

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

4
5
6 Grand Hotel Marriott Point Clear, Alabama

7
8 January 26, 2015

9
10
11 **VOTING MEMBERS**

12 Doug Boyd.....Texas
13 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
14 John Greene.....Alabama
15 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
16 Corky Perret.....Mississippi
17 David Walker.....Alabama

18
19 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

20 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
21 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
22 Jason Brand.....USCG
23 Glenn Constant.....USFWS
24 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
25 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
26 Harlon Pearce.....Louisiana
27 Robin Riechers.....Texas
28 John Sanchez.....Florida
29 Greg Stunz.....Texas
30 Roy Williams.....Florida

31
32 **STAFF**

33 Stephen Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
34 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist
35 Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
36 Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
38 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
39 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian

40
41 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

42 Tom Ard.....Orange Beach, AL
43 Jeff Barger.....Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX
44 Randy Boggs.....Orange Beach, AL
45 Zack Bowen.....SAFMC
46 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
47 Gregg Bray.....GSMFC
48 Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance

1 JP Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
2 Glen Brooks.....GFA, FL
3 James Bruce.....Cutoff, LA
4 Gary Bryant.....Fort Morgan, AL
5 Shane Cantrell.....Galveston, TX
6 Shannon Calay.....SEFSC
7 Kiley Dancy.....MAFMC
8 Jason Delacruz.....Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance/Gulf Wild
9 Michael Drexler.....St. Petersburg, FL
10 F.J. Eicher.....Ocean Springs, MS
11 Blakely Ellis.....Gulf Shores, AL
12 Cynthia Fenyk.....NOAA
13 Troy Frady.....Orange Beach, AL
14 Chad Hanson.....Pew Environmental Group
15 Scott Hickman.....Galveston, TX
16 Peter Hood.....NMFS
17 Larry Huntley.....Pensacola, FL
18 Joe Jewell.....MS
19 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, Marathon, FL
20 TJ Marshall.....
21 Kristen McConnell.....EDF, Austin, TX
22 Paul Mickle.....MDMR
23 Mike Nugent.....Aransas Pass, TX
24 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
25 Tracy Redding.....AL
26 Lance Robinson.....TX
27 Matt Seymour.....Foley, AL
28 Katie Simon.....
29 Bob Spaeth.....SOFA, Madeira Beach, FL
30 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
31 Bill Tucker.....Dunedin, FL
32 Robert Turpin.....
33 Will Ward.....Palmetto, FL
34 Bob Zales.....Panama City, FL

35 - - -
36

37 The Administrative Policy Committee of the Gulf of Mexico
38 Fishery Management Council convened at the Grand Hotel Marriott,
39 Point Clear, Alabama, Monday morning, January 26, 2015, and was
40 called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Doug Boyd.

41

42

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

43

APPROVAL OF JOINT ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY & BUDGET/PERSONNEL

44

MINUTES

45

46

CHAIRMAN DOUG BOYD: I call together the Administrative Policy
47 Committee. We have everyone present except Ms. Dana. Out of
48 the seven members, we have six here and so we have a quorum.

1 The first thing on the agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda and
2 do I hear any changes or additions to the agenda from the
3 committee? Does everybody know who is on the committee? Let me
4 read the names. It's Boyd, Dana, Greene, Matens, Perret,
5 Walker, and Bademan. Any changes or additions to the agenda?
6 Hearing none, we will move to Item II, Approval of the Joint
7 Administrative Policy & Budget/Personnel Minutes.

8
9 Any changes or additions or corrections to the minutes? Hearing
10 none, I will ask for approval of the minutes. There is a motion
11 to approve by Corky and I have a second by Mr. Greene. All in
12 favor say aye; any opposed. The minutes are approved.

13
14 The next thing on the agenda is the Action Guide and if you'll
15 look up Tab G-3, we have two items on there and I am going to
16 rely on Mr. Gregory to go through most of this. There are two
17 items, Tab G-3 and Tab G-4, that we're going to talk about today
18 and then a report on Tab G-5. Mr. Gregory, if you would go
19 ahead.

20 21 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**

22
23 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** This is just an overview. Tab
24 G-4 is going to be the review and decision on various aspects of
25 the AP and SSC structure and I have brought that to the council
26 the last two meetings for review and we need to make a decision
27 at this meeting, particularly with the AP, because if we're
28 going to appoint AP members in March and April, we have to start
29 that advertising soon after this council meeting.

30
31 One of the things I am going to suggest in here or ask is that
32 we postpone the SSC appointments until June because of, one, to
33 reduce the total number of people we have to deal with. If you
34 recall in April of 2013, we had some confusion about people's
35 applications being lost and some people not getting their
36 application. We are trying to strengthen that up so that
37 doesn't happen again and we have about 250 people altogether
38 that we're trying to get reappointments to and so if we can put
39 off the SSC until June, that will help the process.

40
41 The other thing about the SSC meeting is they are supposed to --
42 Any appointees to the SSC are supposed to have their statement
43 of financial interest into the Office of the Regional
44 Administrator forty-five days before they are appointed and so
45 if you back off forty-five days from the council meeting, you
46 don't have much time for advertising the positions and so we
47 would like to do the SSC in June.

48

1 The forty-five-day requirement has been on the books for a while
2 and we haven't really followed them in the past and so this is
3 an attempt to follow that rule. Clearly the SSC members that
4 are already in place are filing their statement of financial
5 interest this month, just like council members are to do before
6 February. That's a reminder to you all as well.

7
8 The thing about the advisory panel is we are suggesting term
9 limits similar to the council. You serve three terms and then
10 you're off for a year and then you can get back on. For the
11 SSC, we have such a need for expertise that we are not proposing
12 term limits for them.

13
14 I also have categories of stakeholders for the APs that we've
15 discussed in the last two meetings and the council has given us
16 guidance that your intention is not to make these categories
17 that are fixed in stone that we have to fill, but rather they
18 are to serve as a reminder to the council and guidance to the
19 council when they make appointments that these are the
20 stakeholders that are out there, but it's nothing that requires
21 you to fill each and every position like it's listed. It was
22 simply an attempt to try to identify the different stakeholders
23 so we can try to avoid having AP committees that are missing
24 certain stakeholder groups.

25
26 For the SSC, the big proposal is to merge them into one Standing
27 SSC, merge the Ecosystem and the Socioeconomic SSC into the
28 Standing. I have some ideas for that.

29
30 Then in Tab G, Number 5, these are comments by NOAA Department
31 of Commerce attorneys on the standard operating policies and
32 procedures that this council presented to them in 2012. This
33 does not include any of the comments that the ad hoc committee
34 on the council provided that we recently finished at the last
35 meeting. That's an additional background document called Tab
36 5(a). We are not here to discuss that, but it's got track
37 changes of all the changes we made in the last two council
38 meetings and so if anybody wanted to bring something up for
39 clarification or change, we can do that, but that's not the main
40 purpose here.

41
42 The main purpose is to review the Department of Commerce
43 comments and to approve or not approve the inclusion of those
44 changes. They are relatively minor. There is a couple of
45 places I have explanation for, but that should go pretty
46 straightforward and so that's the overview of what we'll do.
47 With your approval, Mr. Chair, we can get started on Tab G,
48 Number 4.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I think the most important things that we're
3 going to deal with today are the suggestion from the SSC of
4 integrating the three larger SSCs and I would like to start with
5 that first, if we could, and then the other thing that I think
6 is very important is the staggered terms on the APs. Mr.
7 Gregory, in your Tab G-4, page 6 is the proposed integration of
8 the SSCs.

9
10 **MR. CORKY PERRET:** I have got some questions long before that
11 page, before page 6. I've got a question right at the start,
12 with the introduction, and do we just want to go down the
13 document or, Mr. Gregory, what would you like? How are we going
14 to do this?

15
16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** My understanding is if we start at
17 page 6 that when we finish with the SSC that we will go back to
18 the beginning of page 1.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** That's what I am proposing and is there
21 something just in the formal process, Corky, or --

22
23 **MR. PERRET:** Mr. Gregory, and I quote, there is no formal
24 provision for replacing members who resign before the end of
25 their term, yet I don't see a proposal on how to handle that and
26 so it seems to me we should have -- If we don't have a formal
27 provision, let's have one and that would be for the AP and the
28 SSC. I don't have a suggestion, but I just think we need to
29 have something, a formal provision.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Would you be okay making a motion within the
32 proposed integration of the two, as a part of that process?
33 Okay.

34
35 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** My idea was if we have staggered
36 terms and we are reappointing somebody every year, that is the
37 provision for replacing somebody on an annual basis, rather than
38 waiting two or three years.

39
40 **MR. PERRET:** Okay and if that language is in the document, then
41 that takes care of it, in my opinion. Thank you.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** If it's not, we'll get something to that in
44 there.

45
46 **UPDATE ON AP AND SSC APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND STRUCTURE**

47
48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** On page 6 is the background

1 information and on page 7, we have the proposed SSC integration.
2 One thing I've done in this document is I've highlighted draft
3 motions. This was to kind of give a heads-up to the council
4 where I thought a decision needed to be made, so we just didn't
5 get through the document and go, okay, well that's that.

6
7 I am not trying to put words in your mouth, but this is
8 something I think the council needs to consider and make a
9 decision and so we're the only council that has three major
10 SSCs. We are also the only council that has what we call
11 Special SSCs.

12
13 The Special SSCs have been a part of this council since the
14 beginning and the original intent of that was to bring in the
15 specialists of a particular species, whether it was mackerel,
16 red drum, red snapper, the ichthyologists, the biologists, the
17 behaviorists, which is critical to us today, because the SSC now
18 is populated and we're trying to populate it mostly with
19 quantitative people.

20
21 The Special SSCs were to supplement that core knowledge we have
22 on the Standing and so I am not proposing to change that. What
23 has happened over the years is the Socioeconomic Advisory Panel
24 was created by the council to help the stock assessment panels
25 provide information to the council. I think Robin was on one of
26 the early Socioeconomic APs.

27
28 Then when the decision was made to pay the SSC a stipend for
29 their work, the council staff said we've got these socioeconomic
30 scientists and let's make them an SSC and pay them too, because
31 it seemed unfair not to pay them if you pay these others and so
32 they became an SSC and they have been operating independent of
33 the Standing SSC, even though our SOPPs say they're a subunit of
34 the SSC and they answer to the Standing SSC, but they have never
35 operated that way.

36
37 We have an Ecosystem SSC that was created to help with a grant.
38 When the grant ended, that group continued on and they meet, in
39 the past, sporadically and more frequently now jointly with the
40 Standing SSC.

41
42 Since we're the only council that has this variety of SSCs and
43 we have clearly many more members than any other council, I have
44 been working on and talking to the different SSCs about
45 integrating the three major SSCs into one.

46
47 We will go from thirty-seven people down to eighteen or twenty
48 people and the Standing and the Ecosystem SSC have endorsed

1 pretty much what this proposal is and the Socioeconomic SSC
2 didn't really endorse it when they addressed it two or three
3 years ago, before I became Director, and so what I am proposing
4 here is that we integrate them and in talking with the Standing
5 SSC, what I have learned is they want an emphasis on
6 quantitative biologists to help with the stock assessment
7 reports.

8
9 We have SSC members go to each stock assessment meeting, the
10 data workshop, the assessment workshop, and the review workshop,
11 and they need more people to help spread the load. We need more
12 expertise also. The South has always had a difficult time with
13 stock assessments, in that the expertise, the need, wasn't here
14 historically. I am talking the 1940s and 1950s, after World War
15 II.

16
17 We are one of the regions that never had an international
18 fishery and it's in the Northeast and the Northwest where there
19 are international fisheries that really the stock assessment
20 expertise at the universities and in the agencies really
21 developed.

22
23 We want to strengthen that as much as we can with whatever
24 expertise we have here in the Southeast. We can go outside the
25 Southeast. The South Atlantic Council does that and grabs
26 people from other regions.

27
28 The ecosystem people will be serving on the SSC and what I am
29 proposing is the seven stock assessment people we have on page
30 7, under the proposed SSC integration, three ecosystem
31 scientists, three economists, and we currently have two, three
32 quantitative anthropologists, and we currently have one, one
33 environmental scientist, and one other scientist from any of the
34 other disciplines or from one of the above.

35
36 In talking with the Standing SSC at the last meeting, there was
37 some concern that we would lose too many economists and
38 anthropologists if we only had three of each on the Standing and
39 so I am suggesting here that we consider creating a Special
40 Socioeconomic SSC to be comprised of two economists and two
41 anthropologists that we would bring in to meet jointly with the
42 Standing SSC whenever we address something that is strongly
43 economic or social in nature, much like we use the other
44 biological Special SSCs. That would keep the strength we have
45 now in the economic and the social area. Do you want me to just
46 go through all of this and then come back to the draft motions
47 or --

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** No, let's go ahead and have some discussion on
2 these points now.

3
4 **MR. PERRET:** Doug, you give us, for the APs, the current
5 structure and so on and so forth and can you refresh our
6 memories now of how many do we have on the current SSC and what
7 are their backgrounds? How many economists and all of that kind
8 of stuff? First off, how many are on the SSC now?

9
10 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** We have fourteen.

11
12 **MR. PERRET:** The bulk of those members are the quantitative
13 biologist, stock assessment types?

14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Correct. We have two economists,
16 one anthropologist, no ecosystem people, per se, and the rest of
17 them are -- There's probably four or five quantitative people
18 and then other biologists that aren't as quantitative.

19
20 **MR. PERRET:** You conferred with the different SSC committees
21 that we have and basically got their input and this was the
22 suggestion from the scientists as well as the staff, for this
23 type of makeup?

24
25 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I conferred with the Joint
26 Ecosystem and Standing SSC I think in February of last year and
27 they didn't really discuss it. It was just brought up and they
28 kind of passed it on. The Socioeconomic SSC looked at it two
29 years ago when Dr. Bortone was looking at the SSC structure and
30 I brought up the idea of integrating it, because I was on the
31 Standing SSC at the time. I think Greg might have been there.

32
33 The Socioeconomic SSC people, in general, were not favorable to
34 integrating and I assume they did not want to lose what stature
35 they had. Then I came back to the Standing SSC at this last
36 meeting and presented it in more detail and we did have a
37 detailed discussion and so that was the only real detailed
38 discussion we have had.

39
40 In talking privately with some of the Ecosystem people, they are
41 concerned that since they were created to serve a grant and that
42 grant has gone away that they might just not meet that often and
43 there is a need to integrate ecosystem with stock assessments
44 and I think all of us feel that there should be better
45 integration there and I think they're more favorable to being
46 integrated with the Standing.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Any other discussion?

1
2 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** I would like to see us sort of in the Gulf
3 set an example. I think the Socioeconomic is -- That SSC is
4 quite important in the decision making. You know we have the
5 calibration thing that's being looked at and I think the social
6 and economic -- I think you need to keep the professionals, the
7 experts in that field, to keep looking at those and I would
8 speak against consolidating them.

9
10 If you want to add some members to the Standing SSC to get more
11 knowledge, I would definitely support that, but when it comes to
12 social and economic decisions, I don't know of any council
13 member that can make those without the advice of a panel like we
14 have now.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Other discussion?

17
18 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Of course I'm not on the committee, but I
19 appreciate the care that's being taken in contemplating the
20 makeup of this committee and it's a challenge. You want to keep
21 it right sized for the job, but certainly these different
22 disciplines all bring some very, very important expertise to the
23 difficult decisions that the council is facing.

24
25 The one aspect that I appreciate the extra care on is ensuring
26 that we don't lose that core group of people with the
27 quantitative expertise. The challenge is that we've gone --
28 Peer review was an important issue last year.

29
30 We are attentive to National Standard 2 and the requirements for
31 posting to the Federal Register the council's procedures for
32 peer review and the SSC makeup ensuring that there are people
33 who have adequate skills on the quantitative side to be able to
34 monitor those stock assessments and in some cases actually
35 participate and then holding out enough people at the end who
36 had no hand in the development of that assessment to actually be
37 part of the peer review team is really important.

38
39 That's particularly true with the update assessments, which are
40 now, under our procedures, done in-house, to be able to have
41 people who are a fresh set of eyes to take a look at that
42 assessment and make sure that we've met our obligation for peer
43 review of the assessments.

44
45 My understanding is that the committee, as it stands right now,
46 has a good number of people who have those quantitative jobs and
47 I certainly wouldn't want to see that number drop anything below
48 the proposed seven and if it were higher than that, I would be

1 happy about it too.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Thank you, Bonnie. Go ahead, Greg.

4

5 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** Doug, thanks for letting me address your
6 committee and Bonnie made much of my points that I was going to
7 make and for Doug Gregory, I don't know that I have a better
8 suggestion, but looking at the numbers, fighting that critical
9 mass for sitting on stock assessments and that kind of thing and
10 having done that for many years, if we -- I am just concerned we
11 can find those number of people.

12

13 On the other hand, if we're looking at or trying to calculate
14 eight people that may not be quantitative, many times that
15 committee is way down in the weeds and very heavy quantitative
16 issues that the economists or socioeconomists may not be that
17 engaged with and so that concerns me a little bit and the same
18 thing on the other hand.

19

20 Are you going to have half the people in the room not really
21 engaged in that discussion and then you're giving up other
22 people that could be sitting on other committees? Now, Doug, I
23 don't have a better suggestion on how to do it, because, having
24 been there, there is this real need for integration and the
25 committees not talking to one another and so I don't know and
26 I'm just trying to throw that out there, is that you might have
27 eight people in the room not engaged in assessing a model or
28 something.

29

30 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Doug, what is the current number of quantitative
31 people on the SSC, on the Standing SSC?

32

33 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I can't tell you right offhand.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Is it like twelve, ten or twelve?

36

37 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** No. It's probably five or six,
38 according to Steven.

39

40 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay and so we're going up.

41

42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Most of the people, like myself,
43 are not, quote, stock assessment scientists. There are people
44 with a quantitative background in statistics or math who have an
45 interest and have followed this and so I would five or six that
46 we have now.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay and did you have another comment?

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes and I think there is an element
3 of inefficiency in a multidisciplinary group. One idea that
4 we've come up with to try to address that is -- The reason I
5 have put three and three and three for the new people on the
6 Standing and also recommending a Special Socioeconomic SSC of
7 two of each is so we have five economists and five sociologists
8 or anthropologists that we can tap into if we need is to let
9 them form working groups.

10
11 If they have an idea or a project, like we did with the ABC
12 control rule, go do your working group analysis and bring it
13 back to the full SSC for a decision, discussion and decision.

14
15 I think if we can do that that we will have enough of each type
16 of scientist that they can pursue avenues on their own as a
17 subgroup and bring back to the main body and so we won't be
18 spending a lot of time discussing things that are not relevant
19 to a third of the people or whatever, but that's inevitable.

20
21 The economists are quantitative, just by definition, and so you
22 will see in here that, and this was a suggestion of the Standing
23 SSC, that we emphasize that we want quantitative anthropologists
24 and if they're quantitative, then they'll have some
25 understanding of it, but, frankly, the new stock assessment
26 models being used, like SS3, there is very few people that
27 understand that and so that's not really the issue of having to
28 have a stock assessment person.

29
30 They need to understand population dynamics and fisheries
31 management and what the jargon is, what we're trying to
32 accomplish. It's really just the foundation of that and support
33 it and to go to Mr. Walker's concern, that's why, based on the
34 discussing with the Standing SSC, I've got in here to create a
35 Special Socioeconomic SSC, so that we would have available to us
36 five economists and five anthropologists. That's about the same
37 amount of expertise we have now on the separate Socioeconomic
38 SSC. If we do that, if the council does this Special, then we
39 really won't lose any expertise.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion?

42
43 **MR. WALKER:** I think the way it's set up now is working and like
44 I said, I would like to see the council and the SSCs -- You're
45 looking at biological and social and economic and ecosystem and
46 I would like to see this -- We could set an example for the rest
47 of the nation and maybe some of the other parts of the country
48 would use more SSCs.

1
2 I speak in favor of keeping it the way it is. You've got the
3 experts in that field looking at things that are important and
4 the people coming to these meetings are concerned about the
5 biological and social and economic and the ecosystem. There is
6 a lot of things of value and people are dependent on these
7 experts and I don't see any reason to consolidate at all. Like
8 I said, if you want to add some members to the Standing SSC,
9 some more experts in that field, I am not opposed to that.

10
11 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** I am not a member of the committee, but, Doug
12 Gregory, how did this come up? Did staff bring this issue up or
13 did this originate from the SSC itself?

14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** My recollection is that Dr. Bortone
16 was looking at the SSC structure and proposing different
17 structures probably as far back as 2011. As an SSC member, I
18 took an interest in it and at that time, at one of the joint
19 meetings between the Standing and Socioeconomic SSC in 2012, I
20 proposed an integration of the two, because it made sense to me.

21
22 I mean we're the only council that has this thing where you've
23 got three independent groups giving you advice and there is no
24 real communication among those three groups and it just seemed
25 dysfunctional, to me, and so I took what Dr. Bortone started
26 and, with conversations among other SSC members who actually
27 encouraged me to pursue this, I did this and we are unique to
28 the country.

29
30 If you had been at the Science Center review this past year when
31 Dr. Ponwith mentioned that we had seventy SSC members and you
32 heard the gasp in the room, I don't think it's an example, a
33 good example, that we have right now. If we made the two SSCs
34 subunits to where they had to report to the Standing SSC, that
35 would provide some continuity, but then you have the question of
36 why would a group of biologists be reviewing the
37 anthropologists' recommendations and that sort of thing? There
38 is no way around that part, but this is a discussion that's been
39 going on for three years in one form or another.

40
41 **MR. PERRET:** Gregg, like you, I served on the S&S Committee,
42 Standing S&S, for many years and you bring out a good point
43 about some of the discussion. Some of the members may be lost
44 in the weeds because of the technicalities of one field or the
45 other.

46
47 However, saying that, you can attend a council meeting or you
48 can attend any committee meeting we have and there's going to be

1 several people that are going to dominate the conversation and
2 you just have others that don't talk as much as Robin and I, but
3 I am trying to figure out -- We've got a recommendation coming
4 to us and I want to make our S&S and AP process as efficient as
5 we possibly can.

6
7 I have one more question for Mr. Gregory. If indeed we were to
8 propose this to the council and the council approved this, would
9 you see the system working like it does now and that the S&S
10 Committee meets on issues and say the Special Shrimp Committee
11 meets with them? If indeed we were to have the Special
12 Socioeconomic Committee and if indeed there was an issue
13 relative to that aspect or that science, would you foresee them
14 meeting with the Standing S&S Committee and is that how you see
15 this thing operating?

16
17 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes.

18
19 **MR. PERRET:** The same way we're doing it now with the Special
20 S&S Committees? All right. Well, let's see if I can make
21 people mad and we can vote something up or down. Are you ready
22 for a motion, Mr. Chairman?

23
24 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** If you wish, Mr. Perret.

25
26 **MR. PERRET:** I will try and figure out how to do this. **My**
27 **motion is to propose that we integrate the three large SSCs,**
28 **which currently total thirty-five members, into a single**
29 **Standing SSC of eighteen individuals with the following**
30 **multidisciplinary structure: seven stock assessment or**
31 **quantitative biologists/ecologists, three ecosystem scientists,**
32 **three economists, three quantitative**
33 **anthropologists/sociologists, one environmental scientist, and**
34 **one other scientist from one of the above disciplines or from**
35 **some other field.** That's my motion, Mr. Chairman, and thank
36 you.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** We have a motion on the board and do we have a
39 second on the motion?

40
41 **MR. CAMPO MATENS:** Second.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Camp seconded. Is there discussion?

44
45 **MR. PERRET:** All I will say is obviously our staff has
46 researched this, as well as the previous Executive Director, and
47 if they think this is going to make our operations more
48 efficient, I am willing to try it. If three or four years from

1 now you guys that are still on, and ladies that are still on,
2 this council and it's not working, I know you will see fit to
3 modify it in whatever way it needs to be modified, but I want to
4 give Mr. Gregory an opportunity. This is his suggestion.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion?

7
8 **MR. STEVEN ATRAN:** It just occurred to me and I'm wondering if
9 you might want to change that bottom from one other scientist to
10 two other scientists, so that the total would be an odd number,
11 nineteen individuals. My concern is that if you have everyone
12 attending an SSC meeting that you might end up with a bunch of
13 nine-to-nine votes.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Corky, do you want to modify your motion or are
16 you okay with the way it is?

17
18 **MR. PERRET:** I would have hoped the staff would have had all
19 this worked out ahead of time, Mr. Gregory, and what do you
20 prefer, an odd number or an even number?

21
22 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I have no preference, but you will
23 see eighteen pop up quite a bit. In talking with staff, we
24 think a good AP or SSC or any good productive group would be of
25 fifteen to eighteen individuals. If you want to make it
26 nineteen, that's fine.

27
28 Again, this is going to be guidance for the council. I don't
29 think we'll ever come to an appointment meeting where someone
30 will say we've got to have three ecosystem people, but only two
31 applied. We don't want to get caught in that situation and so
32 this is guidance on how the SSC is to be structured and so going
33 to nineteen is fine.

34
35 **MR. PERRET:** I am looking at the seven other councils and five
36 of the seven have even numbers and two of the seven have odd
37 numbers and so I am going to leave it at eighteen, the original
38 recommendation that came to the council. Thank you.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion?

41
42 **MS. MARTHA BADEMAN:** Can we note somehow in the motion what Doug
43 had just said, that these are suggestive categories, in case we
44 get in a situation where we're short on one and we've got
45 multiples from another or what do you think about that, Corky?

46
47 **MR. PERRET:** I had the same concern. We may only come up with
48 six assessment types and so I guess, if I may, Mr. Chairman,

1 that if the number in a particular discipline are not available
2 that staff and the council can modify that makeup with another
3 discipline, or something to that effect.

4
5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes and if we put the word
6 "approximate" after "following" and before "multidisciplinary",
7 that will capture that.

8
9 **MR. PERRET:** That's what I wanted to do. Thank you.

10
11 **DR. PONWITH:** This is circling back to a question that Mr.
12 Perret asked earlier and that was the process for replacing SSC
13 members when someone leaves the SSC before their term is up.
14 Again, it's just that seven stock assessment scientists, to me,
15 is absolute critical mass and the question is if someone dropped
16 out before their term was up, is there a way to replace them and
17 initiate that earlier than waiting, potentially, for the full
18 year?

19
20 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Corky, could we put something in here about the
21 seven being not less than seven? That would alleviate Bonnie's
22 concern.

23
24 **MR. PERRET:** That's fine with me, but insofar as if one resigns
25 or whatever, Mr. Gregory's explanation earlier that they would
26 be able to replace them with hopefully a like scientist in that
27 field, but that's fine, yes. **I will accept that modification.**

28
29 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Does the board look right to you? My eyes, I
30 can't see that far very well. Not less than seven stock
31 assessment or -- Okay. It's on there. Any other discussion?
32 Bonnie, does that help you?

33
34 **DR. PONWITH:** I think so.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Hearing no further discussion, let's vote on
37 this proposal. **All in favor of the motion please say aye; all**
38 **opposed to the motion say aye. I believe the motion passed on a**
39 **voice vote.**

40
41 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The next issue would be whether or
42 not to create a Special Socioeconomic SSC to be comprised of
43 approximately two economists and two anthropologists.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right.

46
47 **MR. PERRET:** I move that we create a Special Socioeconomic SSC
48 to be comprised of two economists and two

1 **anthropologists/sociologists.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Do I hear a second for that motion? I have a
4 second from Camp. Is there discussion on the motion?
5
6 **MR. WALKER:** That's just four, two members of -- Corky, you had
7 four there?
8
9 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Right.
10
11 **MR. WALKER:** That seems like kind of a small number.
12
13 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Their intent is to complement the
14 three economists and three anthropologists that are on the
15 Standing SSC and so, in essence, when you have a meeting where
16 they need to discuss something, you will have five of each,
17 which is stronger than the current Socioeconomic SSC, because I
18 don't think you have five anthropologists on that committee.
19
20 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** This group would be an advisory group to the SSC
21 and is that the way I read it?
22
23 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** They will meet jointly with the SSC
24 and vote with the SSC, just like our Special Mackerel SSC does.
25 They vote as a group and they don't vote separately and so they
26 will be integrated into the Standing SSC meeting when there is a
27 need to have them convened jointly with the SSC. That's the way
28 they will operate.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Who makes the determination that they are
31 required to meet?
32
33 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The council, the council chair, or
34 myself. It would be at the request of the Standing SSC.
35 Normally we meet -- We automatically pull the mackerel or the
36 red drum folks in when we're talking about those two topics and
37 in this case, if we were talking about allocation, we would
38 automatically bring that Special Socioeconomic SSC in with the
39 Standing, when it's clear that their expertise is needed.
40
41 **MR. RIECHERS:** Doug, I am kind of reflecting back to us trying
42 to find social anthropologists who really work in fisheries and
43 who kind of have that expertise and how they work into this
44 process. Of course, I may be way off on their discipline and
45 how it's evolving through time, but in the past, it's been
46 difficult in how they insert themselves into this very
47 quantitative process, where we end up kind of finding a way to
48 articulate what they're bringing to the table in terms of our

1 documents and where that heads.

2
3 I think we may be setting ourselves up both in a position here
4 where we're not going to find that many people and, secondly,
5 where we have a lot of people who aren't helping the process
6 moving further because they really just -- Their discipline is
7 not allowing them to do that in this way right now. I just
8 appreciate addressing the committee and I will look forward to
9 where you all come out on this issue.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion? I am concerned with this
12 motion that what we've done is we've integrated the entire
13 Socioeconomic SSC into the SSC, is what it appears.

14
15 **MR. PERRET:** Again, I see this special committee just like any
16 of our special committees on reef fish or mackerel or shrimp.
17 If it's a shrimp issue, the Special SSC meets with the Standing
18 SSC and if indeed, like Mr. Gregory used the example of
19 allocation, then I would foresee this special socioeconomic
20 group meeting with the standing group.

21
22 I too have the same concerns that Robin mentioned, because this
23 is a pretty specific discipline and whether we're going to find
24 enough qualified people willing to participate in this process
25 remains to be seen, but I see this special committee operating
26 the same way our other special committees would.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I have a question for Bonnie. Bonnie, if we
29 have the Special Socioeconomic SSC meeting with them, what does
30 that do to the scientific balance, as opposed to the
31 socioeconomic balance on the committee? Am I making myself
32 clear?

33
34 **DR. PONWITH:** I see no problem with having additional economists
35 and sociologists meeting with the group, because often your
36 economists are going to be heavily quantitative in their
37 backgrounds as well and would at least find the stock assessment
38 components of interest. In terms of there being voting problems
39 with people from the social sciences being on the SSC, I don't
40 see a problem.

41
42 **MR. WALKER:** I would just say I speak in favor of the motion.
43 If you're going to dissolve the SESSC, I think this would help
44 at some point -- When it becomes a socioeconomic decision, which
45 is an important decision, I think you need the Special
46 Socioeconomic and it will come in very useful.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion? All right. Let's vote on

1 this one. The motion is to create a Special Socioeconomic SSC
2 to be comprised of two economists and two
3 anthropologists/sociologists. **All in favor say aye; all**
4 **opposed. The motion passes.**
5

6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The next thing I have here is a
7 draft motion and it really doesn't need to be a motion, but it's
8 just a suggestion from staff that when we go to appoint the
9 special SSCs, let's try to limit them to three to five people.

10
11 **MR. PERRET:** A question. How many are on these special
12 committees now, Doug?
13

14 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Well, we have seven on the Special
15 Coral and we have three on King Mackerel and we have six on Red
16 Drum and five on Reef Fish and six on Shrimp and four on Spiny
17 Lobster and so we're pretty close to that now.
18

19 **MR. PERRET:** I want to move to limit the size of the Special
20 SSCs to no more than five members each.
21

22 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Do I hear a second to that motion? I have a
23 second. Is there discussion on the motion? **Hearing no**
24 **discussion, all in favor of the motion say aye; opposed to the**
25 **motion.**
26

27 **MS. BADEMAN:** Doug, the motion that Corky said is not what's on
28 the board. Hang on a second.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay. Let's get it on the board.
31

32 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** It should read "to no more than
33 five members".
34

35 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I am going to read it and then we'll vote again,
36 to make sure everybody understood the motion. The motion is to
37 limit the size of the Special SSCs to no more than five members
38 each. Any discussion?
39

40 **MR. WALKER:** It reads "no more than five" and does that mean
41 they can be as little as one? When you were saying three to
42 five --
43

44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** It's not likely we will go to one.
45 I mean most of them are four to six now.
46

47 **MR. WALKER:** That just concerns me that it could be limited to
48 one and that's my only concern, or one of my concerns.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** That's a council decision when you
3 review the applications and decide who you appoint and so that's
4 a decision you would make at that time. If there is -- That has
5 never happened. I don't think you've ever had one with just
6 two. I think it has gone as low as three people.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Further discussion? We will vote on the motion.
9 The motion, again, is to limit the size of the Special SSCs to
10 no more than five members each. **All in favor say aye; all**
11 **opposed. The motion carries.**

12
13 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The last thing is a request I have
14 of the council and it's to postpone the selection of the SSC
15 appointments until the June meeting, due to the forty-five day
16 lead time needed for the statement of financial interest to be
17 submitted.

18
19 What we're going to have to do for people who are not on the
20 SSCs now that are going to apply, they have to get their
21 statement of financial interest in forty-five days before the
22 council meeting and so we need a good lead time to advertise
23 that and to make people aware, because we have never enforced
24 that before and it would be simpler for us if we do that for the
25 SSC in June and appoint the APs at the March/April meeting.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Is there committee discussion on this concept or
28 this request?

29
30 **MS. BADEMAN:** I would be willing to make the motion.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right. Go ahead.

33
34 **MS. BADEMAN:** Postpone selection of the SSC appointments until
35 June of 2015 due to the forty-five day lead time needed for
36 SOFIs to be submitted and to reduce potential confusion and work
37 load during the transition to staggered terms and the online
38 application process.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Mr. Greene seconds. Mr. Gregory, how many open
41 positions do we have at the current time?

42
43 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** How many positions on the SSC?
44 Seventy.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** How many do we consider to be open at this
47 moment and not filled?
48

1 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** None.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Didn't we have one person drop off this year?
4
5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Well, Greg was on the SSC and like
6 I said in the introduction, we don't have a process for
7 automatically appointing seats. We don't have specific seats
8 like we're trying to establish and so there is no recognition.
9 The Standing SSC at one time was seventeen or eighteen members.
10 When I became the Director, I really wasn't replaced and Greg
11 wasn't replaced and so we haven't kept track of that.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** We have a motion on the board and I am not going
14 to read the motion again. I believe everybody knows what it is.
15 Any further discussion? **All in favor of this motion say aye;**
16 **opposed to the motion say aye. The motion carries.**
17
18 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** That completes the SSC portion.
19
20 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right. Myron, do you have a question?
21
22 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just for
23 clarification, when would we be populating the SSCs, whether
24 it's the Special Socioeconomic or --
25
26 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** In June.
27
28 **MR. FISCHER:** Okay. With enough lead time, could you furnish us
29 the present breakdown and -- Because we may -- I don't want to
30 say swap out, but we may want to look at some of our state
31 people in a different light with this new recalibration of the
32 SSCs and could you furnish that to us in some timely manner so
33 we could get the information?
34
35 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Certainly and, again, the Special
36 SSCs are not necessarily populated with quantitative people like
37 the Standing is intended to do, but we can do that and we will
38 do that probably in the next couple of weeks.
39
40 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay, Mr. Gregory, what else in Tab G-4?
41
42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** We can go back to page 1 and so,
43 again, my intention was that if the council agrees with doing
44 staggered terms and having a term be three years instead of two
45 years and we appoint a third of all the members each year, then
46 that is the process for filling seats in a timely manner.
47
48 Other than that, if you wanted to have a more formal process

1 that we fill seats as soon as one becomes vacant, we possibly
2 could be having closed sessions at every meeting or every other
3 meeting during the year just for one or two people. I didn't
4 think that was necessary and so I haven't proposed anything like
5 that here.

6
7 The first thing here is the proposed terms and term limits and
8 none of our APs or SSCs have term limits at this point in time
9 and staff thought it might be useful to have term limits similar
10 to what the council itself has and so the first suggested thing
11 or motion is that the AP seats may, at the pleasure of the
12 council, be reappointed for two additional terms after their
13 first term, and so that gives them three terms.

14
15 However, AP members may be reappointed to the same advisory
16 panel after having been off the advisory panel for at least one
17 year. Your current policy is no individual can serve on more
18 than two APs simultaneously and so the suggestion is to have the
19 AP seats be similar to council seats as far as term limits go
20 and we have never had term limits before and we are not
21 proposing term limits for the SSC.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I think we have two different things we're
24 dealing with here and, Doug, would you be okay if we divided
25 this and talked about the staggered terms first and then talk
26 about term limits? I see those as separate.

27
28 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes and the next item under this
29 section is AP and SSC terms will be staggered to provide for the
30 appointment of one-third of the membership of the SSC and AP
31 each year.

32
33 The council had a difficult time during the last reappointment
34 process and we have over 250 people that serve on the APs and
35 SSCs. Right now, you do this every two years, every odd year
36 actually, in 2013, 2015. We thought that if we staggered the
37 terms and you did this every year to a third of the people there
38 would be less confusion on that part.

39
40 The potential problem with staggering the terms is confusion on
41 the part of the AP members themselves. They will now, each one,
42 have a different term and when we advertise a seat, we need to
43 make it clear to the existing members whose seat is being
44 advertised and whose seat is not being advertised. I think
45 there is potential confusion there. Right now, everybody has
46 the same term and everybody gets reappointed or not reappointed
47 at the same time.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Is there committee discussion?
2

3 **MR. MATENS:** Doug, you and I have discussed this before and this
4 just occurred to me and I have two questions. How do we choose
5 which sitting members are going to be one, two, or three-year
6 members, one? Two is under your guidelines, it is possible for
7 someone who is a sitting member and would remain a sitting
8 member to apply for a seat that would bring him or her further
9 into the future? If I have one more year left in my term, could
10 I apply for a three-year term coming up and then get four years?
11 You have to forgive me. I am from Louisiana.
12

13 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I haven't thought of that, but I
14 did develop a sophisticated mathematical model for determining
15 what the term limits are. First, we are going to alphabetize
16 all the members that you appoint to the AP and then we'll start
17 at the top and go 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3. That will be their initial
18 term and then from that point forward, everybody has three
19 years, but the issue you brought up I hadn't even considered.
20

21 **MR. PERRET:** Doug, we use comparisons to other councils when
22 it's to our advantage and not so much so when it's to our
23 disadvantage or to a disadvantage and what's the status on term
24 limits and staggered terms for the other seven councils?
25

26 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I do not know.
27

28 **MR. PERRET:** I don't know about this one. Camp has brought up a
29 good point and, of course, he comes from a state with term
30 limits, but they just serve their term in the House and then
31 they run and they become a Senator and they go back and forth
32 and so I guess they could do that too, but have we had a problem
33 or what is the problem that we're trying to fix, other than the
34 staggered thing?
35

36 I can see a hundred coming up at the same time or whatever that
37 number is and I can see a need for that, but we've had
38 difficulty enough trying to get qualified people to serve on a
39 lot of these committees and if indeed we have people that are
40 willing to serve and are contributing, why would we want to
41 limit their time?
42

43 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Let me just speak to that for a second. I think
44 there's two different issues here and that's why I wanted to
45 break them apart. One, the staggered terms is, in my opinion,
46 strictly a logistical administrative problem that we deal with
47 every time staff has to advertise and go through all of the
48 applications and then we make appointments. The other issue,

1 I'm with you that we need to have a deep discussion about that.

2
3 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I recognize I'm putting a lot
4 before you. We are also developing an online application
5 process for both the SSC and the AP and I can demonstrate that a
6 little bit at the full council meeting. It's not live yet, but
7 we have links to some pages, so what you get when you do the
8 reappointment will be consistent among all the different
9 applications, because in the past, sometimes we get an email
10 saying I want to be on that panel and sometimes we get a resume
11 and so we are going to try to develop a form for that.

12
13 The other thing we can concentrate on is not just sending out
14 email notices to existing members, but also mail, paper copies,
15 of their need to be reappointed, because in two or three
16 instances in 2013, we lost people on panels because they thought
17 they applied or they say they never got the notice to reapply
18 and they weren't aware of the process.

19
20 We can strengthen that and we can reevaluate and see if we have
21 similar confusion this year and not do the staggered terms now,
22 but maybe reconsider that at a future date, because I do have
23 mixed feelings about staggered terms. On the one hand, it might
24 simplify our process, but it might turn out to be more confusing
25 for the people that serve on these APs and it may be more work
26 for them than it saves us and so staff doesn't have strong
27 feelings about the staggered term issue.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay and is there further discussion?

30
31 **MS. BADEMAN:** I realize that transitioning to staggered terms is
32 kind of awkward, but I think it would be a good thing. I think
33 it would cut down a lot of the confusion in trying to appoint
34 all those people at one time. It's a lot, I think, thinking
35 back to a couple of years ago, in April. I think it was
36 tedious, to say the least. If we can get there, I am onboard,
37 but how we get there, I don't know.

38
39 **DR. PONWITH:** Again, this is speaking strictly from a logistics
40 standpoint and I don't have any stake in the decision that the
41 council makes, but in managing groups like this internally,
42 staggering makes sense if you have a term limit and staggering
43 becomes almost moot if you don't.

44
45 If the decision for term limits is accepted, then staggering
46 almost becomes an imperative, because you don't want to
47 destabilize your panel by losing too high a percentage. Mr.
48 Gregory's approach makes the sense, the 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3. The

1 catch is that a one-year term is a pretty short term and so an
2 alternative way to do that is to have 2, 3, 4 for the first time
3 and then after that, land on a 3. That way, you don't have a
4 group of people that come in and serve one year and are gone.

5
6 **MR. WILLIAMS:** The staff load problem could be solved by just
7 doing a third of the committees every year too though, couldn't
8 it, rather than -- Just say do Mackerel this year and a couple
9 of the smaller ones and next year do Reef Fish and a couple of
10 the ones that meet less often, but that might not integrate so
11 well with the term limit problem, when Bonnie said that. That
12 might not work so well. That's another way to do it and it
13 would be less confusing, in some ways, but it might create
14 another problem if you go to the term limit thing.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Wouldn't you still have the same problem of
17 figuring out which committee is going to be two years or three
18 years or four years as you do with -- Is there further
19 discussion? We need to keep moving and we are going to run out
20 of time here pretty soon on this committee. Any further
21 discussion on the concept of staggered terms for the SSCs?

22
23 **MR. PERRET:** This would delay things, but I would just like to
24 know, Doug, if you would check with the other seven councils and
25 see if any of them do that and how it's working. If they do it
26 and it's working great, I am all for it and if they do it and
27 it's not working worth a darn, then I think we ought to put it
28 to bed.

29
30 **MS. BADEMAN:** I was just going to note, and Zack can correct me
31 if I'm wrong, but the South Atlantic just started doing term
32 limits this year, right?

33
34 **MR. ZACK BOWEN:** I think it went into place last year.

35
36 **MS. BADEMAN:** Okay, but you all have had staggered terms for
37 some time and is that right or did you just start that too?

38
39 **MR. BOWEN:** I think we just started that as well, but I can
40 check and clarify and get back with you if you need me to, but
41 the term limits just started last year, I believe.

42
43 **MS. BADEMAN:** Okay and so there's one council.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right. Martha, did you make a motion a
46 while ago or am I --

47
48 **MS. BADEMAN:** I think we took care of it. It was the one about

1 delaying. I think we voted on it.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Mr. Gregory and then we'll need a motion on this
4 suggestion from staff.

5
6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Both the term limits and this is
7 something we can bring back to the council in March with more
8 information and the council can decide at that point, because
9 this doesn't affect your appointment process in March.
10 Everybody is going to have to reapply.

11
12 When we advertise it, and I am looking at Charlene for
13 confirmation, but when we advertise it, we can say the council
14 is considering term limits and staggered terms and that may be
15 part of the appointment process, instead of telling them that
16 we're going to do it that way. We can bring both of these
17 issues back to the council in March and that will give us time
18 to find out what the other councils do and bring that to you for
19 consideration.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right and with that, is there a motion that
22 anyone wants to make or are we just going to continue on?
23 Hearing no motion, Mr. Gregory, we will continue on.

24
25 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The next item, on page 2, is -- I
26 don't know if you need to approve the process. We are working
27 on an online process for application, to get formal
28 applications. We have some suggestions for things for the
29 council to consider when they are appointing people to the AP
30 and SSC.

31
32 We will also, at the request of the council, be available to
33 send out hard copy applications to individuals who don't want to
34 do an online application and so people can apply by regular mail
35 as well as online, but they will have to complete a standard
36 form and I can show you all the standard form at the council
37 meeting if you want. We don't have it live right now.

38
39 That's what we intend to do this year to try to make it easier
40 on the public and on yourself in evaluating the applications,
41 but I am not sure a motion is needed here for that.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I agree. I don't think we need one. That is
44 administrative. Any discussion? All right, Mr. Gregory.

45
46 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** On page 3, we have a section called
47 Proposed Updates to the Advisory Panel Structure and, again, I
48 brought this to you at two different meetings. At the last

1 meeting, it was suggested that we not try to develop categories
2 by eastern and western Gulf of Mexico and so what you have
3 before you is kind of a new set of numbers of people.

4
5 You have also told us, based on the experience of the South
6 Atlantic Council, that these categories are not fixed in stone.
7 These are suggestions for the council to follow when they are
8 making the appointments, but these are ideas for how to broaden
9 -- Staff ideas on how to broaden the makeup of the APs so that
10 all stakeholders are represented.

11
12 I am not trying to say we should propose each one individually,
13 but that's at your discretion. If one particular advisory panel
14 recommendation of stakeholders looks inappropriate, you can
15 address them one at a time or we can just go forward with this
16 and I can present this to the council when you make the
17 appointments for your guidance.

18
19 That's all it is and I don't think -- I know there has been some
20 concern about once we do this and once we make a motion that it
21 becomes something you have to do and I don't see it that way.
22 It's advisory and we don't have to put it in the SOPPs that this
23 is the structure of our APs. It's just something for us to
24 consider.

25
26 **MR. FISCHER:** Once again, I would like to make certain, whatever
27 decisions we -- They are just called rough guidelines, because
28 as far as the east and west, and it could even be regionalized
29 tighter than that, but I do think we understand if we're
30 discussing a red grouper or a spiny lobster or a stone crab
31 issue, it should weigh very heavily on input from the eastern
32 and southeastern Gulf, as opposed to if we're doing shrimp work
33 and we need an AP involved with shrimp and it probably should be
34 heavier maybe towards the western Gulf and we just have to think
35 about where that species -- What its habitat is and
36 geographically where it's from. Although I know we're not
37 creating our committees all that way, it's something we still
38 have to consider.

39
40 **MR. MATENS:** I have two kind of nagging concerns about the --
41 The first is about the makeup of some of these. There are some
42 in here that I am a little uncomfortable about the way they're
43 made up.

44
45 Secondly though, more generally, I am uncomfortable about no
46 matter what we say about this and it could just be advice only,
47 limiting ourselves and putting ourselves into a box. I am just
48 still mulling through that in my mind.

1
2 When we start talking about other stakeholders, I mean there's a
3 lot of stakeholders out there and not just the ones that we have
4 on this list and so, for what that's worth, that's kind of what
5 is going through my mind right now.
6

7 **MR. RIECHERS:** I am not on the committee, but sharing some of
8 the same concerns that Camp has, I -- I think our targets for
9 advisory panels, I think we've always done a good job of
10 outlining those targets as we try to think about those panels
11 and pull them together.
12

13 More recently, we have kind of gone to a structure where we've
14 grabbed more ad hoc panels and that, in and of itself, typically
15 is designed to grab certain folks specifically for those areas.
16 I think if we put this in -- Even though it's advisory in
17 nature, I am not certain that it won't be brought up as you were
18 supposed to be targeting these areas and you set it in the past.
19

20 Frankly, I just am at the point here that I think we need to
21 make a decision this meeting whether we go forward or not and it
22 would be my preference not to go forward with this. We are
23 trying to do some other things with structures and term limits
24 to help us and I think we just need to decide which way we're
25 going here at this meeting and we've spent enough time on this
26 discussion continually over the last couple of meetings and we
27 just need to decide one way or the other.
28

29 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I just wanted to say that I don't see a problem
30 with having an advisory type of list, but if it's going to be
31 advisory, I guess what I'm hearing is it's advisory, but we just
32 don't feel comfortable necessarily following it.
33

34 When I hear that, then, to me, there doesn't really seem to be
35 much point in having this list about who you are going to
36 potentially appoint or what types of interest, because it's
37 advisory, but there's people that are uncomfortable with it and
38 don't really want to be following it.
39

40 I don't think that making the list mandates that you do it, but
41 if there is not going to be sort of a consensus that there's
42 going to be an attempt to follow this guideline and perhaps
43 deviate in certain circumstances, then it doesn't seem
44 necessarily worthwhile to have the guideline.
45

46 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** Kind of following on what Camp had said
47 earlier about the makeup of some of the committees, in the past
48 we have had APs that were put together where it was all one

1 particular user group, such as, for example, as the Data
2 Collection AP for Recreational Anglers was strictly all
3 recreational anglers.

4
5 Then we have other APs that are made up where we have a cross-
6 section of recreational and for-hire and commercial, et cetera,
7 et cetera, and so I think that if we're going to look at this
8 from a holistic point of view, we need to decide are we going to
9 put groups of people together specifically for a particular
10 topic and it's going to be just those individuals or are we
11 going to make it a unilateral decision that we're going to have
12 commercial, environmental, for-hire, recreational, and we're
13 going to populate all the committees the same and go from that.

14
15 Now, I understand that there may be a special scenario that we
16 may have to deviate from that and I think that's something that
17 we should look into.

18
19 The other issue I have is looking back through some of the
20 makeup of the APs in the past and I looked at particular
21 individuals and I noted that on several occasions they were
22 people who had put down that they were part of several of the
23 groups that are listed on the board.

24
25 Currently on the screen you see, for example, private anglers,
26 for-hire, environmental groups, and commercial hook and line, et
27 cetera. Well, if you have one individual that clicks multiple
28 categories, then that becomes somewhat confusing, because you
29 could argue that every one of them is an environmentalist or
30 whatever and so on and so forth.

31
32 I think that in moving forward that if we're going to solicit
33 this that we should have people click the box that most suits
34 them, as opposed to multiple boxes where they are trying to make
35 sure, well, if I can't get on under this category, I can get on
36 under this one or I can get on under that one. It seems a bit
37 confusing to me.

38
39 **MR. PERRET:** One thing consistent with this Gulf Council, and
40 I'm sure the other councils, since we started in 1979 is the
41 difficulty or the issues appointing people to these advisory
42 panels.

43
44 In the early days, the discussion was what type of fishermen
45 from what part of the Gulf and so on and so forth and then the
46 environmental community came in the 1980s, I guess it was, and
47 more and more and so every time we have ever had this type of
48 discussion there has been these issues of what's fair and what's

1 equitable and so on and so forth.

2
3 Those of us that take the oath of office, part of that oath is
4 the greatest overall benefit to the nation. One thing I think
5 we definitely should have on these panels is a consumer. Now,
6 we can say every member is a consumer, which they obviously are,
7 but I do think there is a consumer league in each state that
8 probably we should have members of consumer organizations.

9
10 I think we have done a pretty darned good job with populating
11 these panels with geographical representation and various
12 interests, direct interests, in the fishery and members of the
13 environmental community and we're going to have some
14 disagreements and that's why there is seventeen of us that make
15 these decisions.

16
17 It's tough. It's really tough and Myron brought up a point
18 about, well, if it's an issue with spiny lobsters, I think
19 probably the experts or the advisors should be from that
20 particular geography and with shrimp, I agree with him on the
21 west Gulf, except for pink shrimp. That's primarily a Florida
22 fishery and we probably should have the right people from that
23 area on that. This has always been an issue and it's not going
24 to change and hopefully we're in pretty good shape and if we can
25 improve it, so be it.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Mr. Gregory, I am not hearing a lot of support
28 for the structure that you proposed and in all due respect to
29 our former administration, committee chairman, Mr. Riechers,
30 does the committee want to send the direction, in the form of a
31 motion and a vote, to staff about continuing to work on this or
32 not work on it or what's the pleasure of the committee?

33
34 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I understand and if there's no
35 motion, then we don't go forward with it.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I am hearing no motion and so I think we just
38 discontinue work on this particular recommendation.

39
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay, but we do have a couple of
41 things we want to try to address here with the ad hoc panels.
42 It was discussed I think one time before. When we do an ad hoc
43 panel, we --

44
45 **MR. PERRET:** Do we want to do something with the Data Collection
46 thing, the AP, and consolidate it? That seemed like probably a
47 good idea to me and we could have some discussion on it, but
48 that's before your ad hoc stuff.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The Private Recreational Data
3 Collection is an ad hoc committee and so the proposal is that we
4 discontinue that and integrate that function into the overall
5 Data Collection AP. Now, I don't know why this separate AP was
6 formed and I don't have the history to that and so I'm just
7 bringing it to your attention. According to staff, and I have
8 talked with John Froeschke, who is our data collection liaison
9 to the council, and he thought that was a good idea.

10
11 That was one thing we wanted to ask you to do before we start
12 advertising and the other thing was to establish a sunset date
13 for the ad hoc and if not now, at a future date consider it and
14 also, we were asking to eliminate the three state habitat APs,
15 because you did not populate them at the last meeting and we
16 don't use them and we don't address state-level coastal
17 construction projects like the council did in the 1980s and
18 1990s.

19
20 Those are three actions that we're asking the committee and the
21 council to consider and the first one is what Corky brought up,
22 is to integrate the Private Recreational Data Collection AP into
23 the overall Data Collection AP.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I think there's the possibility of several
26 motions there, if I am listening correctly, and if there
27 discussion by the committee?

28
29 **MR. PERRET:** Mr. Chairman, I move that we discontinue the
30 Private Recreational Data Collection AP and integrate function
31 into the Data Collection Advisory Panel.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** You have a motion and do I have a second?

34
35 **MR. MATENS:** Second.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** I have a second from Mr. Matens. Is there
38 discussion? Hearing no discussion, the motion is to discontinue
39 the Private Recreational Data Collection AP and integrate
40 function into the Data Collection AP. Mr. Pearce, you don't
41 have any comment on that, since that's your committee?

42
43 **MR. PEARCE:** No, I mean it was useful at the time and I think
44 they're moving way past that now and we've got a lot of things
45 that are going to go on that we're ready to go with and so I'm
46 fine with that.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right. Then let's go ahead and vote on this

1 motion. **All in favor say aye; all opposed like sign. Hearing**
2 **none, the motion passes.** Mr. Gregory, what's the next possible
3 topic for a motion?
4

5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** To establish a sunset date of May
6 2018 for each ad hoc AP. That can be renewed for an additional
7 period at the council discretion and we just put May of 2018
8 just to have a starting point of discussion. That's three years
9 in advance, three years from now. If the APs are not intended
10 to be ad hoc, then we can make them permanent, but by definition
11 of ad hoc, they are there to do a specific purpose and they
12 should go away when that purpose has been completed.
13

14 **MR. PERRET:** I've got a little problem with this and I won't be
15 around in 2018, but what if the council forms an ad hoc
16 committee at the January 2018 meeting? Does it sunset in May?
17 It seems like we're going to -- The council is going to be
18 setting ad hoc committees for a particular purpose at a
19 particular time and it seems to me if we want a sunset date, we
20 ought to make it May of 2015 and if we've got to renew whichever
21 ad hoc committee it is, we do it, but going that far out, I
22 think we could be creating some problems.
23

24 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Any new ad hoc committee, when you
25 develop the purpose and need for that committee, you should
26 probably establish a sunset date at the time that you then
27 reconsider and if the purpose and need hasn't been completed,
28 you simply extend it for another period of time, but this is
29 just an attempt to force a decision on not having these by
30 default become ongoing, permanent-type committees, but we call
31 them ad hoc.
32

33 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Corky, do you think we need more information
34 about what we're trying to do here or is that sufficient?
35

36 **MR. PERRET:** Again, the current ad hoc panels that I'm looking
37 at, I think they're all active and May of 2018 is fine, but in
38 the future, if you set an ad hoc committee up, say at the end of
39 2017, is it going to automatically sunset on that date? I don't
40 know and, Doug, if you're satisfied with it, I will make the
41 motion to set it at 2018, if you think that takes care of what
42 you're trying to do.
43

44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** There is an alternative approach.
45 See the dilemma staff has is we've got to advertise for all
46 these APs after this meeting and so March and April is not the
47 time, I don't think, for you all to decide to discontinue one of
48 these. Ideally, you would reevaluate this every year and so the

1 date was simply a way to try to get that started.
2
3 If you want, we can simply address the existence of each of
4 these every January and then advertise it if you all decide to
5 keep it going forward.
6
7 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Yes and do we just want to eliminate those that
8 are not useful right now and then have you just go forward with
9 the ones that are?
10
11 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** If we did that annually, that would
12 serve a similar purpose.
13
14 **MR. PERRET:** Would something to the effect of establish an
15 annual review of ad hoc committees -- In January of every year,
16 establish an annual review of ad hoc committees and for those
17 that have fulfilled their obligation, they would be sunsetted or
18 something to that effect? Okay. Let's see.
19
20 **I move that in January of each year the council evaluate each ad**
21 **hoc advisory panel and if they deem the panel has completed its**
22 **assignment that the panel be disbanded.**
23
24 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** We have a motion on the board and is there a
25 second on the motion?
26
27 **MR. GREENE:** Second.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Johnny Greene seconds and is there discussion?
30 I think this is a good cleanup motion.
31
32 **MR. WALKER:** Does the council -- I am just trying to think
33 historically and has it always met in January? I just want to
34 make sure that's clear or the first meeting in each year.
35
36 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** The point there I think is to get it in timely
37 so that we can do the proper advertising for the next round of
38 appointments.
39
40 **MS. LEVY:** That was actually my comment. I was going to suggest
41 that you say the first council meeting of each calendar year,
42 rather than January, so that if you don't meet in January, then
43 you still do it at the first meeting.
44
45 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Corky, are you all right with that?
46
47 **MR. PERRET:** Yes.
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right. The motion is that in the first
2 council meeting of each year the council evaluate each ad hoc
3 advisory panel and if they deem the panel has completed its
4 assignment that the panel will be disbanded. Any further
5 discussion? **All in favor of this motion say aye; opposed to the**
6 **motion. Hearing none, the motion carries.** Mr. Gregory, do we
7 want to go ahead as an Administrative Committee and define some
8 of those for this meeting, to try and clean it up for you? Or
9 we could do it at full council if you want to come back with a
10 list of ad hoc committees that you think --

11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** We have three and they're in the
13 document here. We have an Artificial Substrate Committee, a Red
14 Snapper IFQ Committee, and a Red Snapper For-Hire IFQ Committee.
15 The Artificial Substrate was created in October of 2012 and the
16 Red Snapper IFQ in August of 2013 and the Red Snapper For-Hire
17 IFQ in June of 2014.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay, committee, any comments or questions?
20 Hearing none, we will move on, Mr. Gregory.

21
22 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** In April of 2013, when you reviewed
23 the AP applications, you did not populate the three state
24 advisory panels and staff is not clear if that was intended to
25 eliminate those advisory panels. We have kept them on our
26 website blank and we don't work with state habitat advisory
27 panels like we did in the 1980s and 1990s to review and comment
28 on coastal construction projects that might impact habitat. I
29 just wanted clarification if the council wanted us to eliminate
30 those three advisory panels.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Comments from the states?

33
34 **MR. PERRET:** Mr. Gregory, what's your recommendation?

35
36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** To eliminate them.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Corky, let me just ask from the states who are
39 here, what is you all's opinion on that? Is there any comment
40 or no comment?

41
42 **MR. MATENS:** We in Louisiana are fine with that elimination.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Okay, Corky, thank you.

45
46 **MR. PERRET:** Mr. Chairman, I move that we eliminate the three
47 state habitat advisory panels.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** We have a motion and a second?

2
3 **MS. BADEMAN:** I will second it if nobody else will.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** We have a second by Martha and, Martha, did you
6 have a comment a while ago?

7
8 **MS. BADEMAN:** I was just going to say I'm fine with this and
9 that's all.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Any further discussion? **All in favor of the**
12 **motion to eliminate the three state habitat APs say aye;**
13 **opposed. Hearing no opposition, the motion carries.**

14
15 **REVIEW OF NMFS/NOAA COMMENTS ON 2012 SOPPS**

16
17 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The next item on the agenda is Tab
18 G, Number 5. That's a copy of our SOPPs as of August of 2012
19 that was submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service based on
20 their recommendations for model SOPPs. They are trying to get
21 all the councils to develop consistent SOPPs that are similar.

22
23 Where there were comments by the reviewers, I retyped the
24 comments in italics and I will just go through this and
25 highlight some of this, what we think, what staff thinks, is
26 worth bringing to your attention. Most of the other stuff is
27 editorial and of little consequence.

28
29 It was interesting that the first comment on page 1 was that we
30 put these SOPPs on our website in 2012 when we submitted them to
31 NMFS and he is suggesting that they shouldn't be there because
32 they haven't been approved.

33
34 This was an issue that I resolved a year ago with our liaison in
35 D.C., Bill Chappell, and the question is what SOPPs do the
36 council follow, the ones that they approve or the ones that NMFS
37 approves and that was the dilemma, because it takes two years or
38 more for NMFS to approve SOPPs.

39
40 The response was that we follow what we approve and so this
41 comment is incorrect and we had the right SOPPs on the website.
42 We follow the SOPPs that this council approves and, as you see,
43 these are suggestions by the Department of Commerce on things
44 that we should change.

45
46 They did some reshuffling of council functions and
47 responsibilities. There is nothing new really there. That was
48 on page 2. On page 4, they just noted that that comment was

1 redundant to something said earlier in the document and whenever
2 we mention "member", they want us to say "voting member". Each
3 voting member, on page 5, must take an oath of office.
4

5 **MR. PERRET:** A question. It seems to me that a voting member,
6 and that's fine, in my opinion, under the appointed voting
7 members, but the oath of office in 2.2 below, as trustees of the
8 nation's fishery resources, each voting member -- To me, that
9 should be each at-large and obligatory member, because you've
10 got five state directors that do not take the oath of office,
11 yet they are voting members. I think that would clarify it,
12 that that's talking about those that are appointed as at-large
13 or obligatory members and that's my suggestion for a possible
14 modification.
15

16 **MS. LEVY:** When you talk about voting members appointed to the
17 council, you are only talking about those that are nominated by
18 the Governors and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and so
19 that automatically doesn't include the state directors and the
20 Regional Administrator.
21

22 **MR. PERRET:** I will buy that, but it's still confusing when you
23 read the oath of office in a different section below. It talks
24 about members appointed. The director of the agency has
25 appointed Myron.
26

27 **MS. LEVY:** I understand that, but as the term is used in the
28 Act, it's those that are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.
29

30 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I mean we can make that
31 clarification without contradicting anybody. That's easy enough
32 to do. Right above the oath of office is a paragraph that
33 they've suggested that non-voting members of the council may
34 serve on committees and may serve as chairs and may initiate and
35 second motions, as well as vote on matters that pertain to
36 committee.
37

38 At the meetings of the council, the non-voting members may do
39 neither of those. They may not initiate or second motions nor
40 vote on matters and I think we follow that policy now and so
41 this is just clarification of that. The non-voting members have
42 more leeway in committee than they do in the council.
43

44 The next interesting point is on page 16 and, again, we will --
45 I will come back to the council and this committee at the next
46 meeting with the SOPPs again, where we will start reviewing
47 staff recommendations and integrate those with these and with
48 the ad hoc committee recommendations that we've done earlier.

1
2 I didn't want to confuse things and so I'm doing this in a step-
3 wise matter, but on page 16, the comment was when we say that
4 knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the
5 council is a violation of federal law -- We say that in our
6 chairman's statement and we say that in the public hearing
7 statement, but the question here is which law is violated and
8 it's the Magnuson Act.

9
10 Mara sent me the Section 307 of the Magnuson Act and it says
11 that it is unlawful for any person to knowingly and willfully
12 submit to a council, secretary, or governor false information,
13 and then it has a parenthetical phrase, regarding any matter
14 that the council, secretary, or governor is considering in the
15 course of carrying out this Act and so we got that
16 clarification.

17
18 You can see the person that made that comment may not have been
19 that familiar with the Magnuson Act. A number of different
20 departments review these, the Ethics Department and -- I wrote
21 it on the front cover, but the Financial Assistance Law
22 Division, the Ethics Division, the General Law and Employment,
23 and the Labor Law Office. That's why a couple of these comments
24 don't seem relevant.

25
26 The next major comment is on leave, page 24, and the comment was
27 that much has been left out from the model SOPPs in this section
28 and that we may want to reference 50 CFR 600 and so we're going
29 to take that and put that in there and what that is, it's a
30 paragraph on leave accounting and our suggested wording is going
31 to be: An account shall be maintained -- This from the CFR. An
32 account shall be maintained to pay for unused sick or annual
33 leave, as authorized, and will be funded from the council's
34 operating allowances. Funds may be deposited into this account
35 at the end of the budget period, for us every year, if
36 unobligated balances remain in our budget. Interest earned
37 stays in the account along with the principle for the purpose of
38 paying unused annual and sick leave.

39
40 We have such an account. In fact, we have two accounts. We
41 have one for sick leave and one for annual leave and they are
42 fully paid up. It says budgeting for accrued leave will be
43 identified in the other object class category in the budget we
44 submit to NMFS and so we do that and so we will add that to our
45 SOPPs.

46
47 I don't believe there is anything else that staff thought was of
48 real consequence. They clarified -- They say they will follow

1 the General Service Administration reimbursement rates for
2 mileage. We don't follow that strictly. We are more lenient
3 than that and so I'm going to put in there that the council
4 generally observes and see -- We will respond to National Marine
5 Fisheries Service with changes that we are going to make to this
6 and see where it goes from there and eventually we will get a
7 final approval of our SOPPs, but in the meantime, we're still
8 changing them again and so it's like this is just a process that
9 goes on.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** All right and so the committee can expect more
12 changes to come, based on comments.

13
14 **MS. LEVY:** I was just curious and when you get back with your
15 comments on the DOC and NMFS comments, are you going to include
16 the changes that the council is now currently making or
17 considering or we're just leaving that for another time?

18
19 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I will certainly mention it to them
20 and ask them if they want to see it as we change them or if they
21 want to wait until we finish making changes, but the whole
22 process is not helpful to us. I mean it takes them two years to
23 provide these kind of comments and we're going to be making
24 changes more substantive than that within the two-year time
25 period.

26
27 If it takes that long to get approval from the Department of
28 Commerce or whatever, I don't know what the utility of it is,
29 but we will respond to them and if we -- If the response to this
30 raises a red flag with them, they will tell us and they will
31 tell us you can't do that and so that's the way we'll proceed
32 with that and then once we finish the current revision that we
33 have, we just submit it to them again for approval.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN BOYD:** Thank you, Mr. Gregory. Any other business or
36 comments or questions from the committee? I believe our
37 committee is finished with our work for today.

38
39 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m., January 26,
40 2015.)

41
42 - - -
43