

Stephanie Scull-DeArmey: Would it be okay if we start with your name and the city that you live in?

Susan Shipman: Yes. I'm Susan Shipman, and I live in St. Simon's Island, Georgia.

SSD: The year of your birth and your birthplace?

SS: I was born in February of 1954. I just had my sixtieth birthday.

SSD: Happy Birthday.

SS: Thank you. Well, a month ago, but still, it's a landmark. [laughter] I was born in Dyersburg, Tennessee, which is in West Tennessee.

SSD: Your father's and mother's names and occupation?

SS: My father's name was William Lynn Shipman, Sr. He was a plant engineer for a textile mill. My mother was Virginia Dickinson – was her maiden name, and then, of course, Shipman was her married name. She worked in the home, taking care of us.

SSD: Were you always interested in the marine environment as a child?

SS: I became interested in the marine environment, I would say, in the fourth grade, when I visited cousins on the North Carolina coast. We lived not far from the Mississippi River. So, I was always interested in water. I also think part of that is because I'm an Aquarian. [laughter] I was always interested in biology from a very young, young age.

SSD: Do you have any brothers and sisters? Were any of them involved in fisheries management?

SS: None were involved in fishery management. I had an older sister and older brother. Both are deceased. But my brother was an active sportsman and conservationist, active fisher and hunter, and was instrumental in founding one of the Trout Unlimited chapters where he lived, near Knoxville.

SSD: Do you have any children?

SS: I have one adopted son, who is an artist, and not at all interested in fisheries. He lives in Orlando and is getting ready to move to San Diego at the end of the summer to go to graduate school to UC San Diego in scenic design.

SSD: Can you tell me a little bit about your educational background, where you went to high school and college?

SS: I grew up, as I mentioned, in Dyersburg, Tennessee, went to high school there. After graduation, I went to Mary Baldwin College, which is a women's school in Virginia. One of the

main reasons I went there is they had a marine biology program at the Duke University Marine Lab, which is not far from those cousins I visited, where I fell in love with fiddler crabs. So, I went there, and then after my sophomore year, it became apparent if I were going to pursue marine sciences, I was going to need to transfer to a larger university. So, I transferred to the University of Georgia and finished my BS in invertebrate zoology with an emphasis in marine zoology. Then I went out to the University of Washington Friday Harbor Lab north of Seattle and the Samoan Islands. Spent the summer out there, came back to the University of North Carolina in a sort of a generalized marine sciences graduate program. I didn't finish a degree there but moved to Georgia to work for the Department of Natural Resources as a research associate.

SSD: So, that was your first job then?

SS: Yes, that was my first job.

SSD: Did you work with any notable people early in your career?

SS: Oh, gosh. Let's see. Probably several notable people. At Mary Baldwin, Bonnie Hohn, who was a biology professor, was very, I think, influential. Babs Conant, who was a professor at the University of Virginia as well as Mary Baldwin, she, I think, had a big influence on me. Then when I transferred to the University of Georgia – I'm trying to think of her name. It just slipped my mind. She was the invertebrate biology professor there for a number of years and really had an influence on me and convinced me I needed to go out to Friday Harbor and sort of delve into another ecosystem, totally, in terms of marine invertebrate zoology. Mike (Lavrov?) was out there, and he was a professor. I'd say he was influential. Then when I was in North Carolina, I was a research assistant with Pete Peterson there, so he was influential.

SSD: I have heard from a few people that you were one of the first women involved.

SS: Yes, I was. In fishery management, I think there was a time – probably early on, probably in the [19]80s and possibly early [19]90s, I was the only woman marine fish chief in the country. I don't know, you just roll up your sleeves and you get in there with the guys. I do think women have a very different approach to things. I think we're more into negotiating and that kind of thing. We don't have the testosterone thing that gets in the way, that you sort of see around the table. [laughter] I don't know. At the time, I didn't think a whole lot about it. I was just one of the guys. In fact, a group of them threw me a shower. All my colleagues threw me a wedding shower when I got married. It's all these guys. It was kind of a hoot. That was different. [laughter]

SSD: What was it like being one of the first women?

SS: Well, initially, in terms of working, I think everybody is suspect that you can do the work and that type of thing. But I like to think of myself as a hard worker. So, you just get in there and show them that you can work non-stop, basically. I'm the back deck of a research vessel. I always kid that the way to a research vessel captain's heart is to do the dishes in the galley. I love to wash dishes, so that served me well – and just being willing to do anything. Another

philosophy I've always had is don't ask anybody to do anything you wouldn't do, and I have always thought very much of a teamwork-type approach to just about anything you tackle. In that regard, early on, I think you have to prove yourself, maybe even more so than men in the past. I don't think that's the case now. Although, there's some very, very sharp, young women that are in the field now, and I'm delighted. So, I'd like to think I maybe helped crack the glass ceiling a little bit.

SSD: How did you first become involved in fisheries management?

SS: Through Georgia DNR, actually. When I went to work there, I was a research associate on an early program that was funded by the CZM program, by those funds. It was for offshore management. At the time, Georgia had some exploratory wells from Tenneco and Exxon in the late 1970s. So, I was recruited to come there and work on a CZM project, looking at offshore fisheries as well as cataloging the offshore live-bottom areas. So, it involved a lot of scuba. I've always had horrible sinuses. So, I would really suffer at the depths we were diving. I would come up from a dive and then take codeine to dull the pain. The opportunity came open to move into an inshore program with Georgia DNR. Bob Mahood, who's here, Bob was our director. Duane Harris, who was on the council until recently and termed off, Duane was the chief of fisheries. So, they were both my bosses, and just great bosses, wonderful bosses, because they just gave me every opportunity and didn't make that gender distinction. So, anyway, I moved inshore and started working on shrimp and crabs. That's, I'd say, where I really cut my teeth on management in terms of season openings, your traditional management measures. I worked on the research vessel then. Then I was promoted sort of through the ranks of the different levels of biologists, and then became the chief of fisheries. When Bob left, Duane went into his job, and then I was hired for Duane's job. So, then I did the administrative stuff as well as some of the research stuff.

SSD: How did you become involved with the council?

SS: Oh, Bob Mahood, actually. Bob, I don't know whether he couldn't go to the meetings. Honestly, I've tried to think back and recall how that happened. But in the [19]80s, the early [19]80s, I started going to some of the meetings. I distinctly remember going to the early snapper-grouper meetings when we developed that. Our initial plan was adopted, I think, in 1983. I can remember sitting around the room, the edge of the room and the periphery, and then the people at the table and all the discussions going on. Then mackerel, I would go to some of the mackerel meetings as well with Bob. Then eventually, they eased me into sitting at the table. So, I've been involved in the council stuff since the mid-[19]80s, which seems like forever. [laughter] Trust me, the mackerel stuff has not changed that much.

SSD: No.

SS: I know. I laughed and told Greg today. He said, "You could just sit right back at that table, and you will not have missed a beat." I said, "That's exactly right. "

SSD: [laughter]

SS: I know. That's a scary thing.

SSD: Why do you think that is with mackerel?

SS: Well, I was a proponent for years and years of getting a divorce from the Gulf of Mexico, seriously, and splitting it into two plans. I mean, you saw just a snapshot of that. You're impeded by going forward with what your region may need to do. Now, we worked out some of those bumps along the way years ago when we set up some of the things that were alluded to today, where they set their catch limits. But if you want them in the plan, in the way you're doing things, it's got to go through both councils. Just from a lot of history, I think the two councils are suspect of one another. There's a lot of baggage there that has never been parked and I don't know will ever be parked. You've got fishermen with differing interests, then you have the South Florida issues that we talked about a whole lot at this meeting. It's good news to hear that the mixing zone has moved further south, because it's certainly getting closer to where our council boundaries are. So, who knows that someday maybe we can split it out. It's an incredibly inefficient way to manage the multi-council plans. It took us, I think, six years to get our Dolphin Wahoo plan finished. That was a five-council plan. Took a long time in the late [19]80s to get swordfish done. Then one of the reauthorizations of Magnuson stripped swordfish away from us and gave it to the Secretary of Commerce, to HMS. But that was a very lengthy, painful process too. I think anytime you've got to deal with other councils, it's inefficient and overly complicated. Labyrinthine and Byzantine would be the two words I would describe it as. [laughter]

SSD: What are some of the significant changes in the way that fisheries are managed today compared to when you first began involved in the process?

SS: When we were first involved, traditional management measures, your seasons, your bag limits, your size limits. At the time, I think things were based on fairly – and I'll use the word crude, but I don't mean that in a bad way. That was the state of the science then. You did not have the sophisticated modeling and the technological resources. So, it was a much more simplistic type of assessment process. So, that was on the science end. The other thing that has changed is just the fisheries themselves in terms of the technology. The magnitude of the recreational fishery has grown tremendously, I think. Also, the electronics – the pursuit of fish has, I think, exponentially advanced in terms of fishermen's ability to find and harvest fish, be they recreational or commercial. At the same time, I think the fishermen are much more involved in the process now than they have been in the past. I think the pros and cons to that – well, there's not a con to them being involved. But at times, I think this council, in more recent years, has been more prone to let the fishermen lead them rather than them leading, rather than them showing the leadership that they need to show for conservation. Sometimes, I don't think they have the balls.

SSD: [laughter]

SS: Really. Roy and I talked about that a little bit yesterday. There comes a point in time you have to say the hard words to the fishing community is, "There are not enough fish out there for all of you, and some of you are going to be excluded." None of them want to hear it, and the

council doesn't want to say it. But it's inevitable, particularly in the South Atlantic, with what we call the boutique fisheries that we have that – it was like the conversation last night about red snapper, how many more red snappers the Gulf has, because of its productivity, than we have over here – than we will ever have over here. Yet, you look at the East Coast of Florida and just the number of recreational fishermen alone – quite understandably, I think the fishermen have a hard time understanding how they individually can possibly put a dent in that fishery. I don't think they can wrap their head around how many of them there are. You start doing those multipliers and the math, which is certainly an imprecise science. If we need anything, we need better recreational data. But at the same time, I don't think they have a true appreciation for the magnitude of their potential impact. So, I think the technology has changed. The involvement has changed. Certainly, the act has evolved. I think there's been much more micro-meddling by Congress really getting in there and trying to nitpick. They need to go back to the intent of the original act and let these regions, the councils with the fishermen, really manage the stocks. I think the one thing I see is – what would you call it? It's sort of the tensions that you see in Congress, the lack of willingness to compromise and come together – and basically compromise. I think that there's perhaps less of that now than there used to be. I don't know if that's a long, winding answer to your question.

SSD: What do you say has been the biggest improvement in the way that things have been managed?

SS: Well, certainly. I mean, we've made, I think some real progress in restoring stocks. There have definitely been some great turnarounds. They talked about black sea bass, snowy grouper, certainly the turnaround on red porgy, I mean, a number of the reef fishes. I think it could be argued, because we talked this morning some about the downturn in mackerel catches. But overall, the mackerel stocks have been healthy. We got in there early and managed them, and I think did a good job with managing those. I think, yes, overall, the council process under Magnuson has arrested some downturns in fisheries and turned them around.

SSD: What do you think is still lacking in these improvements?

SS: Well, one thing, I think the council process is so focused on the harvesters, be they recreational, be they commercial. Certainly, the fish houses at kind of the wholesale level, at the fish house level gets involved, because you do have people sitting on the council or people commenting. The consumer in Kansas City and St. Louis, to me, that's a real missing gap. Chefs were trying to, I think, involve chefs, hopefully, through this visioning process. Georgia, we don't have a big fishery at all, particularly, commercial. Even our recreational is smaller. But we have a huge number of restaurants in Atlanta, quite a number here in Savannah, on St. Simons, and they want fresh fish. There's also the big movement of the locavore movement, farm to table, or whatever you want to call it. There's an interest in getting fish domestically and not relying on these imports. It's that end consumer – either the retail, whomever – they are clearly stakeholders, and I'm not sure they're represented. You'll hear some of the commercial guys refer to them. Some fishermen themselves are getting more involved in selling directly to restaurants and that kind of thing. But we just added – I say we; the council has just added their first chef and restaurateur to an AP panel. Dave Snyder who was here for a couple of days, he's out of St. Simons – very active in the restaurant association. So, hopefully, that voice is going to

have more of a say. The data, that's another area for major improvement, particularly, the recreational data. However, with all the technological assets at our disposal – by that, I mean our society's disposal with apps and smartphones and this and that – there's no way that can't be improved. There's a lot of emphasis on that, I think. Resources, the southeast, I think, still gets short shrift with regard to the resources needed to do the stock assessments. You look at a fishery management plan like snapper-grouper that has – well, I don't know, we keep taking species out. So, I'm not sure how many are still in there, but about sixty or so. I do think that so many of those stocks are underassessed. We really don't have a clue of what's going on with them. I think the region, the Southeast region, doesn't have the resources it needs. You've got the science center. Everybody's juggling resources, trying to take care of the Gulf, the Caribbean, and the South Atlantic, and that's an awful lot. I'm not sure we have congressional champions. I think that's another lack in the Southeast now, that once upon a time, we had some very strong, heavy hitters – Fritz Hollings out of South Carolina, Trent Lott, people scattered around. But I don't know that this region – from what I can see, I don't think it's got the champions we once had. I just don't see it. Let's see. The process, again, is just Byzantine. It is just not nimble at all. The science is always lagging behind the decision making. You're having to make these decisions based on science that's three or four years old. Now, hopefully, some of the data improvements or even stock assessment improvements can help that. But there's that lag, and that's a real problem, I think. It affects credibility, particularly among the fishermen, the end recipient of the decision making. I'm sure there's other stuff. That's just for starters. [laughter]

SSD: That kind of leads us to the next question. If you could change anything about the current way that we manage our fisheries, what would that look like?

SS: Flexibility. Oh, yes. I think everybody would. A lot of us who have also served on the Interstate Marine Fishery Commission, we look at that process, and it's so streamlined compared to Magnuson.

SSD: How would we introduce flexibility?

SS: That is a tough thing. One direction that you saw this morning where if you've got, say, South Florida, if there's a way to delegate some of this management to the states – and I've always been a big proponent of the regional management and federal management – in the early days, I was a big proponent of the system. I've turned around just because it's so intractable and it's so difficult to work within this current system. Having been a state director in the past, I see our state systems are more nimble, and we can get things through. Sometimes, that's difficult depending on the state, because a lot of times, the state legislatures retain some of that authority that you would need to accomplish some of the things that a council would otherwise accomplish. It's hard to get things out of state legislature too. But if you have a regulatory board and you have that option to delegate down, that's a much easier way to do it. I've seen this in our state, in Georgia. We have experienced this with EPA regulations. It's a very similar Byzantine-type process. But EPA is set up to delegate down to the state to administer some of those laws – Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, et cetera, et cetera, and hazardous waste. So, I think to the degree some of it could be delegated to this – and I'd say interstate. It's going to have to be some interstate management, unless it is like South Florida. Those resources are really almost region

specific. But if you have migratory stocks, there's still a way to do it between the stocks. I think you're seeing more and more councils want to go to subregion management or even state management in terms of state quotas within the federal system, just because they know from experience with the Atlantic States Commission, the states can do it, and they can do it more quickly, more nimbly, and just more responsibly, and it works. So, that's one way to do it. I don't want to see them throw the baby out with the bathwater with the Hastings draft. I've looked at it.

SSD: I am not familiar with...

SS: Doc Hastings is the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee that was referenced this morning. They talked about Dave Whaley. Dave is a staffer. He's been with House Natural Resources forever. So, he's been through a lot of the reauthorizations. He worked on the draft that's being floated. That's being floated out and about and around.

SSD: Oh, as part of the reauthorization process?

SS: Yes. It's almost like a discussion draft. It doesn't have a number in terms of being a bill, but it is the Natural Resources Committee's discussion draft. There's some good things in that bill, in that draft, and then there's some things that I'd be very cautious about going maybe that far to a correction. I think, in some cases, those are too far a correction. One of the things that I have been very interested in – and it sort of speaks to this whole consumer issue – is making sure all the tools stay in the toolbox. That's where you get into Congress trying to micromanage and say, "Well, the councils can't use this strategy or that strategy." I hope that that doesn't go through. I think you need to maintain all the tools, even if you don't ever use them. I believe ITQs can work. There's a big outcry in the southeast against them, because, again, people are going to get cut out of fisheries. Well, there's not room for everybody – so, things like that.

SSD: Are there any memorable moments or periods that you remember most during your tenure as a fisheries manager?

SS: Oh, my God. Let's see. One that I really, really remember – and I ended up writing an essay about it for the American Fisheries Society magazine and it was snapper-grouper. I chaired snapper-grouper for many, many years in the late [19]80s and [19]90s. When we prohibited fish traps in the South Atlantic, that was a huge undertaking. I remember the vote being seven to six. There again, we knew we were putting people out of business, but it was the right thing to do for the resource. As it turned out, the fishermen who were excluded from that fishery, of course, they sued the council and the other. The council went on to prevail. But they ended up starting the golden crab fishery. Yes, they ended up being the trappers who pioneered that fishery. So, it was like, "There's always a silver lining." Interestingly, here are these people we had totally put out of business, and they came back to the council and asked us to develop a management plan for that trap fishery. I thought, "Wow, that was a stroke of courage on their part to come back to the group that had kicked them out of the fishery, basically." But we developed a very close working relationship with them. So, I don't know, it's all about relationships and that. That was memorable. Some of the other things that were memorable, just the friendships. I mean, I have tremendous friendships that I've made through the council through the years, both staff and

council members currently sitting or having sat on the council in the past. Did you get a chance to meet Fulton Love the other day?

SSD: No.

SS: He was there, and he may be back today. Fulton was on the council for nine years. He's from Richmond Hill, which is just right down the road. I kept up with him just on some other environmental issues, but it was just so good to see him. He's just a great, great guy. Let's see. So, there have been good times, bad times, that kind of thing. I remember taking six years to develop some of these other plans. Dauphin, that just took forever, ridiculously long. Sargassum, I remember that. Calico scallops, we tried to manage in fits and starts. We started to plan about four times and shelved it. I remember that. Another memory I will never forget is, we were meeting in St. Augustine, and it had to do with the rock shrimpers. That fishery is largely down around Cape Canaveral. Every now and then, there's some fishing for rock shrimp that goes on maybe up as far as off of Georgia. It's deep water. Yes, it's a deep-water shrimp. We were in St. Augustine having a hearing, and we were getting ready to close some area for habitat. It was when the council sort of first started getting into habitat protection. Now, we've been working on this probably for a year or more, and the rock shrimpers come out of the woodwork and they bring all their maps of where they've been fishing. All along, they've been saying, "Oh, we don't damage the coral or anything. You don't need to worry about us and there's no need for any exclusion areas or anything." They put their maps up, and they have been going right through the middle of what we call the Oculina Banks. That area had turned into rubble. Well, of course it had, because they had just been going – it was like, "I cannot believe you all have just brought these maps." They sort of sealed their fate in a way. We worked with them and we carved out little areas where they could fish or not fish. Some of that, I think you may have heard the first day of the meeting. There's discussion now about where they can deep-water shrimp and still protect corals, but it started way back in St. Augustine. It was like, "Oh, my God." It was one of the eureka moments. "I can't believe you're doing this." So, there were some meetings where it was like, "Well, we don't want to do this." Luckily, I had dealt with shrimpers so much in Georgia. You just kind of know the nature of the beast. Those are some of the guys you just have to basically stand up to and say, "Look, you're going to get a closure. You can either be a part of figuring out how to minimize the impact to you, or you can just walk away from the table, and we're going to put it where we think it should go." So, they worked with us and – oh, God. [laughter] Yes. So, that was kind of memorable. I remember one of our public hearings in – I think we were in Key West. Oh, God, it just went on and on and on. I think it started at 9:00 a.m. and went until about 9:30 p.m. or 10:30 p.m. I had gone to bed. I'm in bed in Key West, in the Casa Marina Hotel, and I get a call at midnight from some fisherman looking for his girlfriend. I don't know why he thought she would be with me. [laughter] I mean, things like that. He couldn't find her. I said, "Well, I have no idea where she is." I don't even remember this woman. People have been streaming through, making comments at the public meeting – things like that. [laughter]

SSD: Exciting times.

SS: Yes, very exciting. We had another meeting down in the Keys – those were always the good ones. It was pouring rain, pouring. A tropical depression was down there. It was June or



something. So, there was nothing else for the fishermen to do. There was also a NOAA hearing going on about the Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary right as they were designating that. So, some people were at that hearing on A1A at the Holiday Inn, and another bunch were at our hearing. Mike McLemore was the NOAA general counsel at the time. We're sitting at the table, and it must have been a snapper group, or I think I was chairing it or something. This one guy just was coming after Mike. In the Keys, you never knew what they were under the influence of. Oftentimes, it was alcohol. Oftentimes, it was other contraband. Sometimes, it was a combination of the two. Then they were spouting Spanish, all these expletives, which I didn't understand a word of. We have an interpreter, and the interpreter would tell us they said something. You could look at their face and know they didn't say that. [laughter] The interpreter was trying to tone things down. Oh, lord. So, I remember those were some of the good old days. Some of our five-council meetings on swordfish back in the late [19]80s, [19]90s, those were women that would come in with babies and cry in their public testimony and things like that. One of the funniest ones, we had an appeal here – a board of the state directors, and then a NOAA attorney, to hear appeals from guys that did not get into the snapper-grouper fishery when we had the eligibility criteria to get your permits and so on and so forth. There were these guys in North Carolina, and we called them Sleepy and Dopey. One of them had on red insulated underwear, long johns. The other one was under the influence. One was tall and one was short. I could hardly keep a straight face. They were saying they had been disqualified, and they were a partnership in terms of their fishing. One of them said, "Well, I just –" this was one under the influence, I think, of alcohol. This was 10:00 a.m. He was saying something to the effect of, "Well, I just don't have those landings, and I'm not going to be able to get them." He's almost in tears, and his partner reached over and patted him on the leg. He said, "It's going to be okay." [laughter] Oh, God. David (Kufka?) and I, to this day, laugh about Sleepy and Dopey – just some of the characters we made. There was Skip, and there was another guy who told us that we shouldn't regulate goliath grouper that we were talking about earlier today, which used to be called jewfish, and then the name was changed. Nelson White was his name. He was from Florida and was a big diver. He got up in testimony and told us how we needed to harvest more of them because they were eating small children in the Bahamas. [laughter] You're just sitting there looking at the person telling you that, trying to keep a straight face. You're just thinking, "Where do these people come up with this stuff?" We decided Nelson had been underwater too long. [laughter] Yes, some pretty good ones. Those are just a few of my memories. I have to say it was a lot more fun in the old days than it has been of late.

SSD: What have you enjoyed the most about being involved in fisheries management?

SS: I think the friendships, and also feeling like you make a difference in the stocks or the opportunities, providing opportunities for people to fish. But probably when you turn around the stock, that's very rewarding. Just the friendships you make, I think that's the most rewarding thing.

SSD: What about the least?

SS: Oh, God. Some of the meetings that go until 10:00 p.m., which we've had some of those. Then you have to go back and redo what you did the night before, she tried the next morning because you can't remember what you did. The Gulf, we had a joint mackerel meeting in New

Orleans one time. This was, I think, the late [19]80s or so. They walked out of the meeting so we wouldn't have a quorum. I thought, "I can't believe the waste of money and resources and all that." Stuff like that, I don't enjoy. Probably in other ways, when you have had to impact fishermen – I mean, I don't even enjoy putting those people out of business or denying their appeal to get a permit. I don't enjoy that. That's probably the least enjoyable, but it's a necessity. Probably that. Then of late, I just think the convoluted nature of things, the length of time it takes to get things done, I just think it's gotten ridiculous.

SSD: Do you think it used to be easier then in the past?

SS: Oh, yes. I'm sure it was. The science was easier. It's a lot easier to do traditional measures. You try those tools in that toolbox, and then when those don't work, then it gets very complicated and difficult, I think.

SSD: Is there anything that you are particularly proud about regarding your accomplishments in fisheries management?

SS: I don't know, just being part of it and being one of the first women in it. Like I said, I would like to think I've helped make it easier for women to be accepted, I guess.

SSD: We appreciate it.

SS: Well, sure. [laughter] It's a matter of being at a certain place and time. In the early [19]70s, that's really when women were just starting to come into careers that had been traditionally men – so, just by virtue of having been born when I was, I think.

SSD: Do you have any advice for a young person who might want to get involved in fisheries management?

SS: I wish I had studied the social sciences more and economics. I mean, the biology, that's where my real interest was. So, that's the path you go, but you end up – I think interdisciplinary study is more useful to a fishery management career, maybe, than it might have been in the past. As I said, it used to be more straightforward – size limits and all of that. Now, there's so much social dimension and economics and even law. As I got on with my career, I always laughed and said, "I should have gone to law school." I stayed in court so much in my position with the state. We had coastal zone management under my division too. So, I was always in court over permits and things like that. So, that would be my advice, is really pursue an interdisciplinary curriculum, I think. I think that would serve someone well. Eat your Wheaties. It's not for the faint of heart. [laughter] Well, at times, I do wonder, the attention span that's required. In fact, who was it yesterday? Oh, it was the congressman's aide, or the senator's aide who was here [unintelligible], "I can't believe you all get into that level of detail." I said, "Yes." That takes a lot of attention. My son, he's twenty-four. Oh, God, his attention span, he could never even sit through a meeting like that. That process is going to have to adapt to the way people's brains function now, which is totally different, as you know. So, I think there'll have to be some evolution there too. I think with webinars and GoTo Meeting type functions and Skype and that kind of thing, I think meetings probably can be more efficiently conducted. But at some point in

time, people just kind of step forward and lead, and they have to do what they think is best for the resource. You're going to piss some people off, and you just need to accept that. That's my advice. [laughter] Be prepared to piss them off and just live with it. Don't second-guess yourself and don't go back and try to undo everything. One little anecdote, we had an issue – again, it was permit holders that had to do with – early on, when we were reducing the number of permits and set up eligibility. We had had a situation where – I think something had happened in the Florida Keys, maybe a hurricane, and quite a bit of paperwork had been destroyed. So, we made an exception, and I think we allowed the Florida trip tickets to be used. So, that was okay. But then another group of fishermen came to us, and they wanted an exception. There were three women on the council at the time, and then a bunch of men. The men all wanted to make concessions for them. The three women, we said, "No. That's the rule we made. That's the rule we need to stick by." You can almost see all of us at home enforcing. Yes, we're the enforcers. The guys never have the guts or the balls to do it. They will always back away from conflict. It's like, "No." I forget what they started calling us. It might have been the three witches or something. It was like, "We made the rules. That's why they were made. Why are we going back and totally doing another amendment to undo what we did just for this little niche of people?" That's a slippery slope and it never ends. So, anyway, I found we've stuck more (Hardy vest?) to our guns than the guys did.

SSD: I think we have covered everything that I have. Is there anything else you would like to mention or think we should talk about?

SS: I can't think of anything, no. Nothing I can think of. No, I think that's it.

SSD: Thank you so much.

SS: You're welcome.

[end of transcript]