December 30, 1980

MEMORANDUM

TO: Golf Council
FROM: JoAnn Nowogrocki
SUBJECT: Minutes - First Council Meeting
October 12-13, 1976

Enclosed for your information and review are the revised minutes from the first Council meeting on the dates listed above.

jn

Enclosure

cc: Craig O'Connor
Staff
The first meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council was called to order by temporary Chairman William H. Stevenson at 9:00 a.m., October 12, 1976. All members were present for the entire meeting except as noted in the following list of attendees:

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- J. Pearce Johnson
- J. Burton Angelle (Oct. 12)
- Lyle St. Amant (Oct. 13, designee for Angelle)
- Charles H. Lyles
- Wayne Swingle (designee for Hodnett)
- Harmond Shields
- John M. Green
- Theodore B. Ford, III
- George A. Brumfield
- C. Walton Kraver
- Robert P. Jones
- Robert G. Mauermann
- John A. Mehos
- Edward W. Swindell
- Nicholas Mavar, Jr.
- Thomas H. Clark
- Billy J. Putnam
- William H. Stevenson

**NONVOTING MEMBERS**

- Robert W. Thoesen
- RADM W. W. Barrow
- CDR J. R. Mitchell (Oct. 13, designee for Barrow)
- Robert Monks (Oct. 12-13, designee for Hallman)
- Carlton Jackson

Texas
Louisiana
Louisiana
Mississippi
Alabama
Florida
Texas
Texas
Texas
Mississippi
Alabama
Florida
Texas
Louisiana
Mississippi
Alabama
Florida
NMFS
F&WS
U.S. Coast Guard
U.S. Coast Guard
State Department
GSMFC
Others who attended as Interim Council Support Staff or as Observers

George Cross                  Florida
Carl Price                    State Department
Elmo Authement                Louisiana
David D. Plater               Louisiana
Harvey Bullis                NMFS
Tom Moore (designee)          Texas
David Veal                    Mississippi
Paul Keller                   Louisiana
Balt Niquet                   Florida
Russ Miget                    Texas
J. Marange                    Louisiana
William Perret                Louisiana
J. Y. Christmas               Mississippi
Ted M. Flagout                Louisiana
Windell A. Curole             Louisiana
Jack Dunnigan                 NOAA Legal Counsel
I. B. Byrd                    NMFS
Paul Fulham                   NMFS

o Adoption of Agenda

.... Under Other Business the following items were added: (1) proposed
fishery management units in the Gulf, and (2) fishery management plans
currently being conducted under the State-Federal Fisheries Management
Program in the Gulf.

o Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman

.... Bob Jones moved that a vice chairmanship be established who would chair
the meeting in the absence of the chairman. This should be a voting
Council member rather than a designee or proxy.

.. Mr. Green asked what authority would be granted to the vice chairman and
Mr. Jones suggested an executive committee be established composed of the
Council Chairman, Vice Chairman (from another state), and three additional
people from the three remaining states with each state would being equally
represented. The primary authority would remain with the full Council.

.. Motion carried to establish a vice chairmanship.

.. Mr. Green moved that the vice chairman be selected from the voting members
of the Council rather than a designee.

.. After discussion of whether a chairman/vice chairman be a Council member
rather than a designee, Mr. Stevenson summarized the consensus of members
that this is an important issue which needs in-depth exploration as to its
impact on the Council business and members of the Council, and it is
something that needs to be addressed as part of the organizational and
administrative proceedings.
Pearce Johnson moved to nominate the three persons who expressed an interest in serving as chairman, Dr. Ford, John Mehos and John Green.

Bob Jones moved for selection by secret ballot.

Harmon Shields moved for the majority vote on one ballot. Mr. Stevenson asked if the one receiving the lowest number of votes would be dropped after the first ballot. Mr. Green withdrew his name from nominees.

These motions carried.

Mr. John Mehos was elected chairman for the first year of Council operations. Dr. Ted Ford was elected as Vice Chairman for the first year.

Mr. Mehos expressed his appreciation to Council and chaired the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Stevenson explained that meetings of the Council would be taped and a summary provided and the tapes will become the property of the Council.

Identification of Possible Council Office Location Sites

Mr. Stevenson advised that Council could identify one or two geographical areas and NMFS can have GSA survey available space in the areas. Also a decision will have to be made regarding the amount of space required.

The areas of Tampa Bay, Florida; New Orleans, Louisiana, and Houston, Texas, were suggested as possible sites and staff was asked to supply the Council with a list of available GSA space in these areas as soon as possible. Approximately two to three thousand square feet of floor space would be required.

Determination of Council Administrative Staff Requirements and Initiation of Candidate Solicitation

Mr. Stevenson emphasized that the duties of the Executive Director should be determined prior to issuance of a Vacancy Announcement. NMFS will assist in the distribution of the announcement.

There was considerable discussion of requirements for the Executive Director position and what the duties would involve.

Mr. Stevenson advised that NMFS will provide staff support for Council operations and will, additionally, make available an individual on a permanent assignment to the Council for 90 days plus an additional 90-day transitional period. He will be under the direction of the Council Chairman and would prepare the Council budget. This expense, travel, salary, etc., will be borne by the Council and part of its costs.

Mr. Stevenson reviewed some of the technical and administrative functions of the Council. The Executive Director would be responsible for setting up agendas, securing meeting accommodations, issuing Federal Register notices, providing meeting recordings and transcriptions, preparing material for presentation, issuing reports and filing and storing the
reports. The annual budget would have to be prepared and monitored and a bookkeeping system set up as the Council will be audited by GAO, grant reports prepared, personnel recruited and performance standards set up, personnel records maintained, necessary reports prepared and a benefits package secured. Contract management, procurement activities, monitoring, documentation and information, issuing annual reports, coordination with the other entities, and preparation of SOPPs will be among the functions.

Mr. Mehos pointed out that the Executive Director will be overseeing all of these functions and staff support must also be considered.

By consensus, members agreed to proceed with drafting the position qualifications and advertizing for the Executive Director.

Lyle St. Amant moved and the motion carried to adopt the following Position Description:

The Executive Director's activities shall involve him/her in the implementation of the Council's business, policies, and determinations of fishery management activities as they directly affect the public.

While technical, scientific, and statistical advice to the Council will be furnished through advisory committees, the Executive Director will manage all Council programs and technical teams authorized by the Council and will coordinate input to the Council from advisory, scientific, technical, and other committees.

The Executive Director shall also direct an administrative support staff whose tasks will be that of assisting the Executive Director carry out his/her functions.

The Executive Director will be responsible for accounting for and controlling resources allocated to the Council and at the direction of the Council. He/she shall be responsible for the financial management system of the Council, effective control over and accountability for all funds, property and other assets, and for complying with the provisions of OMB Circular A-110 for grants and grant proposals.

He/she will be responsible for developing agenda for public meetings; preparing reports; acting as official spokesperson for the Council, when delegated; establishing, maintaining, and supervising the administrative support staff to carry out support functions; maintaining an understanding of the program and presenting that view to the public when necessary; carrying out decisions of the Council; and any other assignments received from the Council. As the principal full-time employee of the Council, the Executive Director will be the primary contact with the public. He/she will have extensive responsibilities for preparation of news releases, in the name of the Chairman, on programs and achievements of the Council.

The Executive Director reports to the Council through the Chairperson and is expected to carry out functions without direct supervision. ($30,000 - $39,600 and fringe benefits package.)
Mr. Jones questioned whether the Council would be deciding where funds are spent and it was agreed that this position description specifies that the Executive Director role will be implementing Council's decisions.

Members agreed that the vacancy announcement would read as follows under location: It is anticipated at this time that the location will be in the Tampa Bay area, New Orleans area or Houston area.

Mr. Mehos asked members if they wished to discuss the Qualification Standards for the Executive Director or procedures for selection.

Mr. Jones again discussed the establishment of an executive committee composed of the Chairman, Vice Chairman and three members from the three remaining states not represented by the chairman and vice chairman. This committee could screen applicants for the Executive Director, but would not dilute the authority of the Council on any decisions.

Mr. Mehos suggested creating an executive committee of this Council to carry out such administrative and coordinating functions as the Council may delegate to it from time to time. He felt the Chairman should not be able to delegate or assign any duties to this committee; this power should remain with the Council.

Harmon Shields felt guidelines should be developed for Council review and approval to guide the Chairman in calling meetings of the executive committee.

John Green stated that the chairman could be delegated the authority to call upon Council members to perform any necessary tasks from time to time as he deems necessary. Members agreed that he has this authority presently.

Mr. Mauermann felt the Chairman has the power and authority to appoint an executive committee and any other committee. John Mehos stated he did not believe there is a specific executive committee called for in the guidelines; subcommittees are appointed by the Council.

Bob Jones stated he would rather see the states decide on delegates. Expanding on the executive committee composition, each year when a chairman is elected, the chairman and vice chairman would not be from the same state, leaving three other states with the opportunity to select a delegate to serve on the executive committee. The state would make the selection and not the Council.

Mr. Stevenson agreed with the executive committee idea, but pointed out that the entire purpose and intent of P.L. 94-265 was to establish a legislative type of Council without any internal geographical boundaries. It is a group of people who are looking at all of the problems of the entire geographical area of the Council. It is a separate kind of a function from state or regional responsibilities. He suggested that it not be identified so that there must be a person from each state, as the principle of the Act is to set up a regional type of structure rather than a representation from each state.
Mr. Mehos felt this situation was different in that this is a task force which will function from time to time as delegated by Council.

After further discussion, the suggestion was withdrawn.

Ed Swindell opposed this executive committee; ad hoc committees could be formed as Council deems necessary. The executive committee concept can be kept in mind and as time goes on, it can be established if the Council sees that it would be useful.

Members reviewed proposed qualifications standards and Mr. Stevenson explained that these would be the standards for screening to be used by the screening body.

After discussion, Mr. Jones moved and Council approved the adoption of the following Qualifications Standards:

The duties of the Executive Director shall involve him or her in the implementation of the Council's business, policies, and determinations of fishery management activities as they directly affect the overall mission of the organization and the public. The Executive Director will direct an administrative staff whose responsibilities will include providing administrative support.

Candidates for these positions must have demonstrated capability for the use of the principles and practices of general management and the techniques of organization, coordination, and control. Also desirable is a demonstrated knowledge of the application of principles and procedures necessary for the conservation and management of fisheries, as there has to be an understanding of the technical aspects of the program to carry out meaningful policy determinations and evaluations.

Since candidates who fill these positions must be able to meet and deal responsibly with public and government officials at all levels, they must have demonstrated an ability to make clear oral and written presentations and must be able to objectively discuss opposing points of view.

The quality and length of experience will be the basic factors for determining salaries.

Candidates must show successful completion of a full four-year course of study leading to a bachelor's or higher degree from an accredited college or university with major study in fishery oriented disciplines; or four year of experience which demonstrates that the candidate has an understanding of the fundamental principles and techniques of one of the appropriate disciplines equivalent to that which would have been acquired through completion of a four-year course of study.

In addition, candidates must have had at least three years of progressively responsible experience pertinent to the duties of the position. At least one year of this experience must have been at a level of difficulty at or immediately below that of Executive Director.
Mr. Stevenson stated that Council needs to make decisions regarding the administrative procedure, including a procedure for advertising the position; it does not have to be advertised as a committee could go on a recruitment campaign. A target date for hiring should be set, and if a vacancy announcement is used, decide on a closing date. A screening process must also be devised.

Mr. Mehos proposed advertising, setting up a recruiting process, including target and closing dates, select a screening committee and a screening process, and use of government Form SF-171.

There was discussion of whether a physical examination will be required, and it was agreed that NMFS Personnel Department will provide appropriate wording to cover the medical. A security clearance similar to that for Council members will be necessary.

The interim Council support staff was asked to prepare a Position Vacancy Announcement and circulate it as broadly as possible. Applications are to be received in the Regional Office by November 19, 1976. Applicants will be categorized as "highly qualified," "qualified" and "not qualified" and this information provided to the Council Chairman.

Mr. Stevenson suggested that the top five candidates be interviewed by Council at the January meeting (at Council expense) and then a decision reached.

It was proposed that the screening committee be composed of the Chairman, Vice Chairman and one person from each state. Mr. Stevenson will also serve on the committee. All applications will be reviewed and a copy of the resumes will be available for review by the Council. A summary of applicants and their present positions will be provided to Council members.

Mr. Stevenson asked if the announcement should include this note: This position is nonfederal, however, the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 provides that federal employees may be detailed to positions of this Council. By consensus, members agreed to include this.

The screening committee members will be asked to screen the applicants and report their recommendations to the full Council at its third meeting which will be held during the period of December 8-10 in Houston, Texas. The screening committee will travel to Houston early and meet from 1:00 p.m., on December 7 until noon on December 8. The regular Council meeting will be held from 1:00 p.m., on December 8 to 12:00 noon on December 10.

Establishment of Scientific and Statistical Committee and Charge the Committee to Develop Recommendations Regarding: Fishery Management Units and Management Plan Development Priorities for Council Consideration at Second Organizational Meeting.

Mr. Stevenson asked Harvey Bullis, SEFC, to address this question.
.. Mr. Bullis advised that it has been pointed out that the Committee must operate without remuneration. According to the Act, the Committee will be responsible for identifying goals and objectives of fishery management plans; identifying data sources to be used; monitoring and evaluating effectiveness of plans already in place; be a multidisciplined team and equally representative of the entire region. Terms of appointment have not been addressed in the Act. He suggested that they could provide advice on establishment of statistical priorities.

.. Dr. St. Amant suggested that the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee could be part of the Council staff.

.. Mr. Mehos emphasized that staff may be doing some of the work on plans and the Committee will serve as reviewers of plans from the scientific aspect. The chairman and vice chairman will be selected by Council and a charter needs to be developed. He reviewed requirements in the Interim Regulations.

.. Mr. Thoesen asked if a member could serve more than one Council and Mr. Dunnigan advised that he knew of no constraints.

.. Chairman Mehos asked members from each state and NMFS to submit a list of their recommendations for members of the Scientific and Statistical Committee to the Council support staff (St. Petersburg) as soon as possible. The lists would then be combined and circulated to all Council members prior to the next meeting. It seemed to be the general consensus that about 12 members would be appropriate for the committee.

.. Pearce Johnson questioned the advisability of a SSC member also serving on a technical team and Mr. Stevenson stated the member would probably step down temporarily from the SSC in these instances. Dr. St. Amant pointed out that in some cases there is a limited number of people with expertise.

.. There was discussion on whether a Council designee or Council member should serve on the S&S Committee. This can again be addressed after names have been submitted.

- Identification of Fishery Advisory Panels Required and Appointment of Same, if Appropriate.

.... This agenda item was postponed to a later meeting.

- Discussion of Council Statement of Organization Practices and Procedures

.... Recommended was made that the publication of the Council's SOPPs be delayed until about June 30th. The current publication requirement of March 1st as specified in the Interim Regulations does not allow adequate time.

.... Nick Mavar moved to apply for an extension and the motion carried.

- Development of Council Budget and Discussion of Travel Vouchers and Related Administrative Matters.
Mr. Stevenson reviewed needed decisions: (1) FY 1977 budget with an immediate six-month grant and a second six-month grant; how to develop the 1977-1979 budget presentation by December 30th, (2) total NMFS budget on extended jurisdiction which was a contentious issue, and decide whether to take any formal action to the administration of the total national extended jurisdiction budget, and (3) question of whether to sign the grant and assume the fiscal and administrative responsibility for the business of the Council.

A question was raised as to whether Council will prepare plans for shrimp and menhaden, which are primarily in state waters. Mr. Stevenson stated that a jurisdictional question is involved between the state and federal elements as far as the implementation of a plan, and here the question arises as to whether it is inside or outside of the fishery conservation zone. Management is from the shore to 200 miles, however, enforcement is from the shoreward boundary of the state waters to 200 miles. It is Council's decision which fisheries will require a management plan. Jack Dunnigan read from Section 306 (b)1(a) which refers to the Secretary's ability to pre-empt state management within three miles and Section 302 (h)(i) regarding plan preparation.

It was agreed that the species to be managed will determine how the budget will be formulated.

Mr. Stevenson also advised that the Secretary has the prerogative to prepare a management plan in the absence of a plan by the Council.

Dr. St. Amant asked what procedure would be followed if it was determined that a fishery does not exist in the conservation zone and is entirely within the estuarine waters of the state; does the law give the Secretary the right to set up a plan? Jack Dunnigan advised that the law provides that the Council shall prepare a plan for every fishery in the zone and the law defines fishery as stocks that can be treated as a unit for purposes of conservation and management and any fishing for such stocks.

Cooperative management between Council and states was further discussed and it was brought out that plans are living documents that can be changed and updated as new data is developed. GIFA's with foreign countries wishing to fish within the zone were also discussed.

Mr. Stevenson asked Council to discuss the document entitled "Questions for Opinion of Councils" to focus the opinion of the Council as to what the requirements for Council budget will be and Council's opinion on a national budget regarding extended jurisdiction budget. The Council can then make a decision on whether to sign the grant for the first six months of operation, followed by addressing contracts funds.

The above document lists nine questions:

1. How do you expect environmental assessments and impact statements to be developed for your plans?
Mr. Stevenson advised that there had been a legal question as to whether these items would be Council's responsibility and it has been determined that they are.

Mr. Swindell asked if each Council member should make notes on this document and votes taken in this manner. Mr. Stevenson advised that he would be using this as a working paper.

Mr. Putnam moved that there be one collective opinion of Council and the motion carried by consensus.

By consensus, Council agreed that work should be done either in-house or by contract.

2. How should environmental assessment/EIS preparation be financed?

Council agreed that this should be included in the grant.

3. How many days will your Council meet in FY 77? How many meetings?

Council responded with 50 days and 16-18 meetings.

4. Size of Scientific and Statistical Committee? How many days will they meet?

Council response: 12 members meeting 25 days.

Mr. Stevenson referred to a document identifying each Council's budget by line item. The Gulf Council budget for FY 77 is $320.3K.

5. Are proposed Council budgets adequate for perceived needs?

Mr. Jones asked how funds will be divided among the Councils and Mr. Stevenson responded this will be based on their estimates and NMFS/NOAA will have to determine if these estimates can be met. Mr. Schoning will work with the Councils to reach resolutions, if necessary.

He further clarified that with the new administration, a new budget will be considered and the Councils can have input in its development.

Mr. Stevenson reviewed three budget documents: (1) FY 77 Budget Estimate by Regional Fishery Management Council by Object Class; (2) Budget Estimates for the First Six Months of the Regional Fisheries Management Operation by Object Class, and (3) Budget Estimates for the Second Six Months.

Mr. Swingle stated that he thought it had been agreed that the Council would decide on which species to manage during the first year in order to have a basis for procedure.

Mr. Stevenson noted in the State-Federal program approximately $80K is required for plan development and it could be assumed that in FY 77
Council would want to identify two fisheries and it would not even be necessary to identify them for this purpose.

Mr. Stevenson also suggested that an amount be established for a contract for a fiscal system for Council operations. Council agreed that $1,200 could be identified for this purpose and $400,000 identified for development of four plans during FY 77.

Mr. Stevenson suggested that Council give NMFS staff authority to make adjustments in other line items such as: limit employees to seven; the 9.6 percent for benefits seems inadequate and should be raised to possibly 15 percent; travel/transportation of things can be based on meetings and number of meeting days already established and this can be extrapolated and additional adjustments can be made on other items listed.

Mr. Swingle also noted that a ten percent contingency should be added (approximately $70K) as discussed earlier.

By consensus, Council agreed with this approach for the first and second six-months grants.

Regarding the grant of $158,700, Mr. Stevenson asked if Council is prepared to assume the fiscal and administrative responsibility and sign it. The other option is NMFS continuing to provide executive and administrative support, with costs to be deducted after Council has selected staff and is in a position to assume the responsibility.

Mr. Shields moved to adopt the second option of NMFS support and the motion carried.

6. Should Councils contract directly with states for support?
   a. to develop input, data, statistics, and analyses;
   b. prepare management options, plans, or regulations.

Mr. Stevenson recalled a discussion at the Arlington meeting regarding contracting with states. This is a separate issue from the ability of Council to contract with other sources. The states are an integral part of the Act and cooperation is emphasized; however, it could be argued that the states should not have to bear the additional costs.

Mr. Stevenson also pointed out that SEFC is attempting to anticipate the needs of the Councils and reorganize priorities. Twenty-two million has been added to NMFS/NOAA budget to support Extended Jurisdiction requirements. He reviewed a document listing line items and their purposes at the national level in support of EJ and amounts and items identified for the Southeast Region.

Mr. Stevenson advised that each NMFS Region will have two people who will review the plans and they will also ensure that the plans take into consideration the Coastal Zone Management Act.
Mr. Stevenson stated there is a basic question on whether the Council is going to prepare management options, plans and operations or whether it will get involved in the research activities and data statistics and analysis. The Councils should identify their needs in this area and NMFS must be as responsive to these needs as possible within their budgetary constraints, and the states should be in a position to do the same thing.

Mr. Shields suggested that this be considered at another meeting as it needs more thought. At this time he does not wish to relinquish the Council's right to contract with the states.

Mr. Jones observed that in the regulations, the scientific input into the plans should be institutionally insulated from managerial biases and pressure from interested parties while remaining relevant to the problems of management. Anyone who is an interested party or has managerial biases might not be able to direct how the research is to be undertaken.

Mr. Stevenson stated that his responsibility is to identify the Council's informational needs to the SEFC and it is their responsibility to determine how these needs will be met, which will be reviewed by the scientific advisors regarding reliability and quality of the research.

Dr. St. Amant pointed out that research must be continuing and consistent and have an adequate budget to be effective.

Mr. Stevenson clarified the issue that Council's should contract for and money will be available for their contractual needs.

Dr. St. Amant moved to postpone consideration of Item 6 and Council agreed by consensus.

7. What portion of Council funds should be held in reserve by NMFS for needs of the Councils identified after grant applications have been submitted?

From the comments made, Mr. Stevenson will respond that Council feels that there should be no national contingency established; however, the grant amount should be identified and an additional ten percent contingency fund should be added to the grant for discretionary funds to be used by the grantee for contingency purposes.

8. Should NOAA add two vessels to its fisheries research fleet?

Mr. Swingle suggested recommending that both vessels be held back and the funding for one be used for rental of vessels and all Councils would benefit from the funding. It is almost cost prohibitive to use these NOAA vessels for sustained research.
Mr. Green questioned the reasoning behind these vessels and Mr. Stevenson responded that the primary requirement is based on the fact that entities identify the need for more effective information about resources, environment, the entire fisheries system, including surveillance.

Pearce Johnson stated that Council could take the position that it recognizes the need for collection of additional data, but feels that it can best be accomplished by not building these ships and utilizing the funds in all of the areas involved, urging that they explore the possibility of not building the vessels and securing the data by other means.

Mr. Mehos suggested that Council could take the position that there is not adequate money in the suggested budget for the Gulf Council to meet the requirements of the Council in fiscal year 1977; additional funds can and should come from the vessel construction support item in the NOAA budget, even if this means that the construction of the vessels must be postponed, as Council feels this is a low priority item. Mr. Putnam so moved with the addition of the words "or cancelled" after postponed. Motion carried.

9. In the event that Council requests exceed available funds, how should allocation decisions be reached?

Mr. Jones suggested it could be based on poundage and value of landings in various regions.

Mr. Stevenson reiterated that the NMFS Director has agreed to meet with a representative of each of the eight Councils to make these kinds of decisions.

By consensus, it was agreed that Council will recommend that there be a conference with NMFS Director. Utilization, catch and value of commercial and recreational fishery resources should be considered in the discussion with the Director.

o Review of Interim Final Regulations

This item will be discussed at the next meeting.

o Review of Billfish and Shark EIS/PMP's and Development of Council Position

Mr. Stevenson noted that a draft EIS/PMP for the pelagic longline fishery has been prepared and submitted to Washington for the Director's signature on Friday in order to meet the procedures needed to have the plan available if necessary. A policy decision was made to take into consideration the recommendations made at an Atlanta meeting on the billfish plan and this was to abandon it as a billfish plan and redirect it to a PMP for foreign pelagic longline fishery. There will be a 100-mile buffer zone from the beach in which all foreign longline fishing will be prohibited; permits will be issued for foreign longline fishing in the remainder of the FCZ; the fishing will be restricted to a status quo based on the position that the present OY will have a continued increase in recreational fishing activities estimated at two to 60 percent annually and there will be a ten percent reduction in the foreign vessel days and
number of fish taken by the longline fishermen in the FCZ. It is anticipated that the Director will sign the plan shortly, printing will take place in a week and the plan distributed for comment and printed in the Federal Register. A period of public comment follows and the comments incorporated into the plan at which time it will be made a final EIS/PMP. The Director can hold the plan at any stage before it is published, but it must be available should a permit application be received.

- **Proposed Fishery Management Units in the Gulf**
  
  Harvey Bullis provided Council with a listing of the units to be considered.

- **Fishery Management Plans Currently Being Conducted Under the State-Federal Fisheries Management Program in the Gulf**

  Dr. Ford discussed Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and its Technical Coordinating Committee’s cooperation with NMFS to review shrimp species, data information gaps and costs to obtain additional data. Additionally, menhaden is similarly being reviewed. Council may wish to review these plans when they are completed. Recreational fishing and a shrimp resource assessment program are under consideration.

  J. Y. Christmas provided Council with a brief progress report on the status of the fishery management plans for Gulf shrimp and Gulf menhaden that are currently being developed under the State-Federal Fisheries Management Program. There appeared to be general agreement that these studies would be useful to the Council in considering future fishery management plans for the Gulf.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, October 13, 1976.

John A. Nehos, Chairman

Date