need to take a break. I'm not sure what happened to our --

MS. HAGER: I think we have a breaker that's blown, and, Dale, we actually do a lease/purchase analysis for the market, when we start looking at places, and so, whether that's at the end of this year, in the middle of this year, or the end of next year, when our lease expires, that is a part of that discussion, and we have historically tried to at least consider that. We also do that if we have like capital, like the van, or the Barracuda Archiver, that were very expensive pieces of equipment, and we always have a lease/purchase analysis.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any questions? All right, Dr. Simmons, I think we are going close to a point to break. Mr. Anson, if that's what you would like to do at this time, and we're a couple of minutes over.

MR. ANSON: Yes, let's go ahead and take a break. Before we do that though, I just want to recognize -- I saw him standing -- There he is. Mr. Ed Swindell, a former council member, is here today. Ed, welcome. It's good to see you.

MR. ED SWINDELL: I would like to say one thing. For all of you that I don't know, good luck with the council. I wish all of you the best, and I'm heading to North Carolina, to visit my sister and a cousin that's in a care facility, and so I will see all of you at another time, somewhere along the line, but it's good to -- Those of you that I haven't said hello to, hello, but it's good to see all of you, and the best of luck to you. Thank you, sir.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Ed. Safe travels. It's good to see you. All right. We'll break for fifteen minutes, hopefully, and we'll keep our fingers crossed. Let's just plan for fifteen. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think, if I'm correct, we're at Item VIII on our agenda now, and we're going to review, and approve, proposed activities for the Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act. I will turn it over to Dr. Simmons.

REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR PHASE II INFLATION REDUCTION ACT (IRA) FUNDING FOR THE REGIONAL MANAGEMENT COUNCILS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. For this item, we have a very abbreviated timeline, and this proposal is due actually at this meeting, on Wednesday, January 31, and so I think we have time this morning, Mr. Chair, if you want to take any feedback, or suggestions, from the whole council on this, and we will try to integrate those as best we can before the due date, and before this is, you know, finalized at Full Council, and so I just wanted to mention that.

 Just to remind everybody, during our October 2023 council meeting, the process of applying for the Inflation Reduction Act funding for climate-ready initiatives is in two phases, and so we talked about Phase I during that October council meeting, and we applied, and you approved, that \$375,000 to support staff, a staff position for that, and so we have applied for that, and so this is to now discuss Phase II of that funding, and so we have a draft proposal for you all to look at.

It's a framework of activities that we have to submit through this application process, and it is competitive amongst the other regional management councils. Again, the deadline is at this meeting, Wednesday, January 31, and so we don't have a whole lot of time, but we'll do our best to try to integrate any suggestions you have and get that uploaded by the deadline.

Before we get that tab open, Bernie, or while you're doing that, and it's Tab G, Number 8, and just a reminder that we can't — Any funding we receive for these efforts can't be comingled with our current admin award. We have to keep that separate. Staff that work on these activities — They can be divided amongst the awards, but we have to keep track of their time, and so there's going to be some additional administrative burden on our end, to kind of keep up with some of these things, and so I just wanted to remind everybody of that.

This is the template, Bernie, that you have up that we were requested to use for all the regional management councils, but what I would like to pull up is Tab G, Number 8, which is what we put together for the committee.

The other thing is this funding for the regional management councils cannot be used to collect data or to supplement the current monitoring surveys that may be ongoing, and so I also wanted to bring that up as well, because I think there's a lot of other funding that came from this effort that's being funneled through academia and the Gulf States and the Science Center and Regional Office and things like that, and so just to remind everybody that the funds can't be used for that.

I will just start with our title, and, if anybody can think of a snazzier title, that would be great, you know, and it would make it a lot more exciting, but we have "Identification and Integration of Ecosystem Components into Flexible Management Measures for Climate-Ready Fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico".

We were asked to identify those priorities that are in that template and how our main objectives, and deliverables, or subtasks, would meet those objectives in NOAA's template, and so we've tried to do that in Section 3.

We've identified what we think the funding priorities are, those three there, and how we think this proposal will try to integrate those into our two main objectives, and so the first overarching objective for this proposal is to complete the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Ecosystem Plan and its components. This seems to be something that we just really can't accomplish with our

current resources, and so we think that moving this effort over to the climate-ready initiative will really help us get over that hump. We have some additional resources that we can ask for, and I think this is the right way to go about it.

The second main objective is to develop procedures that will streamline management processes and regulatory actions to increase the council's responsiveness to climate change, and this is also something I think we've discussed in recent years, and we just also haven't really had the bandwidth to make adequate progress on that as well.

This proposal covers a multiyear funding request, which integrates two objectives into the overall plan, and so, based on the annual amount of funding that we receive, portions of our admin activities that we're currently considering will probably have to be reprogrammed, based on that, and put over to this pot of funding, depending on what we get, because this is a request. We still don't know exactly what we're going to receive, and we have not received the \$375,000 yet either.

We are going -- We are aiming to communicate, and to engage, with the Regional Office and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, as appropriate, to ensure our products are developed and are compatible with other ongoing shared research and management objectives.

What we've tried to do is, under those two main objectives, there's some sub-items, and so the tasks outlined in the proposal will be performed by the newly-hired Ecosystem Analyst and one fulltime administrative research assistant. We do have that announcement out, and we are hoping to do interviews after the council meeting for that position.

 For the first objective, the Ecosystem Analyst will develop the FMP, which will include separate modules that focus on the council-selected and stakeholder-driven fishery ecosystem issues, which we spent quite a bit of time talking about that during the October council meeting, and then, later on in the agenda this week, we're going to start talking about some of the engagement processes that our O&E has recommended since then for you to consider and how we might mesh that in as we move forward with this funding, and so a lot of different things going on, and hopefully it will all come together here at the end of the meeting.

Let's keep going down, and so we have multiple components that include a management perspective for the FEP and the development

of a communication plan, those modules that I mentioned, summarizing the outcomes of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan process for each of the fishery ecosystem issues, and so the second objective is to hire a consultant to develop procedures that will streamline the council process and provide more flexibility to improve fishery management in response to climate change, and so that's kind of trying to look at our regulatory streamlining, but, before we start developing that amendment, or amendments, or generic amendment, we're suggesting that we hire a consultant to look at the whole process, to look at our process, to look at the regional — The Southeast Regional Office's process, regulatory process, and tell us what other councils are doing, how we can improve our current process, and they will bring all that information to us.

4 5

The council decides that, yes, we want to move forward with this for reef fish, or, yes, we want to try to move forward with this for CMP, or it can be a generic amendment, and so to try to integrate any other activities and processes that regional councils are doing, and that sets us up, hopefully, with a good starting point, so we can really get it moving through our regulatory process.

Now we're going to go -- That's Objective 2 that I just discussed, and so can we go back to Objective 1, please, on page 2, under the Ecosystem Analyst?

The Ecosystem Analyst and the admin research assistant will assist a social scientist contractor, and so, within this, we're suggesting, or proposing, to hire a contractor that will help us in holding and staffing stakeholder engagement workshops, following the Outreach and Education Technical Committee's communication plan, which, like I said, we'll talk about later. This contractor will lead a process for assessing the council's standard audience, as well as identifying underserved communities and stakeholders with current and future -- To help us develop a process for current and future engagements that the council may want to consider, and so that's some of the main things that we're anticipating that consultant will help us with.

If we keep going down to page 3, we're talking about leading to the development of the modules, and so I think, during the Ecosystem Committee in October, we talked about the fishery ecosystem issues, and so we're saying, in this, that we're still going to work through what those issues are, and what the priorities would be, but we're proposing that, on page 4, what those components would look like before we go through this

prioritization process, and then what they would finally look like after the prioritization process, and then what those anticipated deliverables would be.

Each fishery ecosystem module would represent an important body of work that can be disseminated to stakeholders for feedback and provided to the council as part of the fishery ecosystem process. The results of the module could stand alone and may be deemed appropriate by the council, and its scientific advisors, for integration into the management process or not, depending on what is gathered through the stakeholder engagement efforts, and it would be used to update the goals of the council's communication plan, as part of the fishery management FEP, part of the fishery management plan document defined in there. Those reports would come to the council as well throughout this process.

Let's see, and I'm kind of jumping around here, and we talked about the contractor for the stakeholder engagements. I will go back to -- We have a very draft list of the FEIs that we're anticipating, and that's on page 3, and this is not an exhaustive list. These are just items that have been discussed in the various Ecosystem Technical Committee meetings. They're issues that have come up from stakeholders, and they're issues that the council has brought up, and so this is a very draft list.

This is something that we're going to have to work through with this process, but these are things we think directly could be considered are likely are being impacted by climate change in the Gulf of Mexico.

Let's go to page 4 now and talk about the summit. Okay, and so, as part of the FEP process, the council is exploring avenues to involve partner agencies that play a role in the identified fishery ecosystem issues, and so what we're thinking is that we would host a large summit, at the end of this process.

 Something that the council selects is probably is going to involve a lot of other agencies, extra-jurisdictional agencies, and so one of those things might be red tide, and so we're thinking that the summit, or the symposium, would be very large, seventy-five participants, and it would necessitate contracting with a meeting facilitator to fully engage all participants. John, are you noticing anything, or Emily?

We do have a table of proposed activities and expected timeframes, and it starts on page 6 and 7, and then I will have

Ms. Hager walk through the budget. Maybe you can start there, and see if there's some feedback, or questions, and I apologize for jumping around, and I didn't have a PowerPoint. I didn't know if that would be more confusing.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any discussion on this? Yes, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know it will probably shock you, but I have no questions, but I do think the staff is due congratulations for developing a very comprehensive, well-thought-out, and detailed proposal, and I think it all looks good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion? Yes, Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thank you, and we, at the Science Center, reviewed the proposals and found that they matched very well with a number of the things that we've got going on, and I think it's going to be good to be able to work together on these, and so thanks for letting us review them and provide comments. Good luck.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Anson, you know, I'm not sure about the protocol, but, you know, I would like to open this up to the full council for any discussion, on any of these, because, since we do have such a short timeframe to be able to do something, and so, if you're not on the committee, but, if you have comments, please feel free to -- Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm not on the committee, and I first wanted to thank the council staff for meeting with NMFS staff and the opportunity to provide comments and input. I think that was a great discussion, and we met with the South Atlantic Council, and we offered a number of suggestions.

I spoke to Kelly Denit, at the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, late last week, before she provided comments I think on Friday, and I guess a couple of things that I just want to emphasize, because I think it's really important. This is a competitive funding process, right, and so your proposals will be competing with other councils for IRA funding.

The IRA is intended to be transformational, and really our effort, as an agency, is to improve the climate readiness of our fisheries, and so, with these projects, we're supportive of them, but there were points made by Kelly, and our team, in

terms of making sure that there is those direct connections, in terms of how does this improve the climate readiness of our fisheries, how do these relate strictly to the priorities that are being identified in the request for proposals, and then I think, most importantly, going forward, what are the outcomes that can be tangible, and used by this council, in the future, right, and so there's a three-year time horizon for these funds, but what we want to see, at the end of the process, is what's the impact, what's the outcome, and how are we going to ultimately be better off, having gone down this path of utilizing these funds, to improve our climate readiness.

All of that I think is important, and I think you have a lot of aspects that are already in the proposals, but, the more you can emphasize that, and make sure that the tie-into the climate is clear, please do so.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck, for mentioning that. We do still need to address some of Ms. Denit's suggestions, that we did receive at like five o'clock on Friday, and so we're doing our best, and we have some staff back at the office trying to address those right now, but point taken, you know, having that outside perspective and just making sure that we're providing a clear understanding of how the council can use the deliverables and that they circle back to being climate ready, and so we're on it, as best we can, but I appreciate any other feedback.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: It looks like we have a technical issue.

MS. HAGER: Yes, and that breaker went again, and so we're going to have to do some rejiggering. I think we could move forward, at this point, or at least through this section. I could go over the budget. You all have your screens up, and there's nothing spectacular in here that's new information. It's up to the council if you would like to proceed for the next five or ten minutes, and then we can solve this.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think we can. Dr. Simmons, do you have a problem with that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: No, as long as you guys are okay with it. We do have some numbers to go through, as far as --

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: We can bring them up last there, maybe, if we need to, but, yes, let's just move forward with it, unless

somebody has an issue, while we're working on this. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: If there's no other feedback for us right now on this to try to consider, or tweak, we do have some anticipated budgeting numbers that Ms. Hager was going to go through.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay.

MS. HAGER: Okay, and so, as Dr. Simmons mentioned, our first application of this process was for a definitive \$375,000, and that was to support the primary staff person that we are expecting to hire for the first year-and-a-half, about, of the project. We have included this position in the second request for the last nine months of the project, and we've also included an administrative position for research, and to support this whole project, because of the administrative burden.

Then we also have, in the budget, several different meetings where we will have SSC members, and/or council members, attending, and so the costs for those folks to attend, and those are budgeted in personnel costs as well, and we have some benefits in here. We have a lot of travel for these Ecosystem Technical Committee meetings, the SSC reviewing, and these are for just meetings to do the IRA activities, and these are not comingled with any other sort of regular SSC meetings.

We have the O&E Technical Committee meeting, we have the stakeholder engagement things that we're working on, and we have this big summit. Overall, the bottom-line figure is \$1,826,606 for the second phase, which brings the grand total of our request up to \$2.2 million. This also includes the social scientist contractor that we discussed, the facilitator, and the regulatory streamlining consultant, and so that's it, basically, and so we're coming in under two-and-a-half million, which is --You know, if they were take all of the funding and divide it evenly among the councils, that's what it would be, and so we're under that, but it's, I think, enough to complete the activities that we're projecting to do, and that's what we needed to do.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any discussion on the budget side of it? Yes, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I guess this is for Ms. Hager, and so, earlier in the presentation, Dr. Simmons said something about we would have to go back and adjust the administrative award, and I wasn't sure what she was talking about there, and so that would be one

question, and my other question would be, the second part, is are there indirect costs built into this? Like some of our staff is going to have to supervise some of these people, and we've got to house them, and we've got electricity, phones, and I see you have some phone stuff in there, and other indirect type of costs, and, if not, why not?

MS. HAGER: Because we don't have a federally-negotiated indirect rate, and we don't charge one. All of our costs are direct billed. That's the answer to the second-half of the question. The first-half is any activities that we have currently planned in our regular administrative award have to be reprogrammed over, and any of the ones that would fall in this funding, and so it would be like the amendment that we were talking about in here that we're looking at doing.

We would have to move it over to the Inflation Reduction Act and then not charge it under the administrative award, and so the up side is that helps our administrative award budget, if that's activity that we already had planned in this year.

Also, this administrative position may be a position that could be moved over from our existing award, and so that could be something that could also help our budget in the administrative — Because there is going to be administrative work that needs to be done, and that's also why we don't have an indirect rate, and we charge staff time as it is to each activity. We keep very strict work processes as to which — When we have like the coral award, and the people that are working on the coral award only charge to that, and so then, if you submit staff time, you have to do time sheets and things to track people's time, and that's doable, but it's just more complicated, and it just seems a lot easier to make it straightforward, and it's better to be able to stand behind what your numbers are.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion on this? Yes.

 MR. GEESLIN: Beth and Carrie, I appreciate that you all are continually asked to do more with less, and, just for those keeping score at home, the positions — I tried to forward these around to my network, academic institutions and universities, as they come out. For this specific, and I think we had — Just a rundown, and you had a social scientist, and not necessarily associated with the IRA, and you've got two positions here, the ecosystem analyst and an administrative support role, just so I'm keeping track of those, Carrie?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Yes, ma'am.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So we requested two fulltime employees, essentially. One would be a new hire, and then one potentially would be moved from our administrative award currently over to this funding, for the research assistant, which would be an administrative with technical training position.

Then we're looking at hiring a social scientist contractor, as you mentioned, and a facilitator for the summit, to help us with that, which would also be a contract position, and then have a contractor do the regulatory review process, and so that would be a competitive process too, where we try to get a contractor to do that process, to review what's going on and give us a report on ways that we can take that, and what other regions are doing, and put it into our amendments, to streamline and be more prepared for climate readiness.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you. Just so I can tell people, these are two-year terms, and I hear a facilitator, and that's probably something a little different, but those other are year-and-a-half terms, or two-year terms?

MS. HAGER: It's going to depend on the length of the funding. At this point, we are budgeting through the end of the year 2026, and that's what the feedback we've gotten -- It will be whatever the limit is to this funding, because it's a project.

MR. GEESLIN: Understood. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Is it not a three-year? Did I not understand that we have three? Yes, sir.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, that was some of my question too, Dakus, is this is just a temporary job, and then we say thank you?

MS. HAGER: Yes, and that's the thing about grant-funded positions. We are clear, in what we're advertising, that this is based on this funding. You know, that's the world we live in.

45 MR. ANSON: Carrie, where does the person that's identified in 46 the Phase I budget fit into this? Are they doing something kind 47 of distinct, I guess, separate? I'm just looking at if the 48 Phase II is not funded, and they would be doing other work, correct?

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, we are proposing, in the Phase II, that, when we get this person hired, they would execute these activities in Phase II. We have not received the money yet to onboard that person. We do have the application out that says it's a three-year position, and, after funding runs out, there's a possibility that the council could hire you fulltime or not, and it depends on our funding position, but it is time-limited right now, and we were hoping to get the money on January 1, but we have not gotten that money yet, and some councils have already hired staff and onboarded them.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I would think this is similar to a lot of your federal contracts that are coming out. You know, when we get things in our states and all, that's time-limited, and you just hope, from year-to-year, the funding, or something else, will happen, but I think -- Go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So, I guess, back to Mr. Anson's question, if we get the \$375,000, or some of that, to hire this person, and they don't like what we have in Phase II, I suspect that person is going to rewrite this and bring it back to you, because they're going to need funding to support themselves by the third year of this process.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Any other discussion on this? Once again, the full council, everybody, you know, because we want to get the information out as quick as possible, so that they can work on this.

MR. ANSON: So they have to get it submitted -- Wednesday is the drop-dead date, and so, yes, if we have any comments here that modify what's been proposed by Carrie here, or written, then we need to say those now, so to give staff some time to try to make those edits and get it submitted by the deadline, and so, if anybody has any of those concerns, or requests, or changes, they need to be said now. Otherwise, Carrie is going to direct staff to proceed with what we have in front of us.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Our goal is to have a motion on this today, to be able to move forward so they can do this. Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, to that point, do we have to call -- To go into Full Council, to have the Full Council vote, or can the committee vote this to move forward?

 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I will leave that up to the chairman, but I do think what we're trying to do is make sure that we have this full council here in agreement that we want to do it this way, and be able to bring it up, and so, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you would like, I would make such a motion.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Hang on one second.

MR. ANSON: The way that Carrie recommends, or says, we can do this is to go ahead and make that basically one of the first items when we get to Full Council on Wednesday, and so we'll be officially in business in Full Council, and then that gives us another couple of days to maybe think about some things, and changes, and hopefully they're not too big, because they do have to submit it by that time, and so, if you could think of them -- If you think of any of those changes, kind of talk it over with staff, and make sure it's somewhat reasonable, and doable, relative to the timeline they're facing, and then be prepared to bring it to Full Council, if they can complete the change, and so that's, I think, how we're going to operate.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: You know, obviously, if you've got heartburn, that's the problem, if there's something we need to change that's going to be big-time, that's going to be -- Then we need the time to work on that. Obviously, I agree with you that Full Council is going to need to vote on it, and I don't know if we can recommend bringing this to Full Council, and we can have a motion to do that, but, other than that, I'm not sure if we want to make a full vote. Go ahead, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I would like to move that we recommend the council approve the draft Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council proposal for Phase II Inflation Reduction Act funding, as outlined in Tab G, Number 8.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Do I have a second?

MR. DUGAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Any discussion on this? Any opposed? If not, then the motion carries. You know, if you wake up in the middle of the night, and happen to think about something, and it's nothing major, you can always bring it up to us, you know, and we can sit down with it and try to do something, but the big deal is to try to get everything for the paperwork, to where they can have it in on Wednesday. All right. Where are we at

now? Are we still trying to bring this up? Did you want to go ahead and try to do the -- I think she has a slide presentation for us.

REVIEW AND FINALIZE THE STEERING COMMITTEE MAKEUP FOR THE RECREATIONAL INITIATIVE

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chair, if we could. I will introduce it, if that's okay. The next item is to review and finalize the steering committee makeup for the recreational initiative, and so you approved this, moving forward with the recreational initiative, in October of 2023.

We put together a presentation to try to show what we think the roles, and the responsibilities, of the steering committee is going to be for this effort, and we tried to think about, in some of the slides, what would the feedback loop be to the council, and when we anticipate you receiving that information, once we get this consultant onboarded, and so that's what we've tried to lay out in the presentation.

If you would provide any changes to the makeup of this steering committee, via a motion, and then the chair should request council members that want to volunteer for those currently two proposed positions on the steering committee, and then, at the end of the meeting on Thursday, when we do the report, the chair will make an announcement on who those members are. Mr. Spraggins.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Go ahead with the presentation.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: Okay. Bernie, if you can pull up Tab G, Number 9(a) for me. This presentation, I'm going to begin with a little bit of a review of the recreational initiative, just to remind the folks around the table, as well as sort of introduce this to the people in the back of the room, or listening online, that maybe have not been a part of this discussion yet, and then I'm going to move on and focus really on the roles, and the responsibilities, of the steering committee and sort of how we see that process working.

 If you remember, the recreational initiative itself is really an effort that the council is embarking on to engage recreational anglers and associated industry members. We really want to review and evaluate some of our past and current management strategies and see if we can come up with some potential innovative management strategies that could be applied in the future.

We expect that any lessons, or recommendations, that result from this effort could be used to inform council recreational management measures. At its core, we recognize that the recreational sector, in many ways, is not satisfied with their fishing experience, and so we really want to take a moment to sort of step back and look at things holistically and figure out if there's a better way to do this, moving forward.

This plan to deal with this recreational initiative sort of has three components. As I mentioned, this presentation, and what we're doing today, is we're going to try and focus on the steering committee, but I think it's helpful if I sort of let you know, or remind you, of the three components that are going to go into this whole plan.

First, the steering committee is going to be made up of council and agency folks, sort of those interworking folks, and this steering committee is going to be tasked with overseeing and working very closely with the consultant, and that's the next part that I will talk to you about, planning meetings of the working group, and making sure that the right background materials, and reports, are produced through the consultant, and coordinating work on non-workgroup products with the consultant.

I don't know if you remember, but there was that list of like six things that we aim to do through this initiative, and a couple of them were actually not going to be done through the working group, and so the steering committee is going to be kind of working in the backend, with the agency, in order to get work done on those parts, and we do expect there to be monthly meetings of this steering committee, as well as we expect attendance to the actual working group meetings, when that happens. As you can see, this graphic is supposed to kind of show you that these groups all sort of feed into the work of the working group.

The next component is our consultant. That consultant is going to be providing us with professional assistance. They're the ones that are going to be scheduling the steering committee meetings and setting the agendas and making sure that that steering committee is sort of working alongside, to make sure that this initiative is successful.

 They're going to plan, and coordinate, our monthly meetings, and they're going to conduct, and facilitate, the workgroup meetings, and they're also going to develop the reports of the workgroup outcomes.

4 5

This working group, which is our third component, is really the core of this initiative, and this working group is going to be comprised of industry members and fishermen, and they are the ones that are going to be sort of making -- Generating advice and doing the evaluating of our past, current, and potential future management strategies, and so they're going to be attending meetings. They're going to be doing all of the work at those meetings, and so hopefully that's a good overview of sort of the three components that we see.

Then we'll focus mostly on the steering committee, and this steering committee is going to be a core group of individuals who are going to work closely with the consultant to direct work on this initiative, go through the working group, and then, as I mentioned, some of those initiatives that need to be done through coordination with the agencies.

Here is just sort of the scope of work that we've laid out for the steering committee. We're going to ask them first to look at the consultant applications and help select a consultant to guide us through this recreational initiative. They are going to be developing agendas for the working group, also developing the objectives of that working group, and they're going to be reviewing, and synthesizing, the outputs of the working group, and so that's going to be done in concert with the consultant.

They're also going to determine when outcomes, and the deliverables, are ready for council review, and they're going to work with the consultant to develop a stakeholder engagement plan, as well as coordinate all that work on the non-workgroup products.

As we discussed sort of briefly at the last meeting, when we introduced this initiative to you guys, we envision that there's going to be no more than six people on this steering committee. You know, as I sort of briefly mentioned, the steering committee is going to have quite a load on them, and it's going to be actually like a working group, and so we're looking at the idea that we'll have two NOAA Fisheries staff members, and we suggest here that potentially the Southeast Regional, or the National Recreational Fisheries, Policy Coordinator might appropriate person for this role, and that the Regional, Assistant Regional, Administrator would also be appropriate for this role.

We are expecting to have one staff member from the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and then two council members that represent the recreational sector, and then, also, Carrie, the council's Executive Director, will be on the steering committee.

MR. DIAZ: Did you want us to stop you if we had some comments, or did you want to wait until the end?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: That's at the discretion of our chair.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: It's totally up to you. You're giving the briefing, and I will let you decide.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I have three more slides, and so how about I roll through more of the expectations of the steering committee, and then we'll go for it? Okay. Thank you. All right. Next slide, please.

If you are at the council table, and you're thinking that you are a perfect fit for this role, I just want to talk a little bit about what your responsibilities would be. In the time period that we have planned this initiative, it should be about a sixteen-month process, and we did commit to having monthly meetings, at the least, right, and so, if you are going to be the council member that is part of this, it's not a small commitment, right, and so you're going to be asked to be meeting monthly for about a year-and-a-half.

We also expect that you will be able to attend our working group meetings in-person, and we anticipate that there is going to be three of those meetings. They could range anywhere from one-and-a-half to three days each, right, and so I just want you to sort of think about the type of commitment here that we're going for.

The other things that I want to note that we're going to ask you guys to do, and we sort of already went over this, we review the consultant applications, coordinate development of background material, and so there is going to actually be a little bit of work that needs to be done through this body, and then you're going to be coordinating work on those non-workgroup products, synthesizing the discussions and recommendations, and so, after that workgroup has meetings, we're going to expect this steering committee to be helpful in sort of putting together the reports and then making sure that you're reviewing all of the deliverables and outcomes and basically overseeing the consultant.

This is my last slide, and so I just wanted to give you a proposed timeline for this year. What you will notice is, at

the very top, we've got our calendar laid out. The little flowery thing is the council meetings, and so I just wanted to sort of talk a little bit about how we see the flow between the council and the steering committee and everybody going.

As I mentioned, in January, it is the council's responsibility to appoint the steering committee. Once that steering committee is appointed, you will notice that, throughout the spring, the steering committee is going to select a consultant and begin working, and planning, on the workgroup meetings and really planning out the flow of this initiative.

We expect the first update to come from the steering committee to the council in June. In June, it's going to review progress and actually initiate the application process for this working group. Then, over the summer, we're going to develop the working group agenda and background materials. In August, the council will appoint the working group, and then approve the agendas, and then we expect to have our first working group meeting in September, and then the steering committee will be synthesizing the outcomes and present those in our early November council meeting, and then we'll talk about trying to plan, and to execute, the second meeting between then and the end of the year.

Hopefully that sort of lays out what we're looking for. I think our goal here today is to talk a little bit and make sure that we are all comfortable with this steering committee setup and figure out who is going to be the lucky winners of those seats.

 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Thank you very much for your presentation there, and I do think, that when we say "recreational", we're talking charter-for-hire also, and so just understand that, and then I think that that is included in that, and so, right now, I'll open it up, and I think you've got a question, Mr. Diaz?

MR. DIAZ: I have a couple of comments. First, I like your last slide, because I think, a lot of times, we could have council members going in different directions a lot of times, and so, at the last meeting, when we discussed this, when I originally read through it, it said recreational council members, and, in my mind, I thought private recreational representatives.

 At the last meeting, we had discussion on it, and it was pointed out that it could be charter-for-hire or private, and, during the discussion, I agreed with that. I think there's room at the table for everybody, but I did talk to another council member this morning, and I would like to expand this steering

committee, or at least consider expanding the steering committee, to seven members and have an option for three council members, if we had three willing to step up.

Those three, of those three, two of them would be private recreational representatives, and one of them would be a charter boat representative, and so that's just my two-cents, and kind of what I think. Like I said, when I originally read this, I was focused on private rec, and I thought that was the best way to go, but I could see where there's room around, and so I would like to see if we could have some discussion on this and see if other folks agree, disagree, or wherever people are at. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Well, real quick, one thing that I would like to ask a question to the staff, and to Carrie, is do we have the funds to be able to afford someone, because I know, with our budget the way we are, and if we're talking three inperson meetings, that's another council person that's going to have to be paid for, and is that something that we want to talk about? Is there funding there for that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so we would have to revise the budget and consider that, and, yes, we have the funding if you want to do that. My concern more is like logistics, and we're already at that number of people, and trying to get together on a date. I mean, my thinking is we go ahead and establish -- Once we get the group, you know, this is a good week, and we want to try to meet every month in this week, or something like that, but we're agreeing that we're going to move forward and meet with whoever is available. I mean, if you start getting too many people, it gets very difficult to work around that many people's schedule, would be more my concern than budget, actually.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Go ahead, sir.

MR. DIAZ: I agree with your concern, Dr. Simmons. I think that's valid, but I do think this is a very important initiative, and I think our recreational members on the council will have some really good input, and I think they're the most valuable people on this steering committee, and, because of that, I think it's worth trying to work through the concern about logistics.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with Dale, and I was

actually going to bring it up and ask the same question, adding a third council member. I have a couple of questions for Emily that doesn't pertain to that question, but one question that does is where are the meetings? Are they virtual, or are they in-person at the office, or what's the plan?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I think there's sixteen that are going to be virtual, and then there's up to three that will be in-person.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Yes, absolutely, and I don't think that we've determined the best place to have the -- There we go, and so two of the workgroups are in Tampa, and then one of them will be somewhere else, is what we have proposed. Those are the inperson ones that are one-and-a-half to three days.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. I agree with Mr. Diaz. As I'm considering raising my hand for this, it looks like a ton of work. I mean, on the chart here, the steering committee has more work than the actual working group does, that I can see, and so, if I were on such a committee, I think having another additional council member on there would be helpful, and then, on the sixteen meetings that we're talking about, there's going to be a chance that one of us can't make one of sixteen meetings, and so, if there were three, we would potentially have it covered.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your committee, but just one other thought that I had, kind of operating along those lines, as I've been kind of trying to digest all this and what the steering committee makeup would be, and one that may be open for discussion would be an SSC representative on there, to see how this could all be operationalized from that perspective, and it's just a thought. I see the pain on your face, but --

 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: One question I have, and I guess, number one, is do we have three members on the committee here, the council, that would be willing? That's number one. You know, before we try to change this thing, to say that we want to change it from two to three, do we have at least three that are willing to do something with this? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I'm not on your committee, and, I mean, I would certainly like to put my name in the hat, if we do decide to add a third for charter-for-hire. If we only

have the two, I would like to be considered for that charter-for-hire representative. I mean, that is our sole business, and that's what we do, and I also interact daily with the commercial -- Excuse me, not the commercial, but the private recreational fishermen, at our fuel dock, when they come and fuel. I talk to them on a daily basis about what they see, and so I would like to be considered, and so, if you're looking for two or three, I would like to be considered for one of those. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Chris.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on the committee MR. SCHIEBLE: either, and I agree with this, to add another position, and I was going to suggest the same thing, to get the count up to seven, for the simple standpoint of, if the steering committee gets to a point where they need to make a decision, or a tough spot and they need to vote, instead of having an even number, you would have an odd number, where you could have a favor, as As far as the committee, that's their far as a vote goes. whether they want to make it а recreational representative or an SSC member.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When we were envisioning this, we weren't thinking that we would need an SSC member on the steering committee, but, once we get an idea of the various objectives that we're trying to tackle at each of those meetings, and after the council appoints the working group, and what we're trying to operationalize, those aspects of the larger initiative -- Once we get those agendas framed out, we're going to have to engage with the Science Center, and we're going to have to engage with the Regional Office, and we're going to have to figure out what materials and scope we're going to bring for those meetings, and so, at that time, to me, it might be more appropriate to engage with the SSC, was my thinking.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Mr. Williamson.

MR. TROY WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I totally agree with Dale's assessment of what needs to happen on this committee, and I don't want to gild the lily too much, but I think we're required to make a motion to change the composition of the members from six to seven. I would make that motion, that the number of recreational council members on the steering committee be increased from two to three, and be composed of two recreational fishermen and one charter-for-hire.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second? We've got a second. Is there any discussion on this? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a little out of my normal ballpark, but I agree, fundamentally, with what Dale had suggested, but I think the basis for this is that we don't want to exclude charter-for-hire representation on the steering committee.

That says, to me, that it doesn't have to be three, and it could be two, but the point is that we don't want to exclude them from the process. After all, the steering committee doesn't give direction. They are overseeing, in effect, and having that viewpoint is important, but it doesn't necessitate going to three, and, as Dr. Simmons pointed out, there is logistics, and budgetary reasons, which suggests that, if we can do it with two, that might be better. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks. I'm not on your committee, and the intent was never to exclude charter, right, and, when I made the motion for the initiative, the intent was always that this would be an initiative that is inclusive of both private recreational fishing and charter boat activities, simply because red snapper only fishery that we actually implement separation, and separate out those two sectors, and everyone else is managed collectively as a recreational sector, with catch limits and accountability measures, and so I'm supportive of, obviously, this recommendation, and I just wanted to say that, and I'm not on your committee.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Yes, go ahead.

DR. KESLEY BANKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm also not on your committee, but, before you vote, may I make a suggestion that -- Maybe take a show of hands of who wants to be on this committee, to see if you have enough to go up to three, before we go down a rabbit hole that may or may not be fruitful?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I have no problem with that, and that's what I was trying to get, and Ms. Boggs is the only one, so far, that I have heard, and so, you know, I would entertain that now, you know, if we can get a show of hands. Is there anybody on the recreational or charter-for-hire that is on the council now that would be willing to be on this? I am seeing four. Looking

at that, I'm seeing two private and two charter, basically, and is that right? Yes, Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: So I suppose, by definition, I'm charter, but I kind of consider myself fifty-fifty recreational and charter, and so, you know, either one, however you want to decide it, and, you know, if you need me, I will take on the job, and, if you don't, that's okay.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I mean, we'll make this work, but I guess, just back to Mr. Gill's point, and we're not going to operate in a vacuum. I mean, this information, and this framing of the meeting, and so the steering committee -- On the various materials we think we can gather for those meetings, it's going to come back to the council, and that's we tried to lay out in the presentation. We're not going to be operating in a vacuum, where the council doesn't have a say in what we're doing before we execute the meetings, and I just wanted to make that clear.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. I think that -- Go ahead, Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I didn't want to interrupt your thought, but, the way I was looking at this, just for transparency, is that I would be referring to basically the seat that you're filling now, and what your affiliation is now with the council, rather than self-identifying here with the group today, and so that's how I was looking at this.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. I guess that, if we're going to try to fill these positions today, or even make a motion to it, and do we have to take a vote on this, since we have four people?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think the plan, Mr. Chair, was to vote on the motion, if we're going to change the actual makeup, get any other names that want to volunteer for the position, and then, when we get to the Thursday at Full Council, when we're going through the report, I believe the announcement is going to be made for who is on the committee.

 CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay, and so, right now, we have a motion and a second on what we have on the board, and I guess do we have any further discussion on this motion? No discussion. Is anybody against this motion of increasing it from two to three, with two recreational and one for-hire? If not, the motion carries. Mr. Dugas.

 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One more, Emily. Pertaining to the working group, how are those people/fishermen going to be chosen? You mentioned maybe appointed?

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: When we hire the consultant, and we get the steering committee together, we're going to talk about the different type of expertise that they're going to recommend, and the different meetings, and what we're going to try to operationalize in those meetings, and the materials that we're going to put together, and then we're going to come up with an outline for the council to consider for appointing them, kind of like we did with the focus group, and then you're going to look at that, and provide feedback, and then we're going to advertise, and then you're going to appoint them in a closed session.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: I would caution, each and every one of that four that are looking at this, please make sure that you're willing to put the time in to do it, because this is not a committee that's going to be just an easy thing, and, if you're not willing to put the majority of your time, to make one-hourplus, sixteen times in the next sixteen months, and at least travel to three different ones, understand that you will still have a part. You will still have a part in this, because it will be transparent, but I would just caution you, before we get to the final vote on that. Yes, Mr. Anson.

 MR. ANSON: Emily, the schedule kind of said the selection process, or the application process, would be in the height of summer, and does that create any issues, as far as folks getting — You know, hearing that there's a request for this type of person to serve on this particular group, or should it be delayed, for just a month or two?

 MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I think that would be up to your discretion. I have full confidence that we can advertise in a way that will make space for people to be able to apply to it. I mean, I think the application process will be very similar to our AP application, and it shouldn't take somebody too, too long in order to fill out that, and I have confidence that actually, while people are in the height of fishing, they might actually be in the height of thinking about fishing, and so maybe it's actually a strike-while-the-iron-is-hot situation, and it could go either way though.

CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Okay. Anything else on that? Thank you

1	for the presentation, and I think we're down to Other Business,
2	right?
3	
4	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chair.
5	
6	CHAIRMAN SPRAGGINS: Any other business to be brought up in the
7	Administrative/Budget Committee? If not, Mr. Chairman, I'm
8	going to give you back thirty-eight seconds.
9	
10	(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 29, 2024.)
11	
12	