

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE

4
5 Naples Grand Beach Resort

Naples, Florida

6
7 June 5, 2017

8
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

10 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
11 Doug Boyd.....Texas
12 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
13 Paul Mickle (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
14 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
15 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
16 David Walker.....Alabama

17
18 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

19 Patrick Banks.....Louisiana
20 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
21 Glenn Constant.....USFWS
22 Pamela Dana.....Florida
23 LCDR Leo Danaher.....USCG
24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
25 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
26 Tom Frazer.....Florida
27 John Greene.....Alabama
28 Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
29 John Sanchez.....Florida
30 Greg Stunz.....Texas

31
32 **STAFF**

33 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
34 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
35 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
36 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
37 Jessica Matos.....Administrative Assistant
38 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
39 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
40 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
41 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

42
43 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

44 Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC
45 Eric Brazer.....Gulf Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance
46 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
47 Traci Floyd.....MDMR
48 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS

1 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts
2 Scott Hickman.....CFA, Galveston, TX
3 Mark Hubbard.....FL
4 Alison Johnson.....Oceana
5 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA
6 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS
7 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
8 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS
9
10 - - -
11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
8
9 Approval of Final 2017 Budget Funding.....5
10
11 Review of MSA Legislation.....6
12 H.R. 200.....6
13 H.R. 2023.....8
14
15 Other Business.....11
16 Executive Order Regulatory Burden.....11
17 New Gulf Council Website.....13
18
19 Adjournment.....14
20
21
22

- - -

1 The Administrative/Budget Committee of the Gulf of Mexico
2 Fishery Management Council convened at the Naples Grand Beach
3 Resort, Naples, Florida, Monday morning, June 5, 2017, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

5
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE:** We are going to start this morning with
11 Administrative/Budget Committee. The way our SOPPs are written,
12 just to give you a little intro as to why I'm going to be
13 chairing this committee today, the way our SOPPs are written, we
14 actually appoint a specific person, and not a position, per se,
15 but a specific person as Chair and Vic Chair.

16
17 As such, we appointed Dr. Lucas as Chair, and we appointed Mr.
18 Riechers as Vice Chair. As you know, Kelly has transitioned to
19 a new position, and so we have Dr. Mickle, and so he's not
20 officially appointed as the Chair, and so that rolls us into the
21 Vice Chair chairing this committee, and, unfortunately, Mr.
22 Riechers, poor fellow, at the last second, he had something come
23 up, and so he's not going to be with us today. So, no offense
24 to Lance or to Dr. Mickle, but I am going to chair this
25 committee today. So, let me find my agenda, and we will get
26 started.

27
28 If you turn to Tab G, Number 1, that's where you will find our
29 agenda. Are there any modifications or additions to the agenda
30 as presented? Mr. Gregory.

31
32 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUGLAS GREGORY:** For Other Business, I would
33 like to have you briefly talk about the regulatory burden
34 Executive Order that was discussed at the CCC meeting, and I
35 would like to say something, really briefly, about our new
36 website under Other Business.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. We have those two items notated on the
39 agenda for Other Business. Any other additions or modifications
40 to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved as modified.
41 Next, you will find your minutes from our last Admin/Budget
42 Committee meeting. That's listed under Tab G, Number 2. Are
43 there any edits or revisions to those minutes? Seeing none, the
44 minutes are approved as written.

45
46 Your Action Guide and Next Steps are listed under Tab G, Number
47 3, and the first item that we're going to launch into is going
48 to be Approval of our Final 2017 Budget Funding, which should be

1 an interesting discussion. I am going to turn that over to Mr.
2 Gregory.

3
4 **APPROVAL OF FINAL 2017 BUDGET FUNDING**
5

6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** We kept this on the agenda because
7 we expected to have our funding for the remainder of this year
8 from National Marine Fisheries Service, but we do not, and so I
9 really don't have a budget for you to review at this point. I
10 am certain that we'll have one by August, and, by the way, we do
11 have enough money to operate through the end of July, and so I
12 think we're like the other councils, and so we'll all get our
13 money pretty quickly.

14
15 The budget has been passed. The paperwork in NOAA is just being
16 processed, and so we expect to get funds any day now, but we
17 don't have a budget to actually approve. We think it will be
18 close to level funding. It could be a little bit less, or it
19 could be a little bit more. We really don't know at this time.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** As you know, we've been tightening our belt
22 everywhere that we can to try and prepare ahead of time, in case
23 we do have a budget reduction, which is very possible, and so,
24 for example, our SSC meeting, the last one, we did via webinar.
25 The agenda was short enough that we felt that we could do a
26 webinar meeting and that would save a little bit of money and we
27 would still be able to tackle all of the issues on the agenda as
28 needed, and so most of the AP meetings from now on will probably
29 be held in Tampa, because that's cheaper for us. We have a
30 meeting room there, and we can save a few dollars that way.

31
32 We probably won't be getting a whole lot of verbatim minutes on
33 AP meetings and things like that, where we were doing that in
34 the past. Unless it's something that is specifically requested
35 by the council, or a real contentious meeting or something, we
36 probably won't have verbatim minutes. You will have your
37 meeting summary, and it will still be broadcast via webinar, but
38 you just won't have those verbatim minutes, because that does
39 cost extra, and so, anyway we can tighten our belt, we're
40 trying. Ms. Guyas.

41
42 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** Just a question. If we won't have verbatim
43 minutes, those meetings are recorded though, right, so if
44 somebody wanted to -- Okay. Thank you.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Next on our agenda is our Review
47 of MSA Legislation, and I'm going to turn it over, again, to Mr.
48 Gregory.

1
2 **REVIEW OF MSA LEGISLATION**
3 **H.R. 200**
4

5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I received
6 a lot of comments on my reading ability at the last meeting, but
7 I think I will forego that this time and just do a summary. We
8 will touch on the items in H.R. 200 that we did not discuss in
9 April, and then I will identify items in H.R. 2023 which a
10 number of them are duplicative of items that are in H.R. 200,
11 and so that should go fairly quickly as well.
12

13 In H.R. 200, the ones we skipped in April start in Section 7,
14 and that's on page 5 of the handout. Basically, Section 7 is
15 the transparency and public process section. It requires the
16 councils to do basically what we already do, as far as
17 webcasting our meetings and having our recordings online for
18 people to access and doing verbatim minutes of the council. The
19 only thing that might add to us is to actually put a public
20 comment period on our SSC agendas. That's the only thing that
21 we're not doing that's required here.
22

23 The major part of this is also referring to something called a
24 fishery impact statement. When the reauthorization bills
25 started in 2014, some of the councils wanted to replace the NEPA
26 process with the Magnuson Act process, thinking that it would
27 streamline the operations and make it easier for the councils.
28 In this section, it identifies what should be in a fishery
29 impact statement and how the council goes about developing one,
30 and it's intended to replace the NEPA process, but the councils
31 that were really eager to have this change are now saying
32 they're satisfied with the NEPA process, and so that's mainly
33 what that is about.
34

35 Now, I want to point out that I welcome comments, either in the
36 meeting or afterwards with track changes, on any of these items.
37 We are referring to this as a draft at this point.
38

39 Section 8 is limitations on future catch share programs. This
40 amends 303A. It identifies eligibility to vote in a referendum,
41 and it specifies a petition process for any catch share program
42 that the Secretary may want to implement.
43

44 Now, I don't know if that includes the council or just the
45 Secretary's plan that's independent of the council. Right now,
46 there is not a -- It says, in that section, that the Secretary
47 may not implement any catch share program managed exclusively by
48 the Secretary unless first petitioned by a majority of permit

1 holders eligible to participate in the fishery, and so it's not
2 clear what that means.

3
4 Then Section 9 is just the report on the fee. We currently
5 don't see reports on what happens to the money that's collected
6 under an IFQ or catch share program, and the 3 percent of the
7 value of the harvest is the fee, or the maximum fee.

8
9 Section 10 is cooperative research and management programs. The
10 main thing here that would be new is to require five-year
11 updates. Then we'll skip over to Section 18 on page 14, the
12 estimation of cost recovery from a fishery resource disaster,
13 and I had written here that this could benefit the council in
14 the event of a disaster, and it was requested how or why, how
15 that would happen.

16
17 I really can't come up with an idea or why I wrote that as a
18 direct benefit to the council. I perceived it as an indirect
19 benefit, I think because the quicker we know about a disaster,
20 and if something is declared a disaster, the quicker we can make
21 accommodations. That's my thought process on that, but I will
22 change that to not say there is a direct benefit to the council
23 and any other modification that any of the council members would
24 like to see.

25
26 Section 19 is a deadline for action on request by a governor for
27 a determination regarding fishery resource disasters. That's a
28 benefit, in that it will allow for a more timely designation of
29 a fishery disaster than the current process.

30
31 Section 22 on page 15 was about subsistence fishing, which won't
32 affect us in the Gulf. Then the last three sections, 25, 26 and
33 27, we didn't cover. Section 25 is a preference for students
34 studying water resource issues. This is kind of a confusing
35 section, in that it says students should have a preference for
36 being hired to do data collection. This is probably already
37 happening, if students apply, because of their unique
38 qualifications and experience as a marine biology student.

39
40 Section 26 is requirements for limited access privileges. This
41 section requires the council take action within two years after
42 a review is completed. Currently, we do a review, but there is
43 no requirement for us to take action in any timely manner, but
44 this really puts a two-year deadline on taking action, and then
45 Section 27 is healthy fisheries through better science.

46
47 This is largely identifying things that we already do. It does
48 specify for more stock assessments, and I think the stock

1 assessment frequency we get -- It's still going to be kind of
2 dictated by the resources that are available to do them, but, if
3 we can get more frequent stock assessments, that would
4 definitely benefit the council, and it also calls for more SSC
5 involvement in identifying the best available science for data
6 that's collected or provided outside the federal agency or state
7 agency process.

8
9 Now, currently, there seems to be an emphasis on trying to get
10 data from other sources, but we currently do that. The SEDAR
11 process, one of the very first workshops is a data workshop, and
12 that's where fishermen are invited to participate that are
13 active in the fishery and scientists are invited to participate
14 and try to identify all the data that's available, both
15 published and unpublished, to go into the stock assessment, and
16 so that is largely covered. Those are the items in 200 that we
17 didn't cover in April.

18 19 **H.R. 2023** 20

21 Then H.R. 2023, four of these sections are similar or
22 duplicative of sections in H.R. 200, and I will note those. In
23 Section 101, process for allocation review, this is a
24 requirement for the National Academy of Sciences to develop some
25 allocation guidance for the councils, and so, when this is
26 completed, if it passes, we will have another source of guidance
27 for how to determine allocation or reallocations. This section
28 requires that all allocations be reviewed every three years. I
29 think that's probably excessively burdensome. Every five years,
30 or ten years, would be more reasonable.

31
32 Section 102, which is similar to Sections 12 and 29 in H.R. 200,
33 the first part identifies specifically for red snapper, to try
34 to develop alternatives to quotas or ACLs for managing the
35 fishery, and this section would repeal Section 407(d), which
36 required a quota on the recreational sector of red snapper even
37 before ACLs were required. Yes, ma'am.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Sorry you got ahead of me, but I was just
40 going to make one suggestion on Section 102. It's the third box
41 down, your comments over there, where it was talking about
42 reviewing allocations where there is a mixed-used fishery, where
43 you have commercial and recreational fishing.

44
45 You were talking about the burden, that it could potentially
46 place a significant burden on both the council and NMFS staff
47 time to conduct, and I think it may be helpful over there, in
48 that next sentence, that this would include the many species

1 within the reef fish fishery, and can we can get a total count
2 on how many different species we would need to review
3 allocations for?
4

5 That requirement, I think, goes on further to say then how often
6 you're going to have to do those. You know, I think a hard
7 number would be good there, so we could really get a feel for
8 what we're looking at.
9

10 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks, Mr. Gregory.
13

14 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay. Yes, we can do that. Then,
15 in Section 103, there's a moratorium on limited access programs
16 for mixed-use fisheries, and mixed-use is where there's both
17 commercial and recreational sectors.
18

19 Section 104 is related to rebuilding overfished and depleted
20 fisheries, and this is very similar to Section 4 in H.R. 200
21 that provides additional flexibility to the councils beyond the
22 ten-year rebuilding requirement that we currently have, and
23 Section 105 is the modification to the annual catch limit
24 requirement. This is similar to Section 5 in H.R. 200 in all
25 components.
26

27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and, in that second box for Section 105,
28 when I read that one, I think part of my feedback there would be
29 the part that worried me -- This is the section that says what
30 happens to make things to where you don't have to develop an
31 annual catch limit for a species or for a sector of the fishery
32 for that species, and, when I read through that, the invisible
33 hand -- Humans tend to act in their own self-interest, right?
34

35 Well, the way this reads, it's almost a disincentive to improve
36 your data collection. For example, right now, in some
37 fisheries, we have stakeholders really pushing us to try and get
38 better data collection. We just implemented some electronic
39 reporting, GPS requirements, or at least archived, in the for-
40 hire sector, and I think a lot of the impetus there was they
41 were undergoing some things in that fishery that they felt, if
42 they could get better data collection, it could help them.
43

44 Whereas, the way this is written, if your data collection -- If
45 you can get your data collection bad enough, you can throw your
46 ACL out the window, and so it almost seems like a disincentive
47 to improve data and rather an incentive to reduce the accuracy
48 of data, the way it's written.

1
2 I would be worried that that might be what would happen there,
3 and that's both commercial and recreational. I mean, I can see
4 where we might have some people saying get rid of these VMS,
5 because, if our data gets bad enough, we won't have to operate
6 under an ACL anymore, and so I think maybe that might be some
7 feedback we might want to give, and maybe that could be
8 reworded, where we can keep the impetus on improving the data
9 rather than dis-improving it.

10
11 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay. In Section 106, on page 5,
12 exempted fishing permit, this is a new section. This is not in
13 H.R. 200, and the burden here is, at the bottom of that page, it
14 reads that this section would require that any EFP shall expire
15 at the end of the twelve-month period beginning on the date that
16 the permit was issued. That seems burdensome, to only allow an
17 EFP to go on for one year. I would think that that would be the
18 discretion of National Marine Fisheries Service. This is new.

19
20 Then, in Section 201, under Title II, recreational fishery
21 information, cooperative data collection, Section 201, it
22 appears, to me, that this is reiterating stuff that we already
23 do, as far as trying to collect recreational data. If that's
24 not what other people see in this, please let me know, but we
25 largely try -- Like I said, through the SEDAR process, we try to
26 collect data from as many sources as we can find.

27
28 Then Section 202, recreational data collection, is very similar
29 to Section 16 in H.R. 200. There is nothing new in this section
30 that differs from H.R. 200. Now, the difference between the two
31 bills is H.R. 200 is an attempt to reauthorize the Magnuson Act,
32 but H.R. 2023 is simply an attempt to amend the Magnuson Act and
33 not to reauthorize it.

34
35 We have these two bills currently in the committee, and there
36 was some bills that were passed last year, but they haven't been
37 reintroduced this year, addressing other aspects of it, and so,
38 again, I will welcome any comments or feedback from anybody on
39 this. We will continue to work on it.

40
41 I will have more staff members look at it, and we're going to
42 use this document as the basis for any letter that we're
43 requested to write, either through our CCC council coordinating
44 committee process or, if we're asked to give testimony, this
45 sort of information will be the basis for drafting that
46 testimony.

47
48 We wanted to do this and bring this to the council because, in

1 2014, the last time there was a lot of activity for
2 reauthorization, things happened so quickly that we weren't able
3 to bring things to the council to get advice in advance of the
4 testimony, and so we're just trying to get ahead of the curve
5 this time. Any questions? All right. I appreciate it.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Then I had feedback on one other thing. You
8 moved so quick that you passed me by. All right. On the
9 twelve-month expiration on the exempted fishing permits, I was
10 just thinking about the exempted fishing permit that we talked
11 about a couple of meetings ago, where we were going to possibly
12 look at a program that would allow some fishermen off of Florida
13 to go back into an area that was closed outside of a certain
14 fathom curve and fish there again. That had been closed many
15 years ago, due to some interactions with turtles, but the
16 fishery has changed now, and so that may not be an issue.

17
18 If things like that expire after one year, I don't see how, when
19 that is presented to us, from the council perspective, that that
20 would ever pass the litmus test of an SSC or anything like that,
21 if we only have one year of data to say, well, you know, this
22 year, they really didn't have any interactions, and so we think
23 we can open this back up and let them fish here.

24
25 An EFP is almost like an experiment. It's a test, and you want
26 to see how that's going to work, and so I think you probably
27 really have to have more than one year of data to come to any
28 conclusion. That was my only other feedback there. Any other
29 discussion or feedback for Mr. Gregory? Okay.

30
31 So you completed your review of both H.R. 200 and H.R. 2023, in
32 record time, and thank you, sir. That brings us right to our
33 Other Business, and we did have two items under Other Business.
34 We have the regulatory burden requirements and our new website.
35 Dr. Simmons, not to put you on the spot, but were you going over
36 regulatory burden, or did you want me to try and summarize that?

37
38 **OTHER BUSINESS**
39 **EXECUTIVE ORDER REGULATORY BURDEN**

40
41 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** I will start, and you can help me. At the
42 Council Coordinating Committee meeting in May, we got a
43 presentation from Alan Risenhoover on the new Executive Order
44 for regulatory reform, and we can pass that presentation around,
45 or give you the link, if the council is interested, but we
46 basically just wanted to let you guys know that we're going to
47 start working on this with the SERO Office staff.

1 Basically, we're trying to reduce regulatory burden and try to
2 figure out how to adopt or reduce regulations, the two-for-one,
3 and I guess, Leann, if you want to talk a little bit about the
4 significant regulations in any of our regulations that we
5 recently took final action on that this may apply to, because
6 it's a significant economic impact, and they also want us to go
7 through and see if there's any regulations that no longer apply
8 or are applicable, and so I'll stop there and see if you can
9 help me with that.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. It does get detailed pretty
12 quickly, but, essentially, as you know, there was the two-for-
13 one order, right, and we talked about this a little in the past.
14 Most of the rules and regulations that we send off from this
15 body don't meet the threshold to put us into a category where we
16 need to get rid of two regulations in order to have that one
17 regulation implemented that we just sent up to the Secretary.

18
19 However, there may be circumstances where, from an economic
20 standpoint, our regulations may meet that two-for-one threshold.
21 That won't be determined around this table. That will be
22 determined at the agency, and I'm sure they will notify us, but,
23 essentially, what the agency was asking all the councils to do,
24 and not just our council, was to start a short list of
25 regulations that, if you end up trying to implement something
26 that rises to that economic standard, to that two-for-one
27 standard, we need a short list of two regulations that we can
28 get rid of in order to be able to consider implementing that for
29 you.

30
31 Just keep that in the back of your mind. If there's anything
32 that pops into your mind right offhand, staff and myself would
33 love for you to help us out with this, and we will start our
34 short list. Mr. Diaz.

35
36 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not on your
37 committee, but we're taking up something at this meeting where
38 we're getting rid of that hook requirement for the longline
39 fishermen, and it seems -- I don't know if, the way we're doing
40 it, if it would qualify as getting rid of a regulation, but,
41 basically, we have something imposed on them now, and, when we
42 get done, they're not going to have a regulation, basically, and
43 so I don't know if that would qualify for something that would
44 help us or not, but I just wanted to mention that while you were
45 talking about it.

46
47 I think it's a good exercise for us to go through anytime, to
48 see if we've got stuff that's obsolete, that doesn't apply

1 anymore, that we could maybe take out of our library to not
2 confuse people, and so it's probably a good exercise for us to
3 do anyway, and thank you for indulging me.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I agree. Thanks for the comments. Ms.
6 Guyas.

7
8 **MS. GUYAS:** Just a question about how we see this process going.
9 Do we think we will know what these, I guess, regulations that
10 would fall under the two-for-one, or potential regulations,
11 would be before we approve them, or would that come after it
12 goes up to Headquarters?

13
14 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, Ms. Levy maybe can speak to it, but I
15 would say right now, with the newness of that order, that
16 probably, for the moment, we won't know until they go up. We
17 may get to a point in the future where we could get that kind of
18 notification beforehand, but, Ms. Levy, do you want to speak to
19 that?

20
21 **MS. LEVY:** Generally, you're doing the significance for the EO
22 purposes under the RIR analysis that's in the amendment, and,
23 normally, the agency does that after you have taken final
24 action, because it has to be based on the preferred
25 alternatives, but I will say that the council rarely, rarely,
26 rarely, in the fishery management realm, at least this council,
27 does anything that would be considered significant under the EO.

28
29 It would be rare to do that, and so, I mean, definitely I would
30 do what NMFS is asking you to do, but it would be a pretty rare
31 occurrence for something to meet that level. OMB can say that
32 something is significant for other reasons other than economics,
33 and then you might get into it that way, but the \$100 million
34 threshold is pretty high for fisheries stuff.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any other questions or discussion
37 on that Other Business topic? All right. Next, we're going to
38 go into our new website. Would you like to discuss it?

39
40 **NEW GULF COUNCIL WEBSITE**

41
42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** As you all know by now, we have a
43 new website. We want to continue to get feedback on it, what we
44 can do to improve it. We're all very excited. The staff has
45 spent a lot of time in the last few months, I guess since
46 November, putting this together. We are extremely pleased with
47 the outcome. The new site is so much simpler and easier to find
48 things, but there is room for improvement.

1
2 We have distributed it not just to the council, but to other
3 people, and we're soliciting feedback. I just wanted to, one,
4 brag about what the staff has done with this. I think it's a
5 major improvement to our service to the public and ourselves,
6 but, again, I encourage you all to continue to provide us with
7 feedback on how we can improve it.

8
9 Now, one thing that's different is you see, on this, that there
10 is a menu bar across the top. This new website changes
11 depending on what kind of device you're accessing it with,
12 whether it's a phone or -- Like, on my laptop, that menu bar is
13 gone, and you have the three lines on the left side, and that's
14 where you get your menu from, and you click on the plus-sign
15 there to open up the sub-menu for that.

16
17 It's taking some of us, particularly us older people, a little
18 time to get used to this, but it's amazingly efficient, and
19 we're very, very pleased with this and to be able to do this for
20 the council. That's all.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Has everybody been navigating the new website
23 pretty well so far? Good. That means it was a great
24 improvement and we're doing good work. Dr. Mickle.

25
26 **DR. PAUL MICKLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. A little early
27 feedback. The last, I guess, week, I've been directing a lot of
28 our calls at our agency to the website, and all good things.
29 The only -- I got one negative comment, and that was that it was
30 different, and they didn't like the change. That was the only
31 negative comment, and so I think that one will go away with
32 time.

33
34 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I was saying that last November, in
35 fact. It's so straightforward and it's so simple that it
36 appears that stuff is missing, but it's not. It's amazing, and,
37 like I said, we're very pleased.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Kudos to staff as well. I know you all put
40 in a lot of time and effort on this, and so we definitely like
41 it. To have a change and not have a lot of negative feedback,
42 you must be doing something right. All right. That wraps up
43 our agenda for our Administrative/Budget Committee, and I have
44 to say we are under time.

45
46 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 5, 2017.)

47
48 - - -