

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

COUNCIL COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Silver Spring, Maryland
Thursday, November 7, 2019

- 1 PARTICIPANTS:
- 2 PHILIP ANDERSON
- 3 PFMC
- 4 JIM BALSIGER
- 5 Alaska Region
- 6 MEL BELL
- 7 SAFMC
- 8 TONY BLANCHARD
- 9 CFMC
- 10 MIKE BURNER
- 11 PFMC
- 12 JOHN CARMICHAEL
- 13 SAFMC
- 14 ROY CRABTREE
- 15 South East Region
- 16 DALE DIAZ
- 17 GMFMC
- 18 WARREN ELLIOTT
- 19 MAFMC
- 20 DIANA EVANS
- 21 NPFMC
- 22 TOM FRAZER
- 23 GMFMC
- 24 JOHN FROESCHKE
- 25 GMFMC
- 26 MARC GORELNIK
- 27 PFMC
- 28 JOHN GOURLEY
- 29 WPFMC

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 MARCOS HANKE
3 CFMC

4 NICOLE HILL
5 Western Region

6 ADAM ISSENBERG
7 NOAA GC

8 SIMON KINNEEN
9 NPFMC

10 MIKE LUISI
11 MAFMC

12 JESSICA McCAWLEY
13 SAFMC

14 CHRIS MOORE
15 MAFMC

16 TOM NIES
17 NEFMC

18 CHRIS OLIVER
19 NOAA Fisheries

20 MIKE PENTONY
21 North East Region

22 JOHN QUINN
NEFMC

SAM RAUCH
NOAA Fisheries

ERIC REID
NEFMC

ALAN RISENHOOVER
NOAA Fisheries

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 MIGUEL ROLÓN
CFMC

3
4 CARRIE SIMMONS
GMFMC

5 KITTY SIMONDS
WPFMC

6
7 MICHAEL TOSATTO
Pacific Islands Region

8 BILL TWEIT
NPFMC

9
10 JENNI WALLACE
NOAA Fisheries

11 GREGG WAUGH
SAFMC

12
13 CISCO WERNER
NOAA Fisheries

14 DAVE WHALEY
CCC

15
16 DAVID WITHERELL
NPFMC

17 Other Participants:

18 EVAN BLOOM

19 RUSS DUNN

20 TONY FRIEDRICH

21 SARAH HEIL

22 KIM IVERSON

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 BRIAN PAWLAK

3 ROGER PUGLIESE

4 ANJANETTE RILEY

5

6 * * * * *

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

C O N T E N T S

ITEM	PAGE
Welcome and Agenda Review	
Management and Budget Update	
NOAA Geographic Strategic Plans	
CCC Committee/Work Groups	
Scientific Coordination Subcommittee	
Habitat Work Group	
Council Communication Group	
Electronic Monitoring Workgroup	
Regional Fishery Management Forum	
Other Business	
Terms of Reference	
Wrap Up and Next Meeting	
May 26-29, 2020 (WPFMC host)	
September 22-25, 2020 (NMFS host)	

* * * * *

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (8:36 a.m.)

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: All Right. We are going
4 to get going. We are on the final day of our
5 meeting here and I'm going to move right into the
6 management and budget update. NOAA geographic
7 strategic plans and I believe that's Brian Pawlak.

8 MR. PAWLAK: Thank you. Give me a
9 second to get to that presentation set up here.
10 Can you guys hear me okay?

11 MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

12 MR. PAWLAK: Okay. I can't tell from
13 where I'm sitting if that's picking up or not so.
14 And let me just test drive the clicker before we
15 -- okay good. All right.

16 Well, thank you. Thanks for invitation
17 for to be able to talk to you guys today about
18 budget. I know you have had probably two long
19 days and now starting out early morning with
20 budget. Its, I don't know if that's a good or bad
21 thing for me but appreciate the opportunity to
22 talk to you.

1 I know Paul Doremus and I switch back
2 and forth on doing this at this different
3 meetings. Glad to go over where we are at the FY
4 '20 budget here and we will do some of that
5 through this presentation. We will get
6 specifically where we are at Council funding
7 status and where we are with the new grant process
8 and your current grant process. So some of those
9 slides are toward the end of just where you sit at
10 your funding levels and what we think your '20
11 funding levels will be.

12 Just, we have one last kind for landing
13 slide on geographic strategic plan if folks want
14 to talk about that anymore and we will just tell
15 you what the next stage is rolling out for that.
16 And also in here in the presentation if you've
17 been reading ahead or looking ahead, we are going
18 to talk a little bit about just how we have been
19 characterizing the Council budget and the funding
20 that you get from NOAA Fisheries and demonstrating
21 how we want to take some of that detailed -- the
22 way in the past we have conveyed in detail some of

1 those budget lines and roll those up into more
2 common budget lines and no change in funding
3 levels based on that, just a demonstration and a
4 display of how we display the budget.

5 And I'll spend some time on that and go
6 back and forth on some slides there to demonstrate
7 that so that's clear to everyone what we are
8 trying to do with that. So again, thanks for the
9 invitation and just where we stand within the
10 federal budget and where we are in the budget.

11 I know many of you have seen before, I
12 know there is some new faces around the table as
13 well so this might be really old news for some,
14 and may be new to others. But with the federal
15 budget timeline, we are typically always operating
16 in three years if not even four years at a time.
17 We have obviously just finished FY '19 but we
18 actually still have some FY '19 funds to execute
19 and things to clean up there. FY '20 we have the
20 House and Senate marks which we will talk about
21 here in some detail. We are currently under a CR
22 as you all know till November 21. And in the

1 middle of FY '20 execution even though not quite
2 with a full appropriation yet.

3 On FY '21, we have already briefed OMB
4 on the Department of Commerce submission that the
5 Department of Commerce proposal that OMB will
6 consider and then draft into a President's budget
7 for tentative release in February. And there is
8 actually even some early discussions going on from
9 the administration on soon seeing guidance on
10 preparing of the FY '22 budget.

11 So a number of budgets going on at any
12 one time. Overlapping budgets and conversations
13 about any fiscal year. What makes the discussion
14 on budgets sometimes confusing and creates a
15 misunderstanding is, you know, what budget year
16 are you talking about? Are you talking about a
17 budget year of already enacted level, are you
18 talking FY '20 which is a House and Senate mark in
19 a president's budget which could be three
20 different numbers. Three different sets of
21 directions in that any given year of budget.

22 But nothing enacted yet so you have a

1 lot of, you know, potential different numbers,
2 different direction, different conversations about
3 the same pot of money but at different funding
4 levels and what have you and then you've got the
5 planning components. So it definitely can be
6 confusing at times, challenging to communicate
7 where you think you are with the budget and
8 keeping track of just the different years and then
9 in any given execution year like we are right now,
10 waiting for a full appropriation.

11 Again, I think this group have seen this
12 slide from me many times before. It's just an
13 outline and characterizes the flow of the budget.
14 I think most important for this group is what we
15 tend to refer to as the three A's of budgeting.

16 The appropriations, so we first need our
17 appropriation from Congress. Budget needs to
18 provide the funding to the agency. After
19 appropriation, we need an apportionment. That's
20 OMB has to sign, basically signs a document that
21 allows us to legally use those funds. So once we
22 get our apportionment, or sorry, an appropriation,

1 we are required to have an apportionment from OMB.

2 Before we get to the bottom of the slide
3 here, an allocation to our individual FMC's or an
4 allotment to the Fisheries Management Council
5 grants and out the door. And I just flag this
6 slide as we often get questions, I get them from
7 my own fisheries leadership and staff. Why does
8 it take so long to get me the money, Brian, what
9 are you doing? We have got a bill signed a long
10 time ago or what are you doing? You guys at OMB
11 are so slow.

12 The process really takes a lot of time.
13 Sometimes apportionments sit at OMB for 30, 60
14 days, even longer. It's a process we keep trying
15 to push on that you might have been hearing about
16 increases or desires for changes in budgeting way
17 into formulation change even before you have had a
18 budget appropriated. So there is many steps in
19 the process.

20 We have been pretty good as of late
21 particularly with our grants management team of
22 trying to speed up how we get our allocated budget

1 and how we get funding out to the Councils. Years
2 past we had restrictions, some of that OMB's
3 interpretation, some of that our NOAA grants
4 office interpretations on what we could put out
5 the door, how fast we could put money out the
6 door.

7 And I think you will see here at the end
8 and when I get through some of the detail and
9 you've seen in past years, we've been pretty
10 successful in getting money out the door quicker
11 to you, not leaving you close to the edge of
12 running out of your current year award and
13 planning ahead and we have some I think good news
14 on that front this year as well.

15 This graphic here is just a snapshot of
16 NOAA Fisheries budget. Since you last were here I
17 think with Paul Doremus speaking in May, where you
18 see both the House and Senate marks for the '20
19 budget, and that's just reflected in here, just to
20 quick orient you to the slide.

21 Got a 2018 enacted budget on the left
22 here. We have the '19 omnibus enacted budgets.

1 President's budget, the proposed budget, third
2 column in and then you have the House mark and
3 Senate marks. So we like laying out this just
4 graphic picture here so you can just kind of see
5 in the big bins at the program level on our
6 habitat, enforcement, fish management, protected
7 resources and some of these kind of unique funds
8 up here, just where we stand at the different
9 levels from the different stages of budgeting,
10 kind of pointing to my first point we are
11 operating in multiple budgets at any given year at
12 a time.

13 And what you're referring to at any
14 given time makes a difference as to the amounts
15 and such available. And the graphic here is just
16 meant to convey which is more, most clearly seen
17 kind of in this Fish Disaster Mitigation Fund
18 where the enacted budgets we have some funding,
19 President's budget removes that, House mark puts
20 something back in, Senate doesn't. Just trying to
21 give you kind of a scale, a scope of in these
22 programs and in these bar graphs here where you

1 stand.

2 What is I think clearly evident in the
3 House and Senate marks which we have seen since
4 the start of this administration in the budgets
5 proposed by the president, House and Senate is
6 basically rejecting any proposed reductions that
7 the president's budget puts together. And in many
8 cases, you will see not only are they rejecting
9 the decreases and you will see most notably there
10 kind of Fish Science Management, decrease in
11 Pacific Salmon Recovery Fund.

12 House and Senate are rejecting those
13 proposed decreases and you can see just again just
14 for ease of pointing it out, House and Senate
15 marks are actually even putting more money in
16 enacted year after year so we are getting, you
17 know, slight bumps up, bump ups even though the
18 president's budget keeps proposing reductions in
19 decline in the budget.

20 We will highlight some of those here in
21 the next couple slides, what those specifically
22 are. Other interesting or trend that you don't

1 see it here in this slide but trend with both
2 House and Senate mark this year and my staff can
3 yell at me if I get the number wrong, but I think
4 we have over 100 pieces of language, Congressional
5 direction or report language required so we are
6 getting a lot of -- so good news is we are getting
7 some increased funding, that's always good for us
8 in executing our mission.

9 We are also getting a lot of
10 Congressional direction, some of that is shalls,
11 some is that you should. Some shalls are, you
12 know, requirement you must do. Shoulds, you need
13 to consider. We are getting a lot of input
14 through the House and Senate marks in the
15 Congressional language on suggestions of where to
16 put that funding. A lot of expectations of how to
17 use that funding.

18 So we appreciate the increases. Glad to
19 always have them and glad to follow the directions
20 Congress gives us but that does encumber our
21 budget meaning we need to make sure we adhere to
22 that Congressional direction. We need to often

1 work with Congress to figure out what some of that
2 Congressional direction means because it is not
3 often clear what the intent of the language is and
4 that's just a challenge in working through the
5 budget environment we are in and it can set
6 different expectations when yourselves or other
7 constituents see the large increases and want to
8 know why certain things aren't happening or why
9 couldn't you work on this effort or fund that
10 project? Again, a lot of that is increases that
11 come with direction on how to spend that.

12 So specifically, this is the House and
13 Senate mark side by side for FY '20. You can see
14 where I didn't pick every single change out and I
15 initially won't go through every single change
16 here, I'll highlight a few.

17 But first, just to flag one most of
18 interest to this group, Regional Councils
19 Commissions in the House mark was funded at, this
20 is our total budget line, I should step back
21 first. Total budget line here for regional
22 Councils and commission (inaudible) funds. The

1 regional Councils, the commission and some other
2 interstate activity.

3 So that budget line is up at 41.5
4 million. That's a 1.3 million increase above FY
5 '19. The President's budget did ask for an
6 increase in this budget line for the Councils
7 specifically so this increase we are interpreting
8 right now as reflecting an increase to the
9 Councils because that's what was requested by the
10 budget.

11 But looking right next door to our other
12 side of the Capitol Hill here, Regional Council's
13 Commissions is basically level funded at 40.2
14 million. I'll highlight some of the specific
15 language in a couple slides so I won't, towards
16 the end here so I won't go through that now.

17 But again to my point earlier, some
18 specific language provided with the funding there
19 that requires us to look at how we spend some of
20 that funding.

21 Doesn't affect everyone in the room
22 obviously but where there is some kind of a big

1 signals from the Hill just in terms of total
2 dollars is in salmon management and this is a,
3 our, the budget line if folks track the budget
4 lines this is our salmon management activities
5 budget line.

6 So the House mark is putting this at \$37
7 million, same as its been in the past. But they
8 give us a new budget line to address specific
9 salmon commission and treaty issues at \$30
10 million, so quite a huge in dollar in proportion
11 to our budget statement from the House.

12 On the Senate side, they did not give us
13 a new budget line but right within that salmon
14 management budget line where that activity is
15 generally funded, they also added \$19 million for
16 salmon -- Pacific salmon treaty issues and salmon
17 commission, Pacific Salmon Commission.

18 MR. OLIVER: Can I ask a question?

19 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah, sure.

20 MR. OLIVER: So --

21 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah, anyone, please feel
22 free to ask questions all the way through here

1 too.

2 MR. OLIVER: Specific to the Pacific
3 Salmon Treaty, both the House and the Senate
4 provided specific funding so the 30 on the one
5 side and the 19 over FY '19 on the Senate side --

6 MR. PAWLAK: Yep.

7 MR. OLIVER: That '19 was specific to
8 Pacific Salmon Treaties?

9 MR. PAWLAK: Yes, there is --

10 MR. OLIVER: So the both included an
11 increase or yeah?

12 MR. PAWLAK: Yep, yes.

13 MR. OLIVER: Okay. So that's what --

14 MR. PAWLAK: Yes, so I don't -- we don't
15 have the language up here but there is language
16 specific for Pacific Salmon Treaty and that's hard
17 to say fast. Specific for pacific salmon. Yeah,
18 yeah, I haven't had enough coffee or have a beer
19 and try to say that so.

20 Couple other small increases for Pacific
21 salmon with HGMP's that has to deal with hatchery
22 issues. Aquaculture which tends to be a focus or

1 interest of many on the House side is below the FY
2 '19. But again with language we will have to
3 interpret how we meet this directive within our
4 aquaculture budget across NOAA, not just NOAA
5 Fisheries but that we ensure there is \$10 million
6 being spent on shellfish research.

7 So this is just some of the challenges
8 the budget and language we have to go back and
9 make sure across NOAA that we are spending that,
10 that we, you know, and very likely we are probably
11 already spending that across NOAA. If not we have
12 to figure out and at least document how we do that
13 kind of thing.

14 And then in aquaculture on the Senate
15 side, small increase recognized within the
16 aquaculture but again, very specific language on
17 what they think we should be doing with it here
18 regarding regional pilots which is grants out the
19 door and off bottom aquaculture research which has
20 been, that language has been there at least two or
21 three years.

22 Again, just quick going through House

1 and Senate mark, kind of some distinctions. Gulf
2 of Mexico gets a lot of attention obviously in the
3 House and Senate marks as of late particularly
4 related to red snapper. Again with the House
5 mark, we have got 1.5 million directed for
6 independent alternative stock assessment
7 strategies in South Atlantic. Have to determine
8 how to meet that. We have \$10 million for
9 development to implementation of electronic
10 logbooks in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic.

11 Senate mark, won't read every piece to
12 you here but its similar language. Some of this
13 we have seen in the past as well. And I think
14 unique this year because I don't think this was
15 here last year, I think it was here a couple of
16 years ago. This is not within NOAA Fisheries
17 budget but within OAR's budget and Sea Grant has
18 an increase specifically for Gulf of Mexico work
19 as well.

20 Enforcement, again the president's
21 budget as we have talked about here before has
22 proposed elimination of the joint enforcement

1 agreement so the cooperative agreements with
2 states. The House or Senate have rejected those
3 proposals since we have been proposing that.
4 That's the funding level here for enforcement with
5 some attention in funding increases for a Seafood
6 Import Monitoring Program and the Senate kind of
7 is similar but not quite exact attention to
8 enforcement.

9 So again, present that as just where we
10 sit. House and Senate mark, waiting for a budget.
11 See if there is a full year CR, see if there is an
12 omnibus. If the House and Senate do not come
13 together and produce a final budget, they often
14 just leave us with the language with both the
15 House and Senate mark and then it's what usually
16 the language in the omnibus then is that both sets
17 of language apply and where it confusing you need
18 to figure it out.

19 So that's what the agency spends a lot
20 of time then if it's unclear or if there is a
21 direction for a certain amount of funding but then
22 they don't provide that funding, it gets where

1 that's where, you know, NOAA Fisheries and my team
2 has to get together, put our heads together and
3 figure out what does that language mean?

4 How do we interpret that language when
5 there maybe is no proof of funding provided but
6 they asked, they set expectations on the funding
7 level and that's the kind of the devil in the
8 details and some reasons why it takes a while to
9 get the funding out the door once we get an actual
10 budget in place?

11 So I think I just put this slide up here
12 just to remind you where we are. We are in a CR.
13 The President's budget back in March, House mark
14 was in spring, summer. Very recently just had the
15 Senate mark and we are actively in the CR. Hoping
16 that ends, not hoping because it will end. Hoping
17 that ends with at least another CR, a full budget
18 here at the end of November.

19 So here I want to shift a little bit,
20 this is a little different than just the routine
21 budget presentation we have been giving to you
22 guys in the years past. Is go over our budget

1 structure a little bit and how that budget
2 structure relates to the funding you receive and
3 where you receive funding within our budget
4 structure. And then present here in the next
5 couple slides and I'll be glad to go back and
6 forth here as well some of the changes we are
7 presenting, really what is on the display of the
8 budget.

9 So what we have here is our NMFS budget
10 structure. And basically what this is, I know
11 hard to read from far away. These are the budget
12 lines, these are the PPA's for the technical
13 terminology. This is where each one of these
14 lines here, I think there should be 14, this is
15 where we get that budget appropriated from
16 Congress.

17 So when Congress gives us the budget,
18 its put into these budget lines, under these big
19 program mission activity categories under
20 protected resources, this suite of budget lines,
21 fisheries management science, that's suite of
22 budget lines which regional Councils is right in

1 here. Enforcement only has one budget line,
2 habitat only has one budget line. So this is the,
3 our budget structure.

4 This is the form and context for which
5 we request budget and where we get funding into
6 the agency and we have to adhere to spending with
7 the direction with each one of these budget lines.
8 So for most of you probably in the room that's
9 pretty familiar conversation and understanding.

10 Going back and forth here with the great
11 tricks of power point, flashing back in here in
12 red here, these three budget lines flagged in the
13 red boxes now which I can't even read from that
14 far away. I have to look at my notes. Fisheries
15 data collection surveys and assessments, the top
16 budget line. Fisheries management program and
17 surveys, the middle budget line and the one you
18 are all most familiar with, Regional Council and
19 Fisheries Commissions. Those are the three budget
20 lines where primarily your base funding, core
21 funding has been coming from NOAA Fisheries.

22 So you generally don't get protected

1 resources money, habitat conservation, enforcement
2 money. The base money when we present the Council
3 table here every year is from that, those three
4 budget lines.

5 And so moving to the next slide, next
6 display, this is the table you are all very
7 familiar with. Each Council across the top, the
8 source of funding, down the side here. And so
9 highlighted in red here with the red arrows that's
10 the three budget lines I just showed you from the
11 last slide. You've got your Regional Councils
12 budget line PPA, Fish Management programs and
13 services PPA, and fisheries data collections
14 survey and assessments PPA.

15 So that's really the source, that's the
16 appropriate source. These three highlighted with
17 kind of the red arrow here. That's the three
18 appropriated sources of funding that the Councils
19 get money from on the base funding in this table
20 that we go through every year.

21 These budget lines well, I shouldn't
22 even call them budget lines because they're not

1 budget lines. This outlined activity here in the
2 middle which I think I have a cool graphic to show
3 you that activity. There we go. So that activity
4 all mailboxed in the big red where you also have
5 been receiving funds for we went back and looked
6 at the history. Some of these I think are 13
7 years running. It's definitely I think at a
8 minimum 10 years running in these amounts. I
9 don't know if the amounts have been the same. But
10 from these budget lines it has been about 10 years
11 running. And I keep saying budget lines but I'm
12 going to correct myself because the thing is these
13 are not budget lines.

14 This is activity, these are definitions
15 that I think in the past NEPA for example was a
16 budget line. I think it was an earmark at one
17 point. Some of these might have been earmarks at
18 other time from Congress so Congress put them in.
19 They created a budget line by giving us this
20 earmark.

21 But these are our own creation. This is
22 our own documentation. This is our own accounting.

1 These don't really tie to anything in the budget
2 or anything in the system. A record of accounting
3 because these things are just our own method of a
4 tracking or sorry, of a tracking, of tracking with
5 all the funding coming from this top line for all
6 of these activities.

7 So again I'll just do the real quick
8 graphic here. You have got the graphic here. You
9 have got the set of budget lines, the three
10 primary ones that support the Councils and the
11 base funding through your annual award. The three
12 highlighted in red are the appropriated budget
13 lines. Big box around the titling that we have
14 largely invented, in some cases completely
15 invented, this is actually a detailed budget line
16 for us.

17 So it's a mix and match here. Things
18 where we have kind of made up for tacking and
19 things that are actually kind of budget lines but
20 it's a mix and match all coming from the same
21 sources, funds, of those three budgeting lines.

22 So what we are doing in NOAA Fisheries

1 is we want to collapse all that information and
2 presented in that detailed tracking, in those
3 detailed budget lines and roll that up into if you
4 follow my pointer here, just roll that into the
5 top line where we actually see the appropriation.
6 So again I'll just do the magic of power point
7 here.

8 We are talking the detailed budget
9 lines, sub level, below the budget line that we
10 get appropriated funds in, again naming
11 conventions, don't know how they evolved. Same
12 earmarks, some not, some we might have just came
13 up with as activities that was in the grants.
14 Capturing all the data or capturing all the
15 funding in those budget lines, basically rolling
16 that up into the key budget line where that source
17 funding is.

18 So not changing funding at all, not
19 changing distribution, just capturing and
20 simplifying the accounting and tracking of that
21 because it is, again it's their own creation and
22 just creating a base funding for you which is,

1 this is really your base funding out of these
2 three budget lines. And as Chris has often
3 referred to it, taking these programs and just
4 putting it into the base.

5 MR. OLIVER: That was, I was going to
6 just elaborate on that because those six or seven
7 within the box for 10 or 13 years have been what's
8 affectionately referred to as the crumbs or the
9 soft money that was sort of optional for NOAA to
10 give to the Councils. And so many Council CCC
11 members for many years argued that those should be
12 rolled up into the base and so that's essentially
13 what we are doing.

14 MR. PAWLAK: Yes, yes. Again, I'm
15 spending a lot of time on this because budget
16 convention and unless you are dealing with these
17 tables all day this might be really confusing.
18 Maybe it's not if you're living in this all the
19 time and are real familiar with it. So I don't
20 mean to be patronizing but I do want to in detail
21 here but I know at least my staff looks at these
22 tables all the time. You guys may not so I'm not

1 trying to over simplify it here.

2 MR. OLIVER: And just one other item,
3 the base is a traditional long standing formula
4 but by rolling these other times into the base, we
5 are not changing that formula, we are keeping that
6 proportion of those crumbs by each Council.

7 MR. PAWLAK: Correct.

8 MR. OLIVER: Those don't change.

9 MR. PAWLAK: Yep. That's, yeah and as
10 Alan's whispering here, some of the crumbs were
11 actually distributed by formula into separately.
12 Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah so we shouldn't call
13 them crumbs. It's money. It's real money.

14 So what it ends up looking like in the
15 end after we do all that, those maturations, you
16 end up with your new Council stable, same table,
17 new look. You got your three key budget lines
18 rather than the detailed break out. You'll see it
19 presents in this format.

20 All the expectations that you still have
21 all those activities, you still have all that work
22 to do, but I think you know, we are probably

1 weren't being not that we didn't have integrity,
2 we weren't probably being totally honest in that,
3 you know, ACL limitation where we are actually
4 spending 51,000 in that, you know, maybe it was
5 52, maybe it was 49. You know, this implies it a
6 level of detail and accuracy that maybe wasn't
7 there. It is accurate and that's what we were
8 giving you but it's maybe not what you were
9 spending that area.

10 So it provides a little flexibility,
11 just from its your base funding, it's yours to
12 direct and figure out how to meet all your
13 requirements and all those requirements I'm sure
14 still stand but it's a summed up, rolled up way of
15 just presenting it and characterizing it.

16 Again, to Chris has kind of already
17 flagged the key reason why we are looking to
18 simply the table is just to make it consistent
19 with our base budget and what we have in our
20 tracking and our appropriation. Same level of
21 tracking for everyone. It reduces a lot of
22 tracking at that detailed level which there is no,

1 it's nothing in the system, a record for us. It's
2 just, it's our own creation.

3 It also simplifies the awards of grants
4 for each one of those individual activities, at
5 least in theory, don't know if that's was
6 happening or not. There should be a statement of
7 work or I might be using the wrong phrasing,
8 statement of activity for each one of those
9 activities that are listed. Not sure if were
10 adhering to that but again, it just simplifies
11 awards and grants because you don't have all the
12 separate accounting and speaking to every
13 accounting for every one of those six budget
14 lines. You just have to speak to the accounting
15 to the three budget lines.

16 So I'll stop there just because I, you
17 know, and Gregg was talking to me up front, making
18 sure folks understood that. Any questions on the
19 or more explanation needed as we got it up here
20 and, you know, walked through and going to --
21 hopefully I wasn't trying to imply that it was so
22 complicated that I did it three or four times but

1 I know if you're not in there every day it can be.

2 MS. MCCAWLEY: Gregg?

3 MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Brian, and thanks,
4 Chris, for your clarifying remarks too. So this,
5 these items are what we use to refer to as add ons
6 and of course you're subject to each year whether
7 you are going to get it or not.

8 And it seems like by moving them up to a
9 part of the base budget, we are in a stronger
10 position for getting those funds in the future.
11 Is that a proper interpretation?

12 MR. PAWLAK: I mean, I think so. I
13 mean, again, it's what we have called the soft
14 money. I mean, it has been 10, 15 years, hard to
15 call it soft money even. I think to me just
16 (inaudible) I think there is scrutiny with it just
17 putting the base net what you need.

18 I think every time you list one of those
19 things you potentially get scrutiny over what's
20 the dollar level, are you doing that activity
21 versus you have your base funding, that's that you
22 need to do your base operations. I think that's

1 stronger than itemizing everything. So I think it
2 makes that, your point, Gregg, more solid.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: Anyone else? Questions,
4 comments, yes, Tom.

5 Mr. MR. NIES: Thank you for your
6 presentation, Brian. I'm going to use the term
7 add ons because Gregg pointed that out. Not all
8 of the add ons are distributed by the Council
9 percentage formula. How will that be tracked in
10 the future? If you look at it, there are several
11 of them that go to some Councils and not others
12 because for various reasons and I'm curious how we
13 will keep track of that distribution if we not
14 reporting it here?

15 MR. PAWLAK: Right. No, well, so my
16 understanding this might be something Alan needs
17 to jump in. This has been steady, meaning the
18 same, for years. So my assumption here unless
19 someone wants to correct me is that these amounts
20 then would be the similar, the same.

21 So it's not necessarily tracking these
22 individually anymore. Its tracking at that dollar

1 level at the base. Does that make sense? Yeah,
2 Alan is saying which I know you were asking what
3 happens if the base appropriation changes and
4 that?

5 MR. NIES: Well, if you look at the
6 Council peer review line for example.

7 MR. PAWLAK: Now let me go back where we
8 can see that a little more clearly even so. Yep.

9 MR. NIES: There may be another one
10 that's a better example, I don't know. But
11 anyway, if you look at the Council peer review,
12 you can see that some Councils don't get any
13 dollars for this for various reasons that are, we
14 all know now because we are familiar with it.

15 But I guess what I'm concerned about it
16 if you eliminate these lines and funding goes up
17 or goes down, how will adjustments made with these
18 lines and how will they be transparent to us as
19 per what the reasons are?

20 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah. Alan says he's going
21 to try to --

22 MR. RISENHOOVER: All right. So there

1 would be two ways to do that. One time you could
2 take those differential ones off the top. So the
3 peer review ones for example so whatever the
4 Council lines budget is, you take those off the
5 top and then what remains you split by the
6 formula.

7 The issue would be exactly what you're
8 pointing out. What if that changes? So if the
9 number goes up, do the peer review ones go up?
10 The number goes down, do those peer review ones go
11 down proportionately? So that would be a decision
12 at a later thing that I think Brian would talk to
13 you all about.

14 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah and I think we are
15 saying the same thing. The further we step away
16 from why this funding was this amount in the first
17 place, it becomes just your base funding. So I'm,
18 I don't know your business as well as obviously
19 you all do so I just make something up here.

20 If all of a sudden the Gulf of Mexico
21 needed Council peer review and they thought they
22 had to do it for whatever reason, they have their

1 base funding to make that decision. If someone in
2 mid Atlantic, I'm trying to think of someone who
3 has it now. New England has peer review and you
4 decide you don't need to do peer review anymore,
5 it's in your base fund to make that discretionary
6 decisions and that would be reflected in your
7 grant and what you planned to do is ultimately the
8 further you get away from these things there may
9 not be affinity to why it was given in the first
10 place.

11 MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

12 MR. NIES: Thank you I think. I'm not
13 sure I compete follow that explanation. When you
14 refer to this as being part of our base, many of
15 these add ones have been flat for a number of
16 years. So are you saying that the total dollar
17 value is something we should count on as much as
18 you can count on anything in the budget process
19 obviously.

20 MR. PAWLAK: Yes.

21 MR. NIES: Or are you saying that I
22 don't know what your total Fisheries Management

1 PPA amount is but are you saying that the Councils
2 can count on the same percentage of your Fisheries
3 Management PPA going forward? Or are you saying
4 these fixed dollars are now part of our base?

5 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah. I don't think this
6 was ever set on a percentage so I think I would be
7 fixed dollars and again, I think these dollar
8 amounts have actually been fixed for like 5, 10
9 years. It's a long time.

10 MR. NIES: Correct.

11 MR. PAWLAK: So it's, so it's not based
12 on percentage and I think even when the Fisheries
13 Management PPA, this budget line up here, that's
14 our base PPA if everyone is following along, even
15 when that has gone down, these remain the same.
16 And maybe much to your chagrin, even those have
17 gone up have remained the same. So it is fixed in
18 dollar amount is the plan.

19 But again, it would be your base fixed
20 at this place. I'm not in tune enough to know how
21 the changes are made with these things over the
22 years, although I think what our analysis shows is

1 they basically have not changed in like a decade.
2 They've been fixed in dollar amount.

3 Now this is the line that we obviously
4 are seeking changes in and getting changing it
5 because that is the quote unquote Council base,
6 you know, as seen by Congress. And that's where
7 we have been putting money in, driving resource
8 enhancements to this budget line which is your
9 truly base and that's the base support from
10 Congress rather than it these, you know, crumbs or
11 bitsy bops, whatever you want to call them and
12 that's where we have requested increases, that's
13 where Congress has put money. That's where, you
14 know, Chris has been directing and having
15 conversations with Congress about getting funds
16 into that top line.

17 MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

18 MR. NIES: Just one quick question. I
19 have always perhaps incorrectly thought that some
20 of these items were loosely tied, and I do mean
21 loosely tied to the Congressional justification
22 that NOAA prepares for things. Maybe that was an

1 over interpretation so I'm wondering if this will
2 have any impact on that document, this change?

3 MR. PAWLAK: No, I don't believe so. I
4 think all of these, I'll go again go back to where
5 you can read it, the bolding. I think all of
6 these activities fall within the broad
7 categorization of the Congressional justification
8 of what we do with these funding. So I don't see
9 that's an issue being as that these activities
10 will still be happening. It's just we are not
11 tracking them at this detailed level.

12 And so that, I don't see any impact or
13 concern from the Congress. I mean, Congress for
14 all I know doesn't know we even have this table or
15 pays attention to that so. Again that's why I'm
16 going back to, you know, once we get it rolled up,
17 that's what Congress pays attention to, these
18 budget lines here. I mean, obviously they pay a
19 lot more attention to them than just that but
20 that's their appropriated level of concern.

21 MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions? Kitty.

22 MS. SIMONDS: I just want to say that

1 I'm glad that you're doing this because for years
2 we have talked about how our base funding was
3 never enough to survive. And so we have had to
4 use those crumbs, you know, really as part of our
5 base so I'm happy that this is happening. And who
6 wants to be looking at all of those separately
7 lines because we all know what we do in terms of
8 those separate lines.

9 And, you know, some of us have processes
10 that other Councils don't in terms of peer review.
11 So, you know, this has been accepted by all of us,
12 all these years and at one time Chris, do you
13 remember you and I got dumped one year and then we
14 had to like fight to get our line back.

15 So anyway, I'm glad that this is
16 happening because it's ridiculous to have to look
17 at all those line items and say well, we spent so
18 much money on this and that. Thanks.

19 MR. PAWLAK: All right. That's on the
20 record, Kitty thanked me.

21 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Questions,
22 comments? Yes, Carrie.

1 MS. SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Madame
2 Chair. I guess just a question if there were to
3 be more crumbs in the future, based on new policy
4 directives or other things that may arise in the
5 future, would it make it more difficult to
6 distribute those by collapsing these categories?

7 MR. PAWLAK: I think not. I think it
8 actually makes it easier because -- I don't want
9 to keep calling it crumbs. We will call it
10 priority activity. So it, add ons or priority
11 activity.

12 If you -- if something arises where you
13 get that or there are some other distribution
14 funding from these other budget lines, you still
15 put it right in here. Now, obviously it's through
16 a grant so your grant will document, your grant
17 process will document all, you know, the newest
18 thing in science needs to be handled by the
19 Councils and your grant will state that and it
20 will be a dollar amount with that.

21 I mean, we still keep some cuffed tables
22 and systems that hey, we want funding to go in the

1 distribution if there is a new source of funds.
2 So you, we might have a new activity that's not
3 these things, you know, for example. So it will
4 go up into these base line anyway rather than
5 creating a new thing.

6 I mean, we had the, do we even have
7 dereg, yeah we have deregulation sitting on here
8 right now so we, you know, for example we added
9 this but that's, it's really in the base. This is
10 just our own tracking. I think we can -- we in
11 fisheries will keep this to know what the
12 distribution is and if there is a new activity you
13 would have to, you know, we would have to have a
14 cuff system table to know what that is but there
15 is no reason to, for these set of things as kitty
16 was saying, this has been your base for 10 years.

17 So if there is some new activity, I
18 guess it would be question of what's the scale and
19 scope of it. Do you put it in the base and we
20 don't track it other than through the grant
21 mechanism or do you, is it big enough focus that
22 you for some reason highlight and track it and

1 obviously I think just for presentation to this
2 group you would want to demonstrate if there was
3 new money coming in on one of these non-Council
4 lines you would probably want to display that and
5 just understand what it is. I don't think it
6 makes it any more difficult than it is, the bottom
7 line what your.

8 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. More
9 questions or comments? Yes, Dave.

10 MR. WITHERELL: Thank you, Brian. My
11 question, I think first of all rolling up all of
12 those pots of monies into one single line makes a
13 lot of sense. I think the concern is going to be
14 going back to the prior question that Alan
15 answered is are we looking at a new formula for
16 that line? Are we applying the PPA standard
17 formula for that line and then adjusting that?

18 I'm a little concerned that the
19 transparency is going to be lacking when more
20 money gets allocated to one Council above the
21 normal formulary line in the future. Or do we
22 have a separate, standard formula for that second

1 line? I guess that's my concern.

2 MR. PAWLAK: Yes. My understanding and
3 I don't do these break outs, there's not a formula
4 for that line. These are each individually
5 determined and Allen was saying some of these are
6 formulated or had been formulated in the past.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris.

8 MR. OLIVER: Some of those lines were
9 done by the all Council formula and some weren't.
10 But by rolling them up, I think what we are saying
11 is don't look at that new rolled up line as a
12 formulaic but rather a fixed.

13 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah.

14 MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions? Yeah,
15 Bill.

16 MR. TWEIT: Just to continue on this and
17 again, I think this is a real step forward but it
18 does result then in a new base that no longer
19 aligns with the formula that was used to
20 distribute the original base. And that's, that's
21 the only point.

22 So are we just saying okay, because this

1 is as Kitty was articulating, because really our
2 base hasn't just been the top line with the
3 formula. Should we just say okay, we now have a
4 new base and a new formula that then handles the
5 future ups and downs for distribution. Because as
6 Dave says, there was a transparency to the
7 Councils in that formula that was a hard --

8 MR. PAWLAK: Right.

9 MR. TWEIT: -- hard thing to work out --

10 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah, so let me -- yeah
11 sorry.

12 MR. TWEIT: -- as a sharing formula.

13 MR. PAWLAK: Well, let me see if I can,
14 sorry I didn't mean to interrupt you there.

15 MR. TWEIT: So go ahead.

16 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah. So I, my
17 understanding and the Fisheries Management team
18 will have to yell at me if I say it wrong. There
19 is a formula for this, the core Regional Councils
20 line. That's formulaic, that will remain the
21 same. This is now fixed. So there is no formula
22 needed. There is no even discussion on your

1 breakout in this regard.

2 If this money is just rolled up, South
3 Atlantic if I can read from far away, does that
4 say 511? The number is rolled up. It's now 511.
5 Is not necessarily tied to these activities.
6 That's the number, it's not formulaic. It's
7 however it was derived in the historic derivation,
8 derivation of that, if I can say that word. The
9 way it was historically derived is now locked and
10 that's the base if that makes sense. Am I saying
11 that right, guys?

12 MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris?

13 MR. OLIVER: Or I will try another way
14 to say it. The roll up was not, is not intended to
15 change the long standing allocation relative to
16 what Congress appropriates to the Councils. That
17 is still the same formula. Adding this to each
18 Councils budget is not intended to change that
19 baseline formula.

20 MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

21 MR. NIES: I just want to make sure we
22 understand what you mean by this, these lines are

1 fixed. So example I'll use is 2018, I think it
2 was 2018, the agency gave the Councils an extra
3 million dollars for regulatory streamlining or
4 regulatory reduction, I forget what the title was.

5 MR. PAWLAK: Yes, yep, yes.

6 Deregulation. Yep.

7 MR. NIES: Deregulation, right. We
8 obviously didn't get that in 2019. Now when you
9 say these numbers are fixed, are you precluding
10 that we are ever going to get some sort of
11 addition like deregulation or happy birthday or,
12 you know, whatever it is. Or is that still a
13 possibility? Because if it's going to be fixed, I
14 want it to be fixed at the 2018 level.

15 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah. No, so fixed in this
16 distribution based on the 10 year history as your
17 base, I would call the deregulation money was not
18 your base. Because that was like you said that
19 was 2018. The other, you know, again I'll go back
20 to the, all the things in gray box here.

21 This has been categorized or basically
22 considered your base for 10 years. The

1 deregulation item which is actually flagged up
2 here, I think does that say deregulatory action?
3 I can't even read that, sorry. That was an add
4 on. I'm not -- with fixing this base, it doesn't
5 preclude additional activity that for whatever
6 reason might come up.

7 This is, this would be when Dan Namur
8 and the grants team, Dan's sitting back there by
9 the way, are producing your annual budgets for
10 your core funding for your base activities, this
11 would be the base to start from. Then if Chris
12 out of the goodness of his heart found other
13 funding or other activity he could make that
14 direction to put other funding in it.

15 MR. OLIVER: Yeah, maybe a better term
16 for that group rather than add ons or crumbs is
17 discretionary because that's really a
18 discretionary amount from NOAA fisheries to the
19 Councils.

20 MR. PAWLAK: Yes. And it wasn't
21 promised for multiple years and where this funding
22 level here has been basically promised and given

1 for multiple years.

2 MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom to follow up.

3 MR. NIES: So we pointed out at earlier
4 Council meetings, I'm sorry, early CCC meetings in
5 the past, I know we raised this issue with Mr.
6 Doremus at least once or twice that where the
7 federal budget when its produced has adjustments
8 to base, this section never got any adjustments to
9 base. So by you calling this base, does that mean
10 in the future you'll apply these ATB's to this
11 section as well so that we get some increases?

12 MR. PAWLAK: No, not necessarily.
13 Because the ATB's are sometimes directed to us,
14 they're sometimes direction from DOC or to us as
15 to how those ATB's are distributed. I'm not sure
16 exactly that there has never been an ATB here but
17 the ATB's are generally fall way below -- any
18 ATB's we get generally fall way short below any
19 true cost of living increase that we get.

20 MR. NIES: But they're bigger than zero.

21 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah, they're bigger than
22 zero.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I have a list
2 going. Chris, did you want -- okay. Miguel, you
3 had your hand up. Are you good? Gregg.

4 MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madame Chair. So
5 we have got our formula, long standing formula for
6 the top line. This new base it seems people are
7 concerned its fixed at a dollar amount now. If we
8 get more or less in the future if it's just left
9 fixed at a dollar amount, it's going to be up to
10 the discretion of the agency on how those amounts
11 change.

12 The other way to do it would be to
13 create a formula for that new base line using the
14 existing distribution. And then if more monies
15 came in to go up they would be allocated under
16 that formula. If it went down, it would be
17 reduced according to that formula.

18 So it seems like that's the choice here.
19 Either leave it up to the discretion of the agency
20 or suggest that we create a new allocation formula
21 for that line based on the existing dollar
22 amounts.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris.

2 MR. OLIVER: Yes, if I understand Gregg,
3 the top line if the Congressional appropriation
4 stays on the original formula, a new formula is
5 derived for the rolled up line and if that rolled
6 up line changes, it changes based on the new
7 formula for that line.

8 And I think if that's what the CCC
9 thinks is appropriate and it seems reasonable to
10 me, that you should indicate that to us.

11 MR. PAWLAK: Well, yes, and again I'm
12 not -- that's not my decision to make. I'll just
13 point out the history of that, that was not how
14 this was derived.

15 MR. OLIVER: Right.

16 MR. PAWLAK: This is a fixed number. If
17 you create a formula for then this when what we
18 are suggesting is this is fixed, I don't know, I
19 mean, someone who knows algebra much better than
20 me could probably create a formula where this
21 always equals to this but that's what we are --
22 we're basically saying let's stop the messy

1 counting here and fix this into base.

2 It doesn't preclude other money from
3 coming in. It doesn't preclude other support.
4 What we are requesting and then what our trend has
5 been and where we would like to focus where we
6 asked for increases is in the base budget line
7 rather than the, you know, going back to my slide
8 to show the whole budget structure.

9 Where we are trying to put the intention
10 to Congress is where Councils need money is in the
11 Council line. I think you, the Councils at an
12 advantage, the Council, sorry, by requesting
13 funding and seeking funding in this line for you
14 to direct your activity and the work we need done
15 in this important partnership by having funding in
16 this line.

17 I think the more you spread and I'll go
18 all the way back here. The more you spread
19 Council support among all of these lines, it
20 dilutes the power and importance of the Councils
21 contribution to the Fisheries Management process
22 and when you can go to Congress and specifically

1 say I need money for the Councils for this step in
2 the process is a, to me a stronger budget
3 strategy.

4 Again, that doesn't mean there won't be
5 odds and ends or add ones as Chris was referring
6 to them but I think as a strategy for where we are
7 looking to get increases you specifically call up
8 the Councils. The Councils need this for X, Y, Z
9 activity rather than I'm going to use the phrase
10 obviously showing my bias maybe, rather than
11 bearing the activity in all these other lines.

12 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

13 MR. PAWLAK: So if there is no other
14 questions the next slide might help in that there
15 is --

16 MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, go ahead.

17 MR. PAWLAK: If there is no other, I
18 don't want to cut off the questioning. So where
19 we stand with the Council's commissions funding
20 now just to maybe demonstrate how some of this
21 goes is, you know, we have had budget requested
22 increase in president's budget for '20 of 1.3

1 million I believe. That's the Regional Council's
2 Fisheries Commission budget line. As you guys
3 know, that includes more than just the Councils.

4 The prez bud request in '20 we were able
5 to -- remember, I showed you all those decreases
6 in the President's budget. Within the President's
7 budget we got a strong initial and were able to
8 request increase among our \$100 million of
9 decrease across NOAA Fisheries budget, we were
10 able to get increased from the administration
11 approval for a Councils increase and we got that
12 in the Prez bud.

13 The House mark gives nod to that. So if
14 the House mark is in play, the Councils will see
15 that increase. Senate mark leaves it level
16 funded. So we just don't know yet. So just
17 trying to flag where we focused our attention on
18 putting increases rather than spread out through
19 those add ones is focused on the Council line. We
20 got strong support from the administration for
21 that. And the House recognized it, Senate right
22 now is as, has not.

1 MR. OLIVER: I just want to underscore
2 that, that in the face of those huge decreases in
3 the FY 2020 President's budget, the \$2 million
4 increases for the Councils is a reflection of a
5 recognition of the importance of the Council
6 process and managing our fisheries.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chris.

8 MR. PAWLAK: Then I think just a couple
9 more slides here and we will do more questions if
10 needed. Other House language or sorry,
11 Congressional language right now what I referred
12 to up front. We have a long of Congressional
13 direction. This is new. Meaning this is House
14 mark language that we have not seen before, some
15 language we have seen year after year.

16 I don't, because I'm not in the detail
17 of the programs. I don't quite know the meaning
18 and understanding of this and I think, I mean,
19 other than just the face value of what it says
20 there. We are within the funding provided, so
21 again going back, that means within the amount
22 that the House provided here, the 41.5, there have

1 an expectation of \$250,000 spent on this activity.
2 I won't read it to you and know some of you might
3 know specifically what that's about.

4 There is also this language again it's a
5 soft language, it says encourages which is not,
6 you know, what we are not bound by law for
7 producing the specific activity, of working with
8 the states on actions that affect state waters. I
9 don't know the, why that was put in there, how
10 that got derived.

11 Other Senate mark language which again
12 is same as 2019 which is encourages prioritization
13 research around high priority species, and that's
14 language we have seen before as well.

15 MS. MCCAWLEY: Bill?

16 MR. TWEIT: Brian, I know you
17 represented this on the, on one of the earlier
18 slides too, but and maybe I just wasn't paying
19 attention at the right time a year ago. But I
20 don't recall seeing this language in the
21 presentation. I'm sure it was in there, I just
22 don't recall it. Was there a reporting

1 requirement associated with that? Or is there any
2 other and what exactly does it mean do you think?

3 MR. PAWLAK: Sam was just pointing out
4 to me it does say directs. There was not a
5 reporting requirement I don't think, I'm looking
6 at Jenny here. I don't, my staff is telling me
7 there was not a reporting requirement like this.

8 Again, you don't know how some of the
9 stuff gets put in or why some of it gets in. I
10 don't know off the top of my head although we keep
11 separate track in my office of how we meet all
12 these things and some ways you might be able to
13 meet this requirement, you know, prioritize
14 research and monitoring of high priority species.
15 You might be able to argue everything we do now
16 already meets that and that's what we did is I'm
17 sure how we asserted we met that last time.

18 So it's not necessarily a report. It's
19 not necessarily a new specific activity.

20 Obviously you go back here to the House mark
21 language where I think we cut out the directs up
22 here. But this is directed activity. There is an

1 expectation that the, not an expectation, there is
2 a requirement that if this language stays in that
3 this amount will be spent on this activity.

4 Whereas here in this encourages
5 language, that's soft. I'm sure we do that all
6 the time anyway, right. In the last years Senate
7 we might not have presented it last time to you so
8 apologize for that but it was in there and how we
9 track it might just be identifying the present
10 processes we use to prioritize research and
11 address environmental conditions.

12 So no reporting requirement, not
13 necessarily a specific product or project or
14 activity outcome from that depending on how strong
15 the language is.

16 MS. MCCAWLEY: Bill.

17 MR. TWEIT: So we address research
18 priorities each year.

19 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah.

20 MR. TWEIT: And I think most Councils
21 have a similar sort of thing. So are we supposed
22 to take this into account when we revisit our

1 research priorities?

2 MR. PAWLAK: I might have to look to the
3 program and the science community to see how much
4 you think you need to take it into account other
5 acknowledging that it's there and when you do your
6 plans, do you think you meet that?

7 I mean, I don't know if that's, that's
8 really not direction to you. That's -- well that
9 is sort if I guess Councils Fishery Commission,
10 yes it is to you sorry. And that I don't know if
11 we document any of that in our grants
12 requirements. Dan, do we do anything in there?

13 MR. NAMUR: No. I know I'm not on mic
14 but the fact that --

15 MR. PAWLAK: Sorry, I pulled you in.

16 MR. NAMUR: That's all right.

17 MR. PAWLAK: This is Dan Namur if you
18 don't know Dan. He runs our grants program at the
19 national level.

20 MR. NAMUR: Good afternoon, everybody.
21 I'm Dan Namur, I work for Brian and oversee the
22 grants. To your point, you guys set your own

1 priorities so I think this language here and the
2 task that you put into your grant, specifically
3 addressed the priorities that you guys outline so
4 you're basically already meeting this mandate.

5 MR. PAWLAK: Yes. I think again, some
6 of this language, this one in particular from what
7 I know about your processes, I would think we
8 would meet that on a regular basis.

9 MR. OLIVER: I would add that I assume
10 that when the Councils put together their five
11 year research plans that implicit in that process
12 is some recognition of high priority species and
13 then I guess it's up to you to define what your
14 high priority species are.

15 MR. PAWLAK: Right. I think this is,
16 even though there is a direct switch it tends to
17 be a strong wording from Congress. I think this
18 is an easy one for all of you to meet and you
19 probably have all met it so.

20 MS. MCCAWLEY: Kitty?

21 MS. SIMONDS: Right. So, you know, we
22 are entering a new five year funding cycle and so

1 attached to our budgets is the Council program for
2 the next five years and all our priorities are in
3 there. So, I mean, we do it, you know.

4 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah, no, I again I think
5 we are probably spending more time on this than
6 maybe even the Senate did in writing it maybe I
7 don't know. (Laughter) But the, you -- why --
8 how direction enters the House and Senate marks,
9 you never know why. There could be some very
10 specific constituent interest that adds to this.
11 They might have a frustration with one Council or
12 one person or somebody in fisheries. You don't
13 know.

14 I think it's just a reminder that we,
15 you know, got to take their direction seriously.
16 And I think it's asking ourselves do we think we
17 do that? I think looking around the table at the
18 nods and Alan and Jenny here, you know, we do
19 that. All right.

20 Well, let me go the quick where we are.
21 This year obviously we are under a continuing
22 resolution. And for folks that I have been

1 talking to for the last few years know it,
2 sometimes it can be a real challenge to get you
3 money under the CR or get you your money under the
4 CR. And thanks to Dan here so glad he came up
5 because he deserves a lot of thanks for doing some
6 accounting and grant acrobatics to make sure we
7 can get you 50 percent of your projected 2020
8 amount before the end of the CR.

9 So we expect even under the CR, even
10 under the spending limitations of the CR which in
11 past years would have been real difficult to get
12 you even 50 percent of your budget, we are
13 expecting to do that by November 21. And we are
14 on track, Dan, yes?

15 MR. NAMUR: Yes, sir.

16 MR. PAWLAK: See now the table he is not
17 going to say he's not on track. So that's good
18 news on the funding status for your new awards.
19 The new five year award, the first year of your
20 new five year award should be 50 percent funded by
21 November 21. I think we are already signed or
22 close to signing all the no cost extensions for

1 the current grant you have that's closing out your
2 five year award.

3 So I, other words bottom line here, the
4 administration funding flow should be seamless for
5 your Councils for the foreseeable period of the
6 next few months and definitely through the CR.

7 And just lastly and I think it's the
8 last slide, just I think you guys got the detailed
9 update on where we are with the geographic
10 strategic plans. I think this slide is mainly
11 just to highlight where we stand with that. We
12 expect those to be out and published end of
13 calendar year, maybe start of the New Year so
14 December, January.

15 We do have a roll out plan to get those
16 out. Headquarters offices are doing their final
17 review on them and with Chris, Sam, Paul and Cisco
18 doing one last final skim of them if anything has
19 changed based on headquarters back and forth
20 review. But really what now is going to is the
21 formatting, making sure every absolute proper
22 English and wording and the editorial team is

1 looking at them. So those are near done and
2 staging, going to stage a roll out the end of
3 calendar year maybe rolling into January. It's
4 just the point of where we are at with these.

5 And I have generally heard positive
6 things from our regions and centers and from the
7 Councils that they liked the engagement on this
8 and this has gone well. And that's all I have.

9 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. More
10 questions? Kitty?

11 MS. SIMONDS: So in our region, we
12 haven't completely ironed out our differences his
13 the region on the strategic plan. So as I said
14 earlier this week and at the Council meeting we
15 had two weeks ago, that we will be discussing, we
16 are not completely, you know, we haven't completed
17 it as far as I'm concerned and so the regional
18 administrator and I will be talking about this.

19 And our Council, our executive committee
20 is reviewing those plans. Our staffs did work
21 very well together but we still, we have
22 differences in terms of the plan, the way its laid

1 out.

2 MR. PAWLAK: Okay. Duly noted. And
3 Mike probably knows this as well so.

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: Other comments,
5 questions? Tom.

6 MR. NIES: Just a quick comment, Brian.
7 I think we have said it before, but it's worth
8 saying again I think that I know our Council
9 anyway and I'm sure all of us are deeply
10 appreciative of the agencies efforts to get us
11 funding early. It makes it far easier to manage
12 our funds within the grant cycle and I know you
13 have done it at least the last year or two, maybe
14 longer than that, I just haven't kept track and
15 you're trying to do it this year.

16 It certainly take some stress off trying
17 to figure out how much money to squirrel away to
18 cover the period when you don't have any money
19 coming in. And I don't know if you can see that
20 in the way we manage our money yet but I think you
21 will over time, you'll notice that that makes a
22 difference.

1 MR. PAWLAK: Appreciate hearing that and
2 Dan particularly since Dan does the negotiation
3 and argument with AGO and Congress and OMB and so
4 yeah, glad to try to do it and keep it, keep doing
5 it so.

6 MS. MCCAWLEY: Gregg.

7 MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Brian. Yeah, to
8 echo Tom's thanks, yeah to Dan, Brian, Paul and
9 whoever else, everyone in the grants office, its
10 much less stressful to have our money early and I
11 must say the grant extension in the 2020 budget
12 process was very smooth from our end. We
13 appreciate all that help.

14 And then coming back to this topic of
15 this line, this new base line item, I think I
16 don't know whether the CCC is ready to talk about
17 that now or want to revisit that when we get
18 though our committee report so that during the
19 break you can talk some, or whether you want to
20 defer that to a future meeting.

21 But I think, you know, as Chris has said
22 they're willing to hear from us whether we want to

1 leave that at the fixed dollar amount and let them
2 determine how any increases or reductions are
3 allocated or whether we want to create a new
4 allocation formula with the existing numbers and
5 then use that. I think at some point we should
6 decide whether we are going to weigh in on that or
7 not.

8 MR. OLIVER: Yeah, because, I think
9 barring any specific recommendations from the CCC,
10 we would likely do what you had suggested earlier
11 which is a new proportional formula for that line.

12 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Yes, Phil.

13 MR. ANDERSON: I think I pushed the
14 wrong button. I would like to think about that a
15 little bit more before coming to a perspective and
16 providing an opinion about that. Generally I
17 think within the categories of work that are made,
18 that make up that number, that I could see being
19 comfortable with coming up with a formula that
20 represents the proportion of the distribution
21 between the eight Councils for those activities.

22 I think where my concern is and it may

1 be misplaced, is that if there are additional
2 activities that are in that category that a, that
3 the same proportion that's used as a role up of
4 those activities may or may not be appropriate.

5 And so that's the thing that I'm
6 thinking about and I just wanted to make sure that
7 my silence wasn't misconstrued as being at
8 agreement with the proposal that has been put out
9 there for consideration.

10 MR. PAWLAK: So can I offer some input?
11 I serve at the discretion of Chris and what the
12 Council has to do. The proportion question makes
13 me a little nervous from what we just did or some
14 challenges to that based on how we were presenting
15 it.

16 So that budget line I think is about
17 \$125 million budget line. So we are talking like
18 a point zero four percent of that budget line and
19 then to figure out another, a proportional model
20 of that budget line is just my opinion,
21 potentially a tortured process. I mean, the idea
22 is we are trying to fix the base at least for the

1 discussions we at the program level, we are trying
2 to fix the base funding going in.

3 So glad to follow any direction the
4 Council or Chris asks us to do but we could also
5 then be go back and look at the pros and cons or
6 different approaches to doing formula or fixed and
7 what the challenges are to that. I just offer the
8 perspective that we are talking of a total of in
9 '19, the \$4 million out of a, you know, \$120
10 million budget line in a formal for that portion
11 is -- would be unique for how we do it in other
12 distributions. But we can go back and also do
13 some pro, cons, do some different analysis if
14 that's what the Council --

15 MR. OLIVER: I don't think there is any
16 compelling need to resolve this at this meeting
17 today.

18 MS. MCCAWLEY: More questions and
19 comments? Chris and then Kitty.

20 MR. MOORE: I'm with Chris and Phil. I
21 don't think there is any reason why we have to
22 resolve this today. There are a number of reasons

1 that I would have to go over those but I think we
2 pretty much are all in agreement. I'm just
3 looking at folks around the room. We, you know,
4 this is new to some of us, at least I think most
5 of us. So I don't think we are there yet.

6 MS. MCCAWLEY: Kitty.

7 MS. SIMONDS: Well, obviously I'm
8 against developing any new formula for anything
9 because do you think we are going to get more
10 money for those individual line items? And I
11 think the way that Chris handled the deregulation,
12 that money okay so money became available. And
13 then that was divided up among our, the way we do
14 the, our formula.

15 So, you know, he didn't change anything
16 or start looking at the line items to say well,
17 maybe this should be this or that. It's just all
18 this new money I think will continue to be
19 allocated to us with our regular formula. That
20 worked out fine. You said here is a, there's a
21 million dollars. Oh, we divided it all up and we
22 got our money and we were fine.

1 But to go in and develop another formula
2 for those items like you think we are -- somebody
3 is going to say oh well, the Councils SSC stipends
4 are going to go up or whatever. It's all
5 ridiculous I think. This is my opinion. I don't
6 want to deal with any new allocation for those
7 funds.

8 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more
9 questions, comments? Miguel?

10 MR. ROLON: We are dancing around about
11 one issue is the direction they used for
12 discretionary funding period. So we use the
13 formula for the base funding up top and we are the
14 smallest Council. I don't get, we get \$251,000.
15 I don't need a hundred thousand more for doing
16 what we do. I'd rather have that money go to
17 other Councils that will have a need for that.

18 If we have a formula based on what we
19 have this time, at least that we receive the right
20 amount, the 251 and the question is what happened
21 when you have more money for this discretionary
22 line? And some people believe that if we have

1 this formula then it will be easier for the Chris
2 in this case to allocate those monies.

3 But also we run the risk if you are too
4 formulaic, this on the discretionary, the
5 discretion for the discretionary funds goes out of
6 the window. And I believe that we want to discuss
7 this some other time and then allow the group to
8 look at the formula, look at what we have now and
9 then come back to us with the best way to approach
10 this question.

11 MR. OLIVER: I think that's a good
12 suggestion. For the moment I would say that
13 because its discretionary, the default would
14 probably be to keep it in that same proportion
15 just to not make one Council mad and another, you
16 know, another Council happy.

17 But you could look at this on a year to
18 year basis and see what that total discretionary
19 amount is and then decide whether it should be
20 adjusted or not. But just to avoid conflict, we
21 would probably not make any real changes to that
22 proportion without that direction. We would, our

1 default would probably be to keep that the same
2 portion.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: Other comments,
4 questions, concerns? Carrie?

5 MS. SIMMONS: Yes, thank you, Madame
6 Chair. Yeah, I think we would like a little bit
7 more time to think about it. I did have a
8 question about the items, one of the items of the
9 Council peer review. That line item. Is that
10 directly related to SEDAR and the data, the stock
11 assessments and should that line item be -- go
12 below I guess or is it -- are those categories
13 correctly collapsed I guess would be my question.

14 MR. PAWLAK: I can go back just to show
15 folks what you are speaking about specifically
16 here. I think you are speaking about the Council
17 peer review here. Yeah. I don't know, is that
18 for the center for independent experts, Alan, or
19 is that?

20 The program would have to answer because
21 I'm not sure exactly. I think it's appropriately
22 categorized meaning it comes from this budget

1 line. I don't know the specific activity.

2 MR. WAUGH: That's the funding for
3 things like SEDAR. Right. And that has varied
4 over time. Right. It's been stable for a few
5 years if I remember right.

6 MS. MCCAWLEY: Carrie?

7 MS. SIMMONS: So I could be missing
8 something here because I don't look at this like
9 your saying every day. But I believe the other
10 activities for SEDAR and facilitating the stock
11 assessment process are in the section below.

12 So I guess, if we could just look
13 closely at that item to see if it's appropriate to
14 collapse it within that category or if its more
15 appropriate to go to the one below based on how
16 the Councils divide up the stock assessment review
17 process?

18 MR. PAWLAK: Yeah. I can look at that.
19 But you could have within these, this budget
20 structure you could have similar activity, I'm
21 going to call this an activity. You could have
22 Council peer review funded from here and here. I

1 mean, obviously I don't, I think by definition of
2 this table it doesn't look like the Councils do.

3 But you could have it funded in both
4 places depending on how, depending on what the
5 activity is. But we can go see if there's a
6 Council peer review component that has been to the
7 Councils funded out of here.

8 MS. MCCAWLEY: Gregg --

9 MR. PAWLAK: I'm not -- obviously from
10 the base there hasn't been or it would be
11 presented here.

12 MR. WAUGH: Yeah, I know in our case,
13 that the total that we expend for SEDAR, that
14 portion comes, part of it comes from the fisheries
15 data collection and the other portion comes from
16 that Council peer review.

17 So those two numbers together for us
18 equal what we spend to run SEDAR. It's just that
19 they're coming from two different line items
20 within the NMFS budget.

21 MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions and
22 comments? Dave.

1 MR. WITHERELL: I am going to suggest
2 that the executive directors meet and work this
3 out and provide a recommendation at our next
4 meeting. I have a slightly different take on this
5 and I would like to see all the pieces that are
6 allocated by the formula continue to be allocated
7 by the formula and then subset of that, for
8 example the SSC stipend and Council peer review
9 still broken out based on need.

10 So I, but everybody, I expect the other
11 Councils all have a different opinion so I think
12 the ED's could meet, come back to you with a
13 recommendation.

14 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are folks
15 okay with that? I see heads nodding. All right.
16 Other questions, comments, concerns? All right.
17 Thank you very much for that budget update, Brian.

18 MR. PAWLAK: Okay, thank you. And if
19 you need, through the program if you need input
20 from MB on numbers and such, just let I don't know
21 if its Jennie or Brian Fredieu know and we are
22 glad to help. So, thank you.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you so much. Let's
2 go ahead and take our 15 minute break and then we
3 will come back and keep going through the agenda.

4 (Recess)

5 MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, I can hear you.

6 MS. IVERSON: Yes.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. If folks
8 could come on back to the table. All right. We
9 are going to get going here again. So we are
10 moving on to the committees and the work groups
11 and first up we have Roger on the phone and he is
12 going to give us a report on the Habitat Work
13 Group.

14 MS. RILEY: And, Roger, this is
15 Anjanette. I have your slides up and am ready to
16 advance them.

17 MR. PUGLIESE: Okay, thank you,
18 Anjanette, and thank you for doing that. This is
19 Roger Pugliese, Senior Fishery Biologist with the
20 South Atlantic Council and work group chair and I
21 wanted to provide you a report of the Habitat Work
22 Group activities which is really focusing on the

1 work shop that was just held.

2 We had staff from the eight Councils,
3 the five regional offices and select NOAA
4 Fisheries headquarter staff meet in Portland in
5 August to advance our collective work toward
6 effective essential fish habitat consultations on
7 non- fishing activities. And really we are
8 looking at shared current practices, challenges
9 across regions, and really, we are looking at
10 brainstorming ways to improve our collaborations
11 with our partners into the future.

12 During the work shop, one of the key
13 things too was that while we are calling it EFH
14 consultation, it really addressed the broader view
15 of all non-fishing activities because the Councils
16 were noted to have the opportunities to outside of
17 the formal EFH consultation process provide input
18 on policy or review activities.

19 So with that, I wanted to walk through
20 our work group met in the sessions and I wanted to
21 last least touch on some of the components of what
22 happened during the workshop on the sessions, a

1 very brief overview. The report was provided to
2 participants so everybody has a hard copy and even
3 the presentation.

4 So given that, the opening of the
5 overall workshop provided a contextual bridge
6 between the 2016 EFH summit and the activities
7 that were held to advance our understanding and
8 coordination across within regions and across
9 regions nationally.

10 The first core session addressed the EFH
11 consultant process itself and one of the outcomes
12 of that was the opportunity of the Council
13 developing habitat goals to really kind of
14 articulate core standing guidance and clear
15 direction and on what areas Councils would address
16 relative to non-fishing activities.

17 The next session had to deal with
18 focusing on how articulating those habitat goals
19 really assess an effective use of the EFH
20 authorities and the mandates under Magnuson. It
21 provides the habitat goals provided and served to
22 form the action agencies, developers about the

1 roles of habitat and fisheries and then provides a
2 better understanding of early coordination will
3 really reduce potential impact as well as to help
4 prioritize restoration, conservation activities
5 and really encourage any opportunities for
6 resources such as through grants to refine our
7 understanding of the complex systems.

8 And the next session was pertaining to
9 development of Council policy statements to
10 provide standing guidance on EFH consultant and
11 habitat conservation efforts. A lot of discussion
12 and focus on this session because what it was
13 highlighted is that the statements would provide
14 the opportunity to provide standing policies to
15 articulating concerns about non fishing
16 activities, how they affect fish habitats.

17 And also they're easily sharable and
18 they can constitute best practices for habitation
19 conservation, habitat protection, operation
20 policies for the Council's engagement relative to
21 the areas that better benefits Council as well as
22 NOAA.

1 Next area addressed the offshore marine
2 planning and the broader regional issues that are
3 becoming bigger issues that the Council has been
4 -- Councils have been addressing in the near
5 terms. Some focused and some across multiple
6 Council areas.

7 Providing the opportunity to understand
8 how the groups intersect and coordinate and cross
9 cut between the regional wide issues, what
10 practices may be useful in enhancing the Councils
11 contributions and the consultant process either
12 directly in the system or indirectly. And
13 understanding given the limited availability what
14 some of the mechanisms would be to be able to
15 enhance how those coordination efforts get various
16 levels of participation and creation of tools or
17 capabilities to do this and these were highlighted
18 through the sessions.

19 The next area was really trying to look
20 at the opportunity to reach beyond existing
21 operations and further work with the Fishery
22 Science Centers, engage them potentially in short

1 term activities such as highlighting just the
2 entire suite of individuals involved in habitat
3 information or habitat activities or planning and
4 also their participation on regional plan teams or
5 advisory committees or panels. And that was a key
6 opportunity to provide that direct connection with
7 the science centers.

8 A longer term ones had to look at the
9 opportunities to have the refined understanding of
10 the consultation process and kind of looked back
11 to the information that they can create and
12 provide to refine that information that is
13 supporting the consultation.

14 Also how that could also help elevate
15 this up into national science initiatives,
16 aligning with regional prioritizations and how the
17 strategic plans feed into the overall work plans
18 that we have been discussing and I'll highlight
19 that at the end of here that's in the report.

20 Also identifying funding opportunities.
21 There is some times when you have the EFH
22 resources that may be available directly to the

1 Councils or Council priorities that either can
2 enhance some of this capability to have some
3 specific input on a habitat type or a species
4 related habitat activity.

5 The next area was focusing kind of
6 getting to that second part of the name of this
7 whole work shop, the tools and technology to add
8 Councils and regional office and provide the
9 access to the use of EFH information and
10 consultation.

11 And this was really getting to the point
12 of making sure that the information was available
13 to individuals that would be using in consultation
14 or have access to both the Council, the regional
15 offices, science centers and then partners in the
16 regions.

17 One of the mechanisms that was
18 highlighted to make sure that a lot of these
19 different pieces were easily accessible and
20 quickly queriable online through existing systems
21 through the Council or the regional offices or the
22 center and one of these ways to make sure that

1 kind of a lot of it would be there is the
2 opportunity to look at development of regional
3 user guides which would collapse a lot of the core
4 information on the EFH designations by species or
5 complexes within those areas and then linkages to
6 key information that could be useful for
7 individuals looking at non fishing activities
8 impact or specifically EFH consultation.

9 That moves us to the last session
10 dealing with the approaches and best practices for
11 obtaining and sharing data to refine EFH. An
12 opportunity to share experiences on the need for
13 data collection, how we can identify the
14 challenges in getting the level of information
15 that would enhance the ability to respond to
16 impasse or to activities relative to EFH
17 consultation on non-fishing activities.

18 And one of those things was there is
19 that real opportunity to look and maybe this would
20 be way to do it is across regions where those are
21 comparable is beginning to share some of that type
22 of information to capability.

1 And it really focused on how important
2 even the core distributional initial level
3 information is absolutely critical to complete
4 those types of things so that they can really
5 provide the foundation from which us to understand
6 the habitat use. But also that the issue that's
7 become more relevant to all of our regions is some
8 of the issues relative to change over time and
9 some of the shifting populations in species and
10 habitats and prey.

11 Those are going to be critical to know
12 and understand and how we advance that is going to
13 be important. And this also supports the broader
14 understanding of our ecosystem based spatial
15 models.

16 That brings us to a discussion that ends
17 in the focus of the areas, the opportunities to
18 cross between our regions and provide the
19 capabilities or understanding of how we can
20 advance some of this information, build on what we
21 know, and coordinate between us.

22 And this toolkit discussion really is

1 what I envision this is going to be an interactive
2 between our staffs in areas where this information
3 would be available and we can highlight things
4 that provide the ability for Councils to
5 understand and be informed of specific information
6 relative to activities or consultation, to
7 identify key issues within the concern by the
8 Councils, the opportunities on how to provide
9 comments or capabilities that can, you know, each
10 individual area has used or can use. So it
11 provides some guidance on other areas and other
12 capabilities.

13 And also, is it provides enough
14 information where the Councils can actually take
15 some of that and be able to use information in
16 their comments as I mentioned earlier that maybe
17 outside of the formal consultation process
18 abilities to just build on information that
19 supports their mandate but may not be in a formal
20 review.

21 And then it also (inaudible) to the
22 springboard from which to address things and with

1 constrained timeframes. So having the ability to
2 see how other Councils have developed policies or
3 capabilities really advances that and that cross
4 walk between staff and our regions are going to be
5 critical to allow the real opportunity to build on
6 all the good work that has been done in all
7 different levels throughout our area.

8 And that really brings us to kind of the
9 core, the foundation and conclusions and where we
10 go from here. The workshop itself created the
11 workshop report which I have provided to members.
12 There is some final tweaks so this is still
13 somewhat of a draft so by I think within a week
14 that will be the final, final version. But it
15 also sets forward potential tasks into the future
16 that are going to be undertaken.

17 The near term initiatives are really
18 looking at exchanging communication which we
19 absolutely did with just by holding this at the
20 staff level it was so critical, it's one of the
21 really benefits of having it done this way. But
22 it also provides a foundation for longer term

1 organizational planning with this.

2 And during 2020 and beyond, what we are
3 hoping to do is have the work group build on what
4 came out of this report and as focused, it has
5 regional next steps or action work plans, however
6 you want to state it but what they're doing is
7 reaching back to some of the discussions that were
8 held in the workshop and then how do we begin to
9 look at some of those within our individual
10 regions.

11 So the discussions between the Council
12 staff and the regional offices and beyond and the
13 partners within the region would advance those
14 work plans. So that really with additional
15 guidance from the CCC would provide kind of the
16 next steps beyond where we go here. So this is
17 kind of a springboard from which kind of that even
18 closer coordination between our Councils and
19 regions can happen.

20 And so that really leads us to what were
21 identified as opportunities for the CCC to
22 actually weigh in on to support the broader term

1 concept and really there were kind of some big
2 picture activities.

3 One was really to look at an outreach
4 action agencies and remind them of the, about the
5 role of the Councils and how the role in fisheries
6 management as well as addressing essential fish
7 habitat designated by the Councils. And while the
8 NOAA fisheries conducts the consultations, the
9 actions agencies are encouraged to coordinate
10 around actions that impact EFH designated by the
11 Councils.

12 And also the CCC could identify habitat
13 science priorities that are shared across regions
14 and Councils and can communicate them to NOAA
15 fisheries leadership, both at the regional offices
16 and science centers so that the shared science
17 objectives can really provide the foundation for
18 work into the future and benefit multiple Councils
19 in the activities.

20 And that's my quick synopsis of what was
21 a very productive, very eye opening effort. I
22 think this was one of the first times of that type

1 of and it needed to happen at that level, at the
2 staff (inaudible) level to see some of the
3 challenges, some of the focuses, the different
4 ways the Councils can reach a deal with some of
5 these different issues and how we can all learn
6 from each other and also build on that to enhance
7 the entire directive under Magnuson to address EFH
8 consultation and non-fishing activity impacts.

9 And with that I'll conclude my
10 presentation and open it up for any questions.

11 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Roger. I'm
12 looking around the room to see if we have
13 questions or comments. Yes, Bill.

14 MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.
15 Thank you. Roger. Can you, can we go back to
16 the, this one. Yeah. The future actions. The
17 first bullet talks about the Councils themselves
18 becoming included in the EFH consultation process
19 which and I only really know about the EFH process
20 in Alaska because we get annual reports of the
21 agency on what that's like. And they do a ton of
22 consultations, a lot of --

1 MR. PUGLIESE: Right.

2 MR. TWEIT: -- pretty small things. So
3 I'm really wondering what was meant by that
4 because I'm assuming you're not just thinking that
5 Councils should be essentially --

6 MR. PUGLIESE: No.

7 MR. TWEIT: -- acting in parallel with
8 the agency on all EFH applications.

9 MR. PUGLIESE: And to respond to you,
10 absolutely not. I mean, that's, that I think we
11 all going into this know that the day to day
12 consultation effort is really what NOAA is doing
13 and the habitat conservation as they prosecute how
14 you protect the designated EFH by the Councils.
15 So no, that wasn't intended.

16 It was more to have that ability to
17 ensure that the actions agency understand the
18 Councils are part of this process and actually
19 designated the EFH and that there is opportunities
20 to coordinate with them. And I think really want
21 you look at like the second sentence, really what
22 it is is getting to is that that encouraged to

1 coordinate and there is opportunities that they
2 can reach back and forth so it doesn't have to be
3 part of the formal consultation processes. It can
4 be just inform.

5 And in our region a lot of times we will
6 get the some of the report outs on the bigger
7 activities, essentially those are farmed back to
8 us sometimes so that we can see some of these as
9 they are developing for issues that come up. So
10 it is definitely not intended to do that because
11 that would be an overwhelming -- if anything this
12 whole effort here was to figure out a way to
13 advance Councils perspectives on habitat within
14 their regions, how that can be brought to the
15 forefront with some of these different other
16 action agencies or partners and have available
17 online or whatever so that it can -- and then even
18 at the Council level, some of those where we do it
19 is with like habitat policies.

20 The Council over a period of time has
21 developed positions on activities and it
22 ultimately through our coordination with our

1 habitat and ecosystem advisory panel create a
2 policy then that is something that can be used by
3 the NOAA Fisheries in their consultation review or
4 by the Council if they want to provide that
5 directly to an agency.

6 So that does not, you know, set the
7 stage for having to be involved in every single,
8 you know, micro consultation or EFH permit review.

9 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Roger. Looking
10 around. Are there more questions or comments
11 here? Bill.

12 MR. TWEIT: Thank you. Just to follow
13 up, so as I was listening to Rogers answer, he was
14 talking about language that doesn't appear on the
15 screen here. And when I look back at my version
16 from the website it is in there so it looks like
17 this might not be the most current language? The,
18 what's on the screen right now? Or might not be
19 the most current version?

20 MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. You're talking
21 about the future actions?

22 MR. TWEIT: Yeah. The language that you

1 talked about they are encouraged to coordinate,
2 I'm seeing that on the file that I opened up on my
3 computer but I wasn't seeing that on our screen.

4 MR. PUGLIESE: Oh, in the version that
5 was there. Okay. Well, that may -- I don't know
6 if there was an iteration probably with that but
7 that's the intent regardless of what you're seeing
8 and I'm not sure how that there, this went through
9 a number of iterations so hopeful that didn't get,
10 you know, that's the intent.

11 The one you are looking at is the one
12 that was distributed to the CCC so that is what
13 the intent encouraged to coordinate across.

14 MR. TWEIT: Okay, yeah. Now they have
15 got the one that you were talking about up on the
16 screen. Thank you.

17 MR. PUGLIESE: Okay.

18 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Roger. Other
19 questions or comments?

20 MR. PUGLIESE: Okay.

21 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you,
22 Roger.

1 MR. PUGLIESE: Are we good? Thank you.

2 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Next up since
3 we have another person that's going to be on the
4 webinar, we are going to move into to the Council
5 Communications Group and move into Kim Iverson's
6 report.

7 MS. IVERSON: Okay. Good morning. Can
8 everyone hear me?

9 MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

10 MS. IVERSON: Thank you. This is Kim
11 Iverson. I am the public information officer with
12 the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and
13 I appreciate the opportunity to review the Council
14 Communication Work group report this morning.

15 I hope that you've all had a productive
16 meeting week and I understand that you're wrapping
17 things up so I'd like to just quickly give an
18 overview of the report that is in your briefing
19 book.

20 As you know, our Council Communication
21 Group is made up of our staff members from each of
22 the Councils and we last met formally in 2018 and

1 at the May CCC meeting here in Charleston. You
2 were provided with a report from that meeting.

3 So the briefing book update or report
4 that for this meeting serves as an update on some
5 of the activities that we have been doing and
6 collaborating on via email. We do stay in touch
7 on a regular basis as a communications group and
8 share various information on various topics.

9 In the report that you have in your
10 briefing book, there is a number of noteworthy
11 projects. We also, I also noted in the report
12 some issues that were addressed at our May CCC
13 meeting including the request that Dave Whaley had
14 made for fact sheets on just as a reminder on
15 forage fish, climate change, and timing of
16 amendments.

17 It was discussed at the May CCC meeting
18 that in order to expedite that that the executive
19 directors would provide Dave with some updates on
20 the activities that each of the Councils have done
21 on those topics and there was some discussion that
22 the communication work group may want to continue

1 to develop maybe a more comprehensive and
2 collaborative effort on producing some fact sheets
3 a little bit more formally on those topics.

4 At the May CCC meeting, if you recall we
5 also had presentations from the South Atlantic
6 Council staff and had some informal discussions
7 during your breaks and that format was well
8 received.

9 Some of the projects and I won't go
10 through these individually. You have the
11 information in your briefing book but I will
12 highlight that we have been busy as the
13 communication group and working at our individual
14 Councils on such things as website updates and
15 development.

16 Kitty will, can answer any questions
17 that you may have on the Western Pacific but it
18 just recently launched their, a really nice, new
19 website back in October. The Pacific Council is
20 updating its website and the New England and
21 Mid-Atlantic Councils have partnered to develop a
22 new page to address offshore wind issues in the

1 northeast.

2 This new site keeps fishermen and
3 constituents updated on the status of ongoing
4 offshore wind projects and if you have been
5 following that topic, that's quite a challenge.
6 So kudos to those two Councils for creating that
7 webpage.

8 As a group we have been busy exchanging
9 information on in house topics such as upgrades to
10 our AV tools, teleconferencing equipment, use of
11 wireless microphones, things that help us improve
12 our communications with our Council members as
13 well as our constituents.

14 I will note that the North Pacific
15 Council, we have been sharing or has been sharing
16 a lot of information on its new community outreach
17 effort on introducing the Council process. I
18 understand that they launched that effort at their
19 last Council meeting.

20 There have been fact sheets and other
21 outreach tools that have been developed as part of
22 that effort and I'm sure that the ED's there can

1 help and deputies can help explain that in more
2 detail.

3 There is a list of several communication
4 efforts in the report. Everyone has been very
5 busy as you can see. We do stay in touch with
6 each other via email on a fairly regular basis and
7 I would encourage you to take a look at some of
8 the links that are included in the report and look
9 at some of the activities that have been underway.

10 As a group we continue to coordinate
11 with Mary Sabo at the Mid-Atlantic Council to
12 update the all Council webpage and we continue to
13 update our individual sections as needed.

14 Information about this meeting is posted on that
15 website as well as past information on previous
16 CCC and other working group meetings.

17 We have in -- we have been discussing
18 informally the need to meet in person and would
19 welcome the input from the CCC on that and any
20 other ideas that you may have or direction that
21 you may want to provide to the work group as we
22 continue to work together.

1 So that concludes my overview of the
2 report and I'll be glad to answer any questions.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kim. Are
4 there questions or comments for Kim? All right.
5 I don't see any hands. I appreciate you joining
6 us via webinar for that presentation, Kim.

7 MS. IVERSON: Thank you.

8 MS. RILEY: And, Kim and Roger, we are
9 going to go ahead and mute you now. You are
10 welcome to stay on of course but you will be muted
11 and you can let me know if you need to weigh in, I
12 can unmute you.

13 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Now we are
14 going to go back to the Electronic Monitoring Work
15 Group report and, Mike, I believe you prepared
16 some slides for us. I'm going to turn it back
17 over to you.

18 MR. BURNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
19 Yes, per our discussion on Tuesday, I took the
20 bolded recommendations that were in the
21 subcommittee workgroup and put them in a power
22 point and sent those out yesterday afternoon. Tom

1 and Phil have provided some comments on those as
2 well and you'll see those in strike out and
3 colored text to those recommendations.

4 Again I guess just in short overview,
5 the focus of the workgroup discussion and our
6 discussions on Tuesday were this policy directive
7 from National Marine Fisheries Service regarding
8 data retention and how long stored data collected
9 through an EM program needs to be retained for the
10 purposes -- for a variety of purposes including
11 enforcement and log book verification and the
12 like.

13 I had shown these graphics that I pulled
14 from the directive earlier on the second one in
15 the lower right I didn't put on the screen earlier
16 but it's just simply shows the possibility or the
17 likelihood that as fishing years continue, the
18 retention period from the previous fishing years
19 likely is going to overlap with the following
20 fishing period which is going to create additional
21 data storage requirements.

22 But the graphic is just in here for

1 reference if we need to go back to it for
2 discussion purposes. I won't go through it again
3 in detail but in short, I think as we go through
4 the five recommendations that I have highlighted
5 in this power point, I think the main message from
6 the work group and the discussions I have heard
7 since Tuesday was that the main idea here would be
8 to try to minimize the overall data retention
9 period with a primary focus on the cost of that.

10 Again, not trying to take away from the
11 need or the importance of this data but there is
12 growing concern at least on the West Coast and I
13 would imagine in other regions that based on the
14 cost allocation directive and the burden on
15 industry for -- to take on most of those costs,
16 the concern again primarily is housing all this
17 data for a minimum amount of time is desired to
18 keep costs down and to make this program as
19 effective as possible as a potential replacement
20 for traditional observer programs.

21 So with that said, oops. Wrong button.
22 These are the first three recommendations that I

1 pulled out of the submits report that was in your
2 briefing materials. The text in black is the text
3 that was from that original report. Some of that
4 has been in strike out as suggested by some of the
5 reviewers I mentioned earlier and the colored text
6 is new.

7 So item number one focuses on what I
8 emphasized a minute ago, minimizing EM storage
9 costs is a primary concern of the CCC. It's one
10 of the recommendations that the work group focused
11 on. And again I guess I should step back for a
12 second.

13 The directive on storage is out for
14 review through the end of the year and so the work
15 group subcommittee's recommendations here are
16 intended for CCC consideration for potential
17 inclusion in a letter from the CCC to National
18 Marine Fishery Service on this directive that
19 would be sent out after this meeting if that's the
20 will of the group.

21 So again the work group and the edits
22 that you see here on that first bullet are just

1 focusing on the desire to minimize costs through
2 adapting a maximum retention period that applies
3 to all programs but that maximum retention period
4 be minimized and the justification for it
5 clarified.

6 The second bullet speaks to some
7 flexibility. The draft identifies multiple
8 reasons for establishing a minimum retention
9 period as associated with a potential use of the
10 EM data and the video collected with a
11 recommendation from the sub group. And some of
12 the other edits here is that the activity should
13 be accomplished as simply as possible allowing
14 some flexibility but again, with the overarching
15 message to keep things as cost effective as
16 possible.

17 We talked a bit about on Tuesday this
18 interim period. I guess just to be clear when we
19 say interim period, we are talking about that
20 period between the black and the orange boxes
21 here, that period of the extended monitoring
22 timeframe between those two. That has not been

1 defined in the directive and it's sort of been
2 some of the concern of the subgroup.

3 So the idea of being again, the length
4 of this period should be minimized to accomplish
5 the tasks of things like adding up total
6 mortalities against an annual catch limit or for
7 the needs of holding on to EM data for the
8 purposes of potential enforcement or logbook,
9 what's the word I'm looking for, verification
10 processes.

11 So again, an underlying theme here is to
12 make sure the EM program is as effective as
13 possible that would minimize the storage periods.
14 I guess I'll stop there while those are on the
15 screen and see if there's any questions on those
16 three recommendations. Oh, sorry.

17 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, questions? It
18 looks like people are taking the time to read
19 that. All right. I don't see any hands in the
20 air. Do you want to keep going, Mike --

21 MR. BURNER: Yes.

22 MS. MCCAWLEY: -- and then maybe we

1 could get one motion at the end to --

2 MR. BURNER: Sure. And we can --

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: -- accept this.

4 MR. BURNER: We can certainly step back
5 to that. So the final two recommendations that
6 I've highlighted from the subcommittees report
7 talks about a couple of different options here.

8 Number four we spoke to a bit on
9 Tuesday. Again it talks about the maximum
10 duration of the interim period and how it affects
11 the overall retention period. We had talked a bit
12 about Tuesday the group had given a recommendation
13 here that you see in strike out about that being a
14 three month period. Again, I can't speak for the
15 subgroup but I was on that webinar. I think the
16 idea was, the three month idea was an example.

17 Again, I think the concern there was
18 that of the mix, of the data retention program and
19 requirements that the undefined portion was the
20 monitoring period. The idea of limiting that to a
21 maximum so that the overall retention period could
22 be known as it was the desire of the group.

1 I think there is also some need for some
2 flexibility region to region but the, again with
3 costs in mind, the subgroups concern wasn't so
4 much that it be three months as a maximum for the
5 interim period but that the interim period be
6 defined so that it can't be longer than X and that
7 could probably be regionally defined.

8 So as you see here, number four, the
9 specifics of whether that should be a three month
10 period, whether the 12 month minimum retention
11 period should start right at the end of fishing or
12 it should be something longer than three months, I
13 don't know as the subcommittee had a strong
14 recommendation there but again, the overall
15 message here is so that everyone knows what the
16 maximum sidebars are that the monitoring period be
17 defined in the directive with some sort of a
18 maximum.

19 This fifth point we had talked about on
20 Tuesday as well it's concerned about the federal
21 records data confidentiality access and ownership
22 of the stored data. There was concerns on the

1 subcommittee's discussion about those items and
2 how once EM data particularly becomes a federal
3 record, how that information is going to be kept
4 confidential was a concern. And the subgroup
5 recommended for this committees consideration that
6 the recommendations at NMFS be that the final
7 directive speak to that which it doesn't
8 currently.

9 So those are the recommendation that the
10 subcommittee forwarded on to you for consideration
11 and happy to take any questions. Again, the
12 comment period on the storage directive ends at
13 the end of the year.

14 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Questions or
15 comments? Yes, Phil.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.
17 I think one of the things we were struggling with
18 is we have the data collection period which is the
19 fishing year and then we have the data storage
20 period which is at least in part needed for
21 enforcement and other purposes.

22 And then in between those two, we have

1 this interim period where the video review occurs
2 to ensure that the logbook information and other
3 information match up with what is seen in the
4 video. And that timeframe, the way it was
5 constructed at the end of that timeframe was when
6 the clock starts for the data retention period.

7 And, you know, I think what we were
8 struggling with is how do we define that interim
9 period so that it is as short as possible while
10 giving sufficient time to do the review. And also
11 provides the necessary flexibility that may be
12 needed between regions to accomplish that task.
13 Because at the end of that task is when the start
14 of the clock is from the retention period.

15 And I, that's what we were -- well, at
16 least I don't know about we, that was one of the
17 things I was struggling with in terms of trying to
18 construct the potential feedback that we give to
19 National Marine Fisheries Service on their storage
20 retention directive. And I'm not sure we're there
21 yet, but I think the five points that are written
22 up there address the major topics that I thought

1 needed to come from the CCC to National Marine
2 Fisheries Service.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Phil. Other
4 comments, questions, concerns? Tom.

5 MR. NIES: Well, I just want to I think
6 echo most of Phil's comments. I know I raised a
7 couple questions the other day and I think the way
8 these have been rewritten address most of my
9 concerns.

10 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Tom. Other
11 folks, concerns, comments? I will entertain a
12 motion if we are ready to approve this. Tom.

13 MR. NIES: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
14 would like to make, offer a motion the CCC should
15 forward to the National Marine Fisheries Service
16 the comments on the draft EM video data retention
17 directive as presented.

18 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motioned by
19 Tom. Do we have a second? Seconded by Bill.
20 Anymore discussion on this? Is there any
21 objection to this motion? All right. Seeing
22 none, the motion carries.

1 Mike, do you have anything else that you
2 need or want to discuss relative to that
3 workgroup?

4 MR. BURNER: No, thank you, Madame
5 Chair. The Pacific Council will take the lead on
6 drafting this on into a formal letter and get that
7 distributed for everyone's look before it goes
8 out.

9 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mike.

10 MR. BURNER: Mm-hm.

11 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Then we are
12 going to move into our final workgroup. It's the
13 Regional Fishery Management Forum group and, Bill,
14 I think you have some updates for us.

15 MR. TWEIT: Sorry, I, before I turn the
16 microphone over to Diana on that, I did have one
17 last thought on the previous agenda item. And
18 that is that if -- that we -- the CCC send the
19 same set of recommendations if the National
20 Archives undergoes rule making relative to the
21 federal records part of this that we would be
22 prepared to voice the same thoughts to the

1 National Archives for a portion of these that
2 might become federal records.

3 And I don't know what the timing on that
4 would be or anything else but (inaudible) it seems
5 like it would be consistent with our directive to
6 the service on their policy directive.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Good point.
8 Is everyone okay with that? More comments on
9 that? Sam?

10 MR. ALGER: Brett Alger, NOAA Fisheries
11 Electronic Technologies Coordinator. So we in
12 fact have a call this afternoon or a meeting with
13 National Archives to hopefully once and for all
14 button up this hand off that we are going to give
15 to them for them to start the process of doing the
16 federal registrar notice.

17 All along they've said it takes about
18 six months, sometimes it can take much shorter
19 than that. And there will be a 45 day comment
20 period. So once we get sort of notification on
21 when in fact that would start, we would
22 communicate that out to you all.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great.
2 Everybody okay with sending the same comments? I
3 see heads nodding yes. All right, Bill. You
4 ready to move into the Regional Fishery Management
5 forums?

6 MR. TWEIT: I am. But I did, sorry, I
7 had one additional question and that was just
8 about whether you would entertain at the end of
9 this going back to the EFH recommendations because
10 the habitat committee did have a couple
11 recommendations and I don't think we gave them any
12 feedback at all on that.

13 MS. MCCAWLEY: Of course.

14 MR. TWEIT: Okay. But right now let me
15 just turn it over to Diana to walk through this so
16 you don't have to listen to my cough.

17 MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Diana.

18 MS. EVANS: Good morning, members of the
19 CCC. My name is Diana Evans, deputy director for
20 the North Pacific and I helped coordinate the work
21 of the committee that you created last May to look
22 into this proposal of a, we are calling it Council

1 member ongoing development but that same idea that
2 you have IT listed on the agenda as a regional
3 forum for trading for Council members.

4 And we had a proposal about this or a
5 discussion about this at the CCC in May that
6 initiated this committee work to look at an idea
7 for how to establish some kind of ongoing Council
8 member training, recognizing that there is an
9 existing obviously need for all appointed members,
10 new Council members to go to training at the
11 beginning of their Council tenure but that
12 particularly with the ending of the Fisheries
13 Leadership and Sustainability forum which has been
14 providing some of the opportunities for ongoing
15 Council members to continue to meet in a regional
16 forum and discuss issues that are cross
17 jurisdictional for fishery management. It's a
18 small community that does this kind of fishery
19 management work and having that opportunity to
20 develop a network of people who are most possibly
21 dealing with similar issues, but applied in
22 different regions of the U.S. is beneficial for

1 our Council management process in general.

2 So there is a proposal that is, that I
3 believe realized was posted to the CCC agenda but
4 not nearly to the NMFS version for the CCC agenda.
5 It's posted in both places now and it's available.
6 It's a five page proposal and this slide up here
7 really just highlights the synopsis that is at the
8 front of the proposal.

9 The committee had met and talked about
10 at the request of the CCC to talk about how would
11 we go about doing, setting up this kind of
12 training program if the CCC is interested in going
13 that direction to work out some of the logistics.

14 In the longer proposal, talks about the
15 purpose. I think I have talked about that a
16 little bit already but just generally to explore
17 issues and topics that are common to all Councils.
18 Have opportunities for training and developing
19 skill sets for Council members beyond that first
20 year that new member training.

21 The and also to do that in a policy
22 neutral environment where you're not necessarily

1 doing it with respect to an issue that you might
2 be advocating in some way for but just generally
3 be able to work through some of these issues big
4 picture, national issues and changes and how they
5 can be best be addressed at fisheries management
6 best practices.

7 So if you look through the five page
8 proposal we talked about generally the structure.
9 We were thinking along the lines of what had been
10 held through the fisheries forum workshop so a
11 facilitated two to three day workshop for Council
12 members, Council and NMFS staff.

13 In terms of the understanding the
14 workload that would be involved in putting that
15 together, our proposal was to do that biannually,
16 potentially alternating it with the scientific
17 SCS, the National SSC workshop that happens every
18 two years maybe in the intervening years you could
19 have this organized as Council training workshop.

20 And so the committee definitely
21 recommends moving forward with that training
22 program. The committee proposes that the CCC

1 create a steering committee to manage that
2 training program and that's the responsibilities
3 of that steering committee would be to basically
4 to have oversight over the program as it goes
5 forward, liaising with the host Council and with
6 the facilitator specifically to help to develop a
7 contract with the facilitator so it's some
8 logistical work to figure out a cost structure.

9 And then also to come back to the CCC
10 and provide some guidance on the type of topics
11 that would be taken up at each training session
12 and that would be something that the steering
13 committee could bring to the CCC in the annual
14 meeting proceeding, you know, a year out from when
15 that training workshop would happen.

16 Generally, in terms of structure, what's
17 being proposed in this is a participation that
18 would include four seats from each Council for a
19 total of 32 members that could be a mix of Council
20 members and staff at the discretion of each
21 Council but with the idea of generally trying to
22 ensure that, you know, if you are having this

1 every two years that over the course of a Council
2 members nine year tenure on the Council they could
3 attend at least once. That would be ideal.

4 Ten seats reserved for NMFS personnel,
5 NMFS staff to participate and then with the hired
6 facilitators and the three to five presenters, you
7 are talking about just a little under 40, excuse
8 me, a little under 50 attendees per session.

9 We also spoke on the calls, the planning
10 calls for this to talk about the fact that this is
11 going to be most effective if it can be held by
12 invitation only. And so looking at the Magnuson
13 Act requirements for meetings being in public, it
14 seems like this is not one of the requirements.
15 This would not meet those requirements so it
16 should be possible to do that by invitation only.

17 The, in terms for saving some cost
18 information, the proposal talks about the host
19 Council basically doing the arranging for the
20 venue and doing the staffing for the meeting.
21 That's something that obviously as Councils we are
22 all used to and that's something that can create

1 quite a lot of expense for farming that out to a
2 facilitator.

3 And so to keep costs down if a host
4 Councils volunteer to take on that logistic role
5 and then the facilitator would be in charge of
6 planning and organizing the agenda under the
7 oversight of the committee and working with the
8 host Council, contacting presenters and then
9 facilitating at the meeting and providing a
10 summary.

11 We talked quite a lot on our couple of
12 teleconferences about how to do the logistics of
13 looking at different cost sharing options and we
14 talked about a little bit, excuse me, a little bit
15 about that in May as well.

16 But cost sharing between the Council and
17 NMFS, just the mechanics of changing, of arranging
18 for money is not so complicated for NMFS to
19 provide money to the host Council if the host
20 Councils organizing this event but a little bit
21 more complicated for Councils to pay each other so
22 there is some recommendations in the paper on page

1 four about how to look at those different
2 mechanisms.

3 I'm not going to go into those in detail
4 here. That would be something that the steering
5 committee could move forward. Unless you have
6 question on that, I'm happy to talk about that
7 more, there is a particular recommendation.

8 So jumping ahead to the question of cost
9 and that comes to the final point here. We've put
10 together a cost estimate or I think actually Tom
11 from New England put that together for us.

12 Looking at a total cost for one of these
13 events being in the nature of \$120,000. So the
14 shared costs would come to a total of 110,000, you
15 know, approximating for Councils participating
16 with the traveler for facilitators and facilitator
17 contract and then arranging for a meeting room and
18 then Councils and NMFS paying their own travel.

19 So if you look on the final page of the
20 proposal, there is various different options for
21 how we could fund this. There is an option where
22 the Councils pay that entirely. This is entirely

1 funded by individual Councils. There is an option
2 for NMFS to pay it entirely. And then there is an
3 option for cost sharing.

4 And while we didn't necessarily feel
5 confident enough to put this forward as an actual
6 recommendation from the committee, the discussion
7 around the not all members were able to make our
8 final meeting. But the committee was certainly
9 leaning towards this idea of a cost sharing
10 proposal and some of the advantages for that are
11 that it gives both NMFS and the Council some
12 ownership over the training program but especially
13 for the Councils having that balance to be able to
14 design a program that is really useful for
15 Councils members and the training that we think
16 that we are looking for.

17 We circled around the option which is
18 listed in the paper as option 3A but that
19 individual Councils would pay their travel for
20 their own members, NMFS would obviously pay their
21 own travel and then the shared costs would be
22 split between the Councils and NMFS 50/50. So

1 that works out to I think I put that on here,
2 maybe based on the example that we illustrated
3 about \$55,000 per event for National Marine
4 Fisheries Service and then that \$55,000 would be
5 split amongst the eight Councils for the Councils
6 shared costs plus the additional cost for -- of
7 travel for their members to wherever the venue is.

8 We also identified some potential topics
9 for that first meeting but I think the first step
10 here is to look to the CCC to see whether or not
11 you are interested in establishing this program.

12 I think our tentative thought was that
13 if you were to do that then we would be looking at
14 trying to hold the first training in 2021 given
15 that 2020 will be the National SSC workshop. We
16 have that planned so it would be in that next
17 intervening year. Happy to answer any questions.

18 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Questions for
19 Bill or Diane? Yes, Adam.

20 MR. ISSENBERG: So I just want to kind
21 of throw a yellow flag, not a red flat, just a
22 yellow flag about the invitation only question. I

1 mean, I think it kind of warmed my heart when you
2 said, you know, policy neutral. But I, you know,
3 I think any time you are getting feds together
4 with Council folk and other folk then, you know,
5 there is potentially a FACA (phonetic) issue.

6 I think there is definitely a way to get
7 at this but I think, you know, it's just going to
8 require some, you know, careful thinking about
9 sort of, you know, what the terms of reference
10 are, what terms of reference are, what the, you
11 know, kind of characterization of the
12 communication -- of the discussions are.

13 I'm looking at the page on potential
14 topics. You know, some of those I think are, you
15 know, the skill development type things, I think
16 those things don't necessarily raise any types of
17 concerns. You know, the fishery management topics
18 for exploration.

19 I think you just need to be careful to
20 ensure that the -- its understood and communicated
21 that the purpose isn't to recommend -- to make
22 recommendations to the agency and I think with

1 some careful drafting we can handle those issues.

2 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other
3 questions or comments? Phil.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Thanks, Madame Chair.
5 Under the second bullet there, the sub bullet
6 about hosting the training and their region on a
7 rotating basis, was there any discussion about
8 maybe trying to look for some central location
9 that regardless of who the host was that it would
10 be held in a location that was more central to the
11 extent that that's possible rather than having it
12 may be held on some of the extremes in terms of
13 distances that a large portion of the members
14 would have to travel to attend the session?

15 MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Diane.

16 MS. EVANS: So we did have the example
17 that was the cost example that we used as a basis
18 for this was I believe citing the workshop in
19 Denver, Colorado. And certainly understanding,
20 our conversation on the group was noting that one
21 of the disadvantages of the cost sharing option
22 that we were leaning towards is that some members,

1 some Councils rather may have different travel
2 restrictions or, you know, travel budgets in order
3 to attend these workshops.

4 So I think certainly in terms of the
5 fact that there is cognizance of the cost of
6 travel that would be incurred by members and
7 trying to make that as reasonable as possible.
8 There is definitely interest in trying to get
9 participation by all Councils, that was definitely
10 one of the principles that was discussed in terms
11 of the benefit of creating this type of workshop
12 so I think that's consistent with what the types
13 of things that have talked about and then as we
14 plan that first meeting, particularly we could
15 talk more specifically about how to best address
16 that issue.

17 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other
18 questions or comments? Yes, Carrie.

19 MS. SIMMONS: Yes, thank you, Madame
20 Chair. No, I think this is a great proposal. I
21 think we would be in support of it in the Gulf. I
22 still would like us to look at the numbers of

1 people that we're proposing to send.

2 I think we should look at reducing it to
3 three per Council and that is based on three
4 representatives per Council. Just our experience
5 with MREP, the Marine Resource Education Program.
6 I think I have mentioned this earlier in our
7 Council only session.

8 We heard back from Council members that
9 when there were 40 individuals there that they
10 felt that was too many so I think if we are
11 butting up against 50 that's going to be way too
12 many. So I would suggest we reduce that or at
13 least look closely at what the MREP program has
14 done and think about numbers of people we are
15 sending.

16 The other issue is, you know, I think
17 it's going to -- we are going to be hard pressed
18 depending on time of year, the other meetings we
19 have going on to find that many people that can
20 devote time to this. So, I think we need to think
21 about that as well so I would suggest three folks
22 from each Council but other than that I think we

1 are in full support of this.

2 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Carrie. Tom.

3 MR. NIES: Thank you, Madame Chair.

4 Yeah, I think we should -- we can clearly look at
5 the number of people who attend. I would point
6 out that this model is not exactly the same as the
7 MREP model for what's going on. And it's really
8 modeled after the fisheries forum which did not
9 have 50 people usually but did have usually
10 between 35 to 45 attendees including presenters.

11 So, you know, we are probably a little
12 high but I don't know if we need to really push,
13 but I think the steering committee can discuss
14 that. And one of the problems I see is if we cut
15 it down to three attendees per Council, some of
16 the larger Councils like the mid I think would
17 have difficulty getting everybody an opportunity
18 to get to one of these in a somewhat typical three
19 year term -- three term cycle. And it would
20 probably constrain the number of staff members
21 that would be able to attend as well. So that's
22 the trade off when you do that.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Tom. Gregg.

2 MR. WAUGH: And we have had, I think Mel
3 has attended one of those sessions. Two of them.
4 So from our perspective, we see a lot of utility
5 in keeping this going. It's also a way for
6 Council members to share experiences, get to know
7 the NMFS folks that are participating as well.
8 And a way for the NMFS folks to gain some
9 experience in issues we're facing as well so we
10 are fully supportive of the approach.

11 MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other folks want to
12 weigh in or have questions? Ultimately I think we
13 would be looking for a motion here. Yes, Chris.

14 MR. MOORE: So moved.

15 MS. MCCAWLEY: So I'm assuming Chris
16 that that's to accept the recommendations on the
17 board?

18 MR. MOORE: I move the recommendations
19 on the board.

20 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a
21 second?

22 MR. BELL: Seconded.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Seconded by Mel. Any
2 more discussion? Any objection to approval of
3 that motion? All right. Seeing none, that motion
4 carries.

5 So now we are going to go back as Bill
6 mentioned to the Habitat Work Group report.
7 Apparently there were some items in there that we
8 need to give some feedback on. Maybe Anjanette
9 can pull up the presentation.

10 MS. RILEY: Yes, can we also have them
11 unmuted please.

12 MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Carrie.

13 MS. SIMMONS: Just sorry, before we
14 leave this topic, so will we review this again, we
15 will get the steering committee together, we will
16 talk about numbers more, we will talk about
17 locations and topics and in May and then make the
18 final approval. Is that the next step for this?

19 MS. MCCAWLEY: Diane, Bill.

20 MR. TWEIT: I think we also need to know
21 what the agency thinks about it too. So give them
22 some time to think about the recommendation and

1 get back to us. So and maybe have that occur,
2 then the steering group can get back together and
3 have all that in time for May. Does that work?

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: I see thumbs up over here
5 so sounds like it is coming back to May. So we
6 are getting the presentation pulled up. I'm going
7 to assume that this is the more updated one from
8 the website. Okay. I see Anjanette says yes.

9 All right. So these are some possible
10 future CCC actions suggested by the work group.
11 Discussion on this. Bill.

12 MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.
13 The first item, the coordinated outreach to action
14 agencies will probably engender then some addition
15 discussions at the Council level and I guess I --
16 I think this is something the CCC should consider
17 but I think that we should have a clearer
18 understanding of what the potential workload and
19 results from this sort of thing might be, the kind
20 of effort while I think it might be fairly simple
21 to do some initial outreach, that's the sort of
22 thing that probably has to be repeated

1 periodically as people change at the various
2 action agencies.

3 But then secondly, the final line about
4 action agencies being encouraged to coordinate
5 around actions that will impact EFH designated by
6 the Councils. Even though I think Rogers answer
7 described that the Councils wouldn't have a big
8 role in that, I can still see more of a workload
9 for Councils and Council staff in particular
10 coming out of this.

11 And I guess I would before I would be
12 comfortable moving this I think I would actually
13 just request that the habitat, the CCC habitat
14 committee provide us maybe with some more detail
15 about how this might work and a sense of what this
16 might do to Council workload to Council staff
17 workload.

18 I mean, I think it's an interesting
19 idea. I think the committee should be encouraged
20 to maybe flesh it out further and describe in more
21 detail exactly what this would look like.

22 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Bill.

1 Other discussions? Okay, Tom.

2 MR. NIES: I actually think and perhaps
3 we could get the same thing on the second
4 paragraph as well. I'm not at, we are not -- I
5 don't believe we're all actually on the same cycle
6 for research priorities. Some of us are doing
7 manually, some of us are not. I am not sure
8 whether the coordinated approach is better or not
9 because I'm not sure what that involves.

10 I mean, is their idea that the habitat
11 work group would identify these priorities and
12 bring them to us and we would write a letter?
13 Well, okay, that's one thing. But is it something
14 else that they're intending? So maybe they could
15 flesh that one out a little bit too.

16 MS. MCCAWLEY: Bill?

17 MR. TWEIT: Yes. I completely agree
18 with Tom. I would also as part of that just it
19 would benefit me at least to see some examples of
20 the kinds of habitat science priorities that they
21 think are shared across the regions that they
22 might be bringing to us as part of that further

1 exploration.

2 MR. PUGLIESE: Am I online? This is
3 Roger, am I online?

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

5 MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. I just, I thought
6 it probably worthwhile jumping in. I think what
7 we tried to do was capture what at the highest
8 level the CCC could really provide. And I think
9 what I anticipated and I am almost positive of
10 what the group anticipated is that by identifying
11 these as moving forward, of course that's going to
12 take some work by the work group to kind of frame
13 this a little further.

14 I think some for the simpler ones on the
15 beginning in terms of educating action agencies,
16 those could be at a very high level in the
17 association with a CCC meeting or something very
18 differently. I think the operational side of that
19 is you will have and it was kind of focused at the
20 across Councils type of coordination that those
21 higher levels.

22 Because in reality, I think we have a

1 number of different levels and it is really tied
2 to the level the Councils want to engage. The
3 regional partners in agencies, in other areas to
4 address these types of things.

5 So you have a whole spectrum of the way
6 the Councils do address and coordinate with
7 regional partners but that's something that's
8 going to happen individually and that definitely
9 would be scoped out as part of the work plan
10 discussion.

11 So it almost goes back to number one,
12 the work group encouraged the CCC habitat work
13 group to advance what we were talking about the
14 next steps and work plans because that really does
15 kind of set the stage for providing the additional
16 guidance and input to address, you know, kind of
17 the guts of some of these things beyond the higher
18 level input and the higher level, yes we want to,
19 you know, highlight these for action agencies and
20 yes, we would like to see the opportunities to,
21 excuse me, I'm looking at -- to identify science
22 priorities.

1 One of the things that we discussed and
2 you can only go through so much detail within
3 these types of personations within this material
4 is some of the different types of tools where some
5 of these priorities have been actually integrated
6 into online system and can crosswalk between these
7 and look between them. Those are some
8 capabilities that I think are into the future.

9 And you're right, absolutely that was
10 highlighted at the meeting that the Councils are
11 all in different stages, have different aspects
12 for habitats integrated to the overall priorities,
13 to the individual priorities. So, you know, this
14 was at least to acknowledge that there may be
15 value to do this from a broader standpoint but
16 then some of the nuts and bolts I think would be
17 as we look at how we either coordinate within
18 regions or can feed up and say well, this may be
19 something that's common between the different
20 areas then that gets advanced.

21 So I think it's a progression of where
22 we started with this, how we framed it and then at

1 a high level these are the kind of core areas that
2 the CCC as an overall group could endorse but of
3 course that there would be opportunities to the
4 work group itself to be tasked.

5 And I actually was going to, I was
6 really going to wait till we kind of went to the
7 next step of actually doing some of the follow up
8 from here so that when we come to the work group
9 next time, some of these different, more details
10 of what's happened in the different regions to
11 facilitate things that were outcomes from this
12 workgroup. Then I think it would have almost, you
13 know, highlighted the benefits across these
14 different types of capabilities.

15 So I was going to suggest that you
16 probably do need to have an in person, just the
17 core work group meet some time next year to be
18 able to kind of hammer out more details. But that
19 was -- I didn't, I really wasn't going to raise
20 that till we kind of got to some of this being
21 actually accomplished. Because we want to build
22 some interactive capability between our different

1 staff so that we can just be able to access a lot
2 of this information and follow up.

3 So hopefully I can at least get a little
4 more frame for what we were thinking and what the
5 opportunities for the CCC overall as well as what
6 kind for in the weeds type of activities that are
7 going to happen through the habitat work group.

8 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Roger. It
9 sounds like that the committee needs to do a
10 little more work and then bring this back maybe to
11 the May meeting if they can. But before we leave
12 this topic, any more discussion, questions,
13 concerns on this item?

14 All right. I think that concludes the
15 various workgroup report outs. And, Gregg, I
16 think that you're up with the terms of reference.

17 MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madame Chair. We
18 will get this projected in a few minutes. It's
19 also available via the website and we are just
20 making a few relatively minor changes to the terms
21 of reference.

22 We changed our meeting schedule so we

1 don't hold one early in the calendar year anymore
2 so we are striking that language.

3 Under item D, just an attempt to try and
4 get presentations and handouts posted on the
5 website two weeks ahead of time. This gives folks
6 a chance to prep a little better. We know
7 everybody is deadline driven. A process for the
8 CCC Chair to approve the distribution of late
9 materials. But again, trying to get all materials
10 at least one week prior so that we have a chance
11 to prep for the meeting.

12 Under Roman Numeral II, dropping, making
13 hard copy stuff available. Anything that is late
14 is posted to the website and it's available to
15 everybody attending the meeting. Shoring up the
16 public participation a little more indicating that
17 it would occur after the assistant administrator's
18 presentation and make sure it's shown on the
19 agenda.

20 And it right now we just have had one
21 spot, but I think just being flexible like we were
22 here at this meeting -- if there is an indication

1 of more, then we can accommodate that.

2 And clarifying that the scientific
3 coordination subcommittee function in conjunction
4 with -- or inserting in conjunction with Council
5 staff is the plan and conduct meetings and work
6 stops. So just indicating that they're doing that
7 in conjunction with the Council staff.

8 And all of those changes we had before
9 us at the May meeting we, I just neglected to
10 raise this at the end. The one new item is number
11 four.

12 We get quite a few items sent to the CCC
13 for review and we are asking if we can be allowed
14 95 day comment period so that it gives the CCC a
15 chance to circulate comments. Some Councils need
16 to weigh in before they can commit to a CCC
17 letter.

18 So those are the changes and I would be
19 glad to answer any questions.

20 MS. MCCAWLEY: Questions? Chris.

21 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Chair.

22 Thanks, Gregg. So if you look at DI and it says

1 all presentation and handouts should be posted two
2 weeks and there is this week disclaimer after
3 that. Seems confusing to me at least. So is it
4 two weeks everything needs to be posted or is it
5 one week that everything needs to be posted?

6 MR. WAUGH: The intent is to have things
7 two weeks but in recognition that there are going
8 to be exceptions to that, trying to build in a
9 provision where the chair has the option of
10 approving late materials and just sort of
11 reiterating that any late materials should be no
12 later than one week before the meeting.

13 So this is generally how we have
14 operated with our Councils to try and get
15 everything in there two weeks ahead of time. If
16 somebody can't meet that deadline, sort of a
17 harder cut off is a week before the meeting so
18 that people have a chance to look at stuff rather
19 than getting it handed to them at the meeting.

20 MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions,
21 comments? We need a motion to approve these
22 changes to the terms of reference. All right.

1 Bill?

2 MR. TWEIT: Madame Chair, I'll move the
3 amended terms of reference.

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a
5 second?

6 MR. BELL: Seconded.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: Seconded by Mel. Any
8 more discussion? Any objection to approval of
9 these changes? All right. Seeing none, that
10 motion carries.

11 Dave, I'm going to turn it over to you.

12 MR. WITHERELL: Thank you, Madame Chair.
13 I would just like to take a moment to recognize
14 Gregg Waugh's contributions to the CCC over the
15 years. As most of you know, Gregg is retiring
16 next month. And if you don't know his career, he
17 started with the Council as a what were you a
18 temporary, Gregg. In 1980.

19 So I don't know if you're -- where was
20 your office in a closet or in the basement or
21 something like that. But eventually he was picked
22 up as a full time tech support assistant and a

1 fishery biologist starting in 1982 and was
2 promoted to deputy director in 1990 and then
3 executive director in 2016.

4 I had the pleasure of working with
5 Gregg. We overlapped as deputies for about 14
6 years and shared quite a bit of information and
7 got together when we could to share a few laughs
8 and exchange other information.

9 So I just wanted to thank you, Gregg,
10 personally but we also have a plaque for you from
11 the Council Coordination Committee and I would
12 like to read what's written on that plaque right
13 now. I have to take my glasses off.

14 U.S. Regional Fishery Management
15 Councils presented to Gregg Waugh in recognition
16 and appreciation of his distinguished service to
17 the Council Coordination Committee representing
18 the U.S. Regional Fishery Management Councils and
19 for his dedication to the conservation and
20 management of South Atlantic fisheries.

21 So on behalf of all the Councils and the
22 CCC, I want to thank you, Gregg. Thank you very

1 much. (Applause)

2 MR. NIES: Can we get a picture?

3 (Picture taken)

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Now we are to
5 the actions wrap up and next meeting. I'm going
6 to turn it back to Gregg to talk a little bit
7 about the actions that we have done this week.

8 MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madame Chair.
9 And we have got the draft report up, the ED's have
10 been sending me materials. Just going to touch on
11 the motions part so if Anjanette will scroll down
12 and pick up the motions.

13 Just remind you what we have
14 accomplished here and we use this to track what we
15 are supposed to be doing in the interim period.
16 And you, the motions we approved this morning are
17 fresh in your mind so I'm not going to go over
18 those.

19 But motion number one we approved
20 changes to the CCC legislative working paper.
21 Revised the introduction, added a new topic,
22 organized into three groups that are not in

1 priority order.

2 We also conditionally approved
3 introductory language for the working paper. And
4 we also conditionally approved new language for a
5 consensus statement for forage fish. So these
6 changes will go into the working paper.

7 One last bit on the working document
8 right now, scroll to the end please, is a draft
9 agenda. We usually take a few minutes here. I've
10 added a few items that were suggested along the
11 way and this will help Kitty look at this. Keep
12 going, it's towards the very end of the document.
13 Past that. There we go.

14 So just if there is and maybe if you can
15 enlarge that a little bit. So we have got the
16 usual NMFS update in 2020, priorities, public
17 comment, legislative outlook and MSA
18 reauthorization and legislative work group.

19 Another update on the national standard
20 one technical guidance, the COFI input, the BBNJ.
21 Question here on SOPP's. I think we have got that
22 pretty much resolved so I don't think we need to

1 have any more discussions about that.

2 Is there anybody that's interested in
3 keeping that on the agenda? Not seeing anybody so
4 we will strike that.

5 And then the geographic strategic plans
6 update and then one of the items that were
7 suggested here, the Modern Fish Act and the
8 Section 102 report. And a presentation from NOAA
9 GC on that legal case NOAA v. Pritzker. Okay.

10 MR. RAUCH: I don't know if that case is
11 Pritzker was the Secretary of Commerce. So I
12 don't think that's probably right. If this is --
13 so you know what -- this is the case you were
14 referring to the other day. Okay.

15 MR. WAUGH: So NOAA v. Oceana. Is that?

16 MR. ANDERSON: Oceana v. Pritzker.

17 MR. WAUGH: Just making sure you're
18 paying attention, Sam. And then management and
19 budget, the work groups, other business, action
20 and wrap up. Is there any, are there any other
21 topics right now that we want to add to provide to
22 Kitty?

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Carrie then Dale.

2 MS. SIMMONS: Thank you Madame Chair. I
3 just had a question on the SOPP's update wrap up.
4 Could you remind us what the decision or
5 conclusion was again because I can't remember
6 right now.

7 MR. WAUGH: Yes. It was left up to each
8 Council to do their SOPP's and handbooks however
9 they choose. Some of us like the South Atlantic
10 only include what's legally mandated in the SOPP's
11 and then all the other stuff is in the hand book
12 and the SOPP's is what we send up to get approved.
13 Some Councils want to use one document together.

14 So that's left up to each Council and
15 then Brian is working on the review process, a new
16 review process so that when there are changes to
17 the SOPP's that they get through the review
18 process in a timely fashion.

19 MS. MCCAWLEY: Carrie.

20 MS. SIMMONS: Yeah, thank you. So I
21 think we were more interested in that review
22 process. I mean, is that still necessary and

1 trying to simplify that process. Are we sure we
2 don't want an update on that in May or is that
3 something we want to handle by email? I'm still
4 kind of confused on that part of it.

5 MR. WAUGH: Yeah, I mean, in my
6 discussions with Brian and I don't know if he
7 wants to weigh in on it, it's a process they're
8 working on and I'm sure he will inform the
9 Councils when they get something worked out. I
10 don't know that that needs to be an agenda item.
11 It's up to the CCC.

12 MS. MCCAWLEY: Dale?

13 MR. DIAZ: Thank you. I believe in May
14 we had some discussion about unique trip
15 identifiers and I know at our Council we had some
16 discussions about how that would be beneficial if
17 that was ever put in, implemented. And I was just
18 wondering either where we are at on that or if we
19 want to continue that discussion at this May
20 meeting.

21 MR. WAUGH: That may be a good one to
22 get an update on where we are. Yes.

1 MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else?

2 MR. RAUCH: Carrie has got one.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: Carrie.

4 MS. SIMMONS: Yes, thank you, Madame
5 Chair. Just a something to consider perhaps maybe
6 in an update or report on the IUU report to
7 Congress perhaps, I don't know if that's possible
8 or appropriate but I think that's something we
9 would be interested in.

10 MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else?

11 MR. WAUGH: I think, Kitty, did you have
12 an agenda item or are you going to --

13 MS. SIMONDS: No, no, I was just going
14 to say that I plan to work with all the executive
15 directors as well as Brian. There might be some
16 other topics.

17 I was thinking that we should have maybe
18 a large general topic about where the feds and all
19 of us think we are going to be, where are we
20 going? Is there going to be large issue, I mean,
21 you know, we will think about this and have
22 something other than updates on things but I will

1 be working with the executive directors and with
2 Brian and company over the next several months.

3 MR. WAUGH: Okay. If there is nothing
4 else on the agenda, the -- not seeing any. The
5 last part is just I would like to express my
6 thanks to Brian and Anjanette and Diane for all
7 their help with this meeting.

8 And those of you who might have
9 forgotten, this was rescheduled due to the
10 government closure so they had the pleasure of
11 negotiating I guess two rounds of contracts which
12 is never fun. And to all the presenters, and to
13 Alan and Stephanie for the suggestion for that
14 Modern Fish Act session, I think that that came
15 off well and I think the South Atlantic and Gulf
16 work group that will further some efforts on that
17 will be very productive.

18 And thanks to all the ED's for your help
19 over the years. It's been really fun working with
20 you all and the CCC. And Chris, Sam, Alan and all
21 the other folks in NMFS and NOAA GC.

22 I'll really miss the people, the

1 comradery, not some of the process so much but
2 it's been great and thank you very much. It has
3 been an honor to work with you.

4 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Gregg. So
5 before we wrap up, Kitty, did you want to talk to
6 us a little bit about the location of our next
7 meeting?

8 MS. SIMONDS: Sure. So we have
9 circulated a memo to all of you about -- with the
10 information on the May 2020 meeting. It's going
11 to be held at Turtle Bay on Oahu May 26 to 29. We
12 all agreed on the dates several meetings ago.

13 And so the block is through, is from
14 Saturday, May through Saturday May 30. We have
15 the tentative schedule is for us to meet
16 separately on Tuesday the 26th and then in the
17 afternoon and then Wednesday, Thursday, and half a
18 day Friday.

19 The memo includes instructions on how to
20 get your hotel reservations and tells you how far
21 away you are from the airport. And then how we
22 are going to be dealing with the documents.

1 And as I said, I'll be in touch with the
2 executive directors soonest about the agenda and
3 any other things that you all would like to
4 discuss about the meeting.

5 So if you have any questions, you have
6 my email and you also have the memo.

7 MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kitty. Any
8 questions for Kitty?

9 MS. SIMONDS: I think we have a, don't
10 us have some kind of a bet on the weather? Where
11 are you? Yes. Okay. Well, cross your fingers
12 that there will be no hurricanes, no nothing
13 happening at that time.

14 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Yes, go
15 ahead, Chris.

16 MR. OLIVER: Before you adjourn, Madame
17 Chair, I just wanted to say I have worked with
18 Gregg since 1990, almost 30 years when I first
19 came on board the North Pacific Council as a
20 fishery management plan coordinator. I just
21 wanted to echo all the good things that David said
22 and congratulate you, Gregg, on an awesome career.

1 We will miss you.

2 MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Chris.

3 MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any other
4 business to come before the CCC this week? All
5 right. I want to thank everybody for their
6 attention and participation this week. Great work
7 and safe travels going home. Thank you.

8 (Whereupon, at 4:46 p.m., the
9 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

10 * * * * *

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I, Mark Mahoney, notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell the truth under penalty of perjury; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was called; and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.



Notary Public, in and for the District of Columbia

My Commission Expires: March 31, 2022