Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council Meeting

In-person Meeting

August 3rd, 2016 | 3:45 pm

Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, VA

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=550:15:15787198825561::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1734

1. Welcome and Introductions (R. Boyles, Jr., Chair)

2. Review and Approve Agenda – Attachment I

3. Public Comment*

4. Review and Approve May Meeting Minutes – Attachment II

5. ACCSP Status Report (M. Cahall)
   a. Program Updates
   b. Committee Updates

6. Governance Transition Update (R. Boyles, Jr.)

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn

*See Public Comment Guidelines:

http://www.accsp.org/sites/all/themes/aqua/File/ACCSP_PublicCommentPolicyOct2013.pdf

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council Meeting
May 2, 2016
Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, Virginia
https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=552:15:::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1731

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Name	Partner	Phone	Email
Mark Alexander	CT DEEP	(860) 434-6043	mark.alexander@ct.gov
Mel Bell (Proxy)	SC DNR	(843) 953-9007	bellm@dnr.sc.gov
Robert Beal	ASMFC	(703) 842-0740	rbeal@asmfc.org
Joe Cimino	VMRC	(757) 247-2237	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
John Clark (Proxy)	DE DFW	(302) 739-9108	john.clark@state.de.us
Michelle Duval	NC DMF	(252) 808-8011	michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov
Jim Estes (Proxy)	FL FWCC	(850) 617-9622	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Lynn Fegley (Vice-chair)	MD DNR	(410) 260-8285	lynn.fegley@maryland.gov
Martin Gary	PRFC	(804) 224-7148	martingary.prfc@gmail.com
Patrick Geer	GA DNR	(912) 264-7218	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Jim Gilmore	NYS DEC	(631) 444-0430	james.gilmore@dec.ny.gov
Pat Keliher	ME DMR	(207) 624-6553	patrick.keliher@maine.gov
Wilson Laney (Proxy)	US FWS	(919) 515-5019	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Dan McKiernan (Proxy)	MA DMF	(617) 626-1536	dan.mckiernan@state.ma.us
Jason McNamee (Proxy)	RI DFW	(401) 423-1943	jason.mcnamee@dem.ri.gov
Brandon Muffley (Proxy)	NJ DFW	(609) 748-2020	brandon.muffley@dep.nj.gov
Derek Orner (Proxy)	NOAA	(301) 427-8567	derek.orner@noaa.gov
Cheri Patterson (Proxy)	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	cheri.patterson@wildlife.nh.gov
Andrew Shiels	PFBC	(814) 359-5181	ashiels@pa.gov
Gregg Waugh (Proxy)	SAFMC	(843) 571-4366	gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Committee Members Not in Attendance: H. Goodale (GARFO), B. King (DC FWD), C. Moore (MAFMC), T. Nies (NEFMC), B. Ponwith (SEFSC)

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

Others in Attendance:

Name	Title	Partner	Phone	Email
Paul Anninos	REI Systems		(703) 934-3969	panninos@icfconsulting.com
Lt. Michael Eastman	Lieutenant	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	michael.eastman@wildlife.nh.gov
Terry Stockwell	Director of External Affairs	ME DMR	(207) 624-6553	terry.stockwell@maine.gov
Jack Travelstead	CCA			jgtravel54@gmail.com

Staff Members in Attendance: M. Cahall (Program Director), J. Defilippi (Data Team Leader), A. DiJohnson (Recreational Data Coordinator), H. Konell (Data Coordinator), J. Myers (Data Coordinator), J. Ni (Fisheries Data Analyst), S. Rains (Scan Technician), A. Schwaab (Outreach Coordinator), G. White (Recreational Program Manager), C. Wilt (Recreational Data Coordinator), E. Wyatt (Program Coordinator)

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, May 2, 2016, and was called to order at 4:10 o'clock p.m. by Vice-Chairman Lynn Fegley.

Welcome/Introduction – R. Boyles
VICE-CHAIRMAN LYNN FEGLEY: I want to convene the ACCSP Coordinating Council. I am Lynn Fegley from Maryland DNR; and unfortunately Robert Boyles, I was hoping that he would stumble in my now. He is wrestling with the vagaries of Jet Blue. He is not here, and I am going to do my best as Vice-Chair to cover for him.

Public Comment
With that we have an interesting agenda today, but let's start by seeing is there any public comment in the room? Does anybody have public comment? Hearing none;

Committee Consent
- **Approval of Agenda (Attachment I)**
  We will go on to the Approval of the Agenda. Are there any comments, concerns with the agenda? Hearing none;
- **Approval of Minutes from February 2016 (Attachment II)**
  We will move right along to approval of the minutes from February, 2016. Does anybody have concerns or comments on the minutes from the last meeting? Okay this is great. Hearing none; we will move right along to ACCSP Status report from Mike Cahall.

ACCSP Status Report

- **Program Status – M. Cahall**

  MR. MIKE CAHALL: Good afternoon everyone. I'll go ahead and go through our program update; as soon as we get the slide show started. To start with we have filled our Outreach Coordinator position, and we have hired Ali Schwaab; Ali, would you stand up, please? She's hiding. Most of you will get to know her.

  She is the face of the program, and she will be taking care of all of our outreach stuff, and she will be distributing to you shortly, our annual report, which we received this morning. Kudos to Ali for getting that thing done, ordinarily it took Ann about six weeks to finish it, and Ali did it in about three and a half, so kudos to her and we're really thrilled to have her onboard and be fully staffed.

  We've been working on some change management policy. This has been an issue for us for a long time, trying to keep track of what's going on; especially in our information systems. As the program has expanded, the need to make sure everybody knows what we're doing, especially for systems that they depend on, has become more important.

  The IS Committee reviewed a draft change management policy, which will eventually probably come up to this committee; it is next going over to the operations committee. I've gone ahead and taken it upon myself to put an interim policy in place; to make sure that everyone who needs to know what's happening to the systems they depend on are informed well in advance of us making any changes. That was the single biggest problem, making sure that we had a distribution correctly for things like if we added a new column to the database, or suddenly a data element meant something different, or we were adding new functionalities or whatever. We wanted to make sure everybody knew about that. We had some very good news from NMFS ST, and the folks at headquarters. I am sure I won't have my acronyms right. But essentially, there has been funding made available to NMFS for electronic reporting and electronic monitoring projects.

  When they received our spreadsheet that directed funding for the ACCSP projects, they took it upon themselves to directly fund two of our projects from that fund instead of ours, which essentially freed up $275 K for other projects that were on the ACCSP docket. Following the direction that I had from the Coordinating Council, I touched base with Robert, and we went ahead and funded the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Assessment Accuracy Project.

  For those of you who were at the last meeting, as you recall it caused the program a little bit of a conundrum, because this is a project everybody on the Operations Committee liked, but because of the way our ranking process worked, they weren't able to rank it highly enough to get it funded. Then we had additionally enough funding left over to go ahead and fund the next project in priority order, which was the Rhode Island Black Sea Bass Project.

  Just to reiterate, NOAA directly funded the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council Charter boat Electronic Reporting Project, and the Rhode Island Barcode Commercial Fishing

License Project; which is essentially expanding our swipe card reporting into Rhode Island. I am very grateful to Alan Lowther and the folks at NMFS Headquarters that thought of us at that time and were able to free that funding up. They've really have been looking out for us, and I deeply appreciate that.

We've been working very hard on tablet reporting. I'm sure many of you are aware of that. The eTrips mobile tool has been largely completed. Our data feed to the GARFO system has been approved, and we have folks reporting. We don't have a lot of folks yet, because there is no mechanism put in place yet to get them going, but a number of folks who have participated in previous pilots are beginning to report into the system and we are tracking those successful reports.

In addition the eDR swipe card system has essentially been completed. The Massachusetts system went into production on May 1st. We are going back and forth with them now, working through the usual issues that one works through when you put a new system into production. But what I'm getting back is that it is working correctly; that reports are being submitted as they're supposed to be, and it's going pretty well.

The Maine version of the tool has been completed and it's ready for testing. We expect testing to begin in the very near future. They are planning to deploy that tool for the sea urchin reporting. In terms of the Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System (SAFIS) redesign, we have a visioning document that has been drafted and approved by the IS Committee, which clearly defines the scope of SAFIS to include the fisheries dependent disciplines.

That would be at-sea observer, vessel trip reporting, dealer reporting, and dockside biological sampling; and improves the concept on integrated dealer reporting, so that the individual pieces connect to one another automatically. Your observer trip automatically links to your VTR, automatically links to your dealer report, automatically links to your dockside sampling; as the basis of the design of the reporting system. We're working in close collaboration, especially with the Northeast Fisheries Science Center on this particular piece. They have just designed two new systems that used ACCSP coding standards, and were specifically thought of as being used as integrated reporting pieces.

We look forward to really moving forward with that project. Some of your staff may be hearing from Tom Hoops, who've we've contracted to review the current state of affairs in all of our different program partners; their likes and dislikes for the SAFIS system, looking for additional requirements and lessons learned.

In terms of our data warehouse, biological and bycatch database designs are nearly final; and in fact they are deployed and in the system. We just completed the query system development, with some very minor tweaks left to go. We're going to be rolling that out in the very near future; the non-confidential piece of it is finished.

The confidential piece is still undergoing some minor revisions. Mostly we're doing back and forth with our end users, to make sure that we've covered all the bases. This was a project that was funded by the Fisheries Information System (FIS) program, and we've gotten very positive response. It will also allow us to shut down our older Oracle query tool, which has become very problematic. I don't know if the issues that we've been having that have been filtering up to you all. But we've had a very rough time keeping that thing up and working correctly.

We are almost finished with the 2015 data load. We had some minor problems with one of the data feeds, which I think are largely resolved, Julie? Yes. We should have those data available very shortly. They will be used, of course, in Fisheries of the U.S. Moving on to the APAIS, which I'm sure all of you are very interested in hearing.

I will say overall that the APAIS rollout is going about as well as we could have possibly hoped. There have been some minor snags, the kinds of things that you would expect, especially in states that haven't been doing the survey prior themselves. However, I can say that almost all of the issues have been resolved, that reporting is going ahead as it should.

We are receiving data as we're supposed to and been able to process it and transmit it successfully to NMFS; and in fact we believe that we're being able to process these data more quickly and more accurately than has been done before. I want to give a shout out to my APAIS team. APAIS people, would you stand up, please? This is your APAIS team. Jeff, do you want to introduce everybody?

These four folks are processing all your MRIP data, and I have to say you can see the papers, you can hear the papers chunking their way through the scanners in the morning. It is a good feeling, and I'm really pleased with how it's going. We've completed Wave 1 in its entirety, of course Wave 1 is almost a trial run, because it was only North Carolina and a fairly small set; but it went off pretty much without a hitch.

Wave 2 is running, even as we speak. We are really not having any issues. We're also working in Wave 2 for the first time with the head boat assignments, and that has also been working by and large, again as we expected it to go. Again, as concerned as we might have been with some of the issues that we could have encountered, we really haven't. It has gone really, really well. Right now we're reviewing how things went in each of the individual states and looking at the budgets. NMFS has asked us to submit an update to the budget for the next year, so that they can prepare to grant them to the cooperative agreement, so your staff folks might be getting a few questions here and there; but again, this is exactly what we expected as we move forward. I have to say that it is going about as well as it could. I'll turn it over to Pat.

- **Committee Updates – P. Campfield**
  MR. PAT CAMPFIELD: The Operations Committee met about a month ago in April, to approve the FY17 RFP, as well as get an update from RFP Modules Prioritization Workgroup. That

subcommittee met on March 1, with a task of potentially rebalancing the modules or priorities for the different funding areas under the ACCSP RFP.

In the past catch and effort has taken highest priority through this work. We're considering raising bio-sampling bycatch and socioeconomics to at least equal if not higher priority than catch and effort. That is a process that we're going to take slowly and surely; it won't be implemented for the new cycle here.

But we're developing options for possible implementation in the FY18 cycle. The first step of that potential module reprioritization is to flush out two or three different options, whether we hold all these things equal, or put some higher than others; and then take a somewhat quantitative approach to rebalancing.

By looking at the projects that were submitted over the last, say three to five years and rescoring them under these different scenarios or options, where say bio-sampling, bycatch and socioeconomics would be weighted higher than they have in the past. There has been an initial call for that workgroup, and they will continue to work on reprioritization throughout 2016 for possible changes in next year's cycle.

Also during the Operations Committee webinar, we got updates on the new projects from the last funding cycle. Glad to report that those are all going well, with some interesting results early on. The Bycatch Committee is developing a new bycatch sampling program inventory that will be available soon on the website. That is not the bycatch data, but simply a list of the different sampling programs available along the coast.

There has been a ton of work going into that since last August, with a large number of what we're calling fleet calls, where they outline gear codes, identify primary bycatch, primary catch for the stocks range along the Atlantic coast and by statistical area. They are in this process redefining and renaming existing fleets in the matrix.

There will be a final call later here in May, to complete the design of the bycatch prioritization matrix, and then from there the group will populate it and put values into the matrix. The Biological Committee met in early February to complete their matrix. One notable change is the use of a productivity and susceptibility analysis tool that we're borrowing from NMFS tool box.

We're using those values of that information to update resilient scores in the bio-sampling matrix. In the past the values were more qualitative, and from professional judgment from the Biological Committee members. As Mike mentioned, we've developed biological queries for the new data warehouse, which is pretty exciting. Similar to bycatch, there is a new biological sampling program inventory and development, and that will be available soon on the website. ComTech held a meeting a few weeks ago. There has been another big effort to redesign the data warehouse, with beta testing held earlier this spring, and we hope to have a public release very soon; coincident with the spring data log. ComTech also, I think

more as an informational or background discussion is starting to delve into seafood traceability and electronic monitoring; for the traceability part in close coordination with folks in the Gulf, who have been working on that for several years in the past.

ComTech is also completing a conversion factor project up and down the coast, which is out for final comments and review by program partners. Hope to have a final report ready soon. Another significant change is that Standard Codes is to become a full committee at the same level as Commercial Technical, Recreational Technical, and the others, and will consist of representatives from each of those groups; to sort of cross-pollinate on commercial and recreational bio, bycatch and others.

Finally, the Recreational Technical Committee is working on for-hire logbook standards in coordination with some new or current active projects; the South Carolina Validation Project, Massachusetts Electronic Charter boat Logbooks, as well as the South Atlantic Council Charter boat Logbook Project.

Recreational Technical is also working on and contributing to data needs and priorities to build or fold into the MRIP Atlantic Regional Implementation Plan. Those regional plans are being developed throughout the country, so ACCSP is taking a major role in providing input for the Atlantic plan. Also, Recreational Technical is providing continued support for the APAIS transition, including recently completed biologist training; and their next meeting for Recreational Technical will be this summer. I'll pitch it now to Cheri for the governance topic.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Does anybody have any questions for Mike or for Patrick? No, okay hearing none; that brings us to our next agenda items, which involves an action.

Governance Program Decision (Attachment III) – C. Patterson
As you all know, there was an independent program review, and one of the things that that review asked for was to look at the governance of ACCSP, and as such an Ad Hoc Workgroup was formed. I'll just take a moment to say that I am very new to this process. I'm on a very steep learning curve.

But working with this workgroup was really telling the passion, and the commitment, and the knowledge of the individuals on this workgroup; and their care that we have excellent data coastwide is really compelling. I learned a lot and I very much appreciated the time. I want to absolutely recognize Cheri Patterson for her work on this. The Executive Committee has met and has a recommendation to forward to this body, so with that I will kick it off to Cheri Patterson to brief the group.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: Considering that the white paper came out, I think on Friday, and I presume not much of us are speed readers, I put together a presentation to try and go through what the white paper addressed. As Lynn indicated, in 2012 there was an independent program review that panel provided recommendations.

One of those was to undergo a governance review. It was primarily based on these bullets that you see below. Again, speed readers this should be easy for you. The workgroup developed some terms of reference, to help provide direction and address questions. There was a survey conducted of the ACCSP committees and ASMFC and ACCSP staff; to learn about the various ACCSPs representative's opinions and basic knowledge of the structure. If you have the white paper, those survey results can be found in Attachment 3. The first term of reference was to review the process and justification for the creation of the current structure, and to answer a question of is there still a significant concern in combining a data collection program and a regulatory agency?

If you look at the results of the survey, which were broken down into three sections, where all respondents is on your left, just the Coordinating Council participants of the survey are in the middle, and the Advisory Committee is at the right. As you could see, it was a little bit diverse. In the all the respondents, about half said no, there is no longer a concern. But yet half of the advisors said yes, there is still a concern.

The second term of reference, again see Attachment 4 for information on this, pertained to reviewing the scope of other fishery information network programs out there or FINS to look at comparison. Listed here are the six regional Fisheries Information Networks (FIN) in the United States, and who they are currently residing under.

The comments from the FIN review itself, pertaining to ACCSP; I pulled out, between actual summary of the review, as well as comments from the individuals on the panel. The model of each FIN having an institutional home outside of NMFS is appropriate. West PacFIN is the one that is within the services Science Center.

This arrangement allows for separation of data provider from the data client. Having the FINs housed under the regional fisheries commission seems to have been working well, generally. However, it may be wise to consider having a clearer separation between a FINs institutional home with convenience in its operations.

The FIN programs are all facing very difficult decisions about cutting back on important elements. They are feeling the constraint of funding. Stronger stakeholder engagement is essential to building the support for funding increases. If they are supported by the stakeholders, then the programs do succeed.

Third party interests need to help raise the profile and appreciation of the value of these critical programs. Again, these came out of the FIN review itself. The terms of reference Number 3, is where we reviewed the current governance and operation environment of the ACCSP, with particular emphasis on seven areas.

The first one being, would incorporation into the ASMFC be likely to enhance ACCSPs ability to achieve a higher profile or recognition? If you notice, pretty much all the respondents were resoundingly indicating yes, from all three groups. The second part of the third terms of

reference is what impact would potential changes have in ACCSPs ability to seek out additional funding?

What you see in front of you is the current funding process of ACCSP, and then a series of footnotes that kind of describe various overhead charges, $154,000.00 was removed from the original budget process by ASMFC, and it gives that explanation. It just gives you an understanding of what it is currently. If you need to need to know, if you want to see direct comments from the respondents, then I recommend that you see Survey Question Number 4 in the white paper; and there are a couple pages there that give you really direct comments from everybody that participated in the survey. It is pretty interesting. The third aspect of the third terms of reference is does ACCSP and ASMFC staff operate in full coordination. Again, look at Survey Question Number 5.

It was kind of a diverse survey, in regards to this question. In fact the perception of the survey responses really does not reflect the reality of the current collaboration between ACCSP and ASMFC, which is outlined in Pages 7 through 11 in the white paper. There is much more coordination than I believe the survey respondents understood that is occurring.

The fourth TOR, are there opportunities for reorganization and other cost savings by moving ACCSP into ASMFC? Again you have survey questions that you see in front of you, and then Question Number 7 are the direct comments if you want to review those from survey respondents. But here you've got yes; there are probably opportunities for reorganization and other cost savings.

However, you will see further down into this that there really isn't; that the collaboration has really been moved forward between these two organizations very well, and they're operating off both of their strengths, and saving both organizations money. The next one; is there a sufficient level of engagement of state directors and senior level partners in the ACCSP, with special emphasis on funding areas?

In here it is again, kind of a diverse response from everybody. Some are indicating there is not, and then some are indicating yes, there are. Again, the perception here is interesting. The next one, also pertaining to the same question; is integration with the ASMFC likely to improve engagement and support?

Here it seemed a little bit better that yes, if you do integrate that there may have some improvement with partners with engagement and support. What would the pros and cons be to integrate ACCSP with ASMFC? This was a comment survey. If you look at those pages, again you have some interesting perspectives coming from the survey respondents.

Are there other ways to reengage the state directors with the ACCSP without integration; and again, more direct comments and ideas. The fourth term of reference was to provide the Coordinating Council with options for a potential reorganization. There were four alternatives

developed here. Of course Alternative 1 was status quo, where ACCSP would continue to operate as an independent program, governed by the Coordinating Council.

The ASMFC is a project partner and shares administrative coordination with the Coordinating Council. This is funding neutral. The second alternative is enhanced integration of the two organizations, but ASMFC remains independent, which is largely what is happening now. That would also be funding neutral.

The only exception between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 is supervision and oversight of the ACCSP director and staff. Alternative 3 is looking at folding ACCSP into ASMFC. Here ACCSP would be fully incorporated. It would be congruent with existing ASMFC programs, and the ASMFC Executive Director would supervise the ACCSP director; and all staff would be governed by existing SOPs under ASMFC. That again would be funding neutral. The fourth alternative is creating a standalone organization, specifically called ACCSP. It would be separate and independent; it could be governed by a board of directors similar to how it is now. It would be housed physically and administratively separate from ASMFC. This was determined to be a 50 percent cost increase from the current budget.

The Governance Ad Hoc Workgroup, who developed this white paper, came up with some recommendations. Again, what you see in brown font here should help you kind of speed read better through this. But essentially having Alternative 3 be the preferred option. That if it is going to be developed into an ASMFC program that it be congruent with existing ASMFC programs.

That the Executive Director would supervise the ACCSP Director, and all staff would be governed by ASMFC SOPs. But data collection and management programs should be considered equal. ACCSP may hold a higher priority with state directors, partners and stakeholders under ASMFC under this recommendation. ACCSP should be maintained as its partner-driven committee process, which we feel is its strength. It is one of the strongest FIN programs, we feel, out there; due to this bottom up management approach.

If this Coordinating Council and the ASMFC Executive Committee decide to move this forward as an alternative; that a work group be developed to develop recommendations of restructuring; consisting of the Governance Ad Hoc Workgroup members, other Coordinating Council members that would like to join in on the fray, operations and advisory committee members, and ASMFC and ACCSP staff.

- **Executive Committee Recommendation**
The Executive Committee just met and would like to recommend a motion to be presented to the Coordinating Council to consider. That motion is to adopt the recommendation of the Governance Ad Hoc Workgroup, and expand the workgroup to include all of those four that you saw before; those four bullets, and also include ASMFC Commissioners.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: It is now in the hands of this body to decide. This is the recommendation of the Executive Committee. I think just to recap first, very quickly. The Executive Committee is, and the Governance Workgroup has recommended, and the Executive Committee has accepted the recommendation to, if you will, marry ASMFC and ACCSP together. Is there somebody around the table who would like to make this motion? Robert.

MR. ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Thank you, Madame Chair, I apologize for my tardiness.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: It is so good to see you!

MR. BOYLES: It is nice to be here, thank you. I guess maybe a point of order. I think this is a recommendation of the Executive Committee, and a motion that is from the Executive Committee. It is a committee motion, does not require a second. But for the purposes of the record, I will read it into the record.

The motion from the Executive Committee is to adopt the recommendation of the Governance Ad Hoc Workgroup. I'm buzzing. I am a bass player, its feedback, so much for not making a scene. Madam Chair, on behalf of the Executive Committee I would move to adopt the recommendation of the Governance Ad Hoc Workgroup and the Executive Committee, and expand the workgroup to include ASMFC Commissioners to consummate this marriage.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, is there a second? Terry Stockwell.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Second and a question. My question to the Executive Committee is the rationale for including the entire group of commissioners. It's a pretty big workgroup to think through the details. Good luck!

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: I'll defer to my colleagues here, but I think the intent was to allow for participation. We would request that people volunteer to participate in the process from the Commission, just to be able to expand the membership there. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. BOYLES: Madam Chair, since I didn't have the benefit of the Executive Committee discussion earlier. I want to make sure that maybe for the body to understand and to Mr. Stockwell's question, if we could have Coordinating Council members who may be interested in assisting this to let me know as Coordinating Council Chair and commissioners who may be interested to let Doug know. That would be great if we can proceed that way.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Is there any other discussion on the motion? Wilson, did you have your hand up?

DR. WILSON LANEY: I did, Madam Chairman, but it was just to explain what you already explained; about the fact that we did not intend to include the entire commission on the workgroup.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Fine point of clarification. Okay, so I guess we can call the question, and I'm wondering if we can do this by consensus. Is there any opposition to this motion? Okay hearing none; the motion has passed. Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: You look very apprehensive. I just want to reiterate what Cheri said earlier, which is that the ASMFC Executive Committee is going to be talking about this tomorrow morning, making sure. In my mind it is kind of a willing donor and willing recipient kind of arrangement.

Clearly this group unanimously passed the motion to merge ACCSP underneath the ASMFC. I think the other half of that is for the commission to make that same decision, so that everyone is all in agreement, all the parts are in agreement that this is the right direction to go. The Executive Committee will be chatting about that tomorrow morning.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you for that clarification. That makes perfect sense. Okay, so I guess that moves us to our next agenda item, and this is to consider the entire package that came out of the Independent Program Review, and in that package were a series of standard operating procedures.

Consider Acceptance of the Independent Program Review Package (Attachment IV) – R. Boyles
Some of these may wind up being amended, or altered, or even removed if the Executive Committee of the Commission chooses to accept this recommendation and this motion to marry the two organizations together. But nevertheless, this group needs to approve those SOPs. I think if I may, Robert, were you going to go over those? Oh, Mike, so I am going to defer you to Mike to walk you through; just two outstanding that the Executive Committee made a couple of changes to, so Mike.

- **SOP (Attachment V)**
  MR. CAHALL: You have in your package the entire bulk of the program response, the Independent Program Review, which includes a number of SOPs, the Governance recommendation, the Outreach Strategic Plan, and the Long-term Funding Strategy. The Outreach Strategic Plan and Long-term Funding Strategy and the governance now, were in and of themselves approved separately by this body.

  We didn't expect everyone to go through the entire SOP, as there are many, many, many of them. However, two of them have had minor modifications since they were submitted. The Executive Committee approved them just prior to this meeting, and we wanted to bring them to your attention.

  Essentially, the goal of the strategic communication was to work to make sure ACCSPs value could be communicated to Congress and state legislatures. We added a little bit to the very last bullet to make sure that we didn't exclude any of the possibilities of NGOs working with us. It doesn't have to be necessarily our program partners that we might work with to lobby

Congress or state legislatures. That was the purpose of that bullet, and if you could show us the other one.

This is based on a recommendation that Bob Beal made, to add another bullet about the purpose of this was to help integrate ACCSP and Commission staff together, to get more acquainted with working with one another and to get in the habit of working together. Bob suggested that we add; this is things like working with communications and making sure that we actively participate in the policy committees and things like that.

Then in the very last one, Bob suggested that we include in the orientation for new ASMFC Technical Staff, a briefing on ACCSP, what its purpose was and how to go about using its data products. With those two changes, you have in its entirety the programs response to the independent program review and we are asking the Coordinating Council to accept this.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Great, we have an action before us to approve the Standard Operating Procedures. If I may ask, is there any opposition, concern, or comment on the Standard Operating Procedures that you have been presented with? With that we'll consider them accepted.

Review and Consider Approval of 2016 Request for Proposals (RFP) (Attachment VI)
We will move straight along to Agenda Item Number 7, which is to review and consider approval of the 2016 request for proposals. Mike can speak to this. You all have this in Attachment 6. I don't think the RFP looks much different than it has in the past. I believe it is scheduled to go out in May, is that correct? Mike, I'll defer to you if you want to say a few words about it.

MR. CAHALL: The RFP that we're going to put out this year is very much as in prior years. The workgroup that was looking at doing the reprioritization of the program felt that we weren't quite ready to go full steam ahead with reprioritizing the other models of the program; that we need to spend a little time to do an analysis of the impact on changing our budget priorities. But that next year you will see changes in the priorities coming forward to this group. Essentially, the RFP that you have in your package is very similar to prior years. There are some obvious changes in dates and deadlines, and keeping in mind the fact that we now have a fade-off program in our funding, in the long term funding in the Funding Decision Document. We are requesting along with new proposals, multiyear proposals obviously, a strategy for how they're going to fund a new program over the long term.

One of the concerns has always been ending up having to fund extended programs for an extended length of time, which ACCSP of course was not originally intended to do. Other than that it is very similar to prior years, and that is really the only change to the package that you have.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Do we have any discussion, concern, or comment on the 2016 RFP? Wow, okay, well with that is there any opposition to the approval? Did I see a hand go up?

MR. BOYLES: I was going to make a motion, but you've got it already.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Why don't you go ahead and make a motion?

MR. BOYLES: I make a motion to approve the FY17RFP as submitted.

VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Do we have a second, all right, Dr. Duval. Okay and is there any opposition to the motion? Okay hearing none; we are moving right along then to other business. Anybody got some? Oh, Robert.

Other Business
MR. BOYLES: We've just taken a big step, and I would like to commend several folks; most notably Mike and the staff, with completing all the work that needed to be done as the result to the Independent Peer Review, so Mike, and staff, congratulations, and thank you.   To the Coordinating Council, we've taken a big step to seek and find efficiencies in this new realm and this new dynamic of stable funding being, what is the word I'm looking for?

 A flat budget is a win. I think with the governance discussion moving forward, next stop to the Commission's Executive Committee. I think that we are well in place to continue to grow this program to provide good data to support the management decisions that we're all very, very interested in.

Thank you, and particularly to Cheri, who did so much work to shepherd our response to the IPR, as well as the governance discussion; Cheri, a public thank you and a tip of the hat, a tip of a grateful hat to you for your leadership here. Madam Chair, if I may, if you would be so kind. I would make a motion that we adjourn in the memory, the fond memory of Joe Graham; who is no longer with us. Joe certainly taught me a lot about parliamentary procedure and keeping things straight. I'll miss him!

Adjourn
VICE-CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, very well said. I think I would second the motion and adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 o'clock p.m. on May 2, 2016)

- - -