PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

BUSINESS SESSION

Crowne Plaza - Old Town
Alexandria, Virginia
February 5, 2014

Approved August 6, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Louis B. Daniel 2

Approval of Agenda and Proceedings, October 2013 2

Public Comment 2

Draft 2014-2018 Strategic Plan 2
Review Public Comment 2
Consider Final Approval on Draft 2014-2018 Strategic Plan 3

Adjournment 11

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda** by consent (Page 1).

2. **Main Motion**
   Move to approve the 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan and to include the summary of public comment and a notation that the ASMFC considers this Strategic Plan a living document (Page 7). Motion by Bill Cole; second by Tom Fote.

3. **Motion to Substitute**
   Motion to substitute to approve the 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan. We will consider the comments offered in our next version and Annual Action Plan. Motion made by Mr. Abbott and seconded by Mr. Adler. Motion carried (Page 9).

   Main Motion as Substituted
   Move to approve the 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan. We will consider the comments offered in our next version and Annual Action Plan. Motion carried unanimously (Page 10).

4. **Move to Adjourn** by consent (Page 10).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Terry Stockwell, ME, proxy for P. Keliher (AA)
Steve Train, ME (GA)
Rep. Walter Kumiega, ME (LA)
Doug Grout, NH (AA)
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)
Paul Diodati, MA (AA)
Bill Adler, MA (GA)
Robert Ballou, RI (AA)
David Borden, RI, proxy for B. McElroy (GA)
Rick Bellavance, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)
David Simpson, CT (AA)
Dr. Lance Stewart, CT (GA)
James Gilmore, NY (AA)
Pat Augustine, NY (GA)
Brandon Muffley, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
Mitchell Feigenbaum, PA, proxy for Rep. Vereb (LA)
Loren Lustig, PA (GA)
Leroy Young, PA, proxy for J. Arway (AA)
David Saveikis, DE (AA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Bernie Pankowski, DE, proxy for Sen.Venables (LA)
Tom O'Connell, MD (AA)
Bill Goldsborough, MD (GA)
Russell Dize, MD, proxy for Sen. Colburn (LA)
Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for J. Bull (AA)
Louis Daniel, NC (AA)
Bill Cole, NC (GA)
Robert Boyles, Jr., SC (AA)
Ross Self, SC, proxy for Sen. Cromer (LA)
Spud Woodward, GA (AA)
Patrick Geer, proxy for Rep. Burns (LA)
Jim Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Kelly Denit, NMFS
Bill Archambault, USFWS
Martin Gary, PRFC

(AA = Administrative Appointee; GA = Governor Appointee; LA = Legislative Appointee)

Ex-Officio Members

Staff

Bob Beal
Toni Kerns
Kate Taylor

Guests

Mike Millard, USFWS
Michael Pentony, NMFS
Arnold Leo, E. Hampton, NY
Raymond Kane, CHOIR
Sally Campen, Global Guardian Trust
Derek Orner, NOAA
Charles Lynch, NOAA
Wilson Laney, USFWS
Kevin Chu, NOAA
Joe Grist, VMRC

The Business Session of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Presidential Ballroom of the Crown Plaza Hotel Old Town, Alexandria, Virginia, February 5, 2014, and was called to order at 2:25 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Louis B. Daniel, III.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN LOUIS B. DANIEL, III: All right, if we can get everyone to the table for the business session, I'm very hopeful that we're going to make up some time here.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: If you look in your packages of information, you will see an agenda and the proceedings from our October Annual Meeting.

If there are no concerns or questions about those, I will consider them approved by consensus.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: This is an opportunity for the public to speak on items not on our agenda; so basically you could talk about anything you want to expect for the strategic plan. Is there anyone from the public that wishes to address the business session? Seeing no one, we will move into our one specific item of business and that is final action on our Draft 2014-2018 Strategic Plan. Bob.

DRAFT 2014-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN

REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: Just as a quick review of how we got to this point, the commissioners all had a workshop last May in this room. Collette Collier-Trohan came in and facilitated the initial step of the Strategic Plan. Then staff went back and drafted the first version. We had some comments at the summer meeting and again updated that for the annual meeting.

Following the annual meeting, we made just some editorial changes, more or less, and then made the document available for public comment. Three of the states had public hearings; and we did receive a number of other comments. I'll quickly go through that summary of those comments. I wasn't planning on going back through the overall Strategic Plan.

I can if you want; but I think folks have seen it and it hasn't changed much since the annual meeting. I went through it in a lot of detail there. With that, I will go ahead and run through the public comments that were received over the last few months. In all we got over 4,500 public comments, close to 4,600, through January 15th.

As I mentioned, there were comments from three state public hearings, two comments from New Jersey and one from Rhode Island. New Hampshire had a meeting but no one showed up. There were six groups that commented as well. You can see the name of those up on the screen: Northumberland Association of Progressive Stewardship, New York Croaker Association, Maine Elver Fishermen Association, Alewife Harvesters of Maine and Nature Conservancy.

We got five comments from individuals. The bulk of the comments that we did receive, over 4,500 of those were from the Pew Charitable Trust in an Action Alert E-Mail Form Letter that we received. We did receive a number of those after the January 15th cutoff as well. I will go through sort of the categories of comments and summarize what folks said. The first category that we have is public participation. These bullets represent a summary or the perspective of one individual.

There is concern that there is not enough allowance for public involvement throughout the ASMFCA process; plans should place a greater emphasis on showing ASMFC's commitment to the public and their fisheries. They'd like more public comment time at

individual meetings and increased public participation by relevance stakeholders to improve accountability.

The next group of comments were under species rebuilding. There was one comment that rebuilding plans should be based on monitoring and controlling fishing levels rather than pre-specified targets within a certain timeframe; so rather than going back through historic levels, it should be based on more modern levels.

There was a comment that we should take action earlier to avoid overfishing rather than waiting until a species is overfished. There comments relative to diadromous species; requesting that the commission seek ways to address problems of habitat loss and fish passage and outward migration issues; increase collaboration with the FERC process.

The next overall topic was bycatch. The commenter felt the commission should seek ways to effectively monitor and control bycatch and reduce regulatory discards and make full use of what is landed. There was comment on ecosystem-based fisheries management. These comments were based on the Pew Charitable Trust Form Letter that we received.

The vast majority of these comments advocate taking a precautionary approach to management and protecting forage fish species and creating an interstate ecosystem plan covering each major ecosystem under the commission's jurisdiction. Again, that last comment on ecosystem-based management is out of the Pew Charitable Trust 4,500-plus letters that we received.

There was comments that ASMFC favors commercial exploitation of marine resources for food rather than managing for the greatest socio-economic return. They felt that the commission should place greater emphasis on recreational fisheries and catch-and-release fisheries. Another category was the health and abundance of the resources should be the commission's first priority.

They felt that plans lack the statement endorsing health and abundance of marine resources as the highest priority for commission management. The next topic was habitat restoration. The importance of climate change and ecosystem function should be highlighted in the plan's vision and values.

Ocean Planning; this commenter felt that the commission should get more involved with the three regional ocean planning efforts that are going on up and down the east coast. The final category was improving data collection and sharing. The commission should emphasize the implementation of new and emerging technologies, electronic monitoring.

That is the final category urging the commission to get more involved and avail themselves of some of the new technologies that are out there to collect data. Mr. Chairman, that is a quick summary of the public comments that we did receive between this meeting and the annual meeting a few months ago. I can answer questions on these or specifics on the strategic plan if you would like.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Are there any questions for Bob on the public comments on the strategic plan? There were some colorful ones in there, too. All right, that fellow really is a good guy. Do you want to walk us through the plan?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: It didn't seem like they wanted me to.

CONSIDER FINAL APPROVAL ON

DRAFT 2014-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, if we're ready to take action on the Strategic Plan, that is wonderful; but if there are questions, concerns, additions, subtractions or any of that, I need to know. Otherwise, we'll go through it, and I really don't

think everybody wants to do that, but we can. It is up to you. Bob.

MR. ROBERT BALLOU: Well, I'm torn because on the one hand I do not want to go through the plan and don't feel like this is the time or place to go through all of the public comments and sort of vet them. However, I'm very impressed with the comments; and I think in some cases quite comments getting right into both the wording of the plan as well as more substantive issues. I'm sort of struggling here to figure out how best to proceed.

I would like to think that we could find a way to address the public comments but do so in an expeditious and efficient way; and I'm just not so sure how to that. I'm sort of thinking that we want to try to move on, get this plan adopted; but by the same token I'm not sure how to handle all of these public comments. I've gone through all of them and I must say there are some pretty good suggestions in here; and I'm just not so sure how to work through them. I will just leave it at that for now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Are there other comments? Pat.

MR. PATRICK AUGUSTINE: I agree with Bob Ballou fully. I do think that if either the executive committee, probably, or maybe the staff takes the first cut at it; take a further look at this and see if there is anything specifically that pops out that we could add that generically makes sense to add, that will add substance or clarity to our existing document and then bring it back up at either our May meeting, if you think it can be done by then, if that update is done or critique is done between now and then – I know you guys are loaded with an awful of other activities; but if it could be sent out to us in some form, we could look at it either in our briefing book or as a separate document and come prepared at the May meeting or August, as the case may be.

I think we have to get it correct. Bob is correct, I do think we really need to eke out those line items that have been submitted to us that have impact, clarity and add some more comments into our document. So, either May or August with the board ready to make a final decision on acceptance of the total package. That seems to be the most logical way. Bob, I'd ask you in your opinion how does that fit with staff activities that you're challenged with right now. Mr. Chairman, can we have him answer that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: There are a lot comments here, as Bob Ballou mentioned, and the difficulty is picking out which ones to respond to. I think some of these reflect specific concerns or frustrations with FMPs rather than the Strategic Plan. There is a series of comments under public participation. The commission worked pretty long and hard to get to where we are with the public comment process that we have; and the commissioners seem to be okay with that.

The draft right now includes language about transparency and openness of process and those sorts of things; so it is difficult as a staff exercise to go back and necessarily pick and choose which ones need to be addressed or which ones have not been addressed already in the document. If there are specific concepts that are lacking, we can weave those in fairly easily. But picking and choosing which ones of these comments are species-specific or FMP-specific, it gets a little difficult to make sure that we're reflecting the will of this group rather than one individual.

MR. AUGUSTINE: To that point, Mr. Chairman, if you will indulge me for a moment; well, based on that, if there is a common thread about a specific issue, common thread, two or three organizations or groups highlighted some item, maybe that is the thing we eke out; but to ignore in any way shape, form or manner responding back to show that the document has not only been reviewed, we have looked at the detail of some of the comments, I think the

public is owed that in view of the fact that we have some 4,500.

None of them jumped out to me as so specific that I want to grab it and say, "Hey, Bob, can we include that?" I agree with you a hundred percent; but again with 4,500 responses, it has to be something and maybe just put it back on the board, have us go back and take another hard look and through e-mail send back into you what we think might be expended. Does that sound like a fair way to do it as opposed to putting it on the staff?

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I don't know; let me hear more discussion first. Tom.

MR. THOMAS FOTE: It is not the staff's responsibility because we're going to make the decision. Pat, you should go through all those 4,400 comments –

MR. AUGUSTINE: I did.

MR. FOTE: – and then pick out the ones that you think we should do and those are the ones you send around. That is all our responsibility. Staff shouldn't be picking and choosing for us because that was the comments we should be reading; so it is really the board's responsibility to come up with the changes, as far as I feel, and not the staff. That is a lot of work for the staff and then they have to guess what we think is important. It should be with the commissioners to decide after reading all those comments and basically sending them in.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I wouldn't want to have to do it. Is there any other discussion about how to move forward with the Strategic Plan? Doug.

MR. DOUGLAS E. GROUT: I have read a lot of the comments, although I haven't read every single one of them, I'll admit. What I saw on many of them was it seemed like they were edits and wordsmithing. Now, to me they were just expanding on a certain concept we had. While probably the organization or person that put that comment and thought it was very substantive and really changed the whole effect of it, I looked at some of these things, as I was looking through, and it seemed like, well, I can see where that organization or individual was coming from with wanting to have that in.

To be able to go through every single one of these, I think we really have to make changes as Bob said. It is not staff; it is a commissioner's responsibility to find something in here. If there is something in these comments that we feel is substantive enough that we need to move forward and make some changes on this, I think it would almost have to be – if we weren't going to approve this as is today, that we'd have to put a little subcommittee of commissioners together to go through it. If anybody has seen any of the comments and has something that is substantive that they think they want change here as opposed to just wordsmithing, then maybe we do need a group to bring back something in May.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: If anyone has a – we've got at least 20 minutes to work this out; and I really don't want to wait if I can avoid it. It just adds more stuff for staff. If anybody has a specific issue in the comments that they would like to insert into the Strategic Plan, I'll take those now.

I need to know the specific item that you would like inserted in the plan and where in the plan it should be inserted. We can break for 15 minutes, come back at five until three, and then I will go around the table and anybody that has modifications, clarifications, suggestions, we will address those and then I'll accept a motion to approve the plan. Is that a fair approach to knock this out? Bill.

MR. BILL COLE: Mr. Chairman, if that fails, an alternative would be to recognize that our public is diverse, we're very diverse. I don't think we'll ever generate a document that somebody somewhere cannot find something they want a change in. I just don't think it's possible.

What I would suggest as an alternative is that we include this very excellent summary of the comments that we have received at the very end of the document and then go ahead and approve the document with the insertion of those comments at the end and say that the commission is further considering these comments and will make adjustments in the document in the future.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I wish I had said that. If somebody wants to make a motion to that effect or we can take a 15-minute break. We will take a 15 minutes break and come back at five minutes 'til three. Thank you, Bill.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right, everybody put your names on your papers and pass them to the front. All right, back open for discussion on moving forward with the Strategic Plan. Yes.

MR. LEROY YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I have some concern that there have been such extensive comments provided on what is to set the direction for the next five years for the commission if we give no response or show that we've taken those comments into serious consideration. It would seem to me that with this level of comment, there should at least be some type of a comment response document. I don't think blow by blow but at least the types of comments to be categorized and some response be given to that.

MR. BALLOU: I will take a stab at it. Sort of echoing what I just heard from Leroy, I feel that one way to proceed would be perhaps with staff support and involvement an attempt be made to work through what I'll call the wordsmithing suggestions. There is at least one set of comments here from a Virginia-based group that are incredibly detailed and for all I know lend considerable strength and clarity to the document.

There are so many comments that it is going to take a while to go through them. I think it is the sort of thing that perhaps Tina could assist with. It is basically looking at the language that is being used in the draft and comparing it to the language that is being suggested via the comments to see if there are indeed some helpful suggestions to just simply clarify and improve upon the language in the document.

That would be a first phase cut that perhaps with some staff support we could address. Then comes the more substantive review process, which I definitely think is a board/commission process and not a staff process. I think maybe the way to do that would be to try to take all of the comments and summarize them in alignment with the key pieces of the plan; the first being the mission statement, the second being the vision, then values, then driving forces and then goals and strategies; so that if we were to come back in May – again, this is just a suggestion – and as we were to move through those five sections, we would take the first section.

We would review what we have in the draft plan. We would then look at the suggested changes, if any, or to the extent that they exist, and then we would decide as a board whether we think the mission statement, the vision statement, the values' statements should be modified or not. It is just a way to be responsive to the public comment, which is exactly what we asked for and what we got. I think part of this document speaks to being responsive to public input and comment. I think although a lot of us would just as soon get this done and move on, if we don't at least go through that exercise, I worry that it would be a disservice to our constituents. Thank you.

MR. FOTE: I think I remember menhaden and made an easy motion this morning that lasted three hours on an easy motion. Basically, what I'm sitting here is looking at once we start wordsmithing a document, it is the most complicated process that you want to do. I used to send out people to proof some of my stuff because it is horrible and they put it in English; but then you would get a guy that

wants to change the voice that you're putting in this. It is his voice or her voice.

My wife would get upset because she would finally do the final editing to my document. She says, "This guy makes run-on sentences." We don't make run-on sentences because that is not what you do in a report. I think that is a problem. We could spend days going over that document if we wanted to go and nitpick.

That is why I suggested if the commissioners want to look over all the comments and find things that they think pertinent and then bring in the May meeting, if that's what they to do, but I know what a bunch of us are going to do. They're going to go home and they'll wait until the May meeting and they won't have gone into the document because everybody has got busy lives and they're not going to get through it.

I know it is a poor excuse but I'm being honest. It is a really difficult situation. I like Bill's suggestion that they would be amended to put in the document; and at times when we start going through these and find things that need to be in addition, then we can basically add it. But it is up to the commission to find those things and come in and say maybe we should do it.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I just took a motion up there. If I could it on the board, I'm going to make it.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: While that's happening, I think Leroy and Bob made some good points. The problem I think is, first, having one person trying to figure out what is substantive and what is not is difficult. One of the comments that I noticed right off the bat in the Northumberland Group – I don't know that group, but they're from Heathsville I think in Virginia. I had never heard of that group.

But one of the things they did was they took our vision statement, which we spent a meeting on whittling it down to "sustainably managing Atlantic Coast Fisheries" and made it two lines. That is inconsistent with what we were trying to do. Trying to figure out and get buy-in from various wordsmithing exercises; that is going to take up a lot of commission time, I think.

At the same time, I think the information that has been provided by the public is valuable. One option might be to narrow the length of time that the Strategic Plan is valid; so instead of it being a four-year plan, drop it back to a two-year plan with the intent being that as we develop the next two-year plan, we incorporate the comments that we received. Otherwise, we're looking at probably at least a man-month of work to accommodate all this and get it back. I'm not sure what to do about it. Let me go to Bill for his motion and then I'll go to Roy.

MR. COLE: Well, before I make this motion; first of all, I think that we all have ample experience around this table that the way I word something and the way you want to see it worded are two different things. They mean the same thing but they're two different things. We will never have the resources or the time – and I don't think any of us around this table have the patience left, frankly, to try to resolve the wordsmithing issues that are going to arise.

Given that, I'm going to move that we approve the 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan and to include the summary of public comment and a notation that the ASMFC considers this Strategic Plan a living document and we will incorporate these comments as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Motion by Mr. Cole and a second by Mr. Fote. Roy.

MR. ROY MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I had held off specifically waiting for what Bill had to say; and now that I read what he had to say, I'll still make my original suggestion. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that one way to proceed would be the time-honored tradition of assigning a subcommittee of board members to address the concerns and come back to the rest of the board with a summary at the next meeting on how the Strategic Plan should be

revised to reflect public comment. That way it wouldn't take up every single commissioner's time. Clearly, that is a more rigorous assignment than what Mr. Cole proposed. I just throw that out there for what it is worth. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Good suggestion. Doug Grout.

MR. GROUT: Mr. Chair, first of all to the motion; I disagree with it. I think the Strategic Plan needs to be a stand-alone document. I have no problem putting the public comments about it up online; but this document needs to be standalone and nothing with an appendix or anything. As I said, I read a fair amount of these comments. I appreciate the efforts that people put in; but the key word here is it was wordsmithing.

One of the things that I personally really appreciated about this document was the simplicity compared to our past document. It got the point across in very few words of the vision, the goals, where we wanted to go in the next five years. I can understand if any commissioner took something out of this that we were really missing a big point here, but all the points I see here we've addressed it to some – in the comment that I've read, we've addressed to one extent or another.

It seemed like they were trying to in some cases emphasize a little bit more one goal over another or one strategy over another in these comments here. From my standpoint, unless I hear something from a commissioner that says we've this point that this particular commenter has made and we need to put it in there right now, I'm willing to move it forward as is. I'm very comfortable with it. Again, I appreciate all the time and comments that these people put in; but to me they're wordsmithing and we already went through a wordsmithing exercise.

MR. DENNIS ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Doug that the document should stand by itself. It seems a bit strange that we arrive here for final approval but we are now faced with dealing with all the public comments. We've put the cart before the horse or the horse before the cart, whichever the case may be.

When this document was prepared, there was a lot of consideration. It all didn't appear on paper, but there were a lot of individual thoughts by every individual commissioner that went into this document that probably are some of the same things that came now with the public comments. I would rather just approve it as we intended to do.

To the motion, the second part of it where it says we will incorporate these comments as we move forward, I don't think that would be correct because we're not going to incorporate all the comments. There may be something in there that we will incorporate, but we surely are not going to. We would probably want to consider them.

I like the chairman's thoughts that the things that we have now should be used as part of the living document moving forward as we do this again. It gives us a framework to start working on something else. Then, lastly, regardless of what is in this document, we all come to these meetings and we work towards the same common goal regardless of the exact words that are put into the document. The wordsmithing doesn't change what we do and it won't change what we do for the next four years.

MR. THOMAS O'CONNELL: I'm really listening to the conversation still, but I'm inclined to oppose the motion. One, I agree that it should be a stand-alone document. Secondly, I think Bob has made some really good points. We spent a lot of time and there is nothing that I've seen that would change substantially the document. We did spend a lot of time on wordsmithing; but it is the words that we used to describe our strategic plan and it is the understanding of our constituents of those words. I think it is a good idea to review the comments.

Maybe there needs to be some clarity to make it very clear of the words we used and the way the public interprets those words. I think that is a good suggestion that Bob had. It is a five-year plan. If it takes us a little bit more time to get it right and to live up to Goal 5, which is to strengthen stakeholder and public support for the commission, I think we should do that.

If the commission decides to go forward today, my only suggestion would be I think it would be worthwhile as Leroy suggested to have some type of a public response document to demonstrate to the public that we carefully reviewed their comments and this was our response to those. Thanks.

MR. LOREN W. LUSTIG: Mr. Chairman, looking at what we see on the board right now, the words "will incorporate" would demand in my mind a structure or plan that would actually accomplish that. If that was absent, then the credibility of the commission suffers. I, like the people who spoke just before me, would be inclined to vote against the motion as we see on the board. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM A. ADLER: Mr. Chairman, I think that a lot of these comments would bind us to less flexibility; whereas, the Strategic Plan basically sets out where we're going; but it doesn't get so rigid that we really can't wiggle a little bit if we have to, which, of course, we frequently have to.

I think that the Strategic Plan is well done; and I do think that some of these comments would impede our ability to have the flexibility. I do want to bring one thing up. I would like to know where my pay is for the comment of protecting the public but are instead a pimp for the commercial fishing industry. I want to know do we get paid?

MR. COLE: I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania raises a very good point; and I thought about changing but he got ahead of me. I agree that to incorporate these comments as we move forward does make a commitment. I do think that "will consider these comments as we move forward" – the problem that I have here is that all too often we finally get to a document that we can live with and then we lose what the public said about it.

And when we get five years from now, we start thinking back, well, what did the public say back then that needs to be changed? This is just one way in my mind of not committing to anything really but to acknowledge that the public did comment and that we will consider these comments as we move forward. I would appreciate it if we could change the motion to "and will consider".

MR. FOTE: I would just as soon just leave it a living document, period. Basically, if it's a living document that means it will always move forward. That is my understanding of a living document and we basically put it a place separate or something like that.

MR. COLE: I'm acceptable to that, Tom.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer a substitute motion or an amendment, whichever you wish to call it, that we move to approve the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan. We will consider the comments offered in our next version. I will accept any changes to the second sentence that some people might find more favorable, but that is the gist of it.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I would just, perhaps, "in our next version and annual action plans".

MR. ABBOTT: I will accept that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: At least that doesn't intimate that it is going to be 2019 before we address this. That is not speaking in favor or against it; it is just a suggestion. I need a second to that motion; second by Mr. Adler. Robert.

MR. ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Mr. Chairman, I've looked at the comments and I want to, first of all, specifically thank the members of the public

who took the time to look at our handiwork and to look at the comments that a subcommittee already put together and presented at the annual meeting.

From my perspective, the comments that I've read from the public reflect that our public is engaged. They reflect that our public cares about what we do; and our public cares about our outcomes. At the end of the day what I see in most of these comments is support in the direction we're moving.

I get a sense that we're getting tripped up over how we incorporate public comment. I would hope, for one, that we never really stop worrying about that and that we are always sensitive to our constituents, recreational, commercial, environmental, whoever they may be. But at the end of the day what I read in this is largely an endorsement of where we've arrived at for our next five-year period.

Having said all of that, I appreciate the effort to memorialize the commitment to our constituents that we will incorporate their comments and their interest. I think we could probably say thank you, and I'm going to support the motion because I think we're ready to adopt the Strategic Plan. All the other things beyond adopting the Strategic Plan in terms of a commitment to our constituents, a commitment to keep the dialogue open, I think goes without saying.

It is listed in the vision; it is listed in the strategic plan. Again, I salute the effort of this body to put this very deliberate document together; and I salute the comments and effort that our constituents put in reading this very, very carefully. What I see in all this is we may disagree about some of the specifics and about how we arrived there, but this is fisheries management. We need to be adaptive. I support the motion to approve the Strategic Plan. Thank you.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, while I have some angst about the timing that we had for soliciting public comment, Dennis beat me to the motion to substitute that I was going to make. Doug and Robert well expressed the verbiage I would have used. I do support the motion to substitute.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I don't have anybody else down to speak. Bob Ballou.

MR. BALLOU: Yes; I appreciate the discussion and I think I'm increasingly convinced that the substitute motion is the way to go. I like the idea of memorializing the comments for use in our next iteration. I also wonder out loud whether – and I guess through you, Mr. Chairman – maybe we've already agreed on this. If not, I would like to at least throw it out as a suggestion. This would be a stand-alone document, but there would perhaps also be something on the ASMFC's Website that would constitute a summary of the public comments and I think prefaced perhaps with a note of appreciation for the considerable input that was provided and a recognition that we're going to move forward in the way that we are; something that would give the public a response vehicle to see that their comments were received, reviewed and are being held for further consideration; something to that effect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That will be done. Is there anything else?

MR. MARTIN GARY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not opposed to the substitute motion. I just wanted to make an observation. Both my Virginia colleagues and myself were intrigued by the Northumberland Group's extensive wordsmithing comments. None of us were able to recognize who that group was; but while this discussion was going on and a lot of good points were made, I was able to just do a little quick research and connect the dots.

It turns out that the process for the request for public comment, unless I'm mistaken and I don't think I am, worked pretty well. I was able to identify one of my eight commissioners at

PRFC as a member of the Northumberland Group; and knowing that commissioner pretty well and knowing that commissioner's diligence to reading all of the materials that we distribute, I believe she took my dissemination of the public comment period and dutifully distributed that to her membership who took the time and effort to provide those extensive wordsmithing comments.

My remarks are really that this process played out well. It played out the way it was supposed to. Somebody took the time to reach out and accumulate and spend the time to put some thoughtful comments together. Certainly, I recognize all the points that were made here and I can't negate any of them; but I just wanted to make sure you were aware that the process to reach out to the public by all accounts was effective in terms of getting them to engage.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, Marty. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none; I'm going to call the vote. **We're going to vote on a motion to substitute to approve the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan. We will consider the comments offered in our next version and annual action plans. Motion by Mr. Abbott; second by Mr. Adler.** All those in favor raise your right hand; all those opposed same sign; null votes; abstentions. Seeing none; the motion carries.

That becomes the main motion. All those in favor raise your right hand; all those opposed same sign; abstentions; null votes. The motion passes unanimously; as it should. Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We will go ahead and move right into our Policy Board Meeting.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 o'clock p.m., February 5, 2014.)