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PAGE 11: Motion to accept the 2018 proposed budget, as written. The motion carried on page 11.
The Administrative/Budget Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Renaissance Battle House, Mobile Alabama, Monday morning, October 22, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Doug Boyd.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN DOUG BOYD: The Admin/Budget Committee is called together. Let me read the new names of the members. Mr. Boyd is Chair, Dr. Mickle is Vice Chair, Mr. Banks is on the committee, Ms. Boggs, Ms. Guyas, Mr. Riechers, and Dr. Shipp, and Dr. Shipp is absent today. We will start out with the Adoption of the Agenda. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. It’s moved and seconded by Ms. Guyas. Approval of the April 2018 Minutes, everyone I’m sure has studied them in complete detail. Dr. Mickle, you were Chair last time. Any comments from you? Are you all right with the minutes? Okay. All right. Is there a motion to accept the minutes?

MR. RIECHERS: Move to accept as written.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Moved by Mr. Riechers and seconded by Ms. Guyas. The Action Guide and Next Steps, Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have two main action items. We have the approval of the 2018 funded budget, and so we’ll be asking the committee for a motion, after we review that today, and we’ll also touch on the 2019 planning and then talk a little bit about the next five-year funding cycle. We did receive two additional contracts, $45,000 with the Regional Office for the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting efforts, and the essential fish habitat projects, and we had $75,000, and so we’ll talk a little bit about those.

The other main agenda item that we’ll also ask you to take action on today is we have three main sections of the SOPPs that we’ll review, and then we have some other minor changes that we’ll walk you through, and so we’ll ask you for a motion on that as well. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOYD: Thank you, Dr. Simmons. Approval for the Funded Budget, Beth.

APPROVAL OF FUNDED BUDGET

MS. BETH HAGER: Turning to Tab G, Number 4, we’re presenting the committee here with the original 2018 budget, a proposed budget, based on our total funded for 2018, and the year-to-date expenditures for 2018, with the balances, and so those are our four columns that we’re going to review.

We received an additional $146,000 this year from NOAA, in mid-July, after the appropriations were completed. Additional funds were given to all councils this year based on the requirement that we complete a comprehensive review of our existing regulations. Staff had completed this effort, and the council reviewed and approved it back in June.

We have also been notified by NMFS that we need to produce our documents in a format that is compliant with Section 508 standards and guidelines, and these guidelines ensure that information and communications are accessible to individuals with disabilities. This effort will require in-depth training of all staff. In consideration of these additional initiatives, and given significant changes in staff this year, it’s our intention to utilize the additional funds for staff support.

We have had two staff members retire, two staff members promoted, and we’re currently hiring a replacement fishery biologist. You can see the adjustment between the two budgets from the original and then the funded in the lines of salaries, taxes, and associated benefits.

Our year-to-date expenditures cover the elapsed 75 percent of the year, of which we have spent 71 percent of our funding. Although we have many activities planned for the last quarter of 2018, we have also engaged in several efforts to reduce spending this year.

We have switched to a lower-cost health insurance plan, and that was a savings of about $30,000, and we moved our office to less-expensive space, and we also had a delay in moving in, and so that was a total savings of about $60,000 per year, and I recently renegotiated a fixed-price copier lease for us through GSA, and that’s expected to save us more than $25,000 over the course of the next few years, due to that.

Overall, we project that 2018 will end slightly under budget,
due to these cost-saving measures. As we look toward planning
activities in the final year of our five-year award, we will be
including two additional contracts that we received to complete
the EFH work that Carrie mentioned, and that will be about
$75,000, and to assist with the workshops for the implementation
of the for-hire electronic reporting amendment, and that’s the
SEFHIER, which is $45,000. Those will be in 2019, but they are
not budgeted in the 2018 re-budget. The 2018 re-budget just
includes the additional $146,000 that we received, and that’s
all.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. Thank you, Beth. Beth and I were
talking earlier, and Carrie, and the five-year grant ends in
2019, and they’re going to be working, starting in the very near
future, on the 2020 grants and the budget for that. Any
questions for Beth or Carrie on the budget? Kevin.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Boyd. I’m not on your
committee, but just were you still going to talk about those two
new funding -- I am particularly interested in the SEFHIER and
what the council is going to be doing for that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, I can talk a little bit about
that, and I will let probably Emily and John help me fill in the
gaps there. We are going to do I think it’s fifteen in-person
workshops with the Regional Office staff, and we’re going to
help with the planning of those across the Gulf. We’re going to
do I think it’s several webinars, eight or nine webinars, I
believe, that we’re going to help set up, and we have to really
set up some meetings with them and determine the timing.

I think we’re going to hear some presentations later this week
about the implementation of that document and where they see the
timing going, but I don’t know how early next year we’re going
to be focusing on that, but we are going to be busy helping with
those. If you don’t mind, I will let Dr. Froeschke talk about
the EFH project, because he was more actively involved in that
contract.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: Okay, and so John is directing me just to
fill in a little bit of the gaps about the SEFHIER, because, in
front of me, I have our scope of work. What we’ve done is we’ve
decided to partner with the Regional Office. My understanding
is that we expect a final rule to be published in January, and
then there are going to be two phases of implementation here.

In the first phase, we will be requiring the electronic logbooks
for the for-hire component of the fishery, and that will start
on April 1. Then, on October 1, we will add in the minimum
archiving GPS requirement, and so what we have done is we have
partnered with the Southeast Regional Office, and we are going
to host anywhere from twelve to fourteen in-person outreach
meetings across the region to educate our fishermen about the
requirements for the upcoming for-hire electronic reporting
regulations.

We noted that, at a minimum, there should be one meeting per
region, and meetings can be scheduled anytime between now and
May of 2019, and we also committed to holding five webinars to
educate fishermen about the requirements, and then we are going
to provide a detailed summary of each meeting, much like you
have seen in our public hearing reports. I don’t know if
there’s any questions before we move on to the ecosystem stuff.


MS. SUSAN BOGGS: What was the timeline on the AGPS meetings?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Emily?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: AGPS?

MS. BOGGS: The archivable GPS, and you mentioned something
specifically about those.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Got you. Okay. Sorry. We know that the final
rule is going to publish in January, and the use of the GPS is
starting on October 1, and so these meetings, I think, are all
going to be happening before then, but it’s my understanding
that October 1 is when the GPS component of that ruling is going
to be coming out.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: General Counsel.

MS. MARA LEVY: Thank you. I just want to caution a bit,
because we haven’t published a proposed rule yet, and so I don’t
think we know exactly when a final rule is going to publish and
the exact timing of that, and so these might be sort of the
aspirational dates, but we’re a little bit ahead of ourselves,
in terms of exact timing.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, again. Emily or Dr. Simmons, this is
just for administrative portions then of the new regulations
regarding reporting, and it’s not going to be anything related
to technical aspects or the training that’s involved with the implementation of the logbooks or the GPS, correct?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Correct. This sum of money is simply to host sort of the outreach component of implementation.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I guess I was a little confused by your question, but I understand what you’re asking now, Kevin. I think we should just — We do need to have several meetings, and we need to work with the Regional Office staff and really see about the timing on this, and so I think any dates that Emily mentioned, as Mara said, are kind of our goal, but we really need to talk about how we’re going to lay these out, especially with any other council activities that we need to go out and cover in the early spring of next year, and so we haven’t really gotten to that stage yet, and so we kind of got a little bit more detail than I was hoping to get in at this meeting regarding that project, but we would bring back more once we’ve met with them in early 2019, at that January meeting, to discuss.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Thank you. Any other questions? All right. I would like to have a motion to —

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: The $146,000, did you want a little information about that?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, do you want to comment on that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just might clarify that $75,000 — I think maybe John could just walk through what the goals and objectives of that additional funding were, if you don’t mind.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. John.

DR. FROESCHKE: What this is, just briefly, the councils are required to identify and describe essential fish habitat for the species that we manage across the various FMPs. All councils do this, and it turns out that nearly all the councils do it in different ways, based on data availability, or perhaps other things, and so the objective of this is to sort of take an inventory of all the different methods that they use, whether they be model-based or expert guidance or things like that, and
take our own definitions of EFH and apply the various methods to them.

The point of this would be how would our definition of EFH look if we used, for example, the North Pacific methodology or the Mid-Atlantic or something like that, just to give a better contrast of the manner in which we identify and describe EFH in our region and make sure that it’s up-to-date in both the current methods and it reflects the best use of the data that we have, and so, as part of that, we’re compiling -- We have some data, both environmental data and the fish data, and we’re using that across a variety of methods.

We have a literature report, and so we’ll be producing a white paper kind of document summarizing the changes, or at least describing how different methods would affect what we would identify as EFH. If you recall, last year, we did a five-year EFH review, and we outlined some potential updates to the way that we identify EFH in that, and the Regional Office did give us a response letter, and they asked us -- We’ll be asking the council to review their EFH information, as time and priorities allow, and so we’ll probably get the Habitat Committee together in January.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: John, I’ve got a question. Do we coordinate or use the EFH definition that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service uses? Is that a part of this?

DR. FROESCHKE: The definition that we use comes from Magnuson. I am not sure what the U.S. Fish and Wildlife is, in terms of that, and I suspect it’s similar, but I don’t know.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Thank you. Any further discussion? Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I just feel like we’ve spent a lot of time on those two contracts, and so I just -- I didn’t know if anybody had any questions on the actual 2018 funded budget.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Any questions? One of the things that I wanted to note was that we’re going to have some reduction in expenses based on the new office space that we’ve got, and I don’t know what the exact amount is. Beth, do we know?

MS. HAGER: Approximately $60,000 a year, at least, and that’s the initial onset. Then, going forward, the other leases would have been expected to increase much higher and faster than the space that we’re in now, and so it’s a pretty substantial savings. Even just the move itself saved us about $38,000 in
this year alone.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Was that a net figure?

MS. HAGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Okay. All right. Any other questions? If not, I will entertain a motion to accept the budget. Robin.

MR. RIECHERS: I would move that we accept the 2018 proposed budget, as final.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: I have a second by Dr. Mickle. Any further discussion? All in favor, please say aye; all opposed. The motion carries.

Next on the agenda is the Review of the Proposed Modifications to the SOPPs. Dr. Simmons.

REVIEW PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE SOPPS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is in Tab G, Number 5, and it’s in track changes, and so we’ll start on page 5, Section 2.5, with the SSC, the Scientific and Statistical Committee.

You can see the second paragraph there, and we have modified it, the language, to say: “During the appointment process of the Standing SSC, the council shall appoint no more than eighteen individuals, which will include --” Then there are no other changes.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Any discussion? Dr. Mickle.

DR. PAUL MICKLE: This is the proposed change for 2.5, and don’t we currently have nineteen individuals on the Standing SSC?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Correct, and so we were proposing this language because there was an individual put on after the appointment process, and so we now have more, which is what the original language was, “will consist of”, and so we were suggesting this language.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: To that point, I pulled up the website, and I pulled up the Standing, and it doesn’t say, categorically, which scientists are which. It’s composing of eighteen individuals,
which will include approximately seven stock assessment or
quantitative biologists/ecologists, three ecosystem scientists,
three economists, three quantitative anthropologists, and two
other scientists.

If someone goes to the website, like myself, and looks, we see
nineteen folks on Standing, but I can’t figure out which is put
into which category, and I know we’ve had a lot of discussions
in the past of the SSC and its overall goals, and I’ve been very
vocal on what I think the SSC, the Standing in particular,
should provide to the council and how it should provide it, and
I think providing a little clarity on the categorical of who is
put into which seven and two and three and what those two others
are, and who those two others are would provide a little more
structure to the Standing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Mickle, are you suggesting that we do that
on the website or someplace else?

DR. MICKLE: Yes, I think it’s an easy change, just providing
the visible structure, on the website itself. I mean, I would
like to amend the SOPPs to say that the designated shall be
posted on areas where they are identified within the group. I
would like to formalize it like that, but, again, input from the
group, but it’s just something I feel that the Standing needs.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Simmons, do you think we need a motion to do
that, or is that just a simple administrative change?

DR. TOM FRAZER: Doug, I was just trying to reflect on the
meeting that we had, and it was in closed session, right, and so
I know that, as we were identifying individuals to serve on the
Standing Committee, we tried to capture those areas, but I don’t
know if we have documented that anywhere, and so that’s a
question, a procedural one, I guess, moving forward.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Well, what is the pleasure of the committee on
Dr. Mickle’s recommendation? Do you want to have a motion to
clarify? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I have a question back to the first thing that I
think that Dr. Mickle was discussing. The document reads
eighteen individuals, and we have nineteen, and so do we need to
amend the document to reflect nineteen, or do we need to remove
one from the SSC?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Simmons.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Let me try to explain. This is what staff was trying to do. We have nineteen individuals. The council put on an additional individual outside of the normal appointment process, but the council put on eighteen individuals during the normal appointment process, and so, instead of just changing the number in the SOPPs, we were just suggesting saying, at the time of the process, you would appoint eighteen members. You can put as many on there as the budget will allow after the fact, but, at the time of appointment, you’re putting eighteen members on there, is what we were suggesting.

To Dr. Mickle’s point, I think it’s a nice idea. The problem I think we might have is maybe the way the council classified folks. There may be overlap, and maybe they classify themselves differently, or they say they have multiple disciplines. It may seem straightforward, but I’m not sure how that would work with the SSC. Maybe we could talk to the Chair and Vice Chair about it before we just put something like that on the website. I would ask that.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Mickle, would you be okay with that? Yes, Mara.

MS. LEVY: A couple of comments. I understand why this is being proposed, but it sort of seems like you have the SOPPs that specifies something, and then you decide to do something different as the council, which we’ve said the SOPPs aren’t really legally binding, but they are supposed to guide how you operate, and then, in order to reflect that, we changed the SOPPs.

I guess my question is, is changing it right now to reflect what happened during the last appointment process really something that you want to do? Are you going to change it every time you decide as a council that you’re not going to do exactly what it says?

I guess that’s up to you, and then the idea of, during the appointment process you can have no more than eighteen, and I guess that’s fine with me, but I foresee a time in the future where you might be appointing people to the SSC and someone might say, well, I really want nineteen during the appointment process, and so I guess I’m just asking you to think about why you would be changing it and what the impact may or may not be for the future, and I tend to agree with the designating people.

I mean, I guess that would be your prerogative, but that would
be the council’s, or one person’s opinion on the council, about
where that person falls in those different categories, and it
may not be how they classify themselves, or they may have
multiple disciplines.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: To that point, SOPPs are guidance, right, and so I
think providing more structure to the SOPPs gives us more
direction, and I know this is going to complicate things,
because the categorical variables we’re going to give these are
seven stock assessment or quantitative biologists/ecologists,
three ecosystem scientists, three economists, over and over,
like I just said, and so, when we go into these selection
processes, we’re going to have to talk about that, right, and so
we’re all going to be around the table saying, well, we already
have three of that category, and we already have three, and we
already have that seven, but that engages all of us to keep our
eye on what we want specialized in the Standing, right, and so
it brings us back on what we want the Standing to be, and I feel
that more structure in the SOPPs give us that, I guess,
structure that we need to move forward and to keep those
conversations coming up and straying from some things that may
lead the Standing SSC into being particularly, maybe even, in
the worst-case scenario, a political forum, which we certainly —
—I hope none of us want down the road, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Any further discussion? Yes, John.

MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: Yes, I agree with you, and I was supportive
of the change made last time, because of personal, friendly
reasons and this and that, but, since then, I’ve had a chance to
think about it, and I think that this body should be science and
statistical, and we should try to keep it, in the future, going
forward, with people with those backgrounds and that expertise
to it, so that we can continue to do science-based management
and leave the political science to this group here.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Thank you, John. Any further questions or
comments? All right. Carrie, do you want us to vote on
particular sections as we go or the whole document and changes?
I would rather do it the whole document and changes, if we can,
to save time.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, that would be ideal. I guess
I’m just not sure about the website information. We can maybe
have a motion on that separately, if that’s what the committee
would like us to do, and work with the Chair and Vice Chair and
the SSC members individually to classify themselves before we put that on the website, and perhaps we should have that as a separate, stand-alone motion after we're done, if you wouldn’t mind.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. We will come back to that then.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: All right. Let's move on to page 7. Under 2.6.2, Members and Chair, this considers formalizing the requests of outgoing council members for advisory panel appointments, and this had been done I guess ad hoc with the Executive Director and the Council Chair in the past. I am asking the committee and council if they would like to formalize this, with this text or other language you would like to see, and this is what we're suggesting: “Outgoing council members may request to be placed on an AP of their choice until the time of reappointment.”

At the time of reappointment then, they would have to follow the normal practice of applying, like other advisory panel members, and so that was our proposal there, and then the language in the second paragraph that is struck-through is outdated language regarding our Law Enforcement AP. We don’t have that an AP anymore. It’s a technical committee, and so I will stop and see if there is questions.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Ms. Boggs, questions?

MS. BOGGS: I actually just have a comment, and I’m okay with this language, but, based on the conversation we just had with the SSC and what I read in that, I think that we need to add AP of their choice as long as they meet the requirements, because the SSC is specific as to what you want on that committee, or is that not an AP?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Ms. Guyas.

MS. MARTHA GUYAS: Just so that I’m clear, the council member that is outgoing could request to be placed, or placed, on an AP, but it’s still ultimately a council discussion and decision, or is it -- Yes, and I’m seeing head-nods. Okay. I think I’m cool with this then.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Any further questions or comments? Mr. Chairman.

DR. FRAZER: I would just like to get Carrie to weigh-in on that and clarify it a little bit, to Martha’s point.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: We could add some language that says “at the discretion of the council”, or something like that, because it hasn’t been the whole council. It’s been the Executive Director and the Chair in the past. Like I said, this wasn’t formalized.

For example, Dr. Dana is on the Coastal Migratory Pelagics AP, when she came off the council, and Captain Johnny Greene is on the Reef Fish Advisory Panel, until reappointment, and so this is formalizing it, and so, if you would like to put that language in there, we could certainly do that.


MR. RIECHERS: A question or a clarification. Really, if we use this language, can we work on the language just a little bit? It just appears to be a little bit -- At least I’m not reading it quite correctly, but what you’re really trying to say is outgoing council members may request to be placed on an AP of their choice at the time the AP is reappointed, and is that what you’re saying, during the regular appointment process of APs?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That’s not what we’ve been doing. If that’s what the council would like to do, then I don’t think this language is necessary.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Robin.

MR. RIECHERS: No, it’s -- But I thought that’s what you were clarifying it to, and so I’m very confused about what you’re doing, because, no, you’re right that that’s not what we’ve been doing, and I -- Frankly, as long as we’re willing to go by our SOPPs, I am certainly not unwilling to go there, and I would even consider Martha’s comments further as well.

Just because we have had a practice for the past X number of years, started in the 1970s, it doesn’t mean that now, in 2018, that should be a practice that we’re still using in the same way we’ve used it in the past. It may have served us well, but there may be another discussion element about whether we want to continue doing it that way.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Leann.
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MS. LEANN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I’m not on your committee, but I was just going to -- Maybe in different words, what’s being said there, so we’re all on the same page. Council members roll off the council in some year, right, and say it’s this year, and say I roll off and I would like to be on the Shrimp AP, but the Shrimp AP is not up for reappointments for new members until 2021, right, and so, instead of having to wait until 2021, if I’m an outgoing council member, and I requested, if this language is approved, then the Chair and Vice Chair could approve me going on the Shrimp AP, once I’m off the council, but then, in 2021, when it’s time to reappoint members to that AP, I would have to apply, just like anybody else, at that point, and be appointed by the Full Council in closed session. This is just to give that outgoing council member the opportunity to go ahead and get on and not have to wait until that reappointment process.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: That’s the way I read this also, but I understand the confusion. Any other comments? Robin.

MR. RIECHERS: Well, I understand what you’re saying, Leann, and that may -- I am just not reading that sentence that way, and so it may just be me, and we could work for some clarification there, or, if everyone else is reading that sentence that way, then I’m the only one confused.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Mr. Chairman.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Boyd. I think Leann had this pretty spot-on, what the intent of the language is, and so, as long as the staff is appreciative of that, I think that we can work to go ahead and clarify this, as Robin suggested, because I think it is a little awkward, as written.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: We can have that language for the Full Council. I guess the other point that I think Ms. Guyas brought up, and also Mr. Riechers, is we didn’t have in there to request to who, the Chair or Vice Chair and Executive Director or Chair and Vice Chair, or how would you like me to try to word that for the Full Council?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Well, I would leave it up to you all. I mean, that’s the intent, is the Chair and Vice Chair would go ahead and approve that. Then, once the reappointment is necessary, it’s an application. Any other comments? Okay. Carrie, do you want to go on?
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you. Let’s go to page 8.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, just a minute. John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Just a quick question. Hypothetically, say they’re in the 2021 scenario. Say there is a couple of council members stepping off in the interim, from now to then, and they all want to be on the same AP. Now you have loaded it up to twenty-one, albeit that’s a temporary problem that will correct itself in 2021, and is everybody okay with doing that, for purposes of having a meeting and having a quorum and having people show up and all that? That’s just something to consider.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Mr. Chairman.

DR. FRAZER: Again, I just think the way that I would handle that, and I’m sure everybody before me would have handled that, is probably use some discretion there and try to make sure that things are balanced and use a little commonsense. If it was totally frontloaded like that, we would probably have individual discussions with those council members to try to place them in a more representative role, I guess.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Moving on to Section 2.7 on page 8, this is new text that staff is proposing regarding technical committees. I think it was in March of 2015 that the council passed a motion to make the Education and Outreach and the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel a technical committee, and also the Aquaculture Advisory Panel, and we have proposed some language that defines the makeup of those technical committees that wasn’t in the SOPPs for your review.

Let’s go through, and so, generally, we talk about technical committees can be made up of academics, agency, and industry personnel with expertise in relevant subject matter. They can advise and assist the council by reviewing relevant subject matter and providing recommendations.

That is very similar, I think, to what you have for the AP members, and then, for the makeup, we have proposed text for the Outreach and Education Technical Committee, and so that’s Section 2.7.1 that we have up on the screen. It’s composed of fifteen people, or consists of fifteen people, and what that membership makeup would be.
You also passed a motion, more recently, I think, allowing the use of proxy attendees for this technical committee, and so we’ve put that text in there as well. Then, for the Law Enforcement Technical Committee, we have some proposed language for the makeup of that committee, and we have asked — This committee, this technical committee, can actually have official proxies, and those are on our website, or designees, rather, is I think is what you call them, designees for that committee. That was one of the only APs at the time anyways that could have designees, and so you will see those folks reflected on our website, and so we tried to capture that here with this language as well.

One thing that’s been a little bit cumbersome, as far as us trying to track things, is there has been a lot of changes, I think, as far as with this technical committee for law enforcement, with folks that have moved on and they’ve gotten promotions, and there has been some membership changes. We are just asking to be notified when those occur. Staff did eventually find out, but it was through Steve VanderKooy, and so we’re asking — If the council agrees with this, we’ll ask that to be formalized.

Then also, if they’re sending a designee instead of the member, we’re asking for that information in advance for both of the technical committees, at least two weeks in advance, because that would be reflected on our meeting authorization, and we would know, for audit purposes, that that individual is that representative for that particular meeting, and we would be able to pay for their travel, and we would know what that person is doing, what they’re representing, and be able to categorize that meeting, and so that kind of is all-encompassing of the language we proposed.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, just for clarification, could you give a definition of an AP versus a technical committee and the defining difference, just so we’re all on the same page? Mara.

MS. LEVY: That was a perfect question for what I wanted to say. I would suggest adding, under Technical Committees, where you say who the members are and you’re saying technical committee, that a technical committee is a form of an AP, because, really, the council has SSCs, and you can make advisory panels.

Whether you call them a technical committee or an advisory panel, under the Act, they’re all advisory panels, and so you have decided to call these somewhat different, because I think
they’re made up of different types of folks, and it seems like
state representatives and stuff like that, and so they’re a
little bit different than your other APs, but, legally, they are
still APs.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Thank you. I’ve got a couple of comments. As far
as the two weeks notification for when a proxy will be there, I
think that’s fine, as long as the agenda is sent out well ahead
of that, and the reason I say that, and this relates to my other
comment, is, for example, if the Outreach and Education
Technical Committee is meeting, and they’re going to talk about
Facebook, we have a Facebook person that we would want to send
to that meeting who may not be specifically the outreach and
education person for that technical committee, and so we would
just need time to identify who is the right person to send.

Then, kind of on that note, maybe modifying the membership to
include six communications staff from the Gulf states, and maybe
communication or outreach and education, because we have
different folks who are technically communication folks, versus
outreach and education, at least the way our agency is
structured, and I think that will be helpful. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, can you incorporate General Counsel’s
comments without a motion, or are you going to need a motion to
do that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, I think we can do that. We
just need to make sure we put it in the committee report and
that the committee and council is comfortable with that language
that we’re putting in there.

I did have a question, if the committee is okay with this, with
the changes, or any other changes, but I wanted to go back to
Section 2.6.3. I had a question.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. Go ahead. Let’s finish this first.
Anybody have any other questions about this particular -- Yes, sir.

LT. MARK ZANOWICZ: Thank you. I was just wondering why there
wasn’t a Coast Guard representative listed on the LETC?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, are you looking that up in the language?
Thank you. Go ahead.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I apologize about that, but this was hairy. I mean, we spent a long time, Dr. Lasseter and I did, trying to work with Steve VanderKooy on this and looking at our website and looking through minutes and trying to figure out what we had done, and the fact that the Fish and Wildlife Service -- They have two appointments, essentially, for each region, and so I don’t know why it was so difficult, but we seemed like we struggled with it, and so I’m sorry about that. We will add you in there.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Doug. Just, if you add the Coast Guard, will that change that to ten people? I just want to make sure.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie, I am not going to be able to follow you. For some reason or another, my Adobe Acrobat wants me to sign into it, and I’ve never had to do that, and so I’m not going to have it up. Any other questions here? Kevin.

MR. ANSON: I am not on your committee, and I waited until you made your motion, but I am just curious on some clarification, I guess, on the second paragraph on page 8, in Section 2.6.2. There is a strikeout there, and “a period of” has been edited, or modified, and it’s been removed.

It goes back to a comment that John had brought up relative to the timing of the appointments, when they come up for annual appointment and you’ve got some staggered terms in there. The way I read this paragraph is that, if a council member -- Maybe it’s not. Well, how long will a council member be able to stay on, if they request, after they depart? They’re able to stay on for how long, I guess? It is just every year they will get appointed, just out of respect, or deference, that first time, and then, next time, they’ve got to apply, and is that how it would work?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: I will let Carrie respond to that, but my understanding is, in the discussions, that, if they’re in the mid-cycle, they would stay on until whatever that next appointment period is. We do that now in October. Go ahead, Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, we have the terms staggered. They’re on our website for the various APs, but the intent was that, after that appointment cycle had ended, like Ms. Bosarge mentioned earlier, you could be put on now, and so you came off the council in August of this year, but you could stay on the
Shrimp AP until reappointment process, and, at that time, you would have to go through the reappointment process. You wouldn’t just stay on the advisory panel.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Okay, and so, to clarify, I think Kevin’s question is would they be on for three years from at that next appointment cycle, or for the next one, which would be up the next year?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Can we go back to page 7? I think what staff was trying to say here, and obviously we need to work on the language, but what we were trying to say is that they could be -- The council member could request to be placed on an AP of their choice, with the approval, I guess, of the Chair and Vice Chair, until the time of reappointment. That means, at the time of reappointment, you are no longer on that AP. You have to reapply, and so maybe we could say that even differently, and I don’t know.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Mr. Riechers and then Kevin.

MR. RIECHERS: I think the way to clean the language up is to say it just like you did, but maybe even have a second sentence that says that the council member will reapply along with any other applications during the next reappointment process.

I think the point that Kevin was getting to though is are we going to appoint someone and possibly their term come up the next meeting, October, and so I think we’ve got to be somewhat -- We’ve got to use some reason there, but clearly it could be one year or three years, depending on how we’re staggering those terms, and so I think what Kevin is asking is do we want it that way, or do we want to have something different there, or at least --

I’m not going to ask his question for him, but I think that’s what he was alluding to, is it could be as short as one year or less than one year, or it could be as long as, possibly, if they had just been reappointed, maybe three years, given our schedules right now, and aren’t we on a three-year cycle?

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: That was my point, Robin, and thank you for explaining it as well as you did, and that would be my concern, I guess. If one member may want to be on an AP, and the luck of the draw says that they’re only able to serve one meeting, or not even one meeting, and the next one will come off and they’ll
be in a two-year or a three-year situation, and so is there some
leeway in there that we can provide, if that is in fact what we
want to do, is maybe give them up to three years, and that may
be all we need to do, is say up to three years.

**CHAIRMAN BOYD:**  Carrie, and then I have Ms. Boggs.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:**  Well, I guess I would just work
with the Chair and Vice Chair, if that were to be the case, and
say, well, just remember that we’re going to be reappointing
this panel in January of 2021, and Ms. Bosarge wants to be on
the Shrimp Advisory Panel, and so maybe we should wait, and the
council can address it that reappointment process, or something
like that.

**CHAIRMAN BOYD:**  Susan?  No?  Okay.  Any further discussion?
Mara.

**MS. LEVY:**  Thank you.  I have two comments.  One I guess is to
Kevin’s point.  I guess I see a problem with, when you’re
appointing your APs, when it comes up for a reappointment,
you’re looking at the whole suite of people, and you’re
repopulating the AP, and so it seems problematic, to me, to say
that a council member is on it even during that whole
repopulation, like they’re just on it and then they’re included
in the repopulation.

I mean, you would do that through your appointment process, if
you really wanted them to stay, but to keep them there without
putting them in the bunch of applicants that you are considering
seems a little bit problematic, just by virtue of the fact that
really you have dissolved the current AP and are repopulating
it.

Just a question about I guess this edit.  I am not sure what the
purpose of taking out “a period” -- I mean, this applies to all
APs, right, and so all members and officers that actually happen
during the appointment period are appointed for a period of
three years.  They are not appointed for three years, right?
Like, I mean, is there a reason that we’re taking out “a period
of three years”?  Was there a particular purpose, I guess is
what I’m asking.

**CHAIRMAN BOYD:**  Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:**  Gosh, I thought we just were
thinking it was redundant, and so we can certainly leave it in
if we think it’s necessary.
MS. LEVY: I just think it makes clear that the appointment is for a period of three years. It’s not just for three years, meaning you can have appointments and they are all three years, and then they can get reappointed. It’s not just a three-year appointment and then you’re done, and it goes without the term limits thing, right? I mean, it’s referring to the term, I guess, is what I am saying, the period part.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Mara, your recommendation would be to leave that in? Is that correct?

MS. LEVY: I would leave it in unless there is a particular thing that you’re trying to address by taking it out, I guess.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think we thought that was minor and it wasn’t necessary, but we can certainly leave it in. I have an answer regarding the Coast Guard representative. This is where the confusion came in, now that Steven sent me an email, Steven Atran. He’s keeping us in check still. Thanks, Steven.

The LEC and the LE TC are identical, except that the Law Enforcement Committee includes a Coast Guard representative, and the LEC Coast Guard representative is usually the Coast Guard council representative, and you are on the council, and so you cannot also be an AP member, and so that’s why you’re not on the LE TC. We didn’t forget about you.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Did the council understand that? I am not sure that I followed all of that. You got it? Okay. I go back to my question about APs versus technical committees, and so we still have an AP, and he’s on the AP? Mara.

MS. LEVY: I think he’s on the Law Enforcement Council Committee, meaning you have a Budget Committee, and you have a Reef Fish Committee, and he is part of the council, and so he’s on the Law Enforcement Council Committee, and he’s a council member, and so he cannot be on an AP, which a technical committee is, is I think where we’re getting at.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Got it. Any other questions at this point? All right, Carrie. Proceed.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Let’s go to page 17, Section 3.7.3. These are the more minor suggestions here. 3.7.3 is Council
Hearing, and I think we said that we wanted to say “Representative”, instead of “Officer”, and so this is minor language suggestions. Really, officer is -- We refer to officers in the admin handbook as the Executive Director, the Deputy Director, and the Administrative Officer, and so we were just suggesting a word change here.

The other minor change is on page 23, since we were making changes, Section 4.12, the travel reimbursement for non-federal travelers. It’s on page 23. This is language that reflects the changes in the federal guidelines for travel for non-federal travelers. It’s minor terminology changes. Instead of using “vouchers”, we are suggesting using “reimbursement claims” and using “travel guidelines”, and these were just suggested changes because we were making other changes, and staff considered these minor.

There was one other minor change on page 24, Invitational Travel, 4.15, and so it’s “Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council” and just strike “Regional”. I think that was just a typo from another version. That completes our proposed changes, and I will stop there and see if there is questions.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: All right. We talked a minute ago about approving these changes en masse, rather than each individually, and then the possibility of some motions following that. What is the council’s wish? Do we want to go ahead and do some motions to correct it, or do you want to go ahead and approve? Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, I think you guys have given me enough changes, and I can draft those, and we can have the Full Council look at it and have you look at it before you vote on it, since you made several tweaks.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Okay. Let’s do that. I like that idea. Okay. We had two possible motions, one about putting the categories of applicants on the website and then the other about what I call auto-appointments, and so we’ll save those then for Full Council. Any other discussions at this point? Mara.

MS. LEVY: Well, I guess, with respect to those two things, to the extent the committee wants to recommend something -- I mean, you don’t have to do it in committee, but, if the committee has a recommendation for those particular things, if you’re planning on wanting to change the SOPPs, it might be helpful to know that in advance of Full Council, but, obviously, that’s up to you as a committee.
CHAIRMAN BOYD: Council, any comments? I think we’ve had a good
discussion, and I think Carrie and Beth understand the intent,
and so we’ll come back to Full Council with those changes in
there. Track changes to the track changes. Okay. Next on the
agenda is Other Business, and we didn’t have any other business.
I will entertain any, if we have it. Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I guess I’m just not sure it was
clear to me how we wanted to handle the website and the Standing
SSC and if you wanted us to just have staff work with the Chair
and Vice Chair on that and come back to the council with some
idea if they were okay with putting those certain designations
on the website or how you wanted us to handle that.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Just an idea. Since we haven’t -- We didn’t really
do this when we made those appointments before, but, in the
future, when the council is filling the SSC, presumably we’ll
have some kind of table up where we’re trying to fill the
categories, and, if we designate categories for people, maybe we
could put those on the website, but, for now, I don’t think it’s
going to be a good use of our time to try to go back and try to
assign people with, I guess, the different seats. That’s just
my thought.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Well, for a little clarification, and I was
going to bring this up at Full Council, but I will bring it up
now. One of the things that we could do, when the applications
are submitted, is to have people apply for specific areas of
expertise and not just apply it for the AP, but apply for
economics or apply for some other category, and that is the one
that you’re applying for. That way, we know what their
discipline is. Go ahead, Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I thought we did something like
that, but we probably could make it better. I think we ask them
to rank the Standing or all the specials they wanted to be on,
and then I think, in the past, we’ve asked them what they
consider their highest versus lowest expertise, or rank their
expertise, or something like that, when we use the SOPPs, but I
can pull that up to be sure, but I think we did something like
that.

CHAIRMAN BOYD: Okay. Anything else for the committee? If not,
we’re adjourned.
(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 22, 2018.)

---
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