

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY)
COMMITTEE MEETING)

Pages: 320 through 593
Place: Silver Spring, Maryland
Date: October 14, 2015

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-4888
contracts@hrccourtreporters.com

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY)
COMMITTEE MEETING)

Elm I and II Meeting Room
Sheraton Silver Spring Hotel
8777 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland

Wednesday,
October 14, 2015

The parties met, pursuant to the notice, at
9:07 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS:

MAFAC MEMBERS:

- MR. KEITH RIZZARDI, Chairman
- MS. JULIE MORRIS, Vice Chair
- MR. EDWARD P. AMES
- MS. TERRI LEI BEIDEMAN
- MS. JULIE BONNEY
- MR. DICK M. BRAME
- MS. HEATHER BRANDON
- MR. COLUMBUS H. BROWN, SR.
- MR. PAUL CLAMPITT
- MR. PHILLIP DYSKOW
- MR. KEN FRANKE
- MS. LIZ HAMILTON
- MS. MICAH MCCARTY
- MR. MIKE OKONIEWSKI
- MR. ROBERT RHEAULT
- MR. VA'AMUA HENRY SESEPASARA
- MR. PETER SHELLEY

PARTICIPANTS: (Cont'd)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS TO MAFAC

MR. BOB BEAL
MR. DAVID DONALDSON
MR. RANDY FISHER
MS. EILEEN SOBECK

NOAA STAFF & CONTRACTORS:

MS. HOLLY BAMFORD
MS. SUSAN BUNSICK
MS. LISA COLBURN
MR. PAUL DOREMUS
MR. RUSSELL DUNN
DR. NICOLA GARBER
MR. ROGER GRIFFIS
MR. CLIFFORD HUTT
MS. HEIDI LOVETT
MS. SABRINA LOWELL
MS. JENNIFER LUKENS
DR. RICHARD MERRICK
MS. PAT MONTANIO
MS. WENDY MORRISON
MR. SAM RAUCH
MR. MICHAEL RUBINO
MS. DONNA WIETING

OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

MS. PAT CAMPFIELD
MR. RICHARD B. ROBINS

<u>C O N T E N T S</u>	322
	<u>PAGE</u>
Report from the Assistant Administrator NOAA and NOAA Fisheries Priorities - 2016 By Eileen Sobeck, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries	324
NOAA Fisheries Budget Outlook By Paul Doremus, Ph.D., Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations	349
Break	380
Reports from the State Directors Meeting and Fisheries Commissions - Outlook for year ahead By Robert Beal, Executive Director, Atlantic States David Donaldson, Executive Director, Gulf States Randy Fisher, Executive Director, Pacific States	388
Recreational Fishing Update on the development of regional implementation plans and other Recreational Fisheries Initiative Activities (no action) By Russ Dunn, Senior Advisor for Recreational Fisheries	401
Presentation on the 2013 Recreational Bait and Tackle Economic Survey By Cliff Hutt, Ph.D., Research Associate, Economics and Social Analysis Division, Office of Science and Technology	418
Presentation on the 2014 durable good survey, the 2016/2017 trip expenditure survey, and a trip expenditure survey in Southern California on charter anglers By Sabrina Lowell, Ph.D., Economist, Economics & Social Analysis Division, Office of Science and Technology	426
Recreational Fisheries Working Group (RFWG) Discussion Led by Ken Franke, Chair, Recreational Fisheries Subcommittee	440
Lunch	447

C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
Aquaculture	448
Draft Marine Aquaculture Strategic Plan, FY 2016-2020	
By Michael Rubino, Director, Office of Aquaculture	
John Corbin, Chair, Aquaculture Subcommittee	
Bob Rheault, Aquaculture Subcommittee	
Public Comment Period	515
Break	516
Subcommittee Meetings	516
Coastal Resiliency -- Elm I & II Meeting Room	
Protected Resources -- Linden Boardroom	
Recreational Fisheries -- Chestnut Boardroom	
Adjourn	592

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(9:07 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Today, we've got another chock full agenda that will end with our committee meetings. Along the way, we've got the updates from NOAA staff and we've got a good discussion on aquaculture and recreational fisheries scheduled.

Today we're starting off our meeting with words from Eileen and the update on future of MAFAC.

MS. SOBECK: Great. Thanks, Keith. So, last night in the bar, we raised a toast to our departing chairman and departing board members. I'd like to start this morning by welcoming our incoming chair and vice chair.

So, Julie Morris, thank you very much. Congratulations. Thank you so much for agreeing to serve as MAFAC chair. I think everybody who's been involved in MAFAC knows that from the minute she got on the committee, that Julie has been engaged and committed. I think that we look forward to her calm, capable leadership over the upcoming few meetings. She, obviously, has a lot of experience here, and elsewhere, with the committees that she's chaired and reported on.

So, Julie, I invite you to continue the good

1 work and to be in touch with NOAA leadership as you
2 need to. I know you have a lot of discussions with
3 Keith and I know that you will work with the
4 committee, and we look forward to your leadership.

5 Terri Beideman, thank you very much for
6 agreeing to step up as vice chair. As I said last
7 night, sometimes I wonder why people are crazy enough
8 to be on the committee in the first place and then to
9 step up to a leadership committee, or leadership
10 position.

11 I think, again, as we discussed, nobody on
12 this committee, or this council, is really, can be an
13 expert on everything, but you guys bring your
14 perspective and your knowledge overall of our, of the
15 general area that we're all engaged, in and I don't
16 think it matters whether you know the details of the
17 life cycle of the white abalone.

18 You still bring experience and the knowledge
19 of the fact that there are competing interests and
20 consideration and trade offs to everything that we do.

21 I look forward to you bringing that perspective to
22 the business of MAFAC. So congratulations, and a
23 round of applause to our new team.

24 So I just wanted to touch on a couple of
25 themes of where I see NOAA Fisheries going in the next

1 year or so. Actually, one of the things that I really
2 liked when I reviewed my notes was that many of these
3 things have, you know, came up yesterday during the
4 discussion. In my mind, that's evidence that MAFAC is
5 really working.

6 That you guys aren't talking about
7 peripheral issues here. You aren't, kind of, working
8 on issues that nobody really cares about or squabbling
9 in the corner, you're really talking about the issues
10 that are at the heartland of our decisionmaking
11 process, and that's as it should be.

12 You guys are the opinion leaders of our
13 partners and stakeholder groups, and so making sure
14 that you are helping us kind of calibrate the
15 discussions that we're having in, on policy issues is
16 really, really important. It's both the process of
17 discussion with you all, and then, the final product,
18 that you do have one in terms of a report that's,
19 again, useful.

20 And, you know, you -- during all of our
21 substantive discussions, you see that we have a
22 relevant leadership and senior staff present at those
23 discussions. If it weren't important, then we would
24 get junior staffers here to take some notes that
25 people may or may not read, but that's not who we have

1 coming to these meetings.

2 So, I hope that you -- I hope that in
3 response to the commitment that you've made to us,
4 that you see that we are doing the same. That brings
5 me to one of my things for the next year. I've asked
6 what I can do for NOAA and NOAA Fisheries that might
7 be slightly different than other AAs. It is looking
8 at widening our circle of partnerships.

9 I would hasten to add that it's very -- in
10 the heartland of fisheries management and the Magnuson
11 Act, the fishery management councils and commissions
12 are kind of our fundamental bedrock partners. That's
13 never going to change under the Magnuson Act regime,
14 but, in this new and changing world, we need to look
15 beyond traditional partnerships and, you know, welcome
16 other partners, as well.

17 I think that's not a mark of desperation, I
18 think it's a mark of a new chapter, where we're not
19 trying to reach our destinations through litigation
20 and regulation exclusively. We're really looking at
21 our collective goals and our, in a collaborative way
22 to get where we want to go. I think that we're
23 finding commonality in places where it probably always
24 resided, but we haven't taken advantage of it.

25 So, just as an example, we are working

1 really hard to take our NOAA and NOAA Fisheries
2 relationship with NFWF, the National Fish and Wildlife
3 Foundation, to a new and broader place. This is a
4 congressionally-funded nonprofit, it's not exactly the
5 same as other nonprofits, and therefore we can have
6 some relationships with NFWF that we don't have with
7 World Wildlife Fund, who's also a very valuable
8 partner.

9 I think this is a really good time to work
10 with NFWF. Having worked with Department of the
11 Interior, they work every day, as our proponents will
12 tell you, with NFWF. Really, NFWF and Fish and
13 Wildlife Service have a very fundamental understanding
14 of each other's priorities and how those can work
15 together. I think that hasn't been the case with NOAA
16 Fisheries and NFWF.

17 We've found little places, or not little
18 places, run off ways, some of them very significant,
19 to work with each other, but I don't think we've taken
20 full advantage of the relationship. I think that
21 we're now well-positioned to do that. My boss, Kathy
22 Sullivan, the administrator of NOAA, sits on the NFWF
23 board, on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce. She's
24 very engaged. She's very interested in working with
25 the board on some large scale issues.

1 My predecessor, Eric Schwaab, I don't know
2 if you guys know this, has gone to NFWF in a very
3 similar leadership position. He's basically in charge
4 of their national conservation agenda. He's somebody
5 who understands NOAA Fisheries, oddly enough, way
6 better than anybody else at NFWF has before. Tony
7 Chatwin, who sat on this committee with you all, is
8 also in a senior leadership position.

9 So, I think we're in a really good space to
10 exchange views with NFWF and to see if there are areas
11 where they can, "leverage", their own money and go to
12 corporate sponsors, state sponsors, other sponsors and
13 use, find out ways that we can work to get more bang
14 for every buck.

15 I think that in some of the resiliency areas
16 that we've been talking about in the past, and, you
17 know, things like estuary restoration in Puget Sound,
18 for instance, we have discovered that we really have
19 kind of a common interest with NFWF. Same with
20 Penobscot River. They've spent a lot of money up
21 there, and we've spent a lot of money up there.

22 We're going to just sit down and have some
23 really serious conversations about how to build on
24 those existing partnerships, and where else we should
25 work together.

1 We'll be entering into kind of an umbrella
2 MOU with them very soon here. DMOU is really nothing
3 more than a reflection of the existing relationship
4 and our commitment to reduce whatever procedural
5 barriers have kind of been blocking easy, have been
6 sort of deterrent to conversations on more substantive
7 issues.

8 I don't want to dwell on that too much.
9 It's not an exclusive relationship, it's just an
10 example of ways that I want to really take advantage
11 of existing partners and enhance our relationships.
12 Any ideas you guys have about other places where we
13 could, or I could, or Dr. Sullivan, could build some
14 bridges and work more constructively with other groups
15 would be appreciated.

16 Couple weeks ago, month ago, I went to
17 Tucson to the AFWA meeting, the Association of --

18 MR. FRANKE: Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

19 MS. SOBECK: -- thank you, Chris -- Fish and
20 Wildlife Agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service
21 leadership always go. The director of the Fish and
22 Wildlife Service, all of his senior leadership
23 directorates, all of their regional directors go. We
24 send a couple of staff people.

25 Marine issues don't figure very highly on

1 that agenda. A lot of our -- a lot of the senior
2 folks who work on our marine issues, either are not
3 the directors of their state agencies, or answer to
4 another department. On the other hand, I think that
5 we have a lot of common issues we haven't taken full
6 advantage of.

7 So I said I participated in a panel on
8 drought in the west and water issues in the west. The
9 room was packed. People were very interested in the
10 fish, and how water management issues far inland to
11 Idaho are affected. I think we have some additional
12 relationships that we can build on in that group.

13 I was very -- I felt very welcomed and found
14 a lot of points of interest. They have a very active
15 threatened and endangered species task force, where
16 we're talking about how to work constructively with
17 the states and make sure that we have a good
18 constructive dialogue both as, with respect to
19 specific species, but on kind of more abstract, you
20 know, not embroiled in the stresses and disagreements,
21 at the moment, about how to move forward on a positive
22 recovery agenda.

23 So, those are just two examples of larger
24 partnership and relationship issues that I want to
25 work at, on in the next year. I'm not going to spend

1 too much time on the other topics, because I think
2 they're exactly the things that have been on our menu
3 and our agenda here, in this meeting.

4 We came out with our draft ecosystems-based
5 fishery management policy, and are looking forward to
6 getting, to moving forward on a work plan on that.
7 We've been working -- we've made a lot of progress and
8 so have the councils. It's not as if we are, this is
9 day one on DBFM. We're kind of, I think, focusing in
10 on it and trying to get a handle on exactly what we
11 mean and how, what we're going to do in the next few
12 years.

13 We've talked about some of my agenda items
14 for our protected resources, a focus on recovery, and
15 some of our intermediate milestones. I don't want to
16 overstate our successes. We've had a lot of setbacks,
17 and a lot of issues that we're not quite sure where to
18 go.

19 On the other hand, I think that we, as a
20 community, have too often defined ourselves, or let
21 ourselves be defined by our failures, instead of
22 recognizing that we have a lot of good intermediate
23 success stories, both in fisheries and protected
24 resources. I think that building more of those
25 intermediate milestones that acknowledge success is

1 really important. That's a lot of what you heard
2 Donna talk about yesterday.

3 Climate science strategy. As Julie noted,
4 that's a thread in our agency rope that is, if we
5 don't take care of it, we're going to hang ourselves
6 on our own frayed cord here. So it's got to be -- it
7 really permeates everything that we do.

8 I think the only thing we can say about, or
9 one thing you can say about climate issues is none of
10 us have really figured out how to do it and have it
11 right, so at least we're not fighting that much about
12 how to do it. You know, we have competing concerns.

13 I think we're still kind of on the front end
14 of how to deal with that, whether you're, you know, a
15 state, or council, or a federal agency, and so we're
16 kind of all in this issue together of how best to
17 address it. Then, I think that there are a few issues
18 that you all have invested a lot of time and effort,
19 as have we.

20 I don't want to say that we are at the end
21 of our efforts, but I think that we are wrapping up
22 the identification of the problem, come up with a
23 plan. We're in the heartland of implementation.
24 While we want to keep track of it, I don't think that,
25 as a policy matter, we won't be spending as much time

1 now.

2 What I'm referring to is recreational
3 fishing policy. We've come a long way. We've had our
4 two rec fishing summits, we had a lot of work from
5 committees here. We came out with a rec fishing
6 policy, we've come up with our national implementation
7 plan, and at the beginning of next year we'll have our
8 regional implementation plans.

9 We will -- you know, again, the idea is not
10 that you fix things by having a plan or a piece of
11 paper, but the idea is to try to shift our fisheries
12 culture, to make sure that at every important step of
13 the way, not that rec fishing trumps everything, but
14 that we take it into consideration at every step of
15 the way and that we have open lines of communication
16 and dialogue, and go, yeah, and what is, what do the
17 rec fishing community think about this?

18 The implementation plans are designed to
19 make sure that that has been, you know, that that
20 is -- that we have a way to track some progress. Russ
21 and his little band of rec fishing liaisons that are
22 in every region will be monitoring that, and Russ
23 reports directly to me.

24 So, again, this effort will not be, it's not
25 done, but again, I think that our planning, our kind

1 of identification of a priority and getting a plan
2 together, it's now kind of, I think, on an even keel,
3 and we will just, we will note its progress and report
4 back to this group.

5 I think that it's actually a proud moment to
6 say that we are close to a point where we have
7 followed through on our promises. You know, the proof
8 is in the pudding and we'll want to know whether it
9 works, but I do want to acknowledge the hard work of
10 the rec fishing members of this group and the fact
11 that the recommendations didn't just come from those
12 members, but from the whole group, and that we, again,
13 took it seriously. We'll have to have discussions as
14 well.

15 So, I think with that I will leave you, and
16 I look forward to being here this morning, and
17 tomorrow morning as well. Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thanks, Eileen.
19 Questions, comments from the members?

20 MS. MORRIS: I have a question. You dive
21 into the IUU work that your agency's doing and the, I
22 wonder if you could just refresh us on the timeline
23 for the task force work and whether you think MAFAC
24 has an opportunity to weigh in on that, and how we
25 would do that.

1 MS. SOBECK: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: If I could piggyback on
3 that question --

4 MS. SOBECK: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: -- also. I understand
6 that the sustainability analysis that we did in the
7 recommendation has played into the IUU thing, so if
8 you could address all of that, as well.

9 MS. SOBECK: Sure. So, I think -- let's
10 see. So, we worked with you all and you came up with
11 your traceability report.

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Sustainability
13 certification.

14 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. Right. When did that
15 report come out? I think it was right when I -- it
16 was right when I started, I think, so about a year and
17 a half ago, right?

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: At least.

19 MS. SOBECK: Then it was out for public
20 comment. I think, you know, that really gave us a
21 head start. It meant that through the process of
22 working with you all, and hearing from you all, and
23 seeing the report, and seeing the comments on the
24 report, we had a head start -- we, NOAA Fisheries --
25 had a head start in thinking through the questions of

1 traceability certification, the relationship or not to
2 sustainability.

3 I think it was really, really important that
4 we had the benefit of your input on those issues
5 because, at the, our ocean conference -- not the one
6 at Chile last week, but the one a year and a half ago
7 here, in the U.S. -- the President tasked a committee,
8 a task force, chaired by the State Department and NOAA
9 to come up with a set of recommendations involving IUU
10 fishing and seafood fraud and, you know, and tasked
11 the task force with doing that by last December.

12 So, the task force then came up with 15
13 recommendations. 14 and 15 related directly to
14 traceability. Then, about 60 days after that, we came
15 up, the task force came up with an implementation plan
16 as directed by, also by the White House.

17 That plan, that implementation plan has
18 incredibly short deadlines in it relating to the
19 implementation of the traceability program. Basically
20 we have to have a traceability program in place by
21 December of next year. By the end of the
22 Administration. This Administration made it quite
23 clear that it wanted ownership of implementation of a
24 traceability plan. So, we are in the midst of meeting
25 those.

1 You know, the task force had 14
2 recommendations and, on a whole host of things,
3 everything from capacity building, and enforcement,
4 and implementation of important treaties relating to
5 IUU. But if we're just talking about 14 and 15, the
6 traceability recommendations, very short timelines.

7 A goal was to have a traceability program
8 that had to do, that went from catching fish to entry
9 into U.S. commerce, point of import or landing, if
10 it's domestic product, and starting out with not all
11 species, but at risk species first, and then
12 evaluating how to expand the program.

13 We came up a few, couple of months ago with
14 the first, with our proposed list of at risk species
15 and have invited public comment on that. Then the
16 goal is, by the end of October, to come out with the
17 final list of at risk species.

18 While it's a somewhat shortish list, it's a
19 list that includes things like shrimp, so groups of
20 species that cover a large percentage of imports. So,
21 I think that it's, even if it is a relatively short
22 species list, it's going to apply to a relatively
23 large percentage of imports.

24 We will also, at about the same time, come
25 up with the draft traceability scheme. That

1 will -- of course that will come out in a post form
2 and will be out for public comment. I guess what I
3 would say is that proposed rule has been, was -- it
4 was well-informed by the process and by the report
5 that you all came out with.

6 We are operating on an incredibly short
7 deadline. This is going to be a fairly complicated
8 proposed rule with a fairly -- I can't remember what
9 our comment period is. Is there anybody here who
10 remembers? It's going to be as long as possible. It
11 will not be extended. I repeat -- it will not be
12 extended.

13 We are on such a short leash with the
14 Administration to get, to -- every step is kind of
15 contingent on the next step. So, the idea is for that
16 regulation to go final and to be, have a short period
17 of implementation, and then, for us to report back on
18 how and in what way to expand that traceability
19 program beyond the species at risk, and to do all of
20 that before next December. Before December 2016.
21 It's a very long-winded answer. I apologize.

22 The role of MAFAC and its recommendations,
23 we made sure at every step of the way, in terms of the
24 process of going through the development of the
25 recommendations of the task force and the

1 implementation plan, we made sure that all the task
2 force members were aware of, and had access to, your
3 reports and our input that we received on the public
4 comment to that report and we used it to inform our
5 position on, again, the recommendations, the
6 implementation of the plan, and now, the proposed
7 regulation.

8 The regulation will be out in proposed form
9 in a few weeks and I really urge everybody who had
10 input to look, take a look at that and to comment back
11 on it. I hope I've answered the question of how that
12 does or doesn't -- how your feedback -- how your input
13 fed into the process.

14 The charge from the President didn't, kind
15 of, exactly parallel the charge to MAFAC, so I don't
16 think that we can say we took, you know, your
17 recommendation paragraphs, and cut and pasted them,
18 but I hope that you can see your work, and your
19 insight, and your analysis as having informed our
20 position and our policy. So, I hope that's helpful,
21 or will be helpful, when you review the proposed regs
22 and --

23 MS. BRANDON: Can I follow up?

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely.

25 MS. BRANDON: During 2016, or the rest of

1 2015 and 2016, do you see any role for MAFAC to weigh
2 in as a body, rather than as a -- because you
3 mentioned individual members should comment on the
4 draft rule, but do you see a role for MAFAC?

5 MS. SOBECK: I don't know. Does MAFAC
6 generally comment on proposed rules as a body?

7 MS. LUKENS: I don't know the --

8 MS. BRANDON: Or some other way to weigh in.

9 MS. LUKENS: -- answer that question, but I
10 think, in terms of organization, if it is on -- I'm
11 trying to get real time with how long the comment
12 period will be, but, as far as getting the
13 organization together, and the whole body
14 coordinating, there may not be enough time to do that.
15 So the ability to comment individually as, you know,
16 yourself is always wove into that.

17 So, Heidi, I don't know if you have any
18 history on how that's been done before.

19 MS. LOVETT: On occasion, we've done --
20 instead of meetings in person, there have been
21 teleconference meetings to finalize recommendations on
22 particular proposed rules, on occasion.

23 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. I guess I leave it to
24 you guys. It sounds like maybe you did it, you said
25 you did it on national standard one on, based on

1 recommendations as a body. You know, I leave that to
2 you guys. It's going to be on a short, a fairly short
3 turnaround. I'm not going to apologize for that, I'm
4 just going to reiterate that no matter who asks us to
5 extend on the period, we're not going to be able to do
6 that.

7 I know that's going to be problematic for
8 lots of folks, for councils that would like to take
9 some time to look at this and maybe comment formally,
10 but there's no way for us to meet -- there's
11 absolutely no way for us to meet any of our other
12 deadlines if we extend the comment period.

13 It's unfortunate, because, you know, it's a
14 big, it's a change and it's a big change, and it would
15 be nice to have a lot of time for, some time for
16 comments, but then we would be at a point where
17 getting regulatory changes through the system is
18 awkward, if not impossible, and then there being an
19 administration transition, and so that's all going
20 into the mechanics.

21 So, I don't know whether MAFAC could do that
22 and, I really don't know how long the comment period
23 is. I didn't bring my --

24 MS. LUKENS: I will get it for you --

25 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I pulled it up.

1 MS. SOBECK: You pulled it up. Okay.

2 Let's -- yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I pulled up the IUU
4 task force report, and there's a piece in it that
5 refers to the trusted trader program. That's kind of,
6 kind of related to the certification and some of those
7 initiatives. That's the import/export component of
8 it.

9 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. That's a different
10 piece.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. That one is by
12 2016. September of 2016.

13 MS. SOBECK: That's a different --

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That one's within the
15 scope of the whole traceability piece.

16 MS. SOBECK: Let me look it up. Let me look
17 it up, and I'll get you the, I'll get you what our
18 target date is. The schedule -- the report is online.
19 So, anyway.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And here's another piece
21 that we just missed the comment on. That was --
22 they're going to publish that. In the next three
23 weeks, they'll publish the next --

24 MS. SOBECK: Right. Right. Right. We're
25 going to have the final species at risk list in the

1 next three weeks, and then we'll have the proposed
2 traceability regs. So, and what I'm -- what I'm
3 searching for is when we hope to go final on the
4 traceability reg, there's going to be a public comment
5 period and then the period, you know, the period of
6 wrapping up the public comments into a final and
7 getting all that in.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: It's August 2016.

9 MS. SOBECK: That sounds about right. But
10 it will still be a fairly -- that's still a fairly
11 tight -- we're going to have to --

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That's final rule by
13 August 2016.

14 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. Right. You know, it's
15 going to be tricky. We're talking about requirements
16 that are going to apply to imports, and so, we're
17 soliciting, we're having to get comments and reactions
18 from foreign countries, we have to get, you know, all
19 of our funds in the State Department and the Office of
20 the Trade Representative in line to make sure that we
21 aren't violating our international obligations.

22 So, and we're looking forward to getting a
23 ton of public comments on our program. So, if you
24 all -- once we get the deadlines squared, if you guys
25 can, and want to, comment, that would be great.

1 Otherwise, individual comments are also welcome.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Other questions or
3 comments from the members?

4 MS. HAMILTON: I just am pleased that you
5 went to the AFWA meeting and jumped out of the silo
6 and maybe dumped, maybe tipped it over. So I --

7 MS. SOBECK: I don't think -- nothing was
8 that close. It was actually -- it was in Tucson, so
9 there weren't a lot of oceans there, but I found a lot
10 of areas of, you know, that were potential --

11 MS. HAMILTON: Intersected.

12 MS. SOBECK: -- potential areas of
13 intersected interest that -- the one I was struggling
14 with, there was a lot of interest in how to protect
15 monarch butterflies, given their precipitous decline.

16 I'm struggling to figure out how we can contribute to
17 the monarch butterfly decline and butterfly habitat.
18 I think that's actually out of NOAA's jurisdiction.

19 But I'm not going to give up. I told Paul
20 we need to think about our facilities, our NOAA
21 facilities, and whether we can encourage the planting
22 of milkweed on the grounds of government buildings.

23 FEMALE VOICE: That would be great.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: On our roofs.

25 MS. SOBECK: Our roof gardens, yeah.

1 Exactly. Wouldn't that be cool?

2 MR. DUNN: Can I actually -- on the MAFAC, I
3 think, one -- I'm sorry. On AFWA, I think one place
4 that we could ask you all to contribute is the fact
5 that on the -- what is it -- the coastal and oceans
6 committee, the coastal committee, there is very scant
7 engagement by the states at that committee, which is
8 where a significant portion of our portfolio would
9 fall, obviously.

10 We are working with AFWA and others to try
11 and figure out how to boost that engagement. It
12 comes -- it's caused by a number of factors, but, if
13 there are things that you all, ideas you all may have
14 in terms of trying to boost state engagement in AFWA.

15 We continue to believe it's a very valuable
16 forum, but the bang for the buck is limited, and we
17 want to try and boost that. So, we're working both
18 within AFWA, we're talking with some of the
19 recreational groups who are engaged there, such as
20 ASA, trying to strategize how can we, together, push
21 for multiple directions.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you.

23 MS. SOBECK: I do think habitat is a very
24 fruitful area where a lot of the state directors in
25 AFWA are interested in habitat, just as we are, and

1 so, I think there is a fair amount of overlap in
2 looking at coastal habitat issues and, obviously, a
3 strong recreational community input there.

4 A lot of interest in threatened and
5 endangered species, but focused mainly on terrestrial
6 species. You know, a lot of sage grass conversations
7 that really weren't in our current plan. But, you
8 know, our nation's fish are really important to a lot
9 of state directors. So I think, you know, we don't
10 have to do everything. It would be nice to beef up
11 that ocean and coastal group, but if that doesn't
12 work, we'll just work within it. So it's structured
13 by our areas of common interest.

14 We are -- I think we are planning to have
15 another state directors' meeting with NOAA. A NOAA
16 Fisheries state directors' meeting. We had one a year
17 and a half ago, I guess, that I think was quite
18 interesting and successful and we're planning to have
19 one at the beginning of 2016. We'll make sure that
20 you guys know, so that you can get the word out to
21 your state directors, that you think it's important
22 for them to attend.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Seeing no other
24 hands from the members, I just want to make one point,
25 Eileen. I was talking with a number of us last night

1 at the event, and we were reflecting on how years ago,
2 there weren't that many NOAA staff people in the room
3 and how much it means to us now to have the assistant
4 administrator, on a regular basis, sitting here at the
5 table, being part of the conversation and briefing the
6 members.

7 And knowing that the time and effort that
8 we're all putting in as a federal advisory committee
9 is actually valued by the agency is what keeps us
10 coming back and keeps participating. Thank you again
11 for being here and dedicating yourself to, all this
12 time.

13 MS. SOBECK: They told me I have to come.
14 Thank you. I appreciate that. Shouldn't take me
15 seriously. I could easily make excuses, I think, and
16 I will make excuses this afternoon -- I'm sorry -- but
17 I will be back tomorrow. Be here all morning and I'll
18 be back tomorrow morning. You guys have mostly
19 committee meetings. Subcommittee meetings. Great.
20 Thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you,
22 Eileen. So, the next item is another valuable member
23 of the NOAA team, Paul Doremus, the deputy assistant
24 administrator for operations. We're getting the
25 budget outlook and the sad truth about flat is the new

1 up.

2 MALE VOICE: It's better than down.

3 MR. DOREMUS: Stole my line. Thank you.

4 We'll try to move through this quickly. So we're
5 going to pop through the -- a little bit on 2015 and
6 the outlook on '16 and where the organization as a
7 whole stands, from a fiscal point of view, following
8 up on our discussion that we had last time about where
9 we focused pretty heavily in our last meeting on
10 proponents of the President's budget proposal for '16.

11 So, we'll look at where we are with that and possible
12 Senate action.

13 In particular, we had our appropriation in
14 December of this year, which was the good news, I
15 suppose, in '15, although, as many of you know, we
16 didn't actually get a signed apportionment from OMB to
17 spend any of the funds until mid-February.

18 For some areas like SK, and stock
19 assessment, survey and monitoring IJs, some of our
20 external grants, we didn't get approval to spend until
21 March. So, we continue to struggle with uncertain
22 budgets. We did in 2015, even though we had this
23 appropriation on December 13th.

24 It did provide a modest increase over FY14
25 of 1.6 percent. '14 was three and a half percent or

1 so over our low water mark in the FY13 sequestration
2 budget. So, we still have a long way to go. I closed
3 with some observations about that reality in this very
4 uncertain budget environment that we're in.

5 I won't spend much time on the
6 accomplishments here, we need to make up a little bit
7 of time this morning, other than to note that many of
8 these things that we're noting here, going to hear
9 more on our recreational fisheries policy later this
10 morning, great focus, although no real new resources
11 on aquaculture. We have a law that remains and is, I
12 think, in many respects, increasing its prominence as
13 a priority for the agency, even though we're not able
14 to attract more resources to that effort.

15 Big development with the settlement in the
16 Gulf. This is going to shower money on the Gulf
17 commission. Dave Donaldson was telling me last night
18 about his budget's going to quadruple.

19 MR. DONALDSON: I don't recall saying that.

20 MR. DOREMUS: Actually, the reality here is
21 it's a big thing for restoration, but we still
22 have -- and matter of fact, we'll talk a little bit
23 later about councils and commissions. I'm pulling
24 Dave's leg here. This is money that needs to go into
25 new efforts related to restoration. There is -- this

1 really isn't going to touch any of our core business
2 in that area.

3 So, while this is a massive project, that
4 doesn't mean that we're funding everything that needs
5 to be funded in the Gulf of Mexico. So, more to go
6 there. I was just giving Dave a hard time here,
7 because everybody thinks because of this big
8 settlement that all matters environmental are going to
9 be taken care of in the Gulf, and that's just not the
10 case.

11 We've got other important notes here on our
12 habitat focus areas. We talked a little bit about
13 that. Protected resources with the humpback whale,
14 reclassification, and a lot of continued progress on
15 our core goals in the sustainable fisheries demos.

16 So, we could go on. Just a few notes here.

17 I just wanted to highlight many of these areas are
18 areas where we've benefitted substantially, as Eileen
19 was noting in her opening comments, from the
20 perspective and guidance of this committee, and we
21 expect that to continue.

22 The highlights I think on a positive note
23 from 2015, we had some new grant opportunities to work
24 with. Even though we had a flat budget, we had a
25 combined SK program that allowed us to put \$25 million

1 out for 80 projects. This was a major effort.

2 We took a new approach this year. We worked
3 closely with the councils, with the commissions on
4 reviewing and completely restructuring our priorities,
5 much more input from a regional perspective, and we
6 ran a very complex process with a two-step review
7 involving, first, technical review, and then
8 constituent panel reviews.

9 Councils, commissions advised us, helped us
10 put together the constituent panels. So it was a
11 very, very good process and we're look forward,
12 looking forward to continuing our SK effort.

13 I do want to note we were able to use a
14 portion of SK funding, about \$6 million, for national
15 programs. We've made a decision in fisheries
16 headquarters to put all the SK resources out in the
17 region.

18 We don't -- although we have the ability to
19 use 40 percent internally, and, in the past, fisheries
20 has used some SK funds to, basically, for some of our
21 laboratory work, in the last few years, since this
22 program came back on, it was zero funded in '11 and
23 '12 and since '13 we've put all but a very small
24 portion that's required to run these panels,
25 administrative costs, we put it all out into the

1 regions.

2 While we had a national program, the bulk of
3 that went out to our state partners for underfunded
4 data collection efforts where we've been struggling to
5 really manage increased costs of data collection with
6 flat budgets.

7 This is a theme I talk with the three
8 commission directors routinely about. We were able to
9 work through them to fund up some of our fishery
10 information network grants in other areas where we've
11 been struggling for some time with that tension
12 between rising costs and flat budget.

13 So, that was a major focus. Came directly
14 out of our work with the commissions. The state
15 directors, their number one priority are these
16 underfunded data collection efforts. We were able,
17 and very pleased, to be able to put some SK resources
18 against that.

19 Some of that SK resource also went into the
20 second bullet on black hook monitoring and reporting.

21 That was a very good effort with National Fish and
22 Wildlife Foundation. This is an area, as Eileen noted
23 in her opening comments, where we're hoping to deepen
24 that relationship.

25 We had a grant program there with external

1 mash, which is the rate thing on the two and the one
2 and a half million leverage from outside partners.
3 And we hope to be able to build on that basic concept
4 with National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, in the
5 future. So that was a highlight, four major grants,
6 or five -- I'm sorry -- going out there, including a
7 fairly sizeable one in the Gulf of Mexico.

8 We also were pleased to have congressional
9 direction of about \$4 million for coastal and
10 ecosystem resilience grants. The National Ocean
11 Service also had about five. Our grant program is
12 focusing on on the ground projects that are really
13 coastal habitat restoration projects that have a
14 direct linkage to supporting species recovery, fish
15 production, and sort of ecological resilience, if you
16 will.

17 The NOS grant program is focusing more on
18 coastal community preparations and plans for absorbing
19 recovering from impacts of adverse events and long
20 term changes in environmental conditions. So they're
21 both resilience, but have different orientations. We
22 work very closely with National Ocean Service in
23 making sure that those are distinct but complementary
24 efforts.

25 Those will probably be announced, we expect,

1 in December or January, so that process is well
2 underway. The federal funding opportunity was
3 published in May, closed in August, and those grants
4 should be announced in just a couple of months. So
5 that's -- those are very -- that was the good news in
6 FY15, was having those grant programs at our disposal.

7 I think we made very good use of that resource.

8 This is about all we have to say about FY16.

9 You know, we ran up against another -- I was talking
10 with some folks last night. We ran up against another
11 will we shut down moment. This requires a lot of
12 effort in our organization to prepare for, to shut
13 down, and we did, indeed, spend a lot of time, in case
14 we didn't get funding at the outset of the fiscal
15 year.

16 So, we have a CR through December 11th.
17 We're likely to run into a similar kind of stalemate,
18 and we're likely to have to do similar preparations.
19 This is part, unfortunately, part of our current
20 reality. We are pressing ahead, though. Yeah.

21 You know, in one way or another, whether
22 it's under a continuing resolution, or some new
23 determination of our budget level from Congress, we're
24 going to continue to focus on these priorities.
25 There's nothing radically new here. We will

1 be -- we're in the final stages of producing our
2 actual priorities document. We'll be distributing it
3 to you fairly soon.

4 You will notice, as you have for the last
5 few years, a very strong note on our core priorities,
6 our sort of core mission orientation towards
7 productivity and sustainability of fisheries and
8 fishing communities, and recovering and conserving
9 protected resources.

10 We have an element here that we didn't have
11 last year on improving organizational excellence.
12 This is a big focus government-wide from OMB, from the
13 secretary, from our NOAA administrator, Dr. Sullivan.

14 We have a number of things here focused on our staff
15 and focused on our sort of operational integrity, if
16 you will. That remains -- that's always been an
17 issue. We're just making it a little bit more visible
18 in this document this year, unlike last year.

19 We spend a lot of time thinking through how
20 we're going and where our new focus is going to be and
21 a number of the areas that have come up during the
22 course of recent MAFAC deliberations, as well as
23 during this discussion here in the last day. You will
24 see some new inflection here on the IUU issue and
25 related enforcement considerations, also some new

1 language in there on aquaculture, both topics of note,
2 as we were talking about earlier this morning.

3 Also, on this point of recovering and
4 conserving protected resources, a big focus on our
5 species in the spotlight initiative. And that's also
6 been discussed at reasonable length here already.

7 Major focus of one of the organization, as
8 I'll conclude, a concluding note, is on our ability to
9 push forward on this agenda, in the context of a great
10 deal of budget uncertainty.

11 We hope, through increasingly deep and
12 effective partnerships around the organization, Eileen
13 mentioned National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, our
14 working relationship with this committee and your
15 guidance in a number of the program areas that you're
16 currently working with will help us move forward in
17 this context as well.

18 We do have, in 2016, the benefit of a very
19 solid President's budget out there, and we have
20 covered this before -- it's 3.3 percent overall -- but
21 in our operation research facilities account, our core
22 programs, it's almost an eight percent increase. It
23 was a very strong recognition of some funding
24 shortfalls that we need to address.

25 Unfortunately, in both the House and the

1 Senate, all of the proposed increased for the most
2 part -- and I'll go over in a little bit more detail
3 here -- were passed over, so we have just a small, one
4 percent discussion here over our FY15 enacted. So,
5 not a lot of progress on the major initiatives that
6 were proposed by the President's budget.

7 This table on Slide 11 shows you that. The
8 last two columns at the top, incentive marks. The
9 President's budget precedes those. So, you can see in
10 all of our major sub activities, protected resources,
11 fisheries, science and management, enforcement,
12 habitat, those major areas, you can readily eyeball
13 where we are, relative to the PB, and where we are in
14 this middle column relative to -- I'm sorry -- the
15 second column relative to FY15.

16 That's the real reference point. That's
17 what we executed last year. You can readily see that
18 there's fairly limited change. The one area where
19 things did turn out differently -- there's two things
20 that I want to point out on this slide, and then next
21 slide we're getting into some more detail.

22 In fisheries science and management, one of
23 the differences between where we are today and what
24 was proposed, at least in the House, and to a less
25 extent, in the Senate, there was a \$10 million

1 increase for stock assessments focused on the Gulf of
2 Mexico proposed in the House report that was not
3 proposed or aligned with Pres. bud. request. The
4 Senate, I think, provided \$5 million along the same
5 lines.

6 The other thing that I wanted to point out
7 that is not present here is our requested funding for
8 core consultation capacity, that was a \$13, just over
9 \$13 million request in the President's budget. That
10 is a major source of concern for us.

11 If we continue to have growing demand for
12 Section 7 consultations, decreased staff to be able to
13 process that, increased backlog, major economic
14 consequence for people whose projects are tied up with
15 our permit requirements, and that's a source of major
16 concerns. So, buried in all of this is a great deal
17 of pressure on our core consultation capacity. We're
18 very concerned about that.

19 MS. SOBECK: If I could just interrupt just
20 to give you kind of an, kind, idea of magnitude. You
21 know, there was the announcement of the recent BP
22 settlement in the Gulf, was that, you know, between
23 \$15 and \$20 billion and projects are going to
24 be flowing down to the Gulf in the next 10 to 15
25 years.

1 Well, a lot of those are going to have to do
2 with, you know, various coastal projects that are
3 likely to require federal permits, core permits, and
4 they're going to require consultation. Zero of that
5 money, zero of that money went to support the folks
6 who have to do these consultations.

7 So, we already have a huge backlog that
8 prevents us from meeting our statutory deadlines in
9 the Gulf, and there's going to be \$20 billion worth of
10 projects coming through that we're not going to be
11 able to cope with, despite our attempts to kind of get
12 ahead of this problem through our budget request.

13 While people have said, yeah, you should
14 look to, you should realign your resources, look to
15 other regions, we have mega consultations in places
16 like California on re-plumbing the entire West Coast
17 water system, and the effect on threatened and
18 endangered species. Both Fish and Wildlife Service
19 and NOAA species are front and center in that. We
20 can't take resource -- we have no resource -- we have
21 no Peter to rob to pay Paul. Paul?

22 MR. DOREMUS: I got to rob somebody to pay
23 myself. Think I'd rob Peter.

24 MS. SOBECK: I guess I'm just pointing out
25 that sometimes Congress says to us, how come you

1 didn't think about this? Why didn't you get ahead of
2 this? Why are you -- you know, we made it very clear,
3 it made it up through the President's budget, we are
4 not trying to hide our words. We see ourselves as
5 being -- we see some potential, very serious
6 bottlenecks that are going to be our fault, and where
7 that hasn't gotten any traction.

8 MR. DOREMUS: The major problem, huge
9 potential economic cost to delay projects that hang on
10 these types of consultation requirements. So, that is
11 a source of what I would probably call mission risk in
12 the future, and that's going to remain a major
13 consideration for us in this flat budget environment.

14 It really does come down to staff, people, and the
15 resources to pay for that.

16 Got a little bit of a side by side here on
17 '16 House and Senate marks. We did propose, as you
18 know, and we've covered this in prior meetings, a
19 restructuring of our budget. It's really just an
20 aggregation of budget and a slight reshuffling of
21 budget categories. It's not really a restructuring,
22 but an aggregation into bigger buckets that will help
23 our budget justification be more coherent.

24 We put like programs together, so that we
25 have one line for survey and monitoring. That used to

1 be broken into a bunch of different PPAs that fund in
2 different parts of organization. So it's a
3 rationalized, more coherent budget.

4 Both the Senate and House largely concur.
5 The Senate has some minor modifications. We expect to
6 implement that sometime this year. We hoped to start
7 it at the beginning of the fiscal year, but without
8 the budget actually being passed, we can't do that.
9 So, that's likely to go forward, in slightly modified
10 form.

11 A little bit of concern on my part with the
12 House mark that reduces our council and commission
13 line by \$3.2 million. That surprised us. Still
14 trying to get a good feed on what was motivating that.

15 We have some additional consultations coming up,
16 including one later this week, to get a better
17 understanding of that. The Senate did not make that
18 change.

19 They did also pull out from regional council
20 and commission the budget line. They pulled out the
21 IJ and added \$500,000 to that, which is good news to
22 our state partners. A small, but significant, grant
23 program there for inter-jurisdiction fisheries grants.

24 So, that's a small difference between the
25 two that we're trying, hope gets resolved. Under CR,

1 we would, obviously, be just moving along a prior
2 year.

3 Some slight differences here on electronic
4 monitoring and recording. We were directed to
5 continue down the path that we're on by the House, but
6 with limited resources. This is largely what they did
7 last year, too. We used the NFWF partnership with
8 some SK funds to handle that request, would likely try
9 to do the same this year, if it moves along this way.

10 These needs were recognized partially, we're
11 pleased, in the Senate mark, with a \$2.3 million
12 increase for electronic monitoring and reporting and a
13 \$2 million increase for IUU. That is largely people
14 on enforcement related to the IUU, as was requested.

15 We requested about \$3 million in the
16 President's budget for that important increase.
17 Insufficient given the magnitude of the problem, but
18 it would definitely be helpful.

19 A number of other areas where the House and
20 the Senate are dissimilar. Funding PCSRF at \$65
21 million above the '16 request. That's been maintained
22 at that level for some time. Strongly endorsed
23 program by Congress. A major grant program that we
24 have sustained for a number of years.

25 There are some other details in here that

1 you can see, and I'll pass over in the interest of
2 time. Eileen?

3 MS. SOBECK: I just wanted to make one
4 remark about the last box about the EM/ER and IUU and
5 the House mark, which is kind of this continuing to
6 pile on very significant resource-intensive tasks
7 without any new resources is something that we just
8 simply can't do.

9 You know, EM/ER is not cost free and I think
10 that we made a very -- we've tried to make that case
11 in a lot of different ways and are trying to get down
12 to specifics, and that while we can, there might be
13 some cost savings, there are definitely some actual
14 new costs. So, there's some of this that is just not
15 going to happen.

16 The same is true with IUU. We can't -- we
17 have a very limited enforcement budget, we have an
18 obligation to keep a robust domestic enforcement
19 program, and taking on a whole new universe of IUU
20 enforcement with our existing resources, we will do
21 what we can.

22 We do do some now, but to think that we are
23 going to elevate to a whole new order of magnitude our
24 existing, our program of IUU, if we don't get new
25 resources is not going to happen. That's

1 just -- that's -- that's, I think the message that is
2 not getting through. But we are trying to be very
3 clear about what we can and cannot do if we do not get
4 the resources.

5 MR. DOREMUS: Indeed. And, your collective
6 voice and your individual voices on this problem are
7 very helpful to us. Recognizing increased demand
8 level resources, recognizing that sort of core mission
9 capability erosion that we were talking about, for
10 instance, in our core consultation capacity, those are
11 two sources of long term mission risks that the, that
12 all of you and the committee as a whole, I think, will
13 be helpful in advising us on and speaking to.

14 There's two other long term risks that I
15 want to point to as well. The first one is
16 infrastructure. We have an aging oceangoing data
17 collection infrastructure, primarily, but not
18 exclusively, our fleet. That's the focus here.

19 There are about -- there are 16 ships in
20 our, in NOAA's total fleet now. We were hoping to
21 fund over 3,000 days at sea in 2016 President's
22 budget. There's going to be less. We're constantly
23 struggling with days at sea. The long term problem is
24 the age, increasing age and the lack of an accrued
25 recapitalization plan for our fleet.

1 NOAA has, for a number of years, worked very
2 aggressively to recapitalize our space-based Earth
3 observing assets, our satellites. Very expensive.
4 Something that clearly can't be degraded. And you
5 can't take risks with data discontinuities, if you
6 will.

7 Folks do not see the relationship between
8 our oceangoing fleet and our mission capabilities in
9 the same way that they see the relationship between
10 satellites and weather forecasting. So, these are our
11 satellites right here. And these things are getting
12 increasingly old.

13 By 2024, six of our vessels are going to be
14 beyond their design life. The Oregon 2, the
15 Fairweather, the Hi'ialakai, the Thomas Jefferson,
16 Gordon Gunter, and the SETI. The Oregon 2 in the
17 Gulf, the SETI in the Pacific, we're already inside
18 our build window for when those things are going to
19 come offline. They are technically supposed to be
20 pulled out of service in about seven years.

21 It takes about 10 years to get one of these
22 things funded. So, a huge concern of ours is the lack
23 of a plan for dealing with a long term problem. It's
24 there. We can see it. Like the observation Eileen
25 was making, this is a known problem and we're trying

1 to raise attention to it.

2 We also have laboratories all over the
3 country that are similarly aging and we're spending
4 more money and more time dealing with inadequate
5 infrastructure problems. We've got an average age of
6 35 years. Some of our facilities are in excess of 50
7 plus years old.

8 Our Woods Hole lab is 55 years old. We're
9 trying to draw attention to the need to recapitalize
10 it. Mote Lake is very old and constantly
11 requiring -- just replaced the roof on that. Major
12 expense. A lot of other shortfalls at that facility.
13 Our Miami lab, very vulnerable. Right on the coast.
14 Old, constrained.

15 We have strategic facilities plans that lay
16 out this problem very clearly, what our options are.
17 We're trying to advance those, but the way the federal
18 budget works, we don't have the recapitalization
19 budget for NOAA.

20 We can't put resources into a fund that we
21 can use to deal with the expenses over time, like most
22 organizations do. And we're dependent on dealing,
23 getting large appropriations to deal with these
24 problems, and it turns into basically crisis funding.

25 It wasn't until our La Jolla lab was quite

1 literally about to fall off an eroding cliff that we
2 actually got resources to be able to do it. It was
3 the ARRA funding that allowed us to actually complete
4 it, as well as the new laboratory in the Pacific that
5 was started by Senator Inouye. So there's -- this is
6 a crisis model and we don't want to go up to the edge
7 on these assets.

8 The other big pressure we've been talking
9 about is the decreased funding that, for our staff.
10 This has been the fall off from our high water mark of
11 over 3,400 staff. We're below 3,000 now. There's a
12 substantial backlog.

13 Many of you who have heard from us, our
14 workforce machinery in NOAA is quite broken. There's
15 a major effort to revitalize it that we have a lot of
16 time and interest in, and I do believe it ultimately
17 would be successful, but we've got a pretty large
18 backlog of 242 hires.

19 We cannot hire people, even when we had the
20 resources to do so. If we brought them on board,
21 we're still going to be on the order of 250 people
22 below where we were at our high water mark. Fewer
23 people, less resource to get the job done.

24 We are improving productivity, but there are
25 limits to scale and we're long term, I think, going to

1 bump up against those and that's the grave concern
2 that Eileen was talking about earlier.

3 Bottom line, and this has been the bottom
4 line that we've been putting forward to you since
5 FY13, we're going to continue to have very uncertain,
6 and probably flatly declining budgets for some time.
7 Increasing mission responsibilities, nothing is
8 declining here, and if anything, costs are going up,
9 so we need good advice, strong partnership models,
10 maybe different ways of doing business.

11 Everybody's trying hard in EM/ER. I don't
12 think that that's going to be a giant cost saver,
13 although it could be a big improvement in the type of
14 data that we can get long term.

15 We're ultimately going to face some
16 strategic choices, and I think the advice and
17 perspective of this committee will be essential to our
18 ability to navigate that, to make those choices clear
19 to our budget policy stakeholder community and to help
20 us navigate those.

21 But, our emphasis right now, really, is on
22 partnerships -- this committee is one of them -- and
23 our kind of growing sense of potential. National Fish
24 and Wildlife Foundation is another. Those are areas
25 where we hope to be able to, in effect, do more on

1 level dollars.

2 There's a lot of areas where we have not yet
3 found a path forward like that, and these pressures,
4 ultimately, are going to result in some form of
5 choice, or accepted degradation in our mission
6 capabilities.

7 So, I will finish there and turn the mic
8 back to the chair. Thank you.

9 MS. SOBECK: Could I just put one,
10 underscore what Paul said? I think part of why you're
11 hearing us talk about prioritization in so many areas,
12 you know, both in terms of regional, or science center
13 plans, or, you know, whatever endeavor we're working
14 on, is we need to prioritize our, you know, potential,
15 you know, potential work list, because things are
16 going to fall off the table and we want them to be the
17 right things.

18 If we can't do everything, we don't want to
19 renege on things that are our highest priority. Part
20 of the idea is that we will try to align our resources
21 with our priorities, starting at the top and working
22 down.

23 I think that -- I think the message from the
24 budget picture is we'll stretch it as far as we can,
25 we'll try to be creative, we'll try to leverage some

1 partnerships, we'll try to work our way down the list,
2 but things on the bottom of the list may well fall
3 off.

4 MR. BROWN: Paul, if you had a graph of
5 outsourced positions running along with the graph of
6 employees that you have, how would it compare?

7 MR. DOREMUS: I don't have the numbers off
8 the top of my head. There has been some -- in this
9 kind of uncertain budget environment, there's a
10 natural tendency to use term labor and some contract
11 labor when we're not sure if our resources are going
12 to hold. There has been some increased use of
13 contract labor, but not at a level that replaces the
14 400 odd positions that we've dropped.

15 MR. BROWN: Okay.

16 MR. DOREMUS: We're actually doing stamping
17 plans and looking at every FMC's use of their labor
18 composition for the year, and our plans over a five
19 year period. We're putting those together to help get
20 a better handle on that issue.

21 MR. BROWN: Okay. And would you say across
22 the board the positions lost are pretty much
23 throughout the entire range of positions, or --

24 MR. DOREMUS: Yeah.

25 MR. BROWN: -- you know, how much it's been

1 hit more or less?

2 MR. DOREMUS: It hasn't been concentrated in
3 any particular programmatic area. It's been across
4 the board.

5 MR. BROWN: Okay. Great.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Bill?

7 MR. DUSKOW: Are the NOAA vessels a,
8 significant budget line items at \$20 million, \$50
9 million?

10 MR. DOREMUS: The vessel is on the order of
11 \$140 to \$150 million.

12 MR. DUSKOW: Just as a --

13 MR. DOREMUS: Yeah. If you were to build
14 it, and get it appropriated all at once.

15 MR. DUSKOW: Just as an observation, I'm
16 sure, back in the day when NOAA started, ships were a
17 major component of gathering research and data.

18 MR. DOREMUS: Yes.

19 MR. DUSKOW: Airplanes were invented, so
20 they started to be used, satellites came online and
21 they started to be used. So, we're using ships,
22 planes, and satellites.

23 Maybe it's time to look at ships as a
24 gathering tool, as an information tool, and just say
25 we can't afford these anymore, we're going to focus on

1 planes and satellites, and if we need a vessel for
2 some purpose, we'll simply charter it for a finite
3 period of time, and when that project is completed,
4 you know, the charter expires.

5 MR. DOREMUS: We do use chartering very
6 heavily. We've already done a lot of substitution.
7 Our fleet is much smaller than it used to be. There
8 are some areas of the country where there simply are
9 not vessels that can perform the type of work that we
10 need to get done. We do chartering more extensively
11 in Alaska than anywhere else, in part because there
12 is --

13 MR. DUSKOW: Vessels there. Yeah.

14 MR. DOREMUS: -- a fleet there that can
15 handle it. But there are distinctive data collection
16 requirements that only our vessels can do. We're
17 looking long term at ways to reduce our dependency on
18 the fleet, but we do not see a future, even decades
19 out, where we can rely on assets other than these
20 oceangoing vessels. Even some of our efforts to
21 develop acoustic, optical AUV work, you'd have to have
22 a platform for launching, for data collection, et
23 cetera.

24 So, we see a more diversified observing set
25 of options in the future, but we're going to continue

1 to have dependence on these vessels. I expect the
2 fleet size will decline over time, but we can't see a
3 future where it goes to zero.

4 MR. DUSKOW: Without some re-invention, you
5 know, it kind of looks like a train wreck in the
6 future, because you're trying to do --

7 MR. DOREMUS: It is.

8 MR. DUSKOW: -- all of these existing
9 missions, plus all these new charges with the same, or
10 less, resources. I won't say, how are you going to do
11 that, but it seems to me that you have to stop doing
12 something in order to be able to take on these new
13 tasks. I know it sounds impossible.

14 The same argument occurred a decade ago when
15 many corporations looked to corporate jets. Well we
16 have to have a jet, we've always had a jet. Well we
17 don't have a jet anymore. You know, every -- life
18 went on. You know, some form of re-inventing may be
19 the only way out of this dilemma.

20 MR. DOREMUS: Yes. We do expect there to be
21 change in the future, but it is, right now, looking
22 very much like a train wreck, as you put it.

23 MS. SOBECK: I think that's a great
24 observation, but I think it's not just us deciding
25 that there's some things that we can't do --

1 MR. DOREMUS: Understand.

2 MS. SOBECK: -- I think it's the folks that
3 we work with who have to understand that they're not
4 going to get the thing that we do.

5 MR. DUSKOW: But I -- that's an opportunity
6 as well. If you say these are the things that we can
7 no longer afford to do, let your constituents, let
8 your stakeholders help you decide those things,
9 because it's got to happen, it seems, because there's
10 no other solution.

11 MS. SOBECK: So again -- right. I agree.
12 And again, that's part of why we're putting out these
13 strategic plans and, you know, prioritization
14 documents. These will be -- you know, we're telling
15 you how we're ranking our mission obligations and
16 asking for your input, and so that's, I think, exactly
17 what we're doing.

18 We're not kind of saying, we don't have
19 enough money to do everything, so what do you want us
20 to not do, but I think we are trying to make it pretty
21 clear what our priorities are and asking for input and
22 that we're going to use those priorities as a guide to
23 where to put our bucks. So, I couldn't agree with you
24 more.

25 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I'm going to make an

1 observation here to --

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Phil articulated the same
3 thoughts I had, so I'll go another direction, and that
4 is what would a new business model or a stronger
5 partnership look like, or could you expand on that
6 concept?

7 MR. DOREMUS: Basically, there's a couple of
8 things here. One are things like cost leveraging that
9 we're doing with National Fish and Wildlife
10 Foundation, electronic monitoring and reporting. So
11 that's an effective of the business model.

12 Another is basically moving further down the
13 path that we have done under Magnuson. There was
14 direction in Magnuson to cost share and do cost
15 recovery in some aspects of our fisheries, so we do
16 that in some limited fashion now and we're proposing
17 doing that in additional areas. It's very
18 contentious.

19 Like the cost of observers in the northeast
20 right now is a major issue. We're trying to gradually
21 transfer some of those costs to industry. We've done
22 that in other parts of the country. It's very
23 contentious. So, cost sharing models are a big part
24 of it.

25 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I'm going to make an

1 observation here. The map we're seeing
2 is -- we're -- I'm seeing huge gaps in funding, and
3 staffing, and equipment, I'm seeing that we've got the
4 expected consultations ahead that are going to be very
5 expensive, in California and the Central Valley
6 project and all that, but then, you're also going to
7 have the unexpected consultations that are going to
8 come from changing climates and things that we don't
9 know yet. The unanticipated is going to happen.
10 That's the one thing we do know. Change is coming.

11 MAFAC can sometimes say the things that NOAA
12 staff cannot. I'm going to suggest to the members
13 here that we have an opportunity, and I defer, of
14 course, to Julie and Terri, but down the road, it
15 might be appropriate for the strategic planning
16 committee to be looking at these hard budgeting
17 questions.

18 Can we look at alternative funding sources
19 for NOAA and speak out on cost sharing, and cost
20 recovery, and private pay, and user pay, and
21 partnerships? You know, what could we contribute as
22 stakeholder advice to NOAA to say, okay, we realize
23 it's a changing world, and here are some other ways
24 that you can pay for the challenges ahead.

25 That's coming from me with no coaching from

1 NOAA staff. That's just me recognizing, I think the
2 realities ahead.

3 Dan?

4 MR. FRANKE: Yeah. A comment regarding
5 exactly what you were just talking about. I had the
6 pleasure of meeting with Eileen and some of the
7 management staff of the Pacific Southwest Science
8 Center, probably a couple of months ago, and one of
9 the products that came out of that meeting from our
10 perspective was we openly discussed that, how you pay
11 for stuff.

12 We all got a lot of ideas, but, when the
13 rubber meets the road is what's the job and who's
14 going to pay for it, and how are we going to get this
15 thing done. So, like, as an example, our
16 organization, Sport Fishing Association of California,
17 I talked to Eileen and also follow up conversations
18 with her staff.

19 We're going to go through our strategic
20 planning process and our funding process that we have
21 within our organization and I'm actually, I already
22 have a meeting scheduled with the number two person at
23 her Southwest Science Center, we're going to compare
24 our budgets and those things that we were going to
25 fund and those things that they were going to fund

1 that were of similar type projects, we're going to see
2 where we can merge them and maybe provide our boats as
3 charter platforms, or if I'm already funding it
4 through our organization, we invite their scientists
5 aboard. But, bottom line is save the money.

6 We've already made a commitment to the
7 Southwest Science Center that, each year, when we do
8 our strategic planning in December, I'm going to make
9 an appointment over there. I'm going to show them our
10 plan from our board of directors and say, okay, here's
11 what we're going to do, are you, do you see somewhere
12 here where we're going to intersect, and hopefully
13 save both of us some cash. So, I think, honestly, you
14 know, in the current leadership, that's kind of what's
15 happening is they're looking for those things.

16 Another interesting thing, and this goes
17 back to what Phil was saying, a lot of times we have,
18 everybody in this room has different friends, or maybe
19 personal interests in commercial vessels, big boats,
20 that are very expensive. I can say in our region, and
21 I know there's similar dialogues going elsewhere,
22 they're meeting with their scientists, saying what can
23 you do on a smaller vessel, not necessarily needing a
24 200 foot ship.

25 So, those discussions are happening with the

1 idea of reducing budget. So, I do think there's some
2 really good proactive dialogue going in the NOAA
3 leadership right now to try and reduce some of those
4 costs. To Paul and Eileen, we appreciate that.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. I thank you,
6 Paul, for the hard truth.

7 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you all.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. The next
9 item is the report from our state. Wait. The next
10 item is probably a break, as I look at this. We are
11 behind schedule, so let's take a 10 minute break and
12 we'll reconvene at 10:30.

13 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: After that, it will be
15 Russ Dunn and his team from recreational fisheries.
16 Gentlemen?

17 MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 I'm going to start. Eileen mentioned the state
19 directors meeting. We are scheduled to do something,
20 I believe it's the week of February 22nd, in the Gulf
21 of Mexico. We're looking at New Orleans or St. Pete
22 for a venue. We've got a grant in place.

23 As the meeting nears, we'll provide this
24 group with more information, but that's -- tentatively
25 right now it's the last week in February is where

1 we're looking at.

2 In the Gulf of Mexico, we've got a variety
3 of different issues. One of the biggest issues is the
4 oyster industry. Because of -- as a result of the BP
5 spill and the hurricanes, they've been, they've taken
6 quite a hit and are continuing to try and restore
7 historical landings. There's issues with spat set and
8 trying to work out those issues.

9 Production in all the states is
10 significantly lower than it has been historically, and
11 the industry is hurting quite a bit. We're -- it's
12 kind of ironic that in the, probably five or six years
13 ago, we were supplying a lot of the East Coast
14 oysters, the Chesapeake Bay folks, and now it's, the
15 roles are reversed. We're getting -- majority of our
16 oysters that are sold in the Gulf of Mexico are coming
17 from the Chesapeake. So, we're looking at ways to
18 restore that fishery.

19 Another big issue is, and it ties into what
20 Paul talked about, is funding and our, funding our
21 core data collection programs, although I was happy to
22 hear that Paul said he was going to quadruple my
23 budget, so I guess I don't have to worry about that.
24 Just kidding.

25 Funding. We're at a critical level where we

1 have, we've had to take cuts because of level funding.

2 Obviously the cost of doing business increases each
3 year. We're cutting core programs that feed into the
4 stock assessments that -- and at the rate we're going,
5 we're going to have to stop some of these biological
6 sampling or commercial and recreational landings
7 programs.

8 That's going to have a huge and adverse
9 impact on the stock assessments and the quality of the
10 assessments. We'll still be able to do assessments,
11 but the level of uncertainty will be much higher.
12 We'll have to be much more conservative. That's not
13 how we'd like to continue. So, funding is a huge
14 issue with our states.

15 Then, the last issue is, of course, red
16 snapper. I can't go to any meeting and not talk about
17 red snapper. I think it's written in my contract that
18 I have to mention red snapper at least once. We're
19 continuing -- the states are continuing to look at
20 better ways to collect information on red snapper,
21 more timely methods.

22 Texas has their own survey for a number of
23 years. Louisiana just recently implemented their own
24 survey that provides information a little quicker.
25 Both Mississippi, Alabama, and, or Mississippi,

1 Alabama, and Florida are looking at other ways to get
2 more timely information. It's driven by red snapper,
3 but it also provides information on other species.

4 I was at the Gulf Council meeting last week.

5 The discussion about regional management giving
6 authority to the states was, continued to be
7 discussed. Unfortunately the, it's Amendment 39, is
8 going out for public hearing and, unfortunately, there
9 was not consensus on a preferred alternative, so it's
10 going out without any preferreds. We'll get public
11 comment and see where that goes.

12 That's kind of what's going on in the Gulf
13 in a nutshell. If anyone has any questions, I'll be
14 happy to answer them. If not, move on.

15 MR. DUSKOW: David, I have a question.

16 MR. DONALDSON: Yes, sir?

17 MR. DUSKOW: I have heard about this. I
18 don't know if it's ever gotten to the bill stage, but
19 there's been some interest in returning management of
20 some Gulf species, all Gulf species, to the states.

21 MR. DONALDSON: Correct.

22 MR. DUSKOW: Is that a viable alternative?
23 Is that feasible? Because those states have economic,
24 you know, concerns. They have revenue streams, you
25 know. It seems like that there's some merit there.

1 What's your take on that?

2 MR. DONALDSON: Well I mean the -- our -- my
3 member states are interested in pursuing that. They
4 developed a draft program, and there's actually a bill
5 in, that came out of the House, the Gray's Bill, that
6 addresses that. I believe there's a hearing on that
7 next week.

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: There is.

9 MR. DONALDSON: So there -- it's certainly
10 something that they're looking at. If you look at
11 some of the other state-managed species, red drum,
12 spotted sea trout, the states do a fine job with that.

13 So, the issue is red snapper has historically been a
14 federal species, and ceding the authority to a state
15 for a federal species would set a precedent that
16 hasn't happened in that.

17 I just, I'm not sure what the viability of
18 that is. But our states are certainly interested in
19 doing, in pursuing that.

20 MR. DUSKOW: You mentioned those other
21 species. I'm going to generalize and say the states
22 do a great job with in shore species management that
23 are primarily recreational fish. In other words,
24 they're fish that have, don't have a lot of
25 commercial, you know, participation in those specific

1 species. Red snapper doesn't fit that model, nor does
2 grouper.

3 MR. DONALDSON: Right.

4 MR. DUSKOW: They have huge economic value,
5 from a commercial point of view and huge economic
6 value from a recreational point of view, and they're
7 offshore, both. Do you think the states are capable
8 of doing something like that? I'm just asking out of
9 curiosity. You're the expert.

10 MR. DONALDSON: Well, I mean, I -- they've
11 never had to deal with that, but, I mean, they
12 certainly, I think they certainly have the capability
13 within each of the states. There's varying levels of
14 capability amongst the Gulf states, but, yeah, I think
15 they have the knowledge and the understanding to be
16 able to do that.

17 MR. DUSKOW: Thank you.

18 MR. BRAME: Just a comment. Dave brings up
19 a good point about the states doing their own surveys.
20 What we're finding is in terms of EM/RM, red snapper
21 is essentially a rare event species. It's not -- you
22 wouldn't expect to encounter red snapper fishermen in
23 dockside surveys. To the extent you would, red snap,
24 red drum, you know.

25 While we know we have enough intercepts to

1 effectively manage red drum, we don't for snowy
2 grouper. There's a continuum in there. I think we
3 need, the agency needs to figure out where is not
4 enough.

5 A good example is codfish in the South
6 Atlantic, where we had a spike in landings. It turns
7 out, it was one intercept of one boat with three guys,
8 one who had his limit, the other two had almost their
9 limit. That one intercept. Because codfish are not
10 coming up in the survey. So, I almost think we need
11 some sort of workshop, or an effort to determine when
12 is not enough not enough.

13 MS. SOBECK: I think we're aware of those
14 kinds of anomalies and how they can really screw up
15 the system. You know, when they first are encountered
16 they can screw up the system, but I think that there
17 are a coup- -- Richard isn't here at the moment, but I
18 think that we know that we have to try to work around
19 that. We're going to -- I
20 don't -- work around is not the right word. Make sure
21 that those don't completely screw up the systems.

22 MALE VOICE: Yeah. There are a couple of
23 efforts underway to devise appropriate methodologies
24 for red snapper and event species.

25 MR. BRAME: As we assess more species down

1 the food chain, so to speak, it's going to become more
2 and more of a problem.

3 MR. DONALDSON: And MRIP is in the process
4 of -- the Louisiana, new Louisiana survey, the LA
5 Creel is in the process of being certified in, as an
6 acceptable methodology for collecting this information
7 that provides, that addresses what you're talking
8 about, Dick. The other state programs are starting
9 that process as well.

10 So, they are -- MRIP understands the
11 shortcomings of that survey and that when you have a
12 nine-day season having a program that develops
13 estimates on a 60 day plus doesn't work so you need
14 alternative methodologies. They're working to get
15 those other methodologies certified, so they're, as
16 they like to say, you've got those tools in the
17 toolbox that you can use. So, it's not one size fits
18 all. Yes, sir?

19 MR. DUSKOW: Dave, I had one other question.
20 I'm asking you this, just because you're the boots on
21 the ground with the answers. Is there a preferred
22 Gulf red snapper solution going forward?

23 MR. DONALDSON: I don't -- I think that the
24 concept of flexibility is -- each state is different
25 in how they look at the fishery and how they would

1 like to manage it, so there's -- they want to be able
2 to address it based from their perspectives. I don't
3 think there's a one size fits all to address it.

4 MR. DUSKOW: Too bad. Thanks.

5 MR. BEAL: Bob Beal from ASMFC. I'll
6 go -- got five quick items that I'll go through in the
7 interest of time, and happy to answer any questions.
8 Each of these five, now that I look at them, really
9 has a state/federal partnership component. That's
10 pretty important.

11 The first one is the conduct of the site
12 intercept survey for the MRIP program. The Atlantic
13 Coast states are essentially catching up to the other
14 two commissions. Up until, and including this year,
15 the angler, I mean the access point angler intercept
16 survey, which is the site interviews for the MRIP
17 program, have been conducted by an external contractor
18 along the East Coast.

19 We're working now to transfer the
20 administration of that site intercept survey over to
21 ASMFC and to all the states. So, we'll be working
22 with the states from Maine through Georgia, because
23 Florida's already captured with the Gulf states
24 effort.

25 So, next -- starting in January 1, 2016, the

1 states will be conducting the site intercept surveys
2 along the East Coast. So, it's pretty substantial
3 shift. Our states are -- it's a big change for about
4 half of our states. Some of them have been doing it
5 under, you know, working with the contractor, but some
6 of them have not been involved at all.

7 So, it's a big shift for those folks, and
8 they're a little bit concerned about what it means,
9 and they're not real comfortable with it, but we're
10 helping them through it. We'll -- you know, I think
11 by when next year starts, they'll be ready to go. So
12 that's a big shift.

13 The partnership component of that clearly is
14 the efforts are still going to be conducted through
15 National Marine Fisheries Service, and we'll take the
16 site intercept and those two will need to merge
17 together to come up with overall estimates. So, that
18 will be a big change.

19 Atlantic menhaden, which is a bit of a
20 lightning rod here on the East Coast, to say the least
21 is, we're developing new ecological reference points
22 for menhaden. So, this is a bit of a departure from
23 the single-species management approach that we've had
24 in the past.

25 The hope is that these reference points will

1 take into account all the ecological services provided
2 by menhaden, the predator/prey relationships for
3 obviously other finfish, but birds, and whales, and
4 all the other species and taken. Then we'll work on
5 allocation between the reduction in fisheries in
6 Virginia and bait fisheries that go on up and down the
7 coast.

8 So, you know, we've been working with the
9 Beaufort lab and National Marine Fisheries Service to
10 do some of the analysis that we need, and working with
11 the states' biological folks as well. I think that's
12 moving along. It's not a quick process. There's a
13 lot of stakeholder interest, which usually doesn't
14 speed up the process.

15 I think it should be a good outcome and, you
16 know, hopefully, we end up with a program that does
17 take into account all the ecological services menhaden
18 provides and we can sort of once and for all, everyone
19 can agree on the reference points for menhaden, and we
20 can move forward from there.

21 The third item is what I call sort of a
22 budget and survey inventory along the East Coast. I
23 talked to Paul, with Paul a little bit about this last
24 night, offline.

25 What we're working on with all the East

1 Coast states is surveying all the states for, to
2 really paint a picture of what's going on with their
3 budgets, and what surveys and data collection
4 programs, fishery dependent and independent, are,
5 frankly, no longer able to be conducted, or are being
6 scaled back, due to lack of funding. You know, flat
7 is the new increase, which is, you know, given the
8 rising cost of doing business, means it becomes a
9 decrease.

10 So, we're going to try to characterize that
11 along the East Coast for each of the states, and also
12 characterize where their funding of their, you know,
13 the sources of funding comes from. There's obviously
14 the in-state budgets that they get from the state
15 legislative processes, but then there's all the grant
16 programs, and other partnership programs that Paul
17 mentioned earlier.

18 We're going to just, sort of, try to paint a
19 picture. We can use this, working with Paul and
20 others, as we go to the Hill. This is not -- the goal
21 here is not to be states versus feds and say, you
22 know, we need more money, and here's why you guys
23 aren't giving us enough money.

24 It's really a, go to Capitol Hill idea, and
25 say, hey, you know, rising tide needs to rise all

1 ships here. We're all in a tough spot. The data
2 collection programs with the states are lacking. This
3 isn't -- that doesn't just negatively impact state
4 stock assessments, it feeds into a lot of federal
5 programs as well. So we're working on that.

6 The discussion earlier about the strategic
7 planning that this group is working on and, you know,
8 working through the budgetary processes of the Federal
9 Government, you know, I think that's a good idea. I
10 probably can speak for the two gentlemen to my left,
11 that we're happy to help out with that and provide
12 input to, through MAFAC however you guys see fit.

13 I think we're technically advisors to a
14 group of advisors, so -- I'm not how that works, but
15 we're happy to be involved with that in any way you
16 guys see fit. I think it would be a constructive
17 approach.

18 The fourth topic is American eels. One of
19 our states was out of compliance. What that means to
20 the non-East Coast folks is that they, the states come
21 together and agreed to an eel management program, they
22 did not go home and implement that management program,
23 so we notified the Secretary of Commerce that one of
24 our states isn't, sort of, playing by the rules that
25 they developed for themselves.

1 We worked with Eileen and the folks at NOAA
2 Fisheries and there's a moratorium date set for
3 Delaware in the middle of March. So, if they don't go
4 through their legislative process and implement the
5 correct regs, all their American eel fisheries in
6 Delaware will be shut down.

7 So, you know, we appreciate the support of
8 NOAA Fisheries on that. It's sort of our last resort.

9 We try to get the states to cooperate, but it doesn't
10 always work out, and then we need big brother to step
11 in and help us out, frankly.

12 The other related issue on American eel is
13 that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had a petition
14 going for about four years now to list eel as
15 endangered or threatened. A decision came out last
16 week to not list them. The decision was clear, and
17 ASMFC obviously manages the eel.

18 We agree that the decision stated that eel
19 stock is in depleted condition. It's in pretty tough
20 shape up and down the coast. We've got a fairly
21 restrictive management program in place right now.
22 That was noted, that, you know, we need to maintain
23 that to have any chance of rebuilding the eel
24 population.

25 So, we're happy that the species was not

1 listed, because of disruption to another of other
2 fisheries that would have occurred, but we still have
3 a lot of work to do to rebuild that population.

4 The final topic is the horseshoe crab
5 survey. Up and down the East Coast we, you know,
6 horseshoe crab is kind of an obscure species, but we
7 do manage that, and it does have a lot of demands for
8 bait fisheries, biomedical use. And migratory shore
9 birds feed on the eggs of horseshoe crabs in the
10 Delaware region.

11 We have not been able to conduct a survey on
12 that for the last two years, because of lack of
13 funding, but, fortunately, some of the SK funds and
14 resources that Paul mentioned earlier, we were able to
15 access some of that and use that to fund the horseshoe
16 crab survey this year for the first time in three
17 years. So, that will occur in the next month or so
18 through -- Virginia Tech will be conducting the
19 survey.

20 So that's good news. It's an important
21 survey that we've missed for a number of years, but we
22 were able to bring that back online, due to some of
23 the resources made available by National Marine
24 Fisheries Service. So, we appreciate that. Those are
25 my five quick items that are going on. There's a lot

1 more but those are the kind of highlights of the East
2 Coast.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Bob.
4 Questions, comments from the members?

5 MS. SOBECK: I had just one quick comment,
6 which is to underscore, Bob, what you were saying
7 about kind of getting a handle on both, the funding
8 for both state and federal surveys, and recognizing
9 that we can always do better, we can always do more,
10 have more cooperative programs, but, actually, we do
11 rely heavily on the states for our data needs and
12 purposes, and the states rely heavily on us for
13 funding.

14 And, I don't think that we painted as clear
15 a picture of how that works to the outside world as we
16 might, and, to show both our coordination and our
17 inter-dependence, and, so that we don't kind of get in
18 this, let appropriators and others get into a false,
19 you know -- I mean, I'm not going to be cynical here.

20 I think it's kind of a, oh well, if the
21 states cut their budgets, the feds will in the gaps,
22 or we've already, there's enough grant money there to
23 handle it. I just think that we need to show that
24 right now all the ships are floating downwards, and
25 so, we need to get the floating going in the other

1 direction.

2 I think it is on us to tell the story more
3 comprehensively, and so, I think these are going to be
4 well worth the effort of putting them together.

5 MR. BEAL: Yeah. And as the results come in
6 from the survey that we have out to the states
7 right now, we have responses from all but four of our
8 states, I believe. So, we're getting close and we can
9 share those results with everybody as soon -- we need
10 to package them so they're readable, but we'll do
11 that, and then, we can start telling a story,
12 hopefully.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Randy?

14 MR. FISHER: Yeah. Each year, I do a top 10
15 for the commission, so this is Randy Fisher's top 10
16 for 2015. Number one is get Dungeness crab
17 legislation. The West Coast Dungeness crab fishery is
18 the largest fishery and the most money of any fishery
19 in the West Coast.

20 That's been managed by the states for about
21 30 years. That management authority disappears in
22 September of 2016. We just had legislation pass the
23 House last week to allow the states to continue to
24 manage that fishery, and we -- so, it's on the way to
25 the Senate now, and hopefully we can get that done.

1 Second one is sell my house. That was
2 number 10 last year, now number two. Just sold it on
3 Sunday, so that's good.

4 Number three, Pacific Council set
5 regulations for cameras on the wedding boats. We have
6 about 38 cameras out now on the West Coast, we have a
7 number in Alaska.

8 In the Whiting fleet it is one where there
9 is really no reason to have live observers on that
10 fleet when we can cover all of that with cameras. So,
11 hopefully, the Pacific Council will have that happen
12 in their next meeting in February.

13 Number four, have National Marine Fisheries
14 Service separate compliance and monitoring to the
15 regions from the science centers. Now, the science
16 centers on the West Coast are managing the camera
17 operations. We believe that there's a difference
18 between biological and compliance monitoring, and, if
19 that's the case, then why not move the compliance part
20 to the regions where it belongs?

21 Number four, have Alaska disaster relief
22 program process completed. We were granted about \$20
23 million in Alaska, as a result of a 2012 shut down of
24 commercial fishery in the Yukon and the Cook Inlet.
25 We have now put out about \$7.5 million, and we have

1 remaining.

2 We have a process in place now to put
3 research in Cook Inlet at about \$2 million, and so, we
4 want to get this program completed by this year, if we
5 can.

6 Number six, complete RecFIN database on the
7 West Coast. We manage all the recreational databases,
8 and we want to move that platform from one to -- from
9 basically -- to a sequel server database. We're in
10 the process of doing that. We have a contractor
11 involved. And that will happen starting next week.

12 Number seven, do something about sea lions.
13 It's been a disaster. We had 3,000 sea lions sitting
14 in Astoria chowing down on a number of our threatened
15 and endangered salmon species. In the long run, we
16 have the same case. We have some serious issues with
17 steelhead that are listed. We need to do something.

18 We ask -- Marine Fisheries Service could
19 probably help us try and figure out what to do. We've
20 been trapping about 30 of those a year, but that's a
21 drop in the bucket, so something needs to happen.

22 Number eight, set up a meaningful process
23 for the Klamath. We were granted about \$1 million by
24 the Fish and Wildlife Service to set a process to look
25 at the Klamath River and what can be done. Klamath

1 River stocks are one of the keys to continue fisheries
2 on the salmon on the West Coast. Those stocks are in
3 serious trouble. It's a water issue. We need to look
4 at all of the plans that have been developed to figure
5 out whether we can remove some of the dams there, and,
6 if so, how to deal with the farmers.

7 Number nine, continuing our fish, our effort
8 between the three of us. Each year, we go to the Hill
9 and meet with Appropriations staff. That's kind of
10 what Bob was mentioning. You go in and say here's
11 what we need to do, here's how we work with National
12 Fisheries Service. So we seriously lobby on behalf of
13 the states.

14 And number 10 is a complete mapping of coded
15 wire tag and PIT tag. What's that means is that we
16 manage coded wire tag programs for U.S./Canada, and we
17 also do the PIT tag program for the Columbia system
18 out of Bonneville. We do a lot of GIS mapping of
19 those activities, so if you're a researcher, you could
20 say, I want to know how many PIT tags were released in
21 the Naha, coded wire tags and PIT tags, and so, we
22 will have the ability to have those databases working
23 together. So that's my list of ten for the year 2015.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any comments, questions
25 from the members?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you,
3 gentlemen. As promised, you delivered quickly, and
4 helped us get right back on schedule, so we're going
5 to -- we'd like to get a chance to follow up on the
6 prior item.

7 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. On the IUU rulemakings
8 and deadlines I did, since I was not looking at the
9 cheat sheet, I did get some, a couple things screwed
10 up. So, there are two things coming out at the end of
11 October, or -- yeah. The species at risk -- the final
12 species at risk and the final set of criteria used to
13 determine the species at risk.

14 We are aiming for December 2015 for the IUU,
15 or the traceability proposed rule. I kind of got some
16 internal deadlines screwed up there, and we are,
17 something of a 60 to 90 day comment period, so it's
18 going to be pretty compressed.

19 You know, if we can do our internal review
20 faster -- we'll leave as much time for external review
21 as we possibly can, but the deadline that's in the
22 implementation plan is, as Keith said, which is
23 by -- we have to come out -- I think our deadline is
24 in Summer or Fall of 2016, to come out with the final
25 rule. So, it's going to be tough to go from proposed

1 to final in a less than one-year period for a big,
2 new, complicated rule.

3 So, you know, the implementation plan is
4 online. Different implementation plan, it's also
5 online. If you type in IUU task force, you'll find
6 our implementation plan and the inter, the final
7 deadlines. There are some internal deadlines, which
8 are out there that are targets. Thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thanks, Eileen. Okay.
10 So next up is a information briefing from MAFAC on
11 recreational fisheries. Returning to us is Russ Dunn,
12 the National Policy Advisor for recreational
13 fisheries. He's the national point of contact for the
14 saltwater and recreational fishing community, and
15 brings his 19 years of experience back to MAFAC again.

16 MR. DUNN: All right. I guess I was told
17 that most of the presentations have been done from up
18 here, so I will -- all right. So, I think I know most
19 of you, and for those who I may have not met, Keith
20 gave a quick overview.

21 I'm the Recreational Fisheries Policy
22 Advisor and have been working with leadership, and the
23 public, and our partners to develop, as you know, the
24 saltwater rec fisheries policy and implementation
25 plan. I believe, when we met in April, we had -- I

1 think in -- was it April?

2 MS. LOVETT: Yep.

3 MR. DUNN: We had just released, maybe, the
4 implementation plan, or we were just about to, so I
5 will spare you a long overview of the policy
6 implementation plan, and really am going to focus on
7 where have we been, what have we accomplished since
8 April.

9 So, quick refresher on the policy, then
10 recent progress on the plan, or the implementation
11 plan, and then, we'll talk about a couple of things
12 that are coming down the pipe.

13 So, if you'll recall, the policy -- while
14 the entire document represents the policy, the sort of
15 heart of it is captured in this phrase: for -- to
16 foster, support, and enhance a diverse array of
17 saltwater recreational fisheries' opportunities, for
18 the benefit of the nation.

19 So, it -- okay. We support the policy
20 through establishment of three goals. Essentially,
21 supporting and maintaining sustainable saltwater
22 recreational fisheries, promoting saltwater
23 recreational fisheries, for the benefit of the nation,
24 and enduring -- enabling, enduring participation
25 through application of science-based conversation and

1 management.

2 We then took those goals and underpinned
3 those goals with a set of six guiding principles. We
4 identified, I think the actual number is 64, but I
5 haven't counted recently, but, roughly, 60 agency
6 commitments over a four-year timeframe, and we broke
7 them down into a series of guiding principles, and so,
8 what I have done here is pulled out the guiding
9 principles, and just identified a handful of
10 commitments to give you a quick update on.

11 So, two of them -- and there are many more,
12 so, we can -- if you have specific questions over
13 some, I can give you an update. Otherwise, we can
14 talk offline if -- so, first, under supporting
15 ecosystem, conservation enhancement, one of them was
16 to host a workshop on artificial reefs, and,
17 essentially, their application in fisheries
18 management, and, more specifically, in recreational
19 fisheries management.

20 We are working with Atlantic states on
21 developing this workshop. We have just received, from
22 Atlantic states, a list of potential proposal, or list
23 of proposals for facilitators. So, we published an
24 RFP, or Atlantic states published an RFP, and we're
25 going to meet with them later this week to select a

1 facilitator, hopefully, I think on Thursday. So,
2 we're reviewing those proposals right now.

3 We anticipate hosting the workshop in June.
4 We've spoken with Gulf states about bringing their
5 folks in. We'll be inviting all the commissions, the
6 states, councils, other federal agencies. So, the
7 meeting will be hosted here, in Washington metro area.

8 Second is increasing angler engagement by
9 working through the -- sorry. Increasing angler
10 engagement in NFHP, and other habitat action
11 activities such as our NMFS focus areas. We're making
12 some progress here on the national level, the NFHP
13 level.

14 We now have in place four recreational
15 fisheries folks: Whit Fosburgh from TRCP, Mike
16 Leonard from ASA, Sean Stone from CCA, and Chris Wood
17 from Trout Unlimited. So, we want to make sure that
18 the recreational voice is captured at NFHP, and we're
19 working through our regional programs or offices to
20 better incorporate the recreational voice in our
21 habitat focus areas.

22 So, second guiding principle was promoting
23 public access to quality recreational fisheries
24 opportunities. If you haven't figured it out, the
25 key, the colors in the key relate to sort of where we

1 are in progress here.

2 So, first up here is the allocation issue.
3 This has been a long, ongoing issue, and we are very
4 close to final here. The CCC, the Council
5 Coordinating Committee, has accepted a triggers
6 document that they developed, as well as guidance on
7 those factors which should be considered once, and
8 they've decided or council has decided it is
9 appropriate to undertake a review of allocation.

10 So, those documents were accepted in, I want
11 to say June, at the CCC meeting and, as I understand
12 it, that, those documents are now in the process of
13 making their way through the NMFS policy directive
14 system.

15 Second under promoting public access is
16 collaborating with the Sanctuaries Office to highlight
17 recreational fisheries opportunities. One of the
18 projects here, Sanctuaries put out about three, two,
19 three months ago, a report highlighting the economic
20 importance of recreational fishing in West Coast
21 sanctuaries.

22 We worked with them on developing,
23 messaging, and the numbers themselves. They actually
24 drafted the report. I think it did a nice job -- it
25 was a series of reports for each of the sanctuaries.

1 It did a nice job of highlighting the importance of
2 rec fishing within those sanctuaries on the West
3 Coast.

4 Third, coordinating with state and federal
5 governments. This is to show you that I didn't just
6 cherry pick all the places where we are making
7 progress. So, one of the commitments that we have
8 made is to work better with the states to really
9 develop education programs, regarding the regs that
10 are out there.

11 One of the things we hear regularly from
12 people who are in conversation, either under duress,
13 or not, with the enforcement folks, state and federal,
14 is that they simply didn't know the reg. They didn't
15 understand that there was a minimum size, they didn't
16 under -- they didn't realize the bag limit had
17 changed, et cetera.

18 One of the commitments we made was to try
19 and work better with states and develop those
20 education programs so that there's a better awareness
21 among anglers, which can lead to improved compliance
22 and a better understanding of why those regulations
23 are necessary. That is one, frankly, I just have not
24 been able to turn to and start yet.

25 The second, establishing a better dialogue,

1 an improved dialogue with Fish and Wildlife. We've
2 made some progress here. I was just, last week, I was
3 talking to your sister advisory committee out in
4 Bozeman, the Sportfishing Boating Partnership Council,
5 giving them an update on what we've been doing the
6 last year or so.

7 I'm in conversation with them about bringing
8 a staffer from there here to talk to you all about
9 some of the activities that Fish and Wildlife and the
10 council itself are undertaking. We've been
11 sharing -- we've been, done some joint public outreach
12 actions together.

13 We shared a booth at ICAST this past year,
14 and that actually was very successful, for the two
15 federal agencies to be paired up there. We're working
16 on some leadership meetings between Eileen and their
17 leadership over there.

18 Four, advancing innovative solutions. So,
19 one, where we've -- we are making some substantial
20 progress is developing a blast model, which I actually
21 will ask our economists in the room to touch on, if
22 you have a question about what it specifically is.

23 It is essentially a tool to help us
24 understand the impacts and reactions of both anglers,
25 and the fish stock itself, to a given set of

1 regulations. It is sort of seen, I believe, as the
2 cutting edge of how to analyze the potential effects
3 of regulation.

4 It's been applied up in New England, the
5 mid-Atlantic is, has looked at the blast model, we're
6 trying to develop one down in the southeast, and we
7 were able to find some money last year in FY15 to
8 apply to developing a West Coast model. Three or four
9 components -- three of the four components, I believe,
10 have been developed to a large extent, and they are
11 continuing to work on finalizing this tool.

12 Next is a science plan of action for discard
13 and release mortality, to help guide our science work.

14 This is one that I think the rec fish program really,
15 actually played a very significant role in. We funded
16 the Office of Science and Technology to host a series
17 of workshops to sort of sketch out the appropriate
18 components of this, including a public workshop out on
19 the West Coast this Spring, this past Spring, which
20 helped really outline the key components of it.

21 It is being finalized now. I believe the
22 draft is being finalized now, and should be out in the
23 not too distant future for comment. This is
24 something -- you know, barotrauma and bycatch --
25 barotrauma is really a component of bycatch, and

1 bycatch is a -- is -- continues to be a priority, and
2 will continue to be a priority for the agency. We are
3 developing a new strategic plan for bycatch, and this
4 will be nested within that larger agency plan.

5 All right. Providing sound scientific data
6 of great interest to much of the rec community,
7 certainly on the East Coast, is an NRC -- a commitment
8 for an NRC review of MRIP, the Marine Recreational
9 Information Program. It's the catching effort program
10 for recreational fisheries.

11 This is -- it actually should probably be a
12 shade darker than this, but more or less, where we
13 stand is that the terms of reference have been
14 finalized with the NRC, and they are identifying
15 reviewers right now. I believe that by the end of
16 calendar year '16, we anticipate that they will be,
17 have completed their review, and provide us and the
18 public with a report.

19 So, I think that, you know, will answer a
20 lot of the questions of if, have we been on track,
21 have we not been on track, and where we have not been,
22 where do -- how do we need to course correct.

23 Fishing trip expenditure survey. One of the
24 areas we are -- have been trying to ramp up in the
25 last few years, and have been, but need to continue

1 doing so, is improved socio and economic data, and
2 then, its application in management.

3 We are -- our Office of Science and
4 Technology is leading efforts to execute the
5 expenditure survey in all of our states. Many of
6 the -- this will occur in sort of two phases over
7 calendar year '16 and '17, just because of the size of
8 it and the ability to get those out the door in
9 certain timeframe. And Sabrina is actually here. I
10 believe she's sort of overseeing that effort. So,
11 that is moving down the pike.

12 And then, finally, communicating, engaging
13 with the public. We are the first -- the commitment
14 here refers to efforts with, under our MRIP program to
15 form regional communications teams, which is part of a
16 larger effort within MRIP to revamp communications
17 efforts.

18 It has been widely recognized that our
19 communications on MRIP have been less than fully
20 effective, and this is one approach to addressing
21 that, is to form regional communications teams with
22 both agency folks and state folks and the general
23 public, so that we can have a better, both better
24 messaging, and a more transparent process.

25 And, finally, increasing the amount of

1 content on, I guess I should have said on NOAA
2 websites about, that are relevant to anglers. We have
3 begun this. We have, for example, national fishing,
4 boating week. I was able to be a guest writer for
5 administrator's me -- assistant administrator's
6 message for that week.

7 We have -- including some feature stories on
8 our website, we have some new, a number of new videos,
9 two new videos on barotrauma, related to recreational
10 fisheries, and we've been pushing out roughly double
11 the number of notifications to the larger rec
12 community, on actions of significance.

13 So, what is on the horizon? So, we are
14 stepping the national plan down to the regions. Those
15 are in development. We met with all of our folks in
16 mid-August arou -- from around the country to get the
17 ball rolling. Those are under, in development now,
18 and they are reaching out to the rec fish working
19 group. Hopefully, that -- some of you here on the
20 subcommittee have heard from them.

21 They are reaching out to the states and the
22 councils, commissions, et cetera, and will be drafting
23 regional plans based on the national framework, but
24 tailored to address region-specific issues. We expect
25 those in early 2016.

1 As I mentioned, the artificial reef
2 workshop, co-hosted by Atlantic states and NMFS. And,
3 we expect this in hopefully -- June is the target
4 workshop date and, as I said, we are working towards
5 trying to identify a facilitator this week.

6 And then, in '17, we'll provide a detailed
7 update, status update on where we are, with regard to
8 all 64 commitments, and at that time, that will give
9 us the ability to course correct, if needed, and let
10 you all know where we are, and where we still have
11 heavy lifting to do.

12 And I guess one last thing. I'm not sure if
13 I mentioned one -- I think one of the important steps
14 forward that was made this past year was the opening
15 of the SK grant process to the recreational community
16 and recreational issues. It was the first year that
17 was, it was available to the recreational, to
18 recreational issues.

19 There were about nine projects focused
20 really on recreational concerns or issues, most of
21 which were barotrauma-related, or release survival-
22 related, and totaling about \$2.2 million. And so,
23 that was a significant -- I think it demonstrated a
24 very significant shift in agency culture, because this
25 heretofore was not a grant program that was opened up

1 to recreational proposals.

2 So, that is it. Happy to take any questions
3 or comments and then we'll shift to Cliff. Ken?

4 MR. FRANKE: First of all, you've done an
5 amazing job, and I'm going to save all the rest of the
6 comments for my presentation.

7 MR. DUNN: Okay. Any others? Julie?

8 MS. MORRIS: You said somebody would be able
9 to tell us more about blast --

10 MR. DUNN: Yeah.

11 MS. MORRIS: -- and how it informs
12 management.

13 MR. DUNN: Yes. So, Cliff, you -- here you
14 are, right here. Can you save me here?

15 MR. FISHER: So, this is probably a bit of
16 an oversimplification, but, basically, a blast model
17 is, and that kind of category of models are called
18 bioeconomic models. So, they combined biological
19 models with economic models. In the case of blast,
20 we're talking combining stock assessment model with a
21 couple different economic models that look at angler
22 behavior and economic impact of the fishery.

23 So, say you have a stock assessment that
24 shows an improvement in the overall stocks, such that
25 it allows for some kind of liberalization of the

1 regulations, and a council is looking at a few
2 different alternatives. What the blast model would do
3 is it would estimate how those alternatives would
4 affect the overall number of angling trips that would
5 be taken.

6 You know, if you raised the bag limit, how
7 many more trips could you expect to be taken? What
8 would be the effect and the overall economic impact of
9 a fishery as a result of that change, and how would
10 overall harvesting increase, as a result of that
11 change, and how would that feed back into affecting
12 the stock?

13 MR. DUNN: That's what I said. Yeah. So,
14 any other questions? Comments? Yes, Liz?
15 And then --

16 MS. HAMILTON: I would just -- if I could
17 add to that discussion to ask you to remember that I
18 know this is a saltwater plan, but NOAA, because of
19 all the listings in the northwest, controls a lot of
20 freshwater fishing as well. So, you know, as you're
21 looking at the status of stocks and changes in angler
22 behavior, there's huge economics in the freshwater
23 fisheries there and I hope you're not ignoring that
24 when you do your West Coast updates.

25 MR. DUNN: Yeah. And because this

1 saltwater, it is not meant to exclude anadromous or
2 freshwater. It has that, because the vast majority of
3 what we do is marine-related. So, it was really to
4 avoid confusion, because, as we initially floated it
5 without that word in it, there was a lot of concern,
6 well, you're taking over the lakes and streams. No.
7 No.

8 MS. HAMILTON: No. No, but our oceans are
9 so rough for the kicker fleet that that's partly why
10 the economics in freshwater are so huge.

11 MR. DUNN: Yeah. No, they are duly
12 incorporated. All right. So with that, I'll turn it
13 to Dr. Hutt, who is going to talk to you about the
14 cost earnings report on marine bait and tackle stores
15 and this was brought up -- Eileen?

16 MS. SOBECK: So, I just wanted to make one
17 comment, which is, you know, this has been a high
18 priority for me. I didn't start this process of
19 getting the rec voice kind of better integrated
20 through NOAA, but it was a priority when I came here
21 and I wanted to make it a priority.

22 My goal is to put Russ out of a job, and to
23 have enough of a culture shift, so that we take the
24 rec fishing interest and bring rec fishing voices to
25 the table at every step of the process, so that we

1 don't need Russ, and a specific point person in each
2 region. I don't think that's going to happen any time
3 soon. I think, Russ, you're okay for a while, you
4 know.

5 MR. DUNN: Fifteen years until the kids go
6 to college.

7 MS. SOBECK: We know that you have kids to
8 put through college. Don't worry about it. But that
9 is the goal. Even though I do talk to Russ
10 frequently, you know, I'm -- I've had any number of
11 meetings where I get my normal briefing, and I
12 make -- I say why don't I see -- you know, I see in
13 this memo kind of a summary of where there is sectors,
14 and stakeholders, and interest groups are set up.

15 If I don't see rec fishing called out, I ask
16 whether there's been any inquiry or engagement, and I
17 expect others to do the same. I do think that we are
18 seeing that, and, you know, I think Russ and his team
19 deserve a lot of credit. Kudos, Russ.

20 We have briefings for leadership, regional
21 and Washington leadership, before every council
22 meeting, whenever there's a rec matter on the agenda
23 or anything. It might not have rec written on the
24 agenda, but, if there are impacts to rec interests,
25 Russ is always there asking the pointed questions.

1 So, I guess I just wanted to let folks know
2 that there are, I think there are a lot of things
3 happening that are really integral to this whole
4 effort. It's not just about plans, and it's not just
5 about checks in the box, it's, again, reaching up and
6 down our, through our organization and just asking
7 ourselves the hard question about whether we've been
8 inclusive in the voices at the table.

9 So, I think we're making progress on that,
10 but again, the proof is in the pudding, when people
11 feel included and heard, and so, if you're not and if
12 you see instances where you don't think that's
13 happening -- I'm not talking actual, necessarily,
14 outcome going one way, but the process of being at the
15 table and included early on. You know, please let me
16 know, and Russ know, in a regional context.

17 MR. DUNN: Okay. Thanks. All right.
18 Cliff?

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, our next two
20 speakers are Cliff Hutt. Cliff Hutt is going to talk
21 to us right now, and after that, Sabrina Lowell.
22 They're both economists, research economists. They
23 both have Ph.D.s in the field. Cliff was a 2013 Sea
24 Grant fellow. He's now with ECS Federal, a contractor
25 in NOAA Fisheries.

1 Sabrina is an economist in the Office of
2 Science and Technology here, in Silver Spring.
3 They'll be introducing us to some of the economics of
4 recreational fishing.

5 MR. HUTT: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thanks, Cliff.

7 MR. HUTT: So, I'm going to be talking to
8 you today about a survey we recently completed and a
9 report that just went out this past July. There was
10 an economic survey of marine bait and tackle stores.
11 The reason -- this was kind of identified as a big
12 need by a lot of industrial groups, American Sport
13 Fishing Association, and it was targeting retailers
14 that sell bait and tackle, particularly the
15 independent retailers we wanted to look at.

16 In our national models and our expenditure
17 surveys, these stores are kind of lumped in with
18 general sporting goods stores. And, particularly,
19 these smaller mom and pops, they're really drowned out
20 in that data by the bigger national chains. They're
21 selling a lot more than just recreational fishing bait
22 and tackle.

23 So the data there isn't very representative,
24 necessarily, of these smaller stores, and it's really
25 impossible to tease them out of the census data, so we

1 wanted to do a targeted effort, as we realize, you
2 know, while we don't directly manage these businesses,
3 our management efforts do affect them and their bottom
4 line.

5 To target them, we were, as I say, targeting
6 kind of these independent stores, mostly mom and pops.

7 We used like fishing license vendors as proxies for
8 our sample frame. You know, went to each of the
9 different coastal states, including Alaska and Hawaii,
10 to get lists of the stores that were authorized to
11 sell fishing licenses.

12 We also had a couple of national wholesalers
13 provide us with their customer lists -- Big Rock
14 Sports did that -- which was just extremely helpful in
15 kind of filling in some of the gaps. And we
16 concentrated on near coastal counties.

17 Our goal was, basically, to collect baseline
18 economic data, you know, gross sales, what percentage
19 of their sales were marine fishing-related, what were
20 their costs, so that we could get at things like, you
21 know their net revenues, as a result of fishing sales.

22 We wanted to know what kind of fisheries their
23 tar -- their customers were targeting, primarily. We
24 collected data for the 2013 fiscal year.

25 We used that to conduct cost earnings and

1 economic impact assessments, which we did by category
2 for bait and tackle versus kind of other stores that
3 also sell marine bait and tackle, such as convenience
4 stores, marinas, hardware stores, things of that
5 nature.

6 We worked very closely with different
7 industry groups to develop and promote the survey.
8 *Fishing Tackle* retailer magazine, which is an industry
9 trade publication, put out a couple of different
10 articles on the survey. They did one right as we were
11 starting to execute the survey, to encourage their
12 readers to participate in the survey, to fill it out.

13 Ken Franke provided a quote for that, a
14 ringing endorsement of the survey. They also did an
15 article in one of their last issues, kind of filling
16 in their readers on what the results of it were.

17 We got a fairly decent response. A lot
18 better than we were expecting from a lot of industry
19 folks retail. We got 27 percent nationwide. I had
20 one major industry person from Big Rock Sports tell me
21 he thought if we could get 10 percent, we'd hit it out
22 of the park, so I feel like we did pretty good on it,
23 and got just, responses from just under 1,000 stores.

24 About a little over a third of the stores
25 reporting were specific bait and tackle stores, that's

1 what they specialized in, with the rest being
2 distributed by various other categories, such as
3 general sporting goods stores, general retailers,
4 hardware stores, marinas, convenience stores.

5 Stores were, generally, on average, had been
6 in the business of selling marine bait and tackle for
7 25 years. Tended to employ about, you know, three
8 full time employees, on average, for bait and tackle
9 stores, upwards of seven for the other stores, and
10 about four part-time employees for bait and tackle.
11 It was at around six for other stores.

12 Average total sales for bait and tackle
13 stores -- you know, we had a wide range of stores in
14 terms of their gross sales. About a third of stores
15 we interviewed, their total gross sales were under
16 \$200,000, about a third were between \$200,000 and \$1
17 million, and about a third were over \$1 million.

18 The average total gross sales for bait and
19 tackle-specific stores is around \$800 million, with
20 about \$426 million being in saltwater bait and tackle.

21 For other stores, the average was a lot higher, about
22 twice as high, but only about eight percent of their
23 total sales, or \$140 million, was saltwater bait and
24 tackle. You know, we had some pretty big stores that
25 were pulling up the averages. The medians were a lot

1 lower.

2 Costs. You know, for the saltwater, the
3 bait and tackle stores were averaging about \$90,000 in
4 average. Excuse me. Did I say million here? No.
5 Yeah. About \$800,000 for bait and tackle stores.
6 Excuse me.

7 You know, so, sales, about \$426,000, on
8 average, for the bait and tackle stores, with costs of
9 about \$330,000, on average, per year, and, you know,
10 gross earnings of around \$93,000. For the other
11 stores, about \$140,000 in sales attributed to marine
12 bait and tackle, about \$110,000 in costs, and about
13 \$30,000 in net revenue associated with marine bait and
14 tackle sellers.

15 Total sales we estimate at about \$536
16 million in sales from bait, and tackle-specific stores
17 and \$318 million from the other stores, with about 45
18 percent of that being tackle-related, so lures,
19 terminal gear, rods and reels; 18 percent being bait;
20 and the rest being divided between fishing line,
21 apparel, other accessories, and some limited sales of
22 boating electronics, such as GPS units and fish
23 finders, and radios, and things of that nature.

24 Overall, we estimated the total economic
25 impacts of these sales to be about \$2.3 billion and

1 support about just under \$800 million in income,
2 employee and proprietor income, and supported around
3 16,000 full and part-time jobs.

4 Those impacts, you know, \$854 million of
5 those impacts were directly to the store selling the
6 bait and tackle, about \$774 million to the various
7 businesses that were supplying those stores, and about
8 \$700 million were impacts, as a result of household
9 spending by people who were employed through these
10 stores.

11 The big industries that were impacted,
12 besides just the marine bait and tackle retailers
13 themselves, were the service industries and the
14 manufacturing industries, as well as additional, you
15 know, retail and wholesale trade industries. Other
16 industries would include things like agriculture,
17 insurance, banking, things of that nature.

18 These impacts were fairly consistent between
19 sales and jobs, the big difference in jobs being about
20 half of the impacts were, job impacts, were at the
21 marine bait and tackle retailers themselves, and with
22 the reduced job impacts in the manufacturing industry,
23 thanks to automation in the industry.

24 Overall conclusions. You know, these bait
25 and tackle stores are pretty iconic fixtures in their

1 coastal communities. A lot of them have been around
2 for a long time. We found fairly solid cash flow for
3 these retailers, based on the data they provided and,
4 you know, these findings can help inform federal and
5 state decisionmakers on potential impacts to the
6 industry for management actions.

7 As I said, the final report was released in
8 July, and can be found at the link that was provided
9 in the presentation. And, with that, I'll take any
10 questions. Bob?

11 MR. RHEAULT: Cliff, just wondering -- Bob
12 Rheault -- there's a significant commercial rod and
13 reel fishery in many of our regions. Is there a way
14 to -- we're obviously, probably, shopping at the same
15 stores.

16 MR. HUTT: Uh-huh.

17 MR. RHEAULT: Is there a way to tease that
18 out?

19 MR. HUTT: We didn't specifically ask in
20 these, you know, how to -- we didn't ask the store
21 owners to try and tease that out, so we don't have it
22 directly with this data, but I think we could -- based
23 on some of our other cost earning studies, I mean, if
24 you had some more specific data in the region we
25 probably could, I mean, if we had some idea of how

1 many guys are out there doing trips.

2 When I was a Knauss fellow, I was with the,
3 you know, NAHMS, so I know the big rod and reel one
4 for us is those bluefin tuna ones up there in the
5 northeast. Based on trips, and, you know some of that
6 profile, the cost earnings profile data, I know we've
7 got expenditure data on that stuff from -- we did a
8 targeted HMS expenditure survey one, so we've got an
9 idea what the rec, the private guys, the rec guys are
10 spending.

11 We have not done a cost earnings one on the
12 commercial guys doing it, but I suspect, other than
13 maybe gas and their extra time out there, you know,
14 their expenditures on this kind of stuff is probably
15 fairly similar, at least percentage-wise.

16 So, you know, with the number -- knowing the
17 number of trips each are taking, we could maybe get,
18 you know, some rough ideas of it, of the two, of how
19 it might differ, but it would be a little rough.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any questions or
21 comments? Russ?

22 MR. DUNN: Just one quick comment. I think
23 this is, this was a really great example of how, if we
24 can partner with the rec community, we could really
25 get good information and data out there.

1 Cliff really worked hard to get out there,
2 and be seen, and work with groups, as he developed the
3 survey and execute the survey, and I think all that
4 came back in terms of those response rates and the
5 data that was provided. So, it's a great sort of
6 model to build on for how to do a successful effort
7 with the rec community.

8 MR. HUTT: All right. Sabrina?

9 MS. LOWELL: All right. So, I made a slight
10 change to the last slide, so --

11 MS. LOVETT: What's on the website might be
12 slightly --

13 MS. LOWELL: Okay. So, I'll just give you a
14 little, brief overview about some of the economic
15 surveys we just finished, and that we're about to do,
16 and Russ mentioned some of these already. James
17 Hilger, who's at our Southwest Fisheries Science
18 Center, is helping me with these, so his name is here,
19 but also, Scott Steinback helps me a lot, as well as
20 Cliff. So, okay.

21 We just finished in 2014, with results
22 coming in in 2015, the durable expenditures survey.
23 In 2011, we had trip and durable expenditures all on
24 the same survey, but for funding reasons, and other
25 things we just broke them apart this time.

1 So we did 2014, just the durables, which are
2 the 12 month expenditures -- I'll talk about that in a
3 minute -- and then, we're doing the trip part of that
4 in 2016/17, and then, I'll talk a little bit about a
5 survey we're doing, finishing up now in California
6 that actually Ken had helped a lot with, so feel free
7 to jump in at that point.

8 So, typically what we do is we try every
9 five years to collect data on what anglers are
10 spending on their fishing trips, and then their, what
11 we call durable equipment, the things that last from
12 one trip to another.

13 We try to get the trip expenditures by type
14 of trip, is it a short trip, a private boat trip, or a
15 for-hire trip, and we try to break it out by both
16 residents and nonresidents who took trips in that
17 state.

18 And, we use in person interviews, we make
19 use of the MRIP angler access intercept survey, where
20 we can, when we can't, we do mail surveys, or
21 sometimes we do both in the same state. Last time, in
22 2011, we also tried a web-based survey. Like I said,
23 every three to five years since 2006, we've been doing
24 it nationwide in all the coastal states. Let's see.

25 So, in 2014, our goal was to collect these

1 annual-type expenditures that aren't linked to a
2 specific trip, necessarily. Again, that was mostly
3 just for -- to -- the durables take a little bit more
4 time to analyze, so to help speed up the results, as
5 well as, just, we had some funding available in that
6 year.

7 Our target population was saltwater anglers
8 who went fishing in the past 12 months in all the
9 coastal states, except Hawaii. The reason Hawaii is
10 not on here is because it doesn't have a fishing
11 license. So, we couldn't get a good frame for Hawaii.

12 Licensed anglers who were identified using
13 state fishing license databases. Any license that
14 allowed for saltwater fishing during the prior 12
15 months was included, and that included just saltwater
16 fishing licenses, where some of the East Coast states
17 have specific saltwater only, and then, any combo
18 licenses. So, some of the West Coast states are just
19 freshwater/saltwater combo, so they were included, as
20 well.

21 What we were trying to get expenditures on
22 included things like tackle, rods, and reels, and
23 other gear, like lines, tackle boxes, that kind of
24 thing. And anything that's related to their fishing,
25 such as camping equipment, fishing clothing,

1 binoculars, taxidermy, subscriptions to fishing
2 magazines, fishing club dues, of course, the fishing
3 licenses themselves.

4 And the big ticket items, like boat
5 purchases, accessories, and related expenditures, like
6 maintenance and storage, and any vehicles that they
7 use for fishing, like a trailer or a truck they use to
8 pull the boat, and, again, insurance, registration,
9 stuff like that. And then, any second homes they may
10 have purchased, where they used it for saltwater
11 fishing at some point in time, and again, things like
12 maintenance and insurance for the home.

13 We had lower response rates this time around
14 than in 2011, and that's because we used only the
15 license frame, rather than the intercept first to get
16 some prior contact. So, the rates ranged from 20
17 percent to six percent. Overall, nationwide, it was
18 11 percent. We got about 11,000 surveys back. So,
19 the number was good, it's just the response rate was
20 low.

21 And, again, I think it's partly because when
22 you send out without intercepting people first, or no
23 prescreening calls, which we didn't do, because of the
24 expense, there's a lot of people who didn't go
25 saltwater fishing from those licenses, and you just

1 don't know ahead of time how many of those you're
2 picking up who only went freshwater. They just don't
3 mail the survey back. So, it's a little tougher when
4 you do this kind of cold license frame type survey,
5 without a prescreen first.

6 Some of the additional information that we
7 collected, other than their expenditures was the
8 number of days they went fishing in the state in the
9 past 12 months, their gender, their race, their
10 ethnicity, and age -- these are so we can use, just to
11 get a profile of the angler, but, also, to compare to
12 the demographics of the area, or try to do any kind of
13 nonresponse follow up to see what's going on -- the
14 number of years they've been saltwater fishing, and
15 their household income and education.

16 That's a picture of San Diego. Maybe Ken's
17 boat's there. I don't know.

18 And then, the demographics. The number of
19 days fished in the past 12 months, roughly about 28.
20 As with most of our surveys, the high majority of
21 anglers are male, 85 percent, and their -- tend to be
22 in their 50s. And they have quite a bit of saltwater
23 experience, 31.5 years here. And they tend to work
24 about 30 hours a week.

25 Here's a picture of their income

1 distribution. And, you'll see that the highest one
2 was \$100,000 to \$150,000, with 19 percent. Funny
3 thing is I compared this to our rec attitude survey,
4 and the distribution was nearly identical from the
5 survey that Russ did like a few years ago, which is
6 good, right, that they match? But I think some of
7 them changed by like one percentage point, but almost
8 same picture.

9 Then the angler education levels. We have a
10 lot of people who are, had some college or above,
11 which then explains why their income's fairly high.
12 Some of the average U.S. expenditures, for what I call
13 the light equipment and fishing-related gear, like
14 rods and reels, the average was \$226 a year, tackle
15 \$171, and then, you can see it goes down from there.
16 Average cost on licenses, about \$35.

17 Here's, across the states, a picture of just
18 the tackle and related gear. The mean overall
19 anglers, both resident, nonresident, Florida comes in
20 the highest. No surprise, really. Some of the warm
21 water states come in higher than the cold water
22 states, like Maine, for instance. So, all right.

23 And then, what we've done with this is to
24 take those expenditures, and run them through our
25 impact models. We use IMPLAN, that we've been using

1 for a while now, and we estimate the things, like
2 Cliff was talking about with the other survey: the
3 number of jobs, the output, which we call sales, and
4 the personal income. We're writing the report right
5 now, so it's almost finished. Okay.

6 Moving on to the trip expenditure surveys,
7 we have worked with the Gulf states already to get
8 Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi to add a trip
9 expenditure questionnaire onto the intercept, starting
10 in 2016. We are about to, you know, get all that
11 going.

12 And what we're going to be asking about is,
13 you know, what was their species they were targeting,
14 where did they go, what's the motive, trip, the
15 length. Some of this comes off the MRIP itself, and
16 then, we ask trip expenditure questions like how much
17 did you spend on hotel, food, transportation, boat
18 fuel, charter or guide fees, and a few other things.
19 It usually just takes another minute or two to add on
20 to the MRIP. So, we get pretty good response rates,
21 in general.

22 Unfortunately, this year, Louisiana's not
23 doing the MRIP, so we're going to have to do a mail
24 survey in Louisiana, as well as Texas, and so
25 we're -- Cliff and I have put together an RFP what's

1 going to go out this week, to get that. Then we
2 definitely want to do those two states in 2016.

3 Depending on how much money it's going to
4 cost, we're going to try to do Alaska, as well, in
5 '16, and HMS, and the West Coast, but, if we don't
6 have enough money, we're going to push that off to '17
7 for some of those states. And then, we are not doing
8 the Atlantic, Maine to Georgia, until 2017, to let
9 their program get going with the new mode of having
10 the states do everything.

11 And then, finally, James Hilger is
12 conducting a study in San Diego right now on overnight
13 and non-U.S. charter party trips, and looking at
14 methods that will best pick up a representative sample
15 for that group, because we don't think the current way
16 of doing the license frame, or, you know, using the
17 California MRIP type intercept always picks these
18 people up.

19 So, his question was what's the best method
20 to contact the anglers and get them to respond. So,
21 he's trying three different things. He's doing a
22 dockside in person, where, after the trip, they ask
23 them about their expenditures. He's handing out a
24 survey, and asking them to mail it back, and then,
25 he's collecting the name and address and mailing the

1 survey, and asking, obviously, for them to mail that
2 back.

3 And here's how many things they've done in
4 each of those. It's actually going much better than
5 we imagined, so far. The thing we want to look at is
6 what of these three things had the best response rate,
7 how much does it cost to conduct each of those three,
8 and how good is the data that we get from them.

9 We're using the same type of trip
10 expenditure form that we're using in the other states,
11 modified just slightly. The field work is almost
12 complete, and they're getting the last mailings in
13 right now. So, we don't have any results at this
14 time, but we will soon.

15 So, Ken, do you want to say anything about
16 this? Because Ken's been helping with this.

17 MR. FISHER: No. Yeah. We appreciate what
18 you're doing. The big issue there is we have a very
19 large fleet in San Diego that fishes from Central
20 America, French Polynesia all the way up, 16-day
21 trips. This group of anglers will commonly walk on a
22 boat with \$30,000 of fishing rods, will have flown
23 from Europe.

24 The demographics of the group is
25 substantially different than what would be normal for

1 a recreational person in California. Economically, to
2 San Diego it's 200,000 people. So, it's a different
3 group. That number is going to be very important for
4 future decisions in our region. So, we appreciate
5 your work.

6 MS. LOWELL: Thanks. So, the idea is that
7 once James figures out what the best method is, then
8 we'd want to implement the actual survey, hopefully,
9 in '16 or '17. So any questions, you can contact me.
10 Here's another picture from Dana Point, California,
11 taken by me when I was out there.

12 So, hopefully, we'll get some good surveys
13 out this coming year, and we'll have funding, but of
14 course, as you know, funding is always tight. So,
15 that's about it. Any questions? Yes?

16 MS. MORRIS: So, in the part of the fishery
17 management plan amendment where there, we're looking
18 at the different alternatives, and there's like sort
19 of a discussion of the economic impact, as well as
20 the, you know, the other impacts --

21 MS. LOWELL: Right. Uh-huh.

22 MS. MORRIS: -- is that how this
23 information -- will this information be drawn into
24 those analyses? Is that how it would be used?

25 MS. LOWELL: Well, theoretically, it could

1 be. Yes. Uh-huh. You would have to make, you know,
2 some adjustments and figure out -- you might have to
3 run, using the data, some new simulations. Normally,
4 we just do it at a state level, so you'd have -- and
5 not species-specific, so --

6 MS. MORRIS: So, you'd have state level
7 data, but not species-specific data.

8 MS. LOWELL: Well, you could possibly do
9 that. I'm just saying, for our typical reports, we
10 talk about it at a state level, for all the species
11 combined. But for a management plan, you'd want to
12 drill down into the data. And if the anglers answered
13 what species they were fishing for, then you could do
14 that. Yeah.

15 MS. MORRIS: And the bait and tackle data
16 will be available at the state level as well?

17 MR. HUTT: It is right now available at the
18 regional level. We have handouts just by Northeast,
19 Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf, West Coast,
20 Alaska.

21 MS. LOWELL: That's because we just don't
22 have a big enough sample at the state level to do a
23 good statistical analysis. Yes?

24 MS. HAMILTON: We're used to looking at trip
25 expenditures, but, in our industry -- I mean, that's

1 important, expenditures, but, for us, it's all about
2 the durables, so I'm really thrilled that you're
3 looking at that.

4 Is there a way to combine the two? In other
5 words, what someone in, one of our customers spends
6 that day that they go is minuscule, compared to what
7 he spent being able to go fishing, and so -- you know,
8 boats, motors, trailers, electronic, 12 of every lure
9 out there, I mean, there's a lot of money spent that
10 isn't associated with that trip.

11 I've always been curious whether or not the
12 two could be articulated together, so when you're
13 looking at a fishery, you could apportion a percentage
14 of durables to the trips. Does that --

15 MS. LOWELL: It's a little tricky --

16 MS. HAMILTON: Yeah.

17 MS. LOWELL: -- but, you probably could come
18 up with something. I mean you just need to ask the
19 anglers a little bit more questions and then, you
20 know -- because what we don't know is what share of
21 the durables they're using for any given trip.

22 MS. HAMILTON: Right.

23 MS. LOWELL: If you knew that, obviously you
24 could do that, right, so?

25 MS. HAMILTON: Yeah, it would be tricky. I

1 guess you'd have to know how many trips per year --

2 MS. LOWELL: That's right.

3 MS. HAMILTON: -- and that sort of thing.

4 But on the other hand, that's the real snapshot of the
5 economic horsepower.

6 MS. LOWELL: Right. Right.

7 MS. HAMILTON: The other -- since the both
8 of you are answering questions right now, I will ask
9 that, in the survey, was it only coastal county
10 independence, or --

11 MS. LOWELL: Cliff, you'd have to --

12 MS. HAMILTON: Cliff, was it only coastal
13 county independence, or -- because some of the
14 independence in the Northwest, their biggest
15 fisheries, their biggest economics of the year, come
16 to the customers that are walking through an Oregon
17 City, Oregon store, but their customers are going to
18 fish saltwater. So, I wondered how that --

19 MR. HUTT: Yeah. We've seen -- in addition
20 to the coastal counties, we kind of, in each state,
21 worked our way back, at least, into the next couple
22 lines of counties inland.

23 MS. HAMILTON: Right. Just to graph --

24 MR. HUTT: In some of the smaller states, we
25 did the whole state. Florida, we did the whole state,

1 just because it was like, what the heck do you want to
2 do when Florida is coast to coast. But, we asked them
3 for their total sales of fishing, and what percentage
4 was saltwater, so we have estimates for the total
5 fishing-related sales and what they felt was used
6 primarily for saltwater.

7 MS. HAMILTON: Good. Thank you.

8 MS. LOWELL: And in the northwest didn't we
9 actually work up the rivers a little bit, sometimes?

10 MR. HUTT: Yeah. In some areas, like
11 around -- in this area we kind of worked the counties
12 all around the Chesapeake Bay, to get those anadromous
13 stripers. We did that a bit around New York, with the
14 Hudson River Valley. Out West, you know, we talked to
15 some of our folks out there, like how far are some of
16 these salmon fisheries coming in, to capture those
17 counties as well.

18 MS. HAMILTON: Yeah. I noticed the color on
19 your map and was wondering that question.

20 MR. HUTT: Yeah.

21 MS. HAMILTON: The blue that went up the
22 Columbia, that -- okay.

23 MR. HUTT: Yeah. Yeah. That's the blue.

24 MS. HAMILTON: And in -- yeah.

25 MS. LOWELL: Okay. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Sabrina.
2 Thank you, Cliff. Thank you, Russ. Ken might go next
3 before we take our lunch break on the recreational
4 fisheries working group.

5 MR. FRANKE: Thank you. First of all, I
6 know the most unpopular person is always going to talk
7 before lunch, so we're going to make this real short.

8 A lot of the material that I was going to cover, Russ
9 has covered very concisely, as well as some of the
10 materials that they already covered.

11 What I wanted to share with you all is, you
12 know, this, personally, for me is my last meeting.
13 When we started six years ago, most of you were not
14 here, so you weren't privy to the strategic planning
15 effort MAFAC did in the beginning, and I wanted to
16 share with you some of that.

17 When we started, there was no Russ. We had
18 no infrastructure. Our committee basically met and
19 the core group, and they were primarily -- we had one
20 commercial fisherman, we had an environmental group
21 representative, and we had three recreational fishing
22 people. My background was marine law enforcement, but
23 I owned a commercial charter boat.

24 What we came up with was a strategic plan,
25 basically from a business standpoint. What are the

1 issues, how are we going to pay for it, and what's
2 going to be the methodology that we can work with the
3 NMFS administration to try and move things forward.
4 And, I share that with you, because it applies to
5 aquaculture, commercial fishing, what have you.

6 Key to that, the statistical research being
7 done now by the economists, Dr. Hilger, and Sabrina
8 and Cliff, that work has become very valuable. In our
9 region, we're using that material with the
10 mayor's -- the governor's office to move issues that
11 are important to us.

12 I would submit the same thing would
13 be -- whether it's aquaculture, commercial fishing,
14 the whiting, whatever, crabs, getting that statistical
15 research by an unbiased third party, NMFS, is
16 incredibly valuable to us.

17 So, as we, and our subcommittee, were
18 looking at the future, we looked at critical
19 infrastructure, and critical to that was getting that
20 socioeconomic impact information, which I think is
21 definitely on the road.

22 The MAFAC committee on ground zero, what we
23 wanted to do was look where we could make
24 recommendations that were significant, but, at the
25 same time, did something. Not a philosophical pie in

1 the sky, but what can we actually do and actually see
2 it happen.

3 We recommended back then that there be a
4 line-item budget for recreational fishing. The value
5 of that to the other sectors was to hopefully target
6 those areas where there's unintended consequences, or
7 maybe even points of conflict, whether it be
8 allocation, who gets what piece of the pie.

9 So, as a group, MAFAC went through some very
10 arduous discussions about, well what can we recommend
11 going forward that we can accomplish some of this, and
12 hopefully reduce those points of conflict, which that
13 segued into, well we need to have a meeting. That's
14 where that first summit that Russ was talking about
15 was.

16 We had 177 reps there, we had a member of
17 the White House staff there as well, and we made a
18 laundry list of, you know, here's our concerns. Then
19 Russ was tasked with trying to compile it. Then what
20 we did behind the scenes, and I'd recommend, you know,
21 moving forward -- those of you that haven't
22 participated like this, please do -- we got to Russ
23 and we got to the NMFS administration and said, okay,
24 where can we help make those recommendations.

25 Kind of like Keith was saying earlier, we

1 can maybe say as a group here what the NMFS staff may
2 not be able to. That maybe included in congressional
3 commentary, et cetera.

4 So, moving forward, the goal was, is, well
5 what do we recommend? So, as a group, MAFAC
6 recommended that we start looking for some
7 representation on the councils, because there was a
8 perception that there was inadequate, so that
9 recommendation was made.

10 We recommended that there be line-item
11 budgeting for recreational fishing, and that Russ get
12 some staff, as well as not just the empirical staff
13 right where he's at, but regional coordinators. We
14 recommended that there be planning, strategic planning
15 by Russ and his group, but, seeking the input of the
16 industry, as well as the private recreational folks.

17 What we as a group realized, though, is a
18 lot of those folks that go fishing, they don't want to
19 fill out surveys. They want to go fishing with their
20 family, and call it a day and go on their picnic. So,
21 there really wasn't a good voice like at the councils,
22 et cetera, except for those people that were in
23 organized groups, and there weren't a lot of them.

24 So, we looked to have our subcommittee be
25 that voice, to a point, and make those recommendations

1 to help Russ along in his planning efforts. Russ, you
2 have done -- you, Danielle, Bob, have done an amazing
3 job. I sincerely mean that. You have spent hundreds
4 of hours on phone calls and doing documentation with
5 his folks.

6 Russ has been very good about seeking the
7 voice of the impacted parties. I know he's been
8 flying all over the country, face to face meetings.
9 I've been in countless -- I don't even think I could
10 count how many meetings I've been in with Russ all
11 over the country. You know, open, approachable,
12 that's the kind of NMFS that we need. Russ and his
13 crew, you know, my accolades to you.

14 So, going forward, where we're directed now
15 is we did the second summit. The second summit was
16 how did we do between the first summit and this one.
17 We looked at the laundry list, we checked the boxes,
18 and now, moving forward, the focus, I think, is for
19 those regional coordinators to start connecting
20 directly with their communities, which the effort is
21 already afoot to do that.

22 The rec fishing working group, which we, as
23 a group, four years ago, five years ago asked to be
24 put together to provide us with input on the
25 local/regional issues, I think we're at the point this

1 afternoon we're going to discuss sunsetting that, and
2 transitioning that for redirection into the regional
3 coordinators now that they're in place.

4 I would hope that, moving forward, the
5 regional coordinators, those positions remain in
6 place, as a point that the community can connect with
7 NMFS, again, hopefully, to reduce those points of
8 conflict. I know they're working on the allocation
9 issues, et cetera. It just depends, regionally, where
10 the problems are.

11 At the subcommittee level, what we'd be
12 talking about this afternoon is, okay, you know,
13 what's the vision now for a future? A new vision. We
14 had our first five-year vision, I think we did a good
15 job within MAFAC, as a group, to accomplish that, but
16 now, we're going to have to transition into the next
17 steps as well.

18 So, with that, I open it up to questions or
19 comments. Thank you. Sounds like lunchtime, so --

20 MS. SOBECK: Well I just wanted to
21 underscore thanks to Ken and everybody on the rec
22 committee for helping and having MAFAC be kind of a,
23 you know, center of gravity for helping us move
24 forward.

25 As an agency, in a constructive way, I

1 agree, Ken, we're trying to reduce those points of
2 friction that aren't amenable, but I do think that
3 this committee is a really great place to put, kind
4 of, structures in place, processes in place, and to
5 get together information that will help us move
6 forward when we reach those points of friction, in an
7 informed way, instead of sort of a panic, knee jerk,
8 uninformed way, which sometimes -- when you don't have
9 the tools at hand, you just react.

10 I will just say that I've only seen one
11 lapse of judgment on your part, and that was when you
12 decided that at Noon on, in August in La Jolla, that
13 you could find a parking place for big honking truck
14 and a boat trailer. Since that's a land-based model,
15 I'm going to give you a pass on it.

16 Let me just say that, you know, to thank you
17 again for your contributions to MAFAC. We look
18 forward to working with you and, you know, the
19 California rec fishing folks, in particular, and to
20 keep on, keep going forward with our, improving our
21 interface with the rec world in general.

22 MS. MORRIS: So, the agenda says that this
23 is an action item. Is that an action item for today
24 or tomorrow?

25 MR. FRANKE: I believe the rec fish working

1 group, we need to meet as a group to discuss the
2 action item. I think that was premature. I think
3 that should have gone on the next day.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, you're anticipating
5 that we'll discuss it --

6 MR. FRANKE: We're going to discuss it and
7 then come to you with a recommendation, so that you
8 can vote on what you want to do for the future with
9 that group. Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. All right. Any
11 other comments? Any questions?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So we are
14 scheduled to be back from lunch at 1:15, and let's do
15 that promptly, because we have a large, stocked
16 schedule. See everybody at 1:15. Thank you.

17 (Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the meeting in
18 the above-entitled matter recessed, to reconvene at
19 1:15 p.m. this same day, Wednesday, October 14, 2015.)

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

1 thanks for the opportunity to talk to you today.

2 John, can you hear me okay?

3 MR. CORBIN: Yes, I can, Michael.

4 DR. RUBINO: All right. Thanks. So, I was
5 asked to provide a little background about the
6 strategic plan, which all of the headquarters program
7 offices and regional offices are putting together this
8 year, but I wanted to give you a little bit of context
9 for what I hear and see going on in aquaculture around
10 the country.

11 I'd very much like to hear from you later,
12 as well, in terms of what you're hearing and seeing,
13 and then, you know, what does that mean in terms of
14 our role and responsibilities as an agency.

15 You know, going around the country, this
16 part of the world, in the Chesapeake Bay, I was at an
17 East Coast seafood forum at the National Aquarium in
18 Baltimore last week. State of Maryland has 4,200
19 acres of new shellfish leases that they've put in for
20 oyster farming in the past three or four years.

21 That was, in part, due to an effort by some
22 of my colleagues at our Northeast, now greater
23 Atlantic office, Corps of Engineers, State of
24 Maryland. Put together a general permit for shellfish
25 farming in the State of Maryland.

1 And this is typically all up and down the
2 East Coast. I mean, I've got kids in their 20s. They
3 live in Boston, New York, and Washington. After work,
4 they all go to bars and eat oysters on the half shell.

5 That's booming. And many of the people doing that
6 are from fishing and seafood families in coastal
7 communities.

8 Aquaculture is now the third largest landed
9 value fishery on the East Coast. In 2013, it was \$220
10 million. That's probably closer to \$300 million now,
11 because that was a down year for salmon in Maine. So,
12 it's largely salmon, Maine, and then, oysters, clams,
13 mussels, from Maine down through Virginia. Virginia's
14 gone from five million oysters a year in aquaculture,
15 to almost 50 million oysters.

16 How many do they have planted, Bob? Maybe
17 100 million oysters planted coming in the future.

18 On the West Coast, our large seafood
19 companies that fish for pollock in Alaska, process
20 seafood, import a lot of seafood, at least three of
21 them now own aquaculture operations in the United
22 States.

23 One owns all the salmon farms in Puget
24 Sound, another one owns the largest, or the second
25 largest shellfish company on the West Coast, and

1 Steelhead Farms on the Columbia River, a third, owns a
2 major abalone farm in Hawaii. They're all importing
3 lots of aquaculture product from other parts of the
4 world.

5 A number of them, as well as some of our
6 other large seafood companies, had an opportunity last
7 February to meet with Dr. Sullivan at something called
8 the Seafood Summit, that conference where the NGOs
9 meet the seafood community. They all urged NOAA to
10 get more involved in marine aquaculture, in part
11 because they think that China's eating our lunch.

12 So these are companies that rely on, at the
13 moment rely on imported seafood and they're worried
14 that with the rising middle class in Asia, that all
15 that seafood that they import is going to stay in
16 Asia, but will only be available to us at a higher
17 price.

18 So, it will be interesting to see in the
19 next several years whether or not this broader, sort
20 of seafood fisheries community, gets more engaged in
21 solving some of our social and political issues in
22 marine aquaculture in the U.S.

23 So, that's kind of the backdrop, a little
24 bit, from what I'm hearing. Here we are, one of the
25 smallest program offices within NOAA, working to make

1 a bit of the difference. The last major engagement we
2 had with the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee was
3 in the run up to a 10-year plan for aquaculture, that
4 we put together back in 2007, so I very much
5 appreciate the opportunity to be able to engage with
6 MAFAC again. That was such a positive experience back
7 then.

8 This time, I wanted to thank, in particular,
9 John Corbin and Bob Rheault for chairing a task force
10 of MAFAC that provided us with some great advice on
11 this Gulf rule, that is now at OMB for the final
12 review, in terms of how it would work, as well as
13 providing recommendations on a strategic plan.

14 So, let me run through these slides very
15 quickly. And I think that will leave us lots of time
16 for discussion afterwards.

17 This strategic plan is currently out for
18 public review. Just a reminder of our drivers. I
19 could have added Magnuson-Stevens Act, Fish and
20 Wildlife Coordination Act. The agency has, depending
21 upon how you want to read these, regulatory management
22 and economic development responsibilities, not just in
23 federal waters, but in coastal waters, as well, for
24 aquaculture.

25 Well, back again. The other thing to

1 remember is that aquaculture for us is not just
2 aquaculture to produce seafood, but also, aquaculture
3 is a tool to restore endangered species. Think all
4 those salmon hatcheries on the West Coast or salmon
5 hatcheries in Maine.

6 We're talking about perhaps trying to
7 protect and restore abalone populations on the West
8 Coast through hatchery techniques. Coral reefs in
9 Florida are using hatchery techniques to grow corals.
10 So, aquaculture has both a commercial and a public
11 purpose. We think, you know, the science needs are
12 often quite the same, and overlap.

13 On the commercial side, in terms of seafood
14 production, I think you're all well-aware of all of
15 the constraints to marine aquaculture. We have
16 crowded coast lines, lots of different ideas about
17 what to do with those coast lines, conflicting uses,
18 complicated regulatory process, and so on.

19 This is what we set out to do in the 10-year
20 plan, and I think we've made a good bit of progress
21 since 2007. As I mentioned, in the coastal
22 environment we've worked a lot on shellfish farming
23 with the Corps of Engineers and states to improve the,
24 you know, how to get permits, access to sites, while
25 at the same time, maintaining our safeguards missions.

1 We finally have one model for federal waters
2 in the Gulf of Mexico in this draft rule, and we're
3 working with the Corps of Engineers and EPA on a
4 slightly different approach off southern California
5 for a project some of you may have seen, that Sea
6 World and an investor group are putting together.

7 We now have an Office of Aquaculture at
8 NOAA. There's a budget line. It's got a little bit
9 more traction internally, in terms of recognition with
10 our colleagues. And we have been able to do, and
11 we're quite proud of, quite a bit of technology
12 transfer. Think the Sea Grant program, in terms of
13 their grant competition.

14 What the extension agents have been able to
15 do around the country the past several years,
16 installed Kennedy grant program. That's had a
17 significant aquaculture component. We've done quite
18 well in the Small Business Innovation Research
19 program, or the SBIR program, for aquaculture.

20 Seaweed farming in Maine, for example.
21 There are two different companies over the past three
22 years that have received Phase 2 grants for -- to get
23 them going in terms of seaweed farming.

24 On the science side, we focused on what a
25 colleague of mine likes to call tools for rules.

1 Making sure that we have the science and management
2 tools to be able to fulfill our regulatory
3 responsibilities, both in terms of consulting with the
4 Corps of Engineers on permits in state waters, and
5 getting ready for these permits in federal waters.

6 So that's dealing with all of the usual
7 environmental questions of finfish aquaculture that
8 you're well familiar with and have heard about, but
9 also on the shellfish side, looking at things like,
10 well what's the habitat equivalency of shellfish, and
11 what about shellfish and eel grass.

12 So, there's an outline of strategic plan.
13 It's on our website. I don't know whether it was sent
14 to you, but some of you may have it. We put together,
15 you know, vision and mission statements, which you can
16 read.

17 We did try to think about a target. I
18 wasn't really in favor of trying to have a target. I
19 think, as a program, we're too small to perhaps really
20 make a difference in terms of jump starting
21 aquaculture in the U.S. in a big way, but my staff
22 convinced me that we should at least put in a target
23 of continuing the growth path that we've been on for
24 the past several years.

25 I think, as a program, and as an agency,

1 working with many partners around the country, marine
2 aquaculture has grown eight percent a year over the
3 past five years, whereas aquaculture in the U.S.
4 overall has been flat, and even declining in terms of
5 production, because catfish farming is half of what it
6 was a few years ago. But salmon farming, oyster,
7 clam, and mussel farming are all on an increasing
8 trajectory.

9 The things we'd like to focus on, going
10 forward, in some ways look quite similar to the things
11 that we've focused on in recent years. Continuing to
12 work with the Corps of Engineers, and EPA, and state
13 governments on making sure that we do a good job as
14 public servants and regulatory agencies, to make sure
15 that all of those various safeguard missions are
16 fulfilled, but at the same time making it a little
17 easier for the permit applicant.

18 So that's everything from doing coastal
19 marine spacial planning, to go through that dance, to
20 how do you coordinate activities between several
21 federal permits.

22 So, for example, this draft rule in the Gulf
23 of Mexico, in addition to the draft rule, we're
24 working on a memorandum of understanding with six
25 federal agencies that's ready to be signed, so that

1 the permit applicant will come in and have one
2 pre-application meeting with the federal agencies that
3 they need permits from, they'll submit one set of sort
4 of business planning permit documents, they'll still
5 have to get a permit from EPA, a permit from the
6 Corps, and an EPA from NOAA, but the process will be
7 coordinated.

8 There will be one set of monitoring and
9 reporting guidelines that would go to all three
10 agencies. So, this is the kind of work we're trying
11 to do to be more efficient about our job. At the same
12 time, you know, through our science program we want to
13 continue pushing the envelope on smart design,
14 sustainable production, and to make sure that we
15 continue to refine those tools for rules, so that we
16 can be good managers and regulators.

17 And then, budget permitting, and
18 partnerships permitting, continue to work on tech
19 transfer, in helping to jump start this sector. If
20 you go to our website, I think you'll see some
21 elements of how we're trying to do a better job of
22 getting out information that we have collected as an
23 agency to the public.

24 A couple of weeks ago, it was aquaculture
25 week, and my colleagues put together a story map that

1 you can go to. It's a map of the United States. You
2 can click on different parts of the U.S. and look at
3 the research projects that are happening around the
4 country at our NOAA fisheries labs, in the field of
5 aquaculture. You can drill down to, okay, what are
6 they doing, and actually get the project reports, and
7 so on.

8 Over the next -- this next year, we intend
9 to expand that to include the SK projects, the Sea
10 Grant projects, and other things that are going around
11 NOAA, in terms of aquaculture. So, it will be an easy
12 place to go to gain information to sort of what we've
13 been up to.

14 Like many strategic plans, we have
15 cross-cutting strategies. That should be no surprise
16 to them. There a whole variety of deliverables
17 tailored to those key goals, and I'll let you go to
18 the plan, and hope you can provide us some comments on
19 whether we're focusing on the right things, given the
20 limited budget, or whether you'd like us to focus on
21 some other things.

22 As I said, the MAFAC, at least the task
23 force of MAFAC, has provided us some very concrete
24 recommendations on the strategic plans. I very much
25 appreciate those.

1 I read the appendices, or the annexes, for
2 the first time a couple of days ago, and it's a very
3 ambitious set of recommendations and, or ambitious
4 workload that the task force is recommending, a
5 workload that's well beyond our current level of
6 funding and staffing, but I guess its provides sort of
7 an aspirational benchmark for where we could go, as an
8 agency, in partnership with all of you.

9 So, these are some of the things that MAFAC
10 recommended last time, back in 2006 and 2007, I think
11 most of which we were able to implement. The one
12 thing that didn't happen, MAFAC also recommended that
13 our budget be substantially increased, and that hasn't
14 happened since then.

15 So, questions? Comments?

16 MS. BONNEY: I have a question.

17 DR. RUBINO: Yeah?

18 MS. BONNEY: To the chair. So, you said
19 that there's been a 50 percent increase in the last
20 five years in aquaculture. What was the --

21 DR. RUBINO: In marine. On the marine side.

22 MS. BONNEY: What?

23 DR. RUBINO: On the marine aquaculture side.

24 MS. BONNEY: Marine aquaculture side.

25 DR. RUBINO: Not aquaculture overall.

1 MS. BONNEY: But aquaculture overall, or
2 only --

3 DR. RUBINO: Overall, it's been flat.

4 MS. BONNEY: Okay.

5 DR. RUBINO: The value overall has gone up
6 slightly, but production's down, because catfish is
7 down. Farmers can make more money growing corn, and
8 they have to -- and they're competing with all that
9 imported stuff from southeast Asia.

10 MS. BONNEY: So what was the trend before
11 the -- this last five year clip?

12 DR. RUBINO: Well I -- you know, a couple of
13 things happened. It's largely -- salmon farming in
14 Maine went through a whole change. You know, first it
15 was a whole collection of U.S. companies. Then, three
16 Norwegian companies came in, and bought it, and
17 consolidated. Then the federal agencies required the
18 industry to go local genetic stock, so the Norwegians
19 left. Cooke Aquaculture came in, and bought all the
20 assets, and is now the major owner up there.

21 So, they've brought production to where it
22 had been 10 or 15 years ago, but with completely new
23 practices. I mean, I think if you go up there now,
24 you'd be quite surprised. There's been a lot of
25 learning, you know.

1 So, it's all open genetic stock, genetic
2 marking. They can trace every fish from every
3 hatchery batch. They've had virtually no escapes in
4 eight years. They don't use antibiotics anymore,
5 because they vaccinate. They have underwater cameras
6 for feeding. They foul between crops. They've
7 reopened a processing facility in one of the poorest
8 counties of the country. So, that's one of our
9 success stories.

10 A somewhat similar thing happened with
11 salmon farming in Puget Sound, which it kind of limped
12 along and new ownership came in and revised that.
13 Then I think the other big factor is this boom in
14 oyster production on the East Coast and on the West
15 Coast.

16 On the East Coast, it's a lot of younger
17 people getting into oyster farming, and watermen and
18 fishermen going into it. If you go out to the tip of
19 Long Island, for example, a lot of guys who used to
20 fish for lobsters can't do it anymore, because there
21 are no lobsters to catch, so they're putting out
22 oyster cages. On the West Coast, there haven't been a
23 lot of new permits, but the production within existing
24 permits has intensified.

25 In the Gulf, I think the industry there is

1 just realizing that, gee, we could do what the
2 Northeast is doing, and grow oysters off the bottom,
3 and baby them a little bit, and get these high market
4 prices for them. So, I think in Alabama and
5 Mississippi there are a couple of dozen small farms
6 that have started up to grow oysters off the bottom.

7 That's kind of a long answer to your
8 question about why there's been this increase.

9 MS. BONNEY: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mike?

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Doctor, I'm from Pacific
12 Seafood, and we're one of the companies you mentioned
13 has a steelhead farm and --

14 DR. RUBINO: Right. And you own coastal
15 oysters.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- I think some of our
17 group was about to, at least, your name's mentioned,
18 that they I think met with --

19 DR. RUBINO: I met with three of your
20 colleagues last week, or two weeks ago. Right.

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm just, I'm more of a
22 wild fish, always have been, but I'm learning more
23 about aquaculture, because our company's getting more
24 invested. One of the difficulties that I've seen up
25 front and personal is the Humboldt Bay project, which

1 seems to have a lot of opposition from the local
2 level. Is there any -- without getting in the weeds,
3 or the eel grass, in this case --

4 DR. RUBINO: Uh-huh.

5 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- is there any interaction
6 with the federal side, and the state side to kind of,
7 I guess, if not shape policy, at least get a better
8 understanding of the science and the environmental
9 stuff?

10 DR. RUBINO: One thing we did a number of
11 years ago, at the request of both the commercial and
12 the restoration community, on the shellfish side, was
13 to start something called the National Shellfish
14 Initiative --

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

16 DR. RUBINO: -- which was really a way to
17 wave a banner, to sort of shine attention on some of
18 the things going on in both commercial and restoration
19 shellfish.

20 The State of Washington picked up that
21 banner in particular and used it to do quite a number
22 of innovative things and to bring more attention, more
23 money, the attention of the agencies as well, both
24 federal and state, on the permitting questions, issues
25 like ocean acidification. We were able to start a new

1 shellfish research hatchery at our Manchester lab,
2 with the Puget Sound restoration fund and the
3 commercial sector working together.

4 A similar thing is happening in California,
5 and Humboldt Bay is one of the key things they're
6 looking at. So, there are two things going on in
7 Humboldt. One, the harbor district is working with
8 the Corps of Engineers, NOAA, and the state agencies,
9 to set up a master permit for Humboldt Bay.

10 So, they're going to try to solve these
11 conservation questions of eel grass ahead of time, and
12 so, identify exactly where shellfish farming will be
13 allowed. The idea of that is with the master permit
14 out of the way, individual leases will be easier and
15 quicker to obtain.

16 Pacific Shellfish is not waiting for that.
17 They want to go for an individual permit, as well, to
18 expand their existing footprint to back to where they
19 were a number of years ago. So, the federal agencies
20 and state agencies are also working with Pacific
21 Shellfish on that permit, as well.

22 So, there's -- my understanding is I've got
23 a, we've got a number of colleagues on the West Coast
24 working with the Corps of Engineers and state agencies
25 and Pacific Shellfish on that permit.

1 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Thank you.

2 DR. RUBINO: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Ken?

4 MR. FRANKE: Yeah, Ken Franke. Not to get
5 too far into the weeds, but on the California area, we
6 have a coastal commission out there. Are they
7 anywhere involved in the dialogue?

8 DR. RUBINO: They're involved in the
9 dialogue on both shellfish and finfish. As you may
10 know, the first shellfish farm in federal waters was
11 permitted this past year, and the coastal commission
12 was quite involved in reviewing that project and
13 working with state and federal agencies on the
14 monitoring requirements.

15 In fact, we're still -- we, NOAA -- are
16 working with them, and the Corps, and the company on
17 some, revising some of those monitoring requirements
18 going forward.

19 The coastal commission's also been involved
20 in looking at the Rose Canyon fishery project, the one
21 that Hubbs-Sea World and Christy Walton have teamed up
22 to do off San Diego. So, you know, Don Kent and
23 company have had a number of meetings with the coastal
24 commission.

25 MR. FRANKE: I think my question is are they

1 cooperating with you?

2 DR. RUBINO: I think so. Yeah. You know, I
3 think there's -- I think we've reached -- you know,
4 another thing we're seeing, I think, is we've reached
5 sort of a tipping point in public perception about
6 aquaculture.

7 We had many years of wild versus farm,
8 aquaculture's a bad thing, but I think through a
9 number of reports, and just the practical experience
10 of the past 10 years -- many are realizing that
11 aquaculture, including finfish farming, is a very
12 efficient way to produce protein in terms of you can
13 grow a lot of fish in a very small space, whether it's
14 ponds, tanks, or net pens. The food conversion is
15 much, much lower than terrestrial animals, or at
16 least, lower than beef and pork.

17 Yeah, there are environmental questions,
18 like with any human activity, but we've learned about
19 what to do and what not to do. That example I gave of
20 Maine in terms of the way they're doing salmon farming
21 I think is, you know, the most responsible,
22 sustainable approaches that I've seen in the world.
23 So, the industry's starting to get credit for some of
24 that.

25 I also think, especially if you look at the

1 East Coast, the fishermen and watermen and their sons
2 and daughters engaged in aquaculture, who are no
3 longer thinking of these things, necessarily, as
4 separate so much, but as a range of technologies to
5 produce seafood. Yeah, at some level, everything
6 competes with everything else, but the real
7 competition is the imports.

8 So, I, you know, I think we have a ways to
9 go if we're going to really have a major increase in
10 marine aquaculture in the United States. We either
11 have to make room for it in our backyards, so then
12 there's that social process, or we need to invest a
13 lot of money in re-circulated technology to bring the
14 cost of growing marine species in tanks down by
15 several orders of magnitude, which I think will happen
16 eventually, but not tomorrow.

17 DR. RUBINO: Julie?

18 MS. MORRIS: Michael, you mentioned the
19 off-bottom shellfish aquaculture in the Gulf kind of
20 in passing, but could you explain that project a
21 little bit more?

22 DR. RUBINO: Yeah. Traditionally, shellfish
23 has been grown on the bottom, either by putting out
24 shell to attract natural spat, the babies, which then
25 attach themselves, or, in some cases, doing what's

1 called spat on shell, where there's a hatchery that
2 grows the larvae and then has them settle on oyster,
3 old oyster shell in tanks, then puts that shell out on
4 the bottom.

5 So, there's still a fair amount of that
6 going on in the Gulf, particularly the natural spat,
7 and some of that going on in the Chesapeake Bay still,
8 both types.

9 But there have been difficulties in the Gulf
10 with natural spat recruitment. You know, all the
11 Mississippi River diversions that have changed the
12 freshwater. Further east in the Gulf, they've had not
13 enough freshwater, in Florida and Alabama in
14 particular.

15 And so, a couple of the Sea Grant research
16 labs, the one at Dauphin Island in Alabama and the one
17 at Grand Isle in Louisiana, have been working with
18 colleagues in the Northeast and the Northwest on
19 techniques for growing oysters off the bottom, either
20 in cages that are on the bottom, or cages that are
21 suspended in the water column, or in floating cages on
22 the surface. There are all different kinds of
23 methods.

24 What they also then do with that method is
25 they, either through movement of the cages, or by

1 taking the oysters out of the cage, they tumble them,
2 chip the shell which creates a nice deep cup with a
3 flat top, which the half-shell oyster market wants.
4 So that's why they can get 50, 60, 70 cents an oyster,
5 rather than five, or 10, or 15 cents an oyster, for
6 this half shell trade going into oyster bars.

7 So, as I said, I know a couple people in
8 Alabama who are -- have started up farms and are
9 selling to local restaurants in Mobile and in New
10 Orleans, and there are several in Louisiana starting
11 up as well. And it has the strong support at least in
12 Alabama and Mississippi, I'm told, of the state
13 fisheries agencies.

14 Yep?

15 MR. MCCARTY: Are you aware of who might be
16 leading research and implementation on marine
17 aquaponics, integrating maybe a biofiltration system
18 and mitigating ocean acidification?

19 DR. RUBINO: Aquaponics is a way of growing
20 seafood, typically on land, in tanks.

21 MR. MCCARTY: I'm saying in like a marine
22 context. Marine aquaponics.

23 DR. RUBINO: You mean, sort of growing fish,
24 say mussels and algae, in proximity to each other?
25 That's something called -- integrated multitrophic

1 aquaculture is the buzzword these days for that. And,
2 there is some research going on both in Maine and
3 Washington State on that.

4 In Maine, the University of Maine is working
5 with Cooke Aquaculture, the salmon company, both in
6 Maine and in New Brunswick, to grow mussels and
7 seaweed around the cages. The idea is that the
8 mussels and seaweed take up the nutrients, excess
9 nutrients from the salmon.

10 Remains to be seen whether that really works
11 or not. It's a pretty highly dynamic environment with
12 a lot of nutrients in the water anyway. You know,
13 relatively close to the cages, there's no difference
14 in water quality. They're also finding some
15 interesting sort of prophylactic benefits for the fish
16 having mussels and seaweed nearby as well.

17 So that's -- it's an interesting area of
18 research. Similar work going on on the West Coast.
19 In fact, at our Manchester lab. So, but it's in early
20 stages.

21 Eileen?

22 MS. SOBECK: I just wanted to thank Michael.
23 I mean, he's invested so much, and I think has -- he
24 and his team have a ton of ideas, and we've had a lot
25 of good conversations, and a lot of support from Sam,

1 and a lot of interesting conversations with NOAA
2 leadership and Dr. Sullivan.

3 You know, I think there is a renewed
4 appetite to think about aquaculture and its future. I
5 think that the quandary that we're in is there are a
6 lot of great ideas, but there's not a lot of new
7 dollars to invest in it. We've made some attempts to
8 add new money to the aquaculture budget, and haven't
9 been particularly successful yet, and we keep thinking
10 about new ways to do that.

11 You know, if your work here at MAFAC and
12 your support led to some new money to pursue some of
13 these great laundry list of ideas I know Michael has
14 percolating and I know that you guys in your reports
15 have as well, that would be great, but I think that we
16 have to consider the potential reality, the perhaps
17 even likely reality, that expanded investment in
18 aquaculture -- we're talking about, again, a zero sum
19 budget -- is going to come from somewhere else.

20 So, I think in addition to the laundry list
21 of great ideas that we could do if we had a hundred
22 times the money, we would be interested in your views
23 about what are some -- you know, in a more
24 budget-constrained reality where our aquaculture
25 budget remains about the same, where are the most

1 fruitful ideas for new partnerships to make some of
2 these new ideas happen.

3 Among the possible new things that we could
4 take on, how are they prioritized, so if we can only
5 do one or two instead of 99 or 100, which we do, and
6 are there areas that we're spending time on that don't
7 make sense.

8 So, it would really be helpful, to the
9 extent that you all could help provide some of that
10 information, because that is what keeps me up at
11 night. Not what great ideas we could bring to the
12 table if, but how, within the reality, are we going to
13 continue to make progress.

14 Because there is -- I mean progress is
15 happening even without a substantial investment, but
16 how can we jump start it? How can we make it happen
17 sooner, and better, and with, and more easily, and get
18 rid of some of the friction that's clearly still in
19 the system?

20 DR. RUBINO: If I may, I think that leads
21 really nicely into the next section, because we were
22 asked to provide just that sort of guidance. We'll
23 pulled together a task force of some really smart
24 people. I don't know if you want to go right into
25 that yet, Mr. Chair, but it does seem to be a perfect

1 lead in.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any other comments from
3 any of the other members? Phil?

4 MR. DUSKOW: Thank you, Keith.

5 Eileen, help me understand something. We
6 have a very business commerce proactive secretary, we
7 have a President that has said he really wants to do
8 this, and yet, you say there is no climate for getting
9 additional funds right now. Who else would you need
10 to shake the tree with, other than the President and
11 the secretary? What's going on that we don't
12 understand?

13 MS. SOBECK: I think that we need you all, I
14 think we need everybody who could potentially benefit
15 from aquaculture to say that it should be a priority.

16 What we're hearing is, yes, it's a priority, but
17 you've got all your other Magnuson thing, Act things
18 that we want you to do so keep on doing those, and
19 aquaculture, that's good, do that, too.

20 MR. DUSKOW: Well, but extra money --

21 MS. SOBECK: I'm just --

22 MR. DUSKOW: -- if the President wants to do
23 it, the secretary wants to do it, and it seems to make
24 such perfect sense in an environment where we're
25 importing so much of our aquaculture seafood, is this

1 something, Heaven forbid, Congress needs to get
2 involved with?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MS. SOBECK: Right now, in our budgets, you
5 know, there are winners and there are losers. If
6 you -- you know, to put new money somewhere -- there
7 is not new money on top of existing money, there is
8 only reallocating money from one area to a new area.
9 So new dollars from aquaculture right now -- there are
10 not -- there is not new money on top of other money.

11 MR. DUSKOW: I guess I'm asking the wrong
12 question. I'm really trying to understand this.
13 Where does new money come from?

14 MS. SOBECK: Sam?

15 MR. RAUCH: So, if you could go back to
16 Paul's presentation this morning, you'll see the
17 President asked for something like \$960 million in
18 discretionary funds --

19 MR. DUSKOW: Yeah, I've got that.

20 MR. RAUCH: -- Congress, the two bills in
21 the House, \$890 million discretionary funds.

22 MR. DUSKOW: I understand that.

23 MR. RAUCH: So, there's no discretionary
24 funds in Congress, despite what the President's asking
25 for. So if you want new -- if your question is where

1 does new money come from, that's where it comes from.

2 The President has asked for it. Congress has no
3 appetite to give it right now. That's what we have to
4 change.

5 MR. DUSKOW: So there are no -- am I
6 hearing, Sam, that there are no champions for
7 aquaculture in Congress?

8 MR. RAUCH: Not for funding of aquaculture.
9 No. Not for new funding. At least of coastal marine
10 aquaculture. I think there are some supporters for
11 the catfish aquaculture industry.

12 MR. DUSKOW: Okay. Thanks.

13 DR. RUBINO: Again, that may change with
14 these developments that I talked about in my opening
15 remarks, too. In terms of the seafood industry as a
16 whole, are they going to step up in the next few
17 years?

18 MS. SOBECK: I mean that, there might be
19 more advocates, but again, the federal government
20 budget is not growing. You say where would this
21 money -- new -- where would new money come from. I
22 mean, maybe the President could take it from DOD.

23 I mean, they -- the amount of discretionary
24 funding and the appetite for increase is about like
25 this, and so -- and there are a lot of competing, so

1 this is one of many asks. It could be a very, you
2 know, compared to overall budget, a very small amount,
3 but the reality is the Secretary of Commerce and the
4 administrator of NOAA have pretty small latitude in
5 terms of new money.

6 You heard some of the competing objectives
7 that we have. We have ships that are ending the end
8 of their lifetime, we have laboratories -- I don't
9 know if you've been to Buttswoold or our Miami Science
10 Center recently. You know, kind of one moderate
11 hurricane, and our Miami science facility is in the
12 drink. Those are all needs competing for the same
13 flat funds. So, I mean, I don't mean to be glib about
14 this, I'm just telling you the reality of what we're
15 finding.

16 DR. RUBINO: So, as Eileen said, there are
17 ways to do this within existing budgets, too, but it
18 means you have to stop doing something else. So how
19 do we be creative about leveraging? We're also doing
20 a fair amount of that, talking to the Economic
21 Development Administration, talking to other parts of
22 NOAA, talking to USDA.

23 The Department of Energy this year is going
24 to do a \$30 million competitive grants program for
25 marine algae and they want to have the awards done by

1 next August, so 10 projects, \$3 million each. They're
2 relying on our NOAA expertise but we're leveraging
3 Department of Energy money to get that done. So, you
4 know, leveraging partnerships is another way with
5 limited budgets so we're going down that path, too.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mike?

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Speaking a little bit out
8 of frustration, but I went to that Santa Rosa
9 presentation we did and we've been two years in
10 Humboldt Bay, I guess, attempting to get that set up.

11 I can see some kind of cost recovery or enhancement
12 coming from the aquaculture side. I'm saying this for
13 my own company, you know, in, to help. I mean to help
14 fund what you're doing.

15 I sat there and counted. We had a four hour
16 meeting, they drug it out to six hours. CDFNW got
17 there a half an hour late, they interrupted us
18 constantly. We had a attorney, a geologist, a
19 biologist, ecosystem modeler, and I figure we're
20 paying probably \$1,000 to \$1,200 an hour just to sit
21 those guys down and give a presentation, plus I don't
22 know how many hundred pages of DIR, I guess they call
23 it.

24 I'd rather, much rather see our company
25 partnering up and seeing if we can get some things

1 done responsibly than fighting continually to make any
2 progress whatsoever, which at the end of the meeting,
3 I felt we'd gone nowhere.

4 So, when you're -- if you -- doesn't really
5 matter where you spend the money. As you well know,
6 if you're spending it somewhere, you can't spend it
7 somewhere else. At a certain point -- the difference
8 is, at a certain point, we lose profitability.

9 We're already talking about taking ground
10 and making it half as productive, in order to protect
11 eel grass that wasn't there a few years ago. So, I
12 mean -- and we're talking about restoration on
13 saltwater marshes. Quite a bit of stuff, but none of
14 it passed muster in these people's eyes. So I
15 guess --

16 MS. SOBECK: These people, are those NMFS
17 people? I don't --

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: No, no, no, no, no. No.

19 MS. SOBECK: The same folks. Okay. I just
20 wanted to clarify.

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But, see, we have NAMSERV,
22 whatever agency it is, and plus being threatened to be
23 sued and this and that, so it's like, there's probably
24 a more common sensical way to go about this. I don't
25 know what the magic button is, but we appreciate what

1 NOAA's done so far in aquaculture very much, because
2 we'd like to explore that.

3 As you -- 91 percent of our seafood is
4 imported, and we'd like to see if we could turn that
5 around on a small measure, but start somewhere. So it
6 -- but like I say, it was a little bit of a
7 frustrating process for me to sit through. I mean, it
8 was actual hostility in there. It's just like, you
9 know, really? So, I don't know.

10 MS. SOBECK: Right. We've got a lot of
11 states we've got to work with. We've got to find a
12 way. We've got to work with the Corps to deal with
13 some eel grass issues. You know, I mean I agree. We
14 share your frustration, and any suggestions you guys
15 have about how to move past that --

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I bring it up only for
17 one reason, not to just express to vent. I'm not
18 meaning to do that, but that's what we're up against
19 and we're going to have to get that solved if we're
20 going to move forward, I think, in a meaningful way,
21 where you can really put money down and expect to get
22 some return on it.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: John, are you still
24 hearing all this on the phone?

25 MR. CORBIN: I am.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So there's been --

2 MR. CORBIN: Can I also add a comment?

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. There's been
4 quite a bit of frustration over the budgetary issues,
5 and I think some of that is reflected in the report
6 that came back from the task force. I'd love to hear
7 your comments, and then you take that opportunity to
8 introduce the comments from the task force, please.

9 MR. CORBIN: Yeah. I know we're running out
10 of time. I just want to say, in my opinion, the task
11 force would not be doing its job if it didn't indicate
12 that NOAA is under funding aquaculture, marine
13 aquaculture. The need is continuing to grow every
14 year and the risk in our food security is continuing
15 to grow every year. NOAA wanted to hear expert
16 opinion, and from well-informed people, and that's the
17 message is that, you know, more funds are needed to
18 make more progress.

19 Now, I appreciate that we have to work
20 within our means and we have to prioritize and all of
21 that, I've done all of that working for state
22 government, but the message from this task force is we
23 need to find some more money to make more progress.

24 I'd like to ask Michael one question real
25 quick. The NOAA program is described as an informal

1 program made up of three offices. The aquaculture
2 office doesn't have any real authority over any of
3 those, so can you talk a little bit about how you get
4 things done and will implement the strategic plan in
5 that kind of environment.

6 DR. RUBINO: Yeah. I guess I should start
7 with a historical, little historical background. When
8 I first arrived in the agency, it was to direct a
9 cross-line office matrix program, to use the jargon,
10 so there were components at NOAA Fisheries, the
11 National Sea Grant Program, and the National Ocean
12 Service.

13 The matrix approach to things at NOAA went
14 away a number of years ago and we created an Office of
15 Aquaculture within the fisheries service, but we
16 still, informally, have maintained our strong working
17 relationship with the Sea Grant program, and with the
18 science side of the National Ocean Service in
19 particular.

20 So, we get together, the three directors of
21 those groups, on a regular basis, our staffs work
22 together on science things, on coordinating extension
23 services. We've even put budget initiatives together.
24 So, no, I don't have management responsibilities for
25 those other two parts, but I work closely with them.

1 Does that answer the question, John?

2 MR. CORBIN: Yes. Thank you, Michael.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: John, I --

4 MR. CORBIN: Keith, do you want me to go
5 ahead and proceed with the remarks I was going to
6 make?

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: We'd like you to. I
8 know there are some other folks who want to speak, but
9 Dr. Rubino has to leave at 2:30, so we've got a hard
10 stop for this dialogue. I know you want to get
11 through the ATF stuff so, yes, please.

12 MR. CORBIN: All right. I was going to say
13 a little bit about the task force and its workings,
14 but I don't think we really have time for that, so
15 jumping to the findings and the priority
16 recommendations, we found that there are compelling
17 reasons and trends for implementing the current
18 national policy to expand domestic marine aquaculture.
19 It has to do with U.S. food security.

20 U.S. imports are at 91 percent, supplied by
21 an extended global supply chain that is subject to
22 increasing risk of disruption from a variety of
23 influential mega trends, such as global population
24 growth, global climate change, shifts in import/export
25 volumes from producer countries, and occasional

1 geopolitical events.

2 It's becoming clear that these mega trends
3 and others will impact the supply and distribution of
4 food stuff around the world, and seafood is really no
5 exception.

6 ATF recognizes there's been recent progress
7 in developing marine aquaculture, and Michael has
8 alluded to that. We really applaud that. In some
9 respects, marine aquaculture has never had it so good.
10 We have a well-crafted national policy in place for
11 industry development and, there's a dedicated Office
12 of Aquaculture with experienced staff to work with.

13 But there are recurring challenges, and ATF
14 knows that to reach its full potential, these
15 challenges have to be met. We deem most urgent is the
16 failure to complete the adoption of the rule to
17 implement the fishery management plan for regulatory
18 offshore marine aquaculture in the Gulf of Mexico.

19 Also significant is the failure to complete
20 the development of the coordinated permit process that
21 Michael alluded to, so that permits can be processed
22 and issued efficiently for commercial aquaculture in
23 federal waters.

24 In terms of the priority concerns or
25 recommendations, ATF, in reviewing the program and the

1 plan, came up with 21 concerns -- I'm on page 5 now of
2 the report -- for further discussion, and they boiled
3 that down to 11 priority concerns.

4 At 4.1, they ask for NOAA to continue the
5 consolidated permit process for the Gulf of Mexico,
6 and begin issuing permits. The Gulf Council adopted
7 the aquaculture FNP in 2009, but the rule has been in
8 limbo. Currently, the draft rule is at OMB for final
9 review, with no deadline apparent.

10 4.2 requests NOAA, in consultation with the
11 Fisheries Council, to define an efficient standardized
12 permit process for short term aquaculture research
13 projects. There has been a few research projects
14 approved by NOAA for federal waters under MSA, but the
15 process adapts fishing research permits to
16 aquaculture. We really think that needs to be
17 changed.

18 4.3 requests that a new plan indicates that
19 NOAA Fisheries is the lead coordinating agency for
20 marine aquaculture in the Federal Government and the
21 plan is really a national plan, not just a NOAA
22 Fisheries plan.

23 ATF believes that NOAA Fisheries should be
24 recognized as the lead, considering its unique marine
25 aquaculture mission, staffing, and extensive science

1 resources to support development. Such a declaration
2 could help the agency and the aquaculture office would
3 facilitate in cooperation and collaboration both
4 within and outside NOAA.

5 4.4 indicates the U.S. industry and the
6 investment community are looking for a clear
7 declaration that NOAA is fully behind commercial
8 marine aquaculture in federal waters and the
9 implementation of the plan. This also focuses on
10 leadership.

11 When coastal states have fully committed to
12 implementing their aquaculture policies and plans, and
13 committed staffing and funding resources to action,
14 industry has come forward with viable projects.
15 Potential benefits include -- I'm sorry.

16 4.5 recommended NOAA -- it recommended NOAA
17 reduce perceived internal conflicts in processing
18 aquaculture permits that delay timely action. ATF
19 discussed examples of permits that were held up or
20 denied and the perception was NOAA officers charged
21 with resource management and protection did not use
22 best practices or best available science in the
23 decisions.

24 Today, resources are readily available to
25 help address these questions from NOAA's own agencies.

1 For example, the National Ocean Service and its tools
2 for rules application.

3 4.6 asks the aquaculture office to seek
4 positive endorsements of the new plan from NOAA
5 administrators or the Secretary of Commerce in the
6 form of a letter introducing the new plan. This is,
7 was done for the recreational fishing plans.

8 4.7 similarly suggests showing support for
9 marine aquaculture can be demonstrated by the
10 strategic plan being adopted as --

11 (Electronic interference.)

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: You there, John?

13 (Pause.)

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, while we wait for
15 Heidi to reconnect, Bill, do you want to take that
16 opportunity to ask the question that you had?

17 MR. DUSKOW: Thank you. The question was,
18 and I guess you're the person to address this to
19 Keith, has MAFAC ever established an official position
20 in the form of a resolution on what we would like NMFS
21 to do, in regard to aquaculture?

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: There have been numerous
23 positions taken over the years, including one where we
24 had a specific statement on funding. Nothing as
25 explicit as what Eileen is asking for, which is, you

1 know, what do you not cut in return for what you want
2 to fund.

3 I think that would be something that you
4 guys could certainly consider down the road as you
5 convene through the Commerce subcommittee and reach
6 out to the task force. Get specific feedback and give
7 specific ideas. I think you've heard very clearly
8 what their constraint is.

9 MS. SOBECK: I'm not saying we wouldn't
10 welcome you guys saying that we should ask for more,
11 but asking for more of everything hasn't worked for
12 us. So, it's, "do you want this more than some
13 existing thing that we're doing?" That is a powerful
14 statement. Just saying you want more for this isn't a
15 powerful statement. So that's just the reality.
16 Either would be, you know.

17 MR. DUSKOW: You know, I'm just thinking in
18 -- having some history of working with EPA on a number
19 of issues, they seem to be able to come up with money.
20 I don't know what they're, what is different.
21 Obviously something is. I guess I'm not asking for an
22 answer, but --

23 MS. SOBECK: I mean well -- yeah. I mean,
24 gee, you know, if we could come up with money -- we've
25 been trying to figure out how to come up with money

1 with support for this program, and for others. As you
2 know, there's just, there's not as much money as we
3 want there.

4 MR. DUSKOW: It certainly hurts if there
5 aren't champions in Congress that are willing to say,
6 "here's \$100 million to develop a vibrant aquaculture
7 industry."

8 MS. LOVETT: John? John?

9 MR. CORBIN: Yes?

10 MS. LOVETT: Excuse me. We lost you. The
11 connection was broke for a few moments. What number
12 are you on now?

13 MS. BONNEY: He was on 4.6 when we --

14 MALE VOICE: 4.7.

15 MS. BONNEY: Or 4.7.

16 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. You had started --

17 MR. CORBIN: Oh no.

18 MS. LOVETT: I apologize.

19 MR. CORBIN: I was on -- I'm sorry. I was
20 on seven?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

22 MR. CORBIN: Okay.

23 MS. LOVETT: Sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Sorry, John.

25 MR. CORBIN: Hello?

1 MS. LOVETT: Hi. We're here. We can hear
2 you now.

3 MR. CORBIN: This is really, really bad.
4 Your voices are going in and out. I hope you can hear
5 me. So what --

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: John, we do hear you.
7 John?

8 MR. CORBIN: Yes?

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: We do hear you. You're
10 going to start at 4.8. If you would, please, just
11 check in for a response after each number.

12 MR. CORBIN: Okay. Good. 4.8 recommends
13 that the plan should have more specifics in its
14 objectives and deliverables, and more measurable
15 outcomes. Basically ATF suggests it could be improved
16 by being less aspirational and with more quantifiable
17 outputs, metrics, and outcomes for both management and
18 accountability. We understand that -- we know that
19 this is a difficult task, but the Department of
20 Agriculture does this routinely in their planning.

21 4.9 expresses concern that the principal
22 driver of the plan, the five year target of at least
23 50 percent increase, is continuing status quo growth
24 rate at eight percent per year. ATF had a real
25 problem with this approach, extrapolating an existing

1 growth rate.

2 Basically, we believe this is a new plan
3 with a new approach and new ideas and there should be
4 a much more ambitious growth target, or why have a
5 plan at all. ATF suggests at least two times the
6 current volume production from marine aquaculture is a
7 reasonable target, particularly given what is
8 happening in the industry and what is on the horizon.

9 Michael alluded to some of that in his presentation.

10 4.10 also focuses on the planned target goal
11 and illustrates it's much too low compared to the need
12 for increasing domestic aquaculture.

13 4.11 asks for NOAA to develop a marine
14 finfish aquaculture initiative to complement the
15 successful Shellfish Initiative.

16 Am I still on?

17 ALL: Yes.

18 MR. CORBIN: Yeah. Okay. NOAA in a past
19 report projected marine finfish aquaculture has the
20 highest growth potential of all aquaculture products,
21 more than three times that of shellfish. ATF took
22 advantage of its marine finfish expertise and outlined
23 what an initiative might look like in Attachment B.

24 I'm going to just mention the attachment
25 very quickly, and then we can open the floor for

1 discussion. Attachment B has five additional ATF
2 concerns and recommendations for NOAA and they are
3 deemed significant, but not priority.

4 Attachment C responds to a request from the
5 aquaculture office as what ATF's priorities would be
6 if new money were available, and there are three top
7 priorities in that list.

8 Attachment D provides an annotated outline
9 of some ideas for the essential components for marine
10 finfish aquaculture initiative. This was a top
11 priority in the discussion.

12 I'll stop there and we can explore the text,
13 the main text or the attachments as you wish.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, knowing that, Bob,
15 you were a big part of this dialogue as well, do you
16 want to start with any comments?

17 MR. RHEULT: Uh-huh. Just to point out
18 that we had a lot of very talented people brought
19 together. Initially, our charge was to evaluate the
20 FNP, but since we had all these talented people, we
21 kept getting requests from Michael to look at other
22 things.

23 So, we were asked to look at the strategic
24 plan, we were asked to do a mock permit in the Gulf,
25 we were asked what would we prioritize spending on if

1 more money were to come available. That was the most
2 fun of all the various tasks we were assigned.

3 And then, I think that one of the better
4 things we came up with was this Finfish Initiative,
5 patterned after the Shellfish Initiative, which I
6 remind everyone didn't cost any money. There was no
7 money put out by NOAA. It was, allowed us to shine a
8 bright line.

9 A lot of what we're asking for is simply to
10 have the administration shine a bright light on this
11 issue, acknowledge that this is a priority to our,
12 NOAA, acknowledge that we've figured out some of the
13 challenges that have put aquaculture in a bad light
14 amongst many of our detractors based on things that
15 happened 20 and 30 years ago that we've subsequently
16 fixed, and, you know, that we've got a sustainable
17 aquaculture program in the U.S. with unparalleled
18 regulations.

19 None of these things are asking for dollars.

20 It's more attitude, recognition. Help us shine a
21 bright line on our future, so that we can move
22 forward. Now if we can get extra money, we've got a
23 lot of ideas there, too. I just wanted to point out
24 that many, most of these suggestions are not, don't
25 come with a dollar sign attached.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Other questions
2 or comments from --

3 MR. CORBIN: Well said, Bob. It's not
4 necessarily expenditures that are attached with a lot
5 of these recommendations, just action.

6 MS. LOVETT: John, do you want to mention
7 your, the subcommittee conversation and meeting that
8 you had last week, and anything about that, so the
9 rest of the committee can hear that?

10 MR. CORBIN: Well, we had a few hour
11 discussion of the plan, and the committee made a
12 number of very good suggestions to improve clarity of
13 the plan. I think we incorporated virtually all of
14 those in the revised draft that we distributed.

15 There was some concern about the statistics
16 and whether 91 percent imports was, is a precise
17 number. We followed up with asking MAFAC for more
18 information about the import situation and the fact
19 that a lot of product goes off to China and comes back
20 and that sort of thing.

21 There was also discussion of whether, what
22 kind of impact rebuilding all the fisheries that are
23 under management now would have on the imports. MAFAC
24 asked NOAA to, that question and someone did a, what
25 they call a back of the envelope calculation, that if

1 the 59 fisheries were rebuilt, that that would have an
2 impact of \$800 million on an \$18 billion import, you
3 know, of imports.

4 So, we spent some time on those issues and
5 then a few other ones that, just to clarify language.

6 MS. BONNEY: I guess I would note, too, I
7 was on the call, and so, there was some arm wrestling
8 about some of the language, and so, some of it was
9 changed just to build consensus through the
10 subcommittee. So, I think a lot of those wrinkles
11 were worked out and that's the product that you're
12 seeing before you right now.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mike, do you want to
14 weigh in at all?

15 DR. RUBINO: Not at this point.

16 MS. MORRIS: So, Bob and John, which of the
17 11 recommendations are going to cost more money?

18 MR. CORBIN: Which of the 11 recommendations
19 are going to cost more money? Was that the question?

20 MS. MORRIS: Didn't you and Bob both say
21 that most of the recommendations weren't going to
22 require additional money? That a lot of them had to
23 do with attitudes, and leadership, and messaging? So,
24 I'm wondering if -- I'm glad to hear that's true and
25 I'm wondering which of them are going to require

1 additional resources.

2 MR. CORBIN: Well, certainly, the marine
3 fish and Finfish Initiative, which would be a new
4 initiative, would require funds. And of the others, I
5 don't see where there's a change or expenditures
6 required.

7 Bob, what do you think?

8 MR. RHEAULT: Well I haven't had a chance to
9 review these in that light, but I, you know, as I
10 said, I don't believe that most of these
11 recommendations have a price tag attached. We're
12 talking about getting the NOAA Office of Aquaculture
13 to work better with protected resources. We're
14 talking about developing a consolidated permit process
15 with the other agencies.

16 We're talking about a lot of things that are
17 more attitudinal shifts within NOAA NMFS that help us
18 get to the point where we can actually issue a permit,
19 because we're never going to find out what's wrong
20 with aquaculture until we actually try and do it. And
21 right now, that is not possible in the EEZ. I mean,
22 it's just almost structurally impossible.

23 Now there's a few projects, so it's not
24 totally impossible, but it's quite daunting with real
25 money.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just going to point
2 out that --

3 MR. CORBIN: And I might add, a number of
4 these recommendations are in the plan as deliverables,
5 so, you know, this is basically follow through with
6 what you say you're going to do.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Just keep in mind that
8 staffing is still dollars, as far as NOAA's concerned.
9 They're 200 positions short, they only have so much
10 staff capacity. So, you're still asking for
11 dedication of resources to get some of the regulatory
12 and planning issues done.

13 Dr. Rubino?

14 DR. RUBINO: Yes. Thanks. So, that was
15 part of my answer, as well. Certainly things like,
16 you know, why did it take so long to get this Gulf
17 rule done, when the Gulf Council passed it back in
18 2009? That's an example of priorities, and, perhaps,
19 both internal and external politics.

20 Just looking at the MAFAC recommendations
21 here, quite a number of them, you know, we're chipping
22 away at, in terms of regulatory efficiency, the
23 science tools for rules, so that our protected
24 resources folks and the Corps of Engineers have those,
25 have that information to be able to make permit

1 decisions.

2 We can do a good bit of that within current
3 budgets, but it would happen a little faster, as Keith
4 said, if there were some additional staff in the
5 regions, or if it was made a higher priority with
6 those staff in the regions, which also gets back to
7 maybe numbers of staff, too, because they have many
8 competing demands on their time. So, you know, you
9 come with an aquaculture project, and if there's a
10 congressman screaming about something else, what gets
11 priority?

12 In terms of major increase in funding, I
13 think that Appendix C of this report, it looks very
14 similar to the kinds of back of the envelope budget
15 proposals that we've talked about amongst our
16 colleagues at NOAA and USDA, in terms of how would you
17 do more to jump start administrating, in terms of
18 public/private partnerships, in terms of finfish
19 hatchery work.

20 It would be nice to have a little bit of
21 extra money to do things proactively in a region.
22 Maybe we would have saved some of the difficulties of
23 citing projects, whether it be off southern
24 California, or in Humboldt Bay, if money was available
25 to do that dance with the other agencies and the

1 stakeholders.

2 Something called the National Environmental
3 Policy Act, or NEPA, doing an IES, sort of a
4 proactive, regional IES. If you can do those in
5 advance, then it's easier for each project coming
6 forward to get through the process.

7 If the Gulf rule goes into effect, we may
8 need a little bit of additional staff support to
9 review those projects in the Southeast region and a
10 little bit of science support for them to keep track
11 of genetic material, and booth stock, and things like
12 that, but it's not a lot. But I don't foresee, you
13 know, hundreds of applications. We might get a
14 handful, at most, in the first several years.

15 MS. SOBECK: So, I was just going to say,
16 you know, it's not all about money, and so, I do hear
17 what you guys say. I do -- we want to do that
18 attitude adjustment, or the, you know, the turning
19 proactively, providing some leadership to get things
20 done right. You're right, the Shellfish Initiative
21 was a real win/win, and that is what we're looking to
22 replicate.

23 I guess I'm just saying there's no, you
24 know, it -- there -- it does feel sometimes like we're
25 being asked to do more and more in this difficult area

1 where our authority is somewhat less clear and where
2 partnerships, some of them are really well-developed,
3 some of them, as you guys were indicating, at the
4 state level, not so well-developed perhaps, or not as
5 well understood.

6 I think that in a smaller,
7 resource-constrained office that's overshadowed by a
8 lot, you know, by the, some of the political hot spots
9 of issues that we -- you know, some of the same places
10 that we're talking about potential for aquaculture to
11 thrive are the ones where there's intense controversy
12 and budget pressure on other issues.

13 It's not surpri- -- I mean, those things,
14 you know, they -- one could be a solution for the
15 other, perhaps, but, under the pressures of the
16 moment, it's really hard sometimes to spring
17 resources, or even a positive attitude sometimes. So,
18 I do think that support from this group, whether to
19 the rest of the administration, or to your local
20 representatives, or to your partners, or, you know,
21 would be appreciated.

22 But I hear the message loud and clear, and,
23 you know there's no stronger than advocate than
24 Michael for making these things work in the future.
25 My directorate is meeting with Dr. Sullivan on Friday,

1 we meet with her every month to talk about matters of
2 special interest, so this is one of the things that is
3 on my list to talk to her.

4 I bring it -- we discuss it regularly, but I
5 will make a point to make sure that we talk about it
6 this Friday, while it's still fresh in my mind.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. John, you have
8 four minutes to bring this one to closure. What do
9 you want to do next?

10 MR. CORBIN: Well, I would like to see the
11 committee put this to a vote, so we can move the
12 report to NOAA.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Is that your motion?

14 MR. CORBIN: I so move. Yes.

15 MR. SHELLEY: I'll second it.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So the
17 motion is for MAFAC to approve the report that's been
18 distributed to everybody, and that is effectively the
19 subcommittee's report out from the commerce committee.
20 It's been seconded. Is there any discussion? Paul?

21 MR. CLAMPITT: I think the report asked for
22 \$50 million, right? That's kind of a sticking point.

23 I mean, I have no problem with the report, other than
24 that. Other than, if we're asking for \$50 million,
25 and it has to come out of other priorities, like stock

1 assessments, or recreational work, or whatever else
2 we're doing, then I can't vote for that.

3 MR. RHEAULT: So, are you referring to the
4 Appendix B, where we are aspirationally talking about
5 where money would be spent if it came about, or is
6 there something in the main body that actually
7 specifically requested \$50? Because I don't recall
8 that.

9 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I'm referring to the
10 conversation we had on the phone that I was a part of.
11 I remember the topic of -- I mean, maybe we can bring
12 it up or --

13 MS. LOVETT: Is it this one?

14 MS. MORRIS: Attachment C asked for \$20
15 million.

16 DR. RUBINO: Attachment C is a --

17 MR. CLAMPITT: I mean, I'm in favor of --

18 DR. RUBINO: -- what we would spend money
19 on, if --

20 MR. CLAMPITT: I'm in favor of NOAA getting
21 \$20 more million or \$50 more million for supporting
22 aquaculture.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So that is what the
24 document says. It refers to new funding.

25 MR. RHEAULT: That would be --

1 MR. CLAMPITT: Okay. Then I have no problem
2 with it.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And that --

4 MR. CLAMPITT: Long as that's clear.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: The reality is, we have
6 to recognize in light of the conversation we've just
7 had, that the likelihood of getting new funding is
8 slim, and that, at some point, MAFAC may be coming
9 back to revisit this document, and try to establish
10 more stringent priorities. Of course, Paul, when that
11 happened you'd have every opportunity to weigh in.

12 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah. Okay. Great. There
13 it is. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Ken?

15 MR. FRANKE: I have a question. This is for
16 Eileen. Once they identify something like that in a
17 recommendation does that, in theory, open, at least
18 based on the recommendation, an opportunity for a
19 public/private partnership? So, if outside funding
20 can come in, that that might be a mechanism to do
21 that?

22 MS. SOBECK: You know, I think it -- I think
23 anything helps. I think that -- so sure. I think
24 that we -- this is an area that we floated in our
25 discussions with NFWF, to say that we had a

1 significant interest in this, and trying to figure out
2 ways to leverage partnership funds with them, and so,
3 I think bringing this to NFWF and saying, look, we've
4 got MAFAC, a very diverse group, to support this, you
5 know, feel free to call these guys up for ideas about
6 where to go to get some funds leveraged, so sure,
7 that's helpful.

8 I don't think that there's any barrier to
9 pursuing that in the absence of this, but, you know,
10 it's always nice to have, to be able to point to a
11 group like this and say that there's full support of
12 that group. Again, we'd also be saying to MAFAC,
13 to NFWF or any partners that we went forward to, it's
14 like, hey, here's a group that's all for this, feel
15 free to reach out to them and ask them for help in
16 identifying partners.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, just a point of
18 information. Attachment C says new funding of \$20
19 million a year for five years. Attachment D then
20 specifies that \$10 million a year of that \$20 would be
21 used for the aquaculture initiative. The finfish
22 aquaculture initiative.

23 Mike, you had a hand up.

24 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, as I read this, and
25 maybe I'm reading it incorrectly, but it would seem

1 that we're asking for new funding, and it would be
2 somewhat incumbent upon us to go out and see if we
3 could find a source for that new funding. It's not
4 just going to magically appear. So there would have
5 to be a drive to, in some direction, to see where that
6 is.

7 And we probably all have different ideas, or
8 something, but it would almost seem if we're going to
9 be serious about it, then this committee would maybe
10 have some discussion on what that might look like, or
11 maybe it's privately, or maybe it's a subcommittee,
12 I'm not sure, but at least there's more work to follow
13 up and, after we would approve the motion, if we so
14 chose.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. Just as a sort of
16 point of information, the aquaculture task force, and
17 there's another group called CUSP have both
18 acknowledged that this needs to come from Congress,
19 and that's going to involve a lobbying effort.

20 We're not expecting MAFAC to be a lobbying
21 group, but we all accept our role as citizens, and as
22 citizen advocates for something we deeply believe in
23 is to go and bring that message back to Congress, and
24 hopefully Congress will do something.

25 MR. CORBIN: Keith, let me just say that the

1 task force, in its discussions with the office, really
2 supports partnerships, public/private partnerships and
3 leveraging federal dollars with other dollars, both
4 state and private. It's implied in our
5 recommendations, it's not stated specifically, but we
6 certainly fully support that approach.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, John. Any
8 other members with further comment on the motion?
9 Mike?

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just that that was -- so
11 not being part of most of this, or hearing most of it
12 until now, that's what I wanted to hear, as far as
13 kind of knowing how this might proceed. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Seeing no
15 further discussion, take it to a vote. Members in
16 favor, please say aye.

17 ALL: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any members opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Passes
21 unanimously. Thank you, commerce subcommittee. Thank
22 you, John. Thank you, Dr. Rubino.

23 Susan, are you sticking around?

24 MR. CORBIN: Thank you, Keith. Thank you
25 very much.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, John.

2 MR. CORBIN: Thanks everybody.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So safe travels.

4 MR. CORBIN: Keith, did you want to hear a
5 few words about where the mock project is at? We can
6 do that.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes. That was the next
8 on the agenda. Dr. Rubino is scooting out, Susan's
9 going to be staying here, so, yeah, if you would
10 please brief the members on the mock permit project.

11 MR. CORBIN: All right. Well, thanks. I
12 don't really have much more than what's in the summary
13 that is provided to the members. I just want to say
14 that the concept is this is a new permit, and this is
15 a new type of process, so there's likely to be
16 glitches and rough spots to work out.

17 And so, MAFAC suggested that we come up with
18 a representative commercial project, a mock project,
19 to run through the process, see where these problems
20 are, and look at both process, as well as content of
21 the application and the guidance document. The idea
22 is to try to work some of these things out before the
23 application goes live.

24 We currently are finalizing a representative
25 project. There's a subgroup of the task force,

1 commercial guys, that have been working with me on
2 finalizing the project. We're now working with the
3 regional coordinator for the Gulf, Jeff Beck, and the
4 National Ocean Service, who has offered their
5 assistance in terms of identifying a suitable site.
6 They've been very, very helpful in doing that. They
7 have tremendous resources to call on.

8 And we're preparing a project description
9 that fits what's called a pre-application checklist of
10 information, that Dr. Beck needs to distribute to all
11 the stakeholder agencies in preparation for a
12 pre-application conference call, so that -- and this
13 is the way it would be done, I think, in a real
14 application.

15 So, we're close to finalizing that, and the
16 concept that we're proposing is the largest project
17 you can propose under the rule, 12 million pounds a
18 year. The fish is red fish, which was -- you may
19 remember black and red fish was a very popular food
20 item some time ago. This could be done in 900 surface
21 acres. So, that's where we're at.

22 I'm really happy. I think we have a good
23 team and a good approach to this. I think the real
24 outcomes that -- you know, I guess the base case for
25 outcomes really is going to depend on the cooperation

1 and collaboration with the regulatory agencies, and
2 whether they can fit this additional task into their
3 workload. I guess we'll see how that goes and report
4 back as needed. That's all, Keith.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, John.

6 Bob, do you want to follow up?

7 MR. RHEULT: Just that the Cape's office
8 down in, I guess it's North Carolina, has been
9 tremendously helpful in their mapping and GIS,
10 informing our site selection process, informing us
11 about other competing uses in the Gulf, which is a
12 heavily used area.

13 They identified spots where they thought we
14 could squeeze in aquaculture operations. We then
15 looked at that from a more practical standpoint of
16 where you can land those fish, how you can get to the
17 farm economically, and then, plugged in some rather
18 standard, well-described methods for growing fish in
19 the open ocean that have been adopted in other
20 nations.

21 And, so, we'll push this through the process
22 and see what it looks like. Hopefully it will allow
23 all the agencies to re-examine their processes and
24 develop something that's workable for the industry
25 going forward.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Susan?

2 MS. BUNSICK: Yeah. I just want to thank
3 the task force. I think -- a couple of things.
4 Having a rule to focus on got the federal agencies
5 working together in a subgroup reporting to the task
6 force that Sam Rauch chairs, but not until we start
7 thinking about what are these projects actually going
8 to look like -- those of us who work in aquaculture
9 have a general idea what they look like, and we've
10 actually visited some farms, people in other agencies
11 have no clue.

12 And so, it's really helpful and it's been
13 helping, you know, get attendance up on our internal
14 conference calls with the other federal agencies. I'd
15 also say it's working in a couple ways. Originally,
16 we thought it'll work great, in terms of testing the
17 final process, but it's also testing us -- you know,
18 Murphy's Law, if something could possibly be
19 misunderstood, it will.

20 So, we had this first draft of a
21 pre-application checklist, and so, the task force was
22 nice enough to demonstrate how different people could
23 interpret what we're asking for a little bit
24 differently.

25 So, it's really helping already with -- and

1 it will be great to see once we get that final set of
2 information together, again, getting the other
3 agencies and the NOAA folks, because it's not just the
4 other agencies, it's our protected resources people,
5 our endangered species people, our NEPA people, are
6 going to have to look at it, too, and so, it'll be
7 good for all of us involved.

8 So, we're looking forward to continuing to
9 work with them. Thank you both, and the whole task
10 force.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, Susan, on the
12 budgetary conversation that we've been having, as this
13 process plays out, and if we succeed in reducing the
14 regulatory obstacles, does it also come with the
15 benefit of reducing the resource-intensiveness of the
16 regulatory process for NOAA? Meaning that you
17 actually have more staff capacity.

18 MS. BUNSICK: Over time it may. I mean they
19 talked about the work that the NOS folks have been
20 doing. Will NOS be willing to allow those folks to
21 spend time helping future real applicants? If the
22 answer is yes, then is it going to be these folks?
23 Are they going to have to bring on some more? So, I
24 think there's a learning curve.

25 Yeah, ultimately, a more efficient process

1 will reduce the need for staff time, but to get there
2 is going to take some work. And again, are we going
3 to be internal consultants to the applicant, or are
4 they going to have to go hire that, or we have to hire
5 more folks?

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Bob, was that a hand up?

7 MR. RHEULT: Yeah. I just wanted to
8 acknowledge the work of the task force and the really
9 titanic effort that John has put in to leading this
10 diverse and contentious group to a consensus. It has
11 really been more work then anything I ever
12 anticipated. John has carried more than his share of
13 the water on this effort.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. I echo that
15 sentiment --

16 MR. CORBIN: Thank you, Bob, for those kind
17 words. That doesn't mean I forgive Keith for getting
18 me involved in this task force effort, though.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Well, John, I'll try to
20 make up for that again now. You know, I said this on
21 a conference call the other day, I'll say it on the
22 record here. I think what you've done is tremendous.
23 I think that task force is tremendous. If you look
24 at who's on there, and the amount of expertise that's
25 on there, and the value that they add to this process,

1 it's really something that MAFAC should be proud of.

2 So, I hope that we're able to continue to deliver good
3 products and change national policy on aquaculture. I
4 commend you for your work so far, John.

5 MR. CORBIN: Well thank you. I'll pass that
6 along to the task force. Thank you, Keith.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Julie?

8 MS. BONNEY: So, this is Julie Bonney. I
9 was just looking at what your tasks are for the task
10 force, in terms of timeline in the future. So, maybe
11 you could kind of give us what you think is on your
12 list.

13 MR. CORBIN: In terms of the mock process, I
14 think the pre-application meeting is probably going to
15 occur sometime in November. After that, it really
16 depends on the delivery of products from the
17 regulatory task force.

18 We're willing to review the guidance
19 documents. The permit guidance. There's a baseline
20 environmental survey guidance. We're even willing to
21 review the MOU among the agencies, and, of course, the
22 application. That's key. What we'll do is provide
23 feedback on that.

24 As I said, you know, it's really going to
25 take extraordinary cooperation to get as much out of

1 this mock process as possible. The task force would
2 like to see it go to a mock permit. Actually issue a
3 mock permit that we could comment on. That's probably
4 extending into next year. When? I don't know. It
5 kind of depends on these other documents and when
6 those can be finalized.

7 MS. BONNEY: And then, based on your
8 comments on the strategic plan, or ours, there was a
9 suggestion about setting objectives and milestones, so
10 if that comes back as a go, would you guys be willing
11 to interact on that?

12 MR. CORBIN: I think we certainly would,
13 Julie. Yeah. No question. That was a bone of
14 contention that we've had with the aquaculture office,
15 understanding that it's very, very difficult to do.
16 So, but, yeah, the answer's yes.

17 MS. BONNEY: So then, you're talking
18 probably a year or 18 months of work then?

19 MR. CORBIN: Perhaps. Yeah.

20 MS. BONNEY: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Just a heads up to add
22 to that list, John -- this is Keith again -- yesterday
23 we spent a lot of time talking about resilience, and
24 we were talking about stock resilience, and ecosystem
25 resilience, and working waterfront resilience, and I'd

1 also point out it's possible that out of the
2 conversation from resilience, an item could get kicked
3 back to the task force, too.

4 MR. CORBIN: Well what -- my approach to
5 that would be to ask the task force if they felt they
6 could contribute to that subject, and we'll see where
7 we're -- what we get.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Understood. Peter?

9 MR. SHELLEY: Peter Shelley. This is
10 exposing my own ignorance. I know that this is
11 premature, given the state of this "industry" in the
12 EEZ, but have there been discussions about rents, or
13 fees, or anything else associated with aquaculture
14 facilities in the EEZ? Like stumpage fees, or
15 administrative costs. Or any discussion about --

16 MR. CORBIN: I thought I heard the term
17 rent. Again, you guys are breaking up. It's a little
18 hard to follow.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: You did. He asked if
20 there --

21 MR. CORBIN: The Gulf rule is kind of a flat
22 fee for the permit. I don't know. Susan, do you
23 remember that off the top of your head? I want to say
24 \$10,000, and \$1,000 a year, and then \$5,000 to renew,
25 or something along those lines.

1 MS. BUNSICK: Right. And there's no --
2 because this is under the authority of Magnuson Act --
3 and I'm looking at Keith, because he's the lawyer
4 here, you know, it's -- you're allowed to recover
5 administrative costs.

6 But we're not issuing a lease, we don't have
7 leasing authority, so it's not like an outer
8 continental shelf lease that the oil and gas companies
9 could get. So, we are charging based on what we're
10 allowed to charge under the Magnuson authority, and
11 recovering of administrative costs.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Thanks.

13 MS. BUNSICK: There's a dollar amount listed
14 in the rule for all those things.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Other member discussion
16 on the mock permit item?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. John, thank you
19 for joining us by conference call and getting up
20 bright and early there, in Hawaii, to be part of the
21 dialogue. Appreciate your effort.

22 MR. CORBIN: Thank you, Keith. Aloha.

23 ALL: Aloha.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I'm a little bit
25 behind schedule. We had this time slated for public

1 comment. Is there anybody here today for public
2 comment?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Nobody in the
5 room for public comment, so that puts me back on
6 schedule. We can take a 15 minute break. See
7 everybody at 3:00.

8 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So
10 yesterday, as we sort of went around the room and
11 people were reacting to the morning's presentations on
12 resilience, I just kind of sat there and took a bunch
13 of notes, and tried to identify major themes that came
14 out of the presentations, and then, major themes that
15 came out of the commentary.

16 This has sort of been, you know, how I've
17 developed this chair and how I try to help shape the
18 agendas for the next meetings is, you know, get the
19 feedback from the membership, see if I can capture
20 some concepts, and then send those concepts to
21 subcommittees so that they can be discussed at further
22 length, so that they can be turned into white papers,
23 and so that we can figure out what to do next.

24 I'm just going to offer up some ideas and my
25 insights and Heidi's going to have some of them on the

1 screen for you. I'm wide open to your suggestions and
2 feedback, but I'm going to actually start with the
3 end, and then I'll work my way backwards.

4 So, Heidi, if you could just go to the
5 bottom of the document.

6 All right. So, I -- the five bullets
7 reflect some of the concepts that I saw us discussing
8 and opportunities for us to shape what MAFAC can do
9 over the coming say year. I'll go to the last one
10 first, because it's probably the most discrete and
11 easiest to understand.

12 We had a lot of discussion about what's the
13 meaning of the word resilience? What's in it? Well,
14 there was this document that was included in the
15 resilience back up, the NOAA habitat enterprise
16 document. I had actually looked it up and it's one of
17 the attachments to our agenda.

18 If you look at that document, one of the
19 goals in there is increase resilience of coastal
20 ecosystems communities and economies, through habitat
21 conservation. So, I read through this document,
22 started marking it up, and then what I realized is,
23 well, maybe this is a good way for MAFAC to really
24 start thinking about what's resilience, what does it
25 mean.

1 The first thing that I said we could do was
2 comment on this document. It just -- in fact, one of
3 the things I noticed looking at this document was it
4 has a series of goals, objectives, and strategies. If
5 you -- everybody's got computers, so you all can pull
6 up the document I'm talking about.

7 MS. LUKENS: Did you -- I'm sorry. Can we
8 ask you questions --

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes, ma'am.

10 MS. LUKENS: This is that habitat strategic
11 plan?

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: This is the --

13 MS. LUKENS: Positive habitat conservation
14 strategic plan?

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes.

16 MS. LUKENS: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, in the advance
18 materials on coastal resilience, one of the things we
19 received was the draft habitat enterprise strategic
20 plan. So, if you click on that, it's a 29 page
21 document. You start scrolling through it, and you'll
22 see that there's a goal specifically on resilience.

23 One of the things that I realized, as I read
24 through this document, was the first goal on trust
25 resources had very specific timeframes, and very

1 specific projects, and really specific ideas, but the
2 goal on resilience was really broad, and lacked any of
3 that kind of detail.

4 Some of you may have read this document in
5 advance, some of you may not have, but, just as a
6 first item for MAFAC to tackle, it struck me a very
7 good first project could be commenting on this
8 document. You've learned a whole bunch in the last
9 couple of days about resilience, you understand these
10 concepts. That was one thing that I put on my bullet
11 list of potential action items for MAFAC to do. I saw
12 that as an item that could be done through this
13 working group.

14 And the second item that came out, you
15 already heard me mention to John Corbin on the phone.
16 There was some discussion as things went around about,
17 well, was there a role for aquaculture? What are the
18 communities that were relying upon aquaculture? Could
19 aquaculture be used for stock enhancement? You know,
20 what role could aquaculture play in resilience?

21 And there may be ways for this working group
22 to refer a specific question to the aquaculture task
23 force, and ask them to weigh in on how can we create a
24 more sustainable, more resilient working waterfront in
25 aquaculture communities or communities that are

1 dependent on a single species? Are there
2 opportunities to use aquaculture to ensure their
3 resilience?

4 It just struck me that we have this great
5 resource, we've got these experts on the aquaculture
6 task force, so something for us to think about is is
7 there a resilience question we can ask them?

8 Another major theme that came out in the
9 discussion was about the science. Do we have gaps in
10 our science? In fact, question five out of the seven
11 questions that NOAA asked us to look at on the
12 resilience dialogue was, are there gaps in our
13 information?

14 Or another theme that was mentioned all the
15 time was we haven't, we don't have enough data, or we
16 haven't analyzed the data that we have to make
17 decisions quickly enough in our climate changing
18 world.

19 Having sat in some of the climate task force
20 meetings, I know that they have already discussed that
21 point. A good question to ask them might be do you
22 have suggestions or ways that NOAA could accelerate
23 the data analysis to be more responsive, to get more
24 done, to empower better decisions on reactions when we
25 have problems.

1 So, I saw potential for a question and
2 that's -- the second of the bullet points there is,
3 you know, data analysis to empower more decisions, do
4 more analysis, do it more efficiently, gaps in the
5 data. Those are the questions that we can frame to
6 the climate task force.

7 Then a final theme that I heard over and
8 over here was the adequacy, or inadequacy, of the
9 council process to deal with the challenges of climate
10 change, to deal with the realities of needing to build
11 resilience, and needing to respond rapidly, or to
12 engage in a long term plan. Is that something that we
13 could tackle, as the MAFAC ad hoc working group?

14 All right. So these were my attempts to
15 capture the discussion, turn them into key questions
16 and ideas that then could be directed to appropriate
17 committees, so that we could start the conversation.
18 I'm not prejudging what the outcomes are, I'm just
19 trying to identify the key questions, so that you all
20 can figure out what to be working on for the next year
21 to 18 months.

22 So, I'll give you a moment to read the
23 bullets with -- on the screen and, you know, having
24 heard my background, and then, I am wide open to your
25 ideas and dialogue about what we do next. But, I

1 would just remind everybody that the ultimate
2 objective of today's meeting is to try to establish a
3 work plan for MAFAC. What do we want to do with this
4 issue of resilience for the next two or three years,
5 and who do we want to work on these key questions?

6 Mike?

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I like your approach. The
8 only question I have, and maybe it's just I'm hung up
9 on it, but the, is the habitat the portal to get at
10 the resilience and -- I look at vulnerability aspects
11 also. It seems to encompass more than just habitat
12 itself. I'm not -- I don't know if you're quite, your
13 focus is on just the habitat side of it, or if
14 there's --

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I think NOAA made it
16 clear --

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- or if it's more, it's
18 kind of a starting point for you to --

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That's how I see it.

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: What NOAA's made clear
22 to us is they're open to having dialogue on
23 resilience, when it comes to resilient stocks,
24 resilient ecosystems, resilient communities. And I
25 think all of those are important topics for MAFAC, and

1 they're all relevant.

2 I identified the enterprise habitat document
3 as something that was a good first task where
4 everybody could kind of think about these issues,
5 learn about these issues, have something tangible to
6 work with, and give really specific comments on a
7 document that was about resilience.

8 It is by no means what I think is the only
9 thing you should do, but, you know, I'm the outgoing
10 chair, and you all are going to have to decide what
11 you're going to do over the next few years.

12 Bob?

13 MR. RHEAULT: So, up there, you've got
14 climate task force question mark. Is there one, or is
15 something you're thinking about forming, or?

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: No, we have one.

17 MS. LUKENS: We have a climate task force.
18 They're the ones who commented on the climate science
19 strategy that Roger was talking about yesterday. And
20 one of their tasks that has yet to be articulated or
21 outlines, aside from looking at the climate science
22 strategy and commenting on it, is looking at the
23 socioeconomic impacts of change to communities.

24 So it -- like Roger said, or I think he said
25 yesterday, there's a lot -- there's a potential for

1 overlap and coordination with what they're doing.
2 Maybe asking them to do a subset of something with
3 what this group decides to focus on. Or, you could
4 potentially have -- one thing is you could potentially
5 have some members from that group sitting in on your
6 discussions and cross-fertilization. So there's --

7 MR. RHEAULT: Is it a NOAA group? Is it
8 outside experts? Is it a MAFAC group?

9 MS. LUKENS: It's a MAFAC group. Just the
10 same set up, the same way as the aquaculture task
11 force. It's internal --

12 MR. RHEAULT: Outside experts.

13 MS. LUKENS: Yeah, but there's some folks
14 from MAFAC on it, but I'll -- you know, about --

15 MR. SHELLEY: It seems almost like this
16 resilience, coastal resilience topic has overtaken the
17 climate task force, in a way, because it seems -- at
18 least, based on the presentation, this seems to be the
19 frame through which NOAA was going to be looking at
20 its priorities, its investments, its choices.

21 MS. LUKENS: If you look at the charter for
22 the climate task force it's literally one sentence,
23 and they have yet to kind of flesh out what that
24 question would be.

25 So, I think it would -- Roger and I have

1 been talking, and so, it would be nice that we could
2 kind of coordinate that together, so that you could
3 make use of the work of the climate task force with
4 what you all are working on, given that resiliency is
5 such a large topic. So, that's one thing to think
6 about, as an opportunity to get some resources,
7 looking at issues, once you kind of figure out what --

8 MR. SHELLEY: For me, the whole thing just
9 seems incredibly daunting. It just seems like a huge
10 mountain to try to climb and be useful on root.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: By no means am I
12 suggesting --

13 MR. SHELLEY: No, not that you are, but I'm
14 just saying I think we do have to be very critical --

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right.

16 MR. SHELLEY: -- in terms of what we choose
17 to work on, or we will fail.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I was trying to come up
19 with discrete projects, which could be executed.

20 MR. SHELLEY: The one thing you didn't
21 mention -- and I think maybe, Mike, can you get any of
22 this -- there's an interesting presentation, again, I
23 don't exactly what the federal role is around
24 community resilience; economic, port side, markets,
25 all that sort of stuff that's really not captured in

1 your list, explicitly. I think you should at least
2 put it up there, so we can knock it off if we choose
3 to.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, actually, I was
5 watching that presentation, and, my Florida bias, I
6 thought of Cedar Key, right, which is a community
7 that's highly dependent on shellfish aquaculture, and
8 thinking about the radical changes taking place in the
9 Gulf. Then I'm reading about the particular type of
10 clamshell that they've discovered that is a native
11 that seems to be thriving under their current
12 conditions.

13 But, you know, what happens if the climate
14 change factor is causing massive collapse in their
15 current shellfish stock? That community is extremely
16 vulnerable. So what's the vulnerability analysis on
17 the shellfish? What's the vulnerability analysis on
18 that community? Can the aquaculture task force weigh
19 in? How many other communities like that have the
20 same sort of risks and concerns?

21 You know, of course I defer to you, Bob.

22 MR. RHEAULT: Yeah. So, I mean, I see a
23 huge potential nexus for aquaculture in terms of
24 habitat, carbon capture, resilience, coastal
25 protection, stock enhancement, and so, I'd be willing

1 to bite off that chunk about the nexus between various
2 aspects of aquaculture, and how we could be counted on
3 to, you know, contribute to the questions of
4 resilience.

5 I think there's a large body of potential
6 interactions there that I just brushed on. I'd
7 be -- I don't think, necessarily, that the aquaculture
8 task force is the best because they are almost
9 exclusively finfish experts, and a lot of what I'm
10 talking about are habitat related to oyster
11 restoration or, you know, resilience, in terms
12 of -- well, certainly stock enhancement from fish
13 hatcheries is something they could bring to the table.

14 What's the potential there? What, you
15 know -- so, but, that's a piece that I could work on
16 developing a set of drafts, or things that we could
17 then flesh out, if the group thought it was worth
18 pursuing.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, being more specific,
20 I'd like us to come out of today's meeting with a
21 series of questions that we intend to seek the answers
22 to, with people assigned to work on those questions
23 and answers.

24 So, the last one, for example, is offer
25 specific comments on the habitat enterprise strategic

1 plan, especially goal three regarding resilience. Who
2 can do that? We can do that. This group, over the
3 course of the next meeting, will do that.

4 So now, on your issue of sending a question
5 to the aquaculture task force to tackle resilience,
6 what exactly is the question? Because I'm very
7 sensitive to Peter's point, which is, you know, the
8 potential scope of this is so dramatic, we have to
9 figure out what do we want to ask and what do we want
10 answered.

11 We understand there's lots of issues that
12 we're wrestling, so I want you to think about what is
13 the task, how do we frame it. I think that's a great
14 idea, to go to the aquaculture task force. It's just,
15 okay, what exactly can they do, what can we ask them
16 to do, and what can they deliver, and by when?

17 MS. LUKENS: Can I offer a point of
18 information, or context? I don't know if this is
19 helpful. I think we had this in our conversation -- I
20 think it was you I was talking to last night -- in
21 terms of, there's so much going on with resilience,
22 and why are we asking MAFAC to look at resilience.

23 I think it's an administration priority
24 heard about, White House priority from commerce all
25 the way down through NOAA: resilience. For so many

1 years, and the couple years I've been in fisheries,
2 resilience has been a term that really has been
3 reserved and used for the National Ocean Service,
4 who's dealing with coastal zone management.
5 Fisheries, I don't think, has had a voice in
6 resilience.

7 I think one of the things behind this idea
8 is what are the fishing -- what's the fishing
9 community's voice? What are our stakeholders' voice?
10 What are their needs for resiliency that we may not
11 be providing right now that we could do better, that
12 we could tap into our partners internally across, like
13 at Sea Grant or the Ocean Service, to help them, or
14 externally, with partners to help the fishing
15 community.

16 Getting that voice there of fisheries into
17 the dialogue of resiliency. Because so -- so -- for
18 so long the conversation has just been about physical
19 resiliency, like Holly was talking about yesterday,
20 sea walls, but really, it's about economic resiliency,
21 too, and connecting all of those dots.

22 So, it's an opportunity to not have the
23 fishing community's voice lost in the larger dialogue
24 of resilience. That's one way of looking at it. I
25 don't know if that's helpful to you all.

1 But then, another thing in the dialogue that
2 we had kind of putting this task together was really
3 thinking about -- how can we get from you all ways to
4 be strategic to help those communities, once we better
5 identify what that might be that we're not doing. So
6 that's -- I don't know if that's helpful or not, but
7 just, chew on that.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Actually, to help focus
9 that a little bit, if you could go into our annotated
10 agenda, or just go back to the -- go to the agenda,
11 and then, if you click on the link for the discussion
12 paper on the charge to MAFAC, under the category of
13 resilience, it has seven questions.

14 MS. LUKENS: Those don't have to be the
15 questions, but --

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: These are just the
17 questions that staff framed for us, and now, we can
18 pick and choose where we go from here. If you look at
19 these questions you'll see over and over it's --
20 they're probing it. The point Jennifer was making is
21 how do we build resilient communities, and a resilient
22 economy, and they're clearly a big nexus to those
23 issues here. It's not just resilient stocks and a
24 resilient ecosystem.

25 MS. LUKENS: Mike, did you have a question?

1 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well maybe we're kind
2 of -- I view vulnerability is like the antithesis,
3 almost, of resilience, and understanding where you're
4 vulnerable, kind of let's you know where you've got to
5 protect yourself, or find a solution for where you're
6 going to go the wrong direction, I guess.

7 So, I think that there has to be some level
8 of understanding what it is we're attempting to
9 identify, so we can be resilient, and what would cause
10 us not to be.

11 On the economic side, I mean, it's different
12 for different communities. Obviously, a community
13 like Kodiak's going to be a lot different from some
14 place that has a lot of aquaculture going on. They
15 might have similar things, but there's -- I think you
16 might have to group communities in the -- I guess, you
17 know, dependency on specific fisheries, for example.

18 And then, what I'm a little bit lost on is
19 how do you identify where the vulnerability is, where
20 the cracks are going to appear in the armor, or we're
21 not going to spring back if something happens. So
22 that -- I guess from my thinking that's -- I -- for
23 me, the community aspect is important, and the
24 economics, because I almost see an economic equation
25 there.

1 Regardless of which community it is, at a
2 certain point, if there's not enough income coming
3 into that community, from this natural resources that
4 we're harvesting, or recreational, it can be, also,
5 then, at some point, the community starts to go into
6 stress mode and infrastructure, housing, all the rest
7 of it starts to suffer, including the residents.

8 Then, you've got to -- you're beyond
9 vulnerable, you're impacted. So, can you make a
10 determination to figure out when is that going to
11 occur, or what is it in this climate change exactly,
12 specifically, or as specific as you can get that's
13 going to drive you into that vulnerable stage?

14 MS. LUKENS: Uh-huh.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: That's where I'm a little
16 bit lost, I guess. Ocean acidification, that's a
17 pretty easy one. If you can't grow, the shells on the
18 oysters won't grow when you're growing oysters, that's
19 not a good thing. So, I'm just throwing that out
20 there for thought.

21 MS. BONNEY: So, I'm getting a little
22 worried about the topic. Community resiliency? I
23 mean, depending on who the audience is and what
24 they're talking about it could really go side. So, I
25 guess, I think we have to focus on what, is this about

1 climate change, acidification, or what.

2 So, for instance, they have the working
3 waterfront, which is a lot of the prime infrastructure
4 for seafood's been bought up for other uses.

5 You have -- there's a lot of focus in Alaska
6 where you built all these permit systems, IFQs,
7 limited entry permits, state permits, and so, people
8 are basically saying they can't move across fisheries
9 because of the permits. You have rural communities
10 where people are moving out of rural communities and,
11 you know, so a lot of the Alaska rural communities are
12 really getting to the point where they're at a tipping
13 point of going away.

14 But, none of -- those are more social
15 factors, economic factors, population centers. It's
16 nothing to do about climate change and fish stocks.
17 So, are we trying to fix all the world in terms of
18 communities, or only focusing on what's happening due
19 to climate change and how to, what, focus on that
20 topic.

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And that's why I'm also a
22 little bit lost. It's just what, specifically, can
23 you say in terms --

24 MS. BONNEY: So I guess -- yeah.

25 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- concept?

1 MS. BONNEY: Well, but so, I guess, I'm
2 looking at the chair as he's leading this. How do you
3 stay narrowly focused or we're going to have --

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I agree there's only so
5 much we can tackle. That's why, like my first one,
6 was comment on a document, right? I mean are we all
7 in agreement that one's a good place to start?

8 MS. BONNEY: I haven't read it, but I will
9 take your word for it, based on what I see at --

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: There's a specific
11 discrete task, it's been drafted by NOAA, and I was
12 just saying that we can comment on that. All right.
13 So, now I've heard this dialogue, and I'm thinking
14 about when we refer to the aquaculture task force, and
15 I heard your point, Bob, clear about vulnerabilities,
16 and I'm hearing the big points -- well, are we talking
17 about stocks, or ecosystem communities, or all of the
18 above, so here's the question I just drafted that I
19 could suggest we send to the aquaculture task force.

20 How can aquaculture increase the resilience
21 of stocks, ecosystems, or communities? Question.
22 Identify specific fisheries, ecosystems, or places
23 that are vulnerable and where aquaculture is already,
24 or could make a significant impact.

25 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So, I'm going to go back

1 at you on --

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So -- and now play with
3 it. Right.

4 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So --

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm not holding that.

6 MS. BONNEY: -- what was that? Managing our
7 nation's fishing?

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mm-hmm.

9 FEMALE VOICE: Fisheries.

10 MS. BONNEY: Yeah. They had a whole section
11 on aquaculture and the ability to, what, rebuild
12 coastal communities, but that was more of an economic
13 charge with that as an opportunity than it is about
14 impacts from climate change, so, I would hate to see
15 the aquaculture task force spend a lot of energy on
16 that.

17 I mean, they could go back and review that,
18 and look at it as the light of what was talked about
19 in those sessions, and then redirect that conversation
20 to more of a, the climate change, what, focus that
21 we're tending to go to. I'm assuming that's the
22 direction we're going is climate change, not
23 just -- and how that affects communities.

24 So, I guess that's a question to the group,
25 too, is are we only focused in on the climate change

1 issue? Are we trying to, like I said, address all of
2 those for resiliency?

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: If I just look at finfish,
4 like what Dawn is -- it's Ken, right? Or the -- it's
5 talking about -- let's just say the ocean gets a lot
6 warmer. So, he plants, or puts a bunch of fish in the
7 pen, that all of a sudden it gets warmer, and they
8 don't survive.

9 That's kind of a major hit. I can see that
10 as being like affecting aquaculture decisions as well.

11 I imagine shellfish would be similar. They'll maybe
12 have to use a different breed of oyster that warms up
13 by 10 degrees or something.

14 MR. RHEULT: So, yeah, I think I'd just
15 like to back up a little bit and go back to what
16 Bonnie has just raised, and I would like to see us
17 focus on the climate change, because that's a big
18 enough fight. If we try and get into all the societal
19 ills and the diversity, and the economic, blah, blah,
20 blah, and all this other stuff, we're not going
21 to -- we're going to never be able to focus.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

23 MR. RHEULT: I have plenty to bite off on,
24 in terms of I think we all can see ways in which we
25 can talk about resilience in fishing communities, or

1 just looking at OA, temperature, sea level rise, and
2 how are we going to be resilient in the view of
3 habitats, fish stocks, landings, jobs, and, in view of
4 those three challenges that we think we've got
5 reasonable models to forecast, how these things are
6 going to change.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: The way temperature or
8 what?

9 MR. RHEULT: Sea level rise are the three
10 big ones. You know, so I've been on these exercises
11 where we sat down with a whole group of farmers from a
12 state and said, how is this going to affect bees, and
13 apples, and you know, then you think through.

14 Farmers tend to say, well, you know, okay,
15 Connecticut's going to feel like Virginia in 100 years
16 so I know they still grow bees in Virginia and still
17 grow apples, I'll be okay. There's going to be some
18 challenges, we'll have new diseases, we might have to
19 get new strains, but I'll still be able to grow
20 apples.

21 But, you know, there's some people that are
22 really like, my God, when the sea level rises and all
23 these sewage treatment plants are under water, now
24 that's a big problem, you know. I know that, okay,
25 Virginia's going to feel like Louisiana. Well, they

1 still grow oysters in Louisiana. I'll be able to
2 figure that one out.

3 But if the OA actually does, you know, mean
4 that I can't grow oysters anymore, holy moly, that's a
5 big difference. Now -- you know. Or, you know, sea
6 scallops. If we suddenly have to do hatcheries to get
7 larvae through the first 48 hours of survival to meet
8 the OA challenge, well that's something we can do, but
9 it's going to require a lot of hatcheries. So, I
10 think there's nexuses for each of our groups to
11 address these challenges.

12 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, to keep it bite size, I
13 can see where aquaculture can be a real lead, and if
14 you want to develop something later on, then they
15 could start with aquaculture and the habitat, and, I
16 don't know, is that enough about -- or are you --

17 MR. RHEULT: I can see five different areas
18 where we can have a significant role in carbon
19 capture, in algal culture, to moderate acidification.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, help me craft a
21 charge here, because I've written down two sentences
22 to try to capture what we would refer to aquaculture.
23 If I've come close, great, and if not, tweak it. So
24 just --

25 MR. RHEULT: I'm happy to take the charge.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just saying take a
2 moment, actually --

3 MR. RHEAULT: You want me to do it now?

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes.

5 MR. RHEAULT: No. I don't want --

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes. I'm going to just
7 detour. You have a little task here, and I'm going to
8 keep us chugging along, right?

9 MS. BONNEY: I like the addition of the
10 algal and other, and carbon capture, besides just
11 growing --

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I agree.

13 MS. BONNEY: -- shellfish.

14 MR. RHEAULT: Well there's, right, shellfish
15 for habitat and the -- in -- you know, in the
16 shoreline. There's a lot of different nexuses for
17 aquaculture. Stock enhancement for fisheries that are
18 stumbling or over fished.

19 MS. BONNEY: Right.

20 MR. RHEAULT: There's a lot of potential.
21 Not necessarily saying they're all going to be great,
22 or they're all going to work, but there's -- I see
23 potentials.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I'm going to let Bob
25 craft a, tweak my question. I want to ask the same

1 question in the context of what are we going to send
2 to the climate science committee?

3 MS. BONNEY: Well, I guess --

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So we've got this
5 climate science task force, we've identified these
6 issues of data analysis gaps. Yes, ma'am?

7 MS. LUKENS: Maybe, since Roger is here now,
8 he can talk about -- they were asking what the climate
9 task force was doing and I said that it's essentially
10 the next task is kind of a one line that has yet to be
11 fully articulated what it -- well may -- it's probably
12 in your brain and hasn't, not on paper, what the next
13 task is.

14 If you want to talk to us, and talk about
15 what you were thinking about for the climate task
16 force and that task impact aspect of it, so they
17 can -- more than what I said.

18 MR. GRIFFIS: Hi, again. Nice to be back
19 with you. So, we had written a potential task that,
20 for the group to help us understand what some of the
21 characteristics of resilient fishing communities would
22 be, and what tools and approaches NMFS should be
23 thinking about to help those communities, both assess
24 their risk, and then, be able to think about how to
25 reduce the risk.

1 So, for example, Sea Grant actually has
2 funded some projects on the East Coast, where they've
3 engaged fishing communities up and down the coast and
4 they've, sort of talking to them about, well, you
5 know, ocean's changing, here's what we -- here's
6 what's changing, here's what we think is going to
7 happen, and here -- and then engage them in thinking
8 about what are the implications for.

9 In one case they did -- I think it was a
10 clam community, it was doing mostly clam fishing,
11 another one was I think more offshore, and one was up
12 in Maine on lobsters, I think it was. So, they were
13 testing this idea of how do you engage a community in
14 talking about change. What's at risk, and where they
15 want to go with it if their -- what are the options to
16 help reduce the risk.

17 That was -- it's one of the efforts that's
18 ongoing in this topic of, well how do you engage with
19 a fishing community or a fishing sector in helping
20 them think about change and what the options are.

21 So our question to the climate group was
22 could you help us survey, a little bit, the kind of
23 approaches that are out there, and give us some
24 feedback advice on what NOAA -- what NMFS should be
25 thinking about as far as tools and approaches. That's

1 kind of where we had gone on it, knowing that we had
2 some social science-related folks on the group, and
3 that they might really want to bite into that.

4 So, we were interested in tools and
5 approaches. What does it mean for NMFS? Because our
6 engagement with fishing communities is fairly limited,
7 and, I mean, that is, in that, you know, NMFS does its
8 thing, Sea Grant is much more on the front line of
9 working with the communities, so this would perhaps
10 get them talking to both Sea Grant's fishing
11 communities, different sectors about, you know, are
12 they thinking about risk and change, what approaches,
13 what tools might work, and give us that kind of
14 feedback.

15 MS. BONNEY: So, I'm going to go back. You
16 weren't here when we talked about this in the
17 beginning, but I get concerned about when you start
18 surveying communities about their resiliency, because
19 it could be a whole suite of things, and not centered
20 around climate change, you know.

21 It could be migration out of rural
22 communities, it could be the structure of management
23 with limited access structures, IFQ permits, or it
24 could be -- what was my third -- all the waterfront
25 being bought up by big business, right, and turned

1 into some other use. So, if it's not well-focused, I
2 think you may end up going down a rabbit hole, so to
3 speak.

4 I'm wondering -- now, if I remember right,
5 we were talking about having each region write a
6 climate change document, in terms of the science that
7 they're going to do within the region.

8 MALE VOICE: Regional climate plan.

9 MALE VOICE: Yeah.

10 FEMALE VOICE: Yeah.

11 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

12 MALE VOICE: The action plan.

13 MALE VOICE: Action plan.

14 MS. BONNEY: And I'm wondering if -- this is
15 just another idea. I mean if we move down this road,
16 I think it really has to be very narrowly focused, or
17 it's just going to go way out there. Maybe you could
18 pick two communities that are at risk and try this
19 assessment, but maybe the task force should review one
20 of the climate strategies across, or from one of the
21 regions to see as, or help come up with a guideline of
22 what one should look like.

23 MR. MCCARTY: I've got an idea I've just
24 been thinking about. There's a coordinated recovery
25 plan, or coordinated recovery bill for Puget Sound

1 Congressman Denny had. There's three major
2 administrators in the northwest have been identified:
3 EPA Region 10, NOAA northwest, and Army Corps.

4 Then thinking about how -- what I'm grasping
5 at is some kind of a formula that enables a region to
6 be creative across the board with intergovernmental
7 and interagency cooperation.

8 So, then, for permitting, funding,
9 management, regulatory oversight, that there's some
10 kind of a cross-cutting policy and management priority
11 that enables the families of government, for instance,
12 in the Northwest to advance a lot of the work that's
13 coming out of, from the organic process.

14 Governor Christine Gregoire put together a
15 blue ribbon panel on ocean acidification. Some of the
16 recommendations that came out of that panel are
17 actually now being implemented with various
18 interagency, private sector, different -- like science
19 out of NOAA Sand Point.

20 I mean, so, some of the things that are
21 actually going on is looking at business opportunities
22 for aquatic plants to mitigate water quality for ocean
23 acidification.

24 So, looking at medicinal and culinary grade
25 seaweeds, kelps, and then analyze -- and then, I think

1 then adding to the, like the resiliency, like what
2 sort of recipes and formulas can we come up with that
3 have viable business models, so that these solutions,
4 these adaptations, mitigation strategies for climate
5 and ocean acidification actually have, you know, a
6 deliverable outcome that's beneficial to communities
7 that can cross-train into these adaptation, mitigation
8 business opportunities.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, I think he hit on a key
10 two words that I saw more than anything else in there.

11 It's a viable business. You've got to have some kind
12 of economic engine in these communities that -- and
13 it -- we're talking fishing communities, so I expect
14 we're talking -- if we want to preserve a cultural
15 aspect of that, it's going to be some kind of natural
16 resource extraction.

17 I think I kind of agree with what Jill was
18 saying, but if you've got an event going on, where
19 they're buying up all the waterfront, closing down
20 canneries or processing houses, that is totally a
21 different thing. If you want to preserve a cultural
22 community, and a fishing community, that's a different
23 aspect of it. But it's still a vulnerability.

24 If your goal is to preserve a fishing
25 community, if you're, we're not worried about

1 gentrification -- I think I heard that term
2 earlier -- then, you know, it's just not our task to
3 handle. There's got to be some kind of viable
4 economic engine. It can't be government. Grants run
5 out eventually. You can't put everybody on welfare.

6 When you start closing -- like when Boeing
7 closed, many had that sign up in Seattle, you know,
8 last one out, turn out the lights. It took a while
9 before we bounced back, before the resiliency factor
10 in Seattle. Microsoft came in, Boeing came back in a
11 big way. Lots of things happened.

12 How do you -- you either keep what you've
13 got, the extraction formula going in a successful
14 manner, or you find a replacement. I see, in this
15 case, one solution to that. Aquaculture as a
16 replacement. It's not going to work for every
17 community, but it would work for many communities, or
18 could.

19 It's also something that we could use for
20 stock re-enhancement, potentially. I guess it's been
21 done already. So there's one possible solution for at
22 least part of what we're talking about.

23 Communities are -- because of the
24 differences in the resource extraction and the
25 difference in the regulatory systems and how that's

1 done, there's going to be quite different challenges
2 in different communities, but I think it always comes
3 back to that viable business engine in those
4 communities.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So I'm
6 listening to the dialogue and we're getting bigger,
7 and bigger, and bigger. I'm going to play chair now
8 and I'm going to say, no, let's shrink back down.
9 Let's narrow the focus again to the specific question
10 that we can answer now. Eventually, I think we need
11 to get to those big questions but I'm just trying to
12 get --

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I'm not trying to
14 enlarge it.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I understand. I know
16 where you want to go, and I'm not disagreeing with
17 you.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just saying we need
20 to start with certain more discrete questions. I've
21 got -- I've come up with a question. Bob buys into,
22 one, aquaculture. I'll write that in a second. We've
23 come up with a question on editing the habitat
24 document.

25 I'd like us to come up with a question to

1 ask the climate and marine resources task force. The
2 first question that I think we should be asking is
3 about those first two bullets that we just kept asking
4 ourselves over, and over, and over in the dialogue.
5 So many people weighed in on those two things. That
6 would be a narrow question that we could craft.

7 We could eventually get to the bigger ones.
8 Remember, we can work in iterations here. This is
9 the first round. There can be more.

10 MS. BONNEY: And which two questions are --

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: There's two bullets on
12 the screen. Those were --

13 MS. BONNEY: Timing?

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: There were so many
15 people who raised those two issues.

16 MS. TROTТА: It says --

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: How do we make the
18 councils and NOAA get better and be more responsive to
19 changing climate issues? The council process doesn't
20 work. How do we make quicker decisions? You know,
21 that came up over and over again. The other one that
22 came up was, did we have the right data? Were we
23 analyzing the data? Do we need more information?
24 What were the gaps in the data? Right? Those two
25 areas suggest that there's a really discrete question

1 that we could ask.

2 MS. BONNEY: Okay. I just couldn't figure
3 out which --

4 MS. LUKENS: Yeah. This document is in your
5 email.

6 FEMALE VOICE: These two. I just circled
7 those two that he said.

8 MS. BONNEY: So I guess --

9 MR. AMES: There's structural and organic
10 problems with our current system if you're going to
11 apply it to fishing communities. There's 60 of them
12 in Maine. Most of them are quite small, even by
13 Alaska standards, probably.

14 Diversity and access to fisheries is
15 probably central, because smaller scale fishermen
16 don't have the option of steaming 150 miles down the
17 shore or 200 miles off to Georgia's bank. They have
18 to stay within a relatively small range. The bulk of
19 fishing communities is made up of smaller nestles.

20 The next is when climate change occurs and
21 that transition from one batch of species to the next
22 comes along, those fishermen need access to these new
23 species. If that isn't built into the system, what
24 you're going to do is you're going to put Maine
25 fisherman out of business, so that South Carolina

1 fishermen can have the opportunity to steam to Maine
2 coastal waters and harvest it. That's -- I'm not
3 saying that's bad. I'm saying that the communities
4 that that supported needs --

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Can you identify the
6 data gaps, the information needs, to help make that
7 possibility in the future a reality, so that we can be
8 responsive to those needs? And can you help me frame
9 a question to ask the climate marine resources task
10 force, so that we can say, would you please work on
11 this for the next six months, and report back to us.

12 MR. AMES: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Peter?

14 MR. AMES: Yeah. The one other factor that
15 goes along with that, if -- and I see ASMFC as the
16 transition zone, where it facilitates that, because,
17 if you're going to encapsulate fishermen in a
18 community to what's available in a three mile limit,
19 they're licked, because that's one of the problems
20 that exists today. Maine virtually entirely depends
21 on lobsters alone.

22 The mechanism for improving other stocks is
23 a situation where if you have a bycatch and you have a
24 vested interest, you take care of it, and if you
25 don't, you won't. So, I would suggest that the

1 ability to transition to other species, as they become
2 available in the immediate vicinity within that
3 coastal zone, that inner layer beyond the three mile
4 limit, is absolutely critical if you want long term
5 resilience in that fishing community.

6 MS. BONNEY: So, I guess I have a question.

7 Peter's up next? Did you call on --

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I did

9 MS. BONNEY: Okay. I'm sorry.

10 MR. SHELLEY: I mean, it seems to me if
11 you're serious about this, you have to be able to
12 access, I don't know how many fishery management plans
13 there are in the country -- 60, 50, I don't know how
14 many there are -- kind of simultaneously, and, you
15 know, the only way you can really do that is through
16 the national standards.

17 The agency, I think, would have to commit
18 itself to being more directive in terms of using the
19 national standards to reshape how the different
20 councils set up their management plans to address
21 these questions. If you can't get at the management
22 plans, then you're really not going to touch fishery,
23 you're not going to touch fish, or shellfish in
24 federal waters.

25 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Sue, you're next. Then

1 I'll get in line.

2 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So, well that's what I'm
3 struggling with is we have -- I think of the, a
4 climate group as more climate scientist type, and a
5 lot of the things that we're talking about are
6 nonpolicy, like how do you divide up the fish, based
7 upon where it moves, and how do you set it, how do you
8 get the council to be more reactive, or, you know,
9 more proactive on a timeline.

10 To me, it seems like the first thing you
11 need to know is understanding what's going on with the
12 stock. In other words, is it -- because it could be
13 going up dramatically or down dramatically, could be
14 moving, you might be getting stock structures, issues.

15 So, to me, it seems like they could tell us
16 what's going, you know, what would be the indices
17 that, as affecting those stocks. That why I was
18 thinking that the climate strategy out of the regions
19 might help inform that. Then, we move to the next
20 level, which is the policy implications of what we
21 know. I don't know.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Roger, and then Mike.

23 MR. GRIFFIS: Unless you want to build on
24 that, Mike. I don't want to change to --

25 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I think she's got a

1 good starting point, just like what you're looking for
2 is if you're looking for -- okay. Climate changes.
3 It does change. How does that affect and impact the
4 stock? That's going to have an economic outcome, if
5 you're fishing on that stock, those stocks. So
6 understanding that, I think that's not data exactly.
7 That's more predictability, based on data, I guess.

8 The second piece, though, when we're talking
9 about councils and NOAA to engage in rapid response, I
10 see them creating management systems that are anything
11 but rapid. We've talked over and over the other day,
12 it went around and around the room: flexibility,
13 flexibility, flexibility. We're building inflexible
14 systems in our management.

15 We may be getting ourselves trapped in a box
16 where it takes us five years to get out of it just to
17 get a new FNP in place, and by that time it may have
18 changed again.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: You know, I'm just, I'm
20 afraid of a world where everything deteriorates into
21 emergency rulemaking. I mean, that's --

22 MS. LUKENS: I want to make sure I capture
23 your comments. So, it's getting down to, are you
24 saying that all the flexibility point that we were
25 talking about with councils yesterday, that process,

1 commenting, or thinking of ways to help --

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think it's a
3 philosophical shift in what we're doing now, because,
4 in the Pacific council, for example, and I'm being
5 cynical here, but it seems like there's thou shalt
6 nots or, you know, going in place faster than anything
7 else. You're going to get narrower and narrower focus
8 and then, when it comes time to be flexible, there's
9 no flexibility left.

10 Personally, just as a counter to that, I
11 would say co-op systems on the other hand, where
12 there's a responsibility on the industry side, besides
13 stakeholders, and they are accountable for what they
14 do also, you have a faster ability to change and
15 adapt. So, you still -- the science is another thing,
16 piece entirely.

17 But, just looking under management systems
18 as they exist now, and if we're going to have, be able
19 to do the rapid response, how is that going to -- do
20 we need to change that, or look at that at least, or
21 analyze it to see if we're -- if I'm totally wrong,
22 I'm totally wrong, but it seems to me we're getting
23 more burdened on us to make those changes that may be
24 necessary at a faster pace.

25 MR. AMES: I would endorse that, too.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I do want to hear from
2 other --

3 MR. GRIFFIS: And that would be a very
4 valuable undertaking. It could also be quite an
5 undertaking, right, if you're talking about --

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Big time.

7 MR. GRIFFIS: -- us testing the nimbleness,
8 flexibility, responsiveness -- pick whichever of those
9 words one would want -- of our current, you know,
10 fishery management system to respond to a changing
11 world. That's a big one, I mean.

12 And so, one -- but let me just frame it.
13 One could drill down there, and say, you know, are
14 there some particular things, low hanging fruit, that
15 could be done, not to overhaul the system, but
16 to -- I'm just trying to frame what might be a doable
17 task.

18 I want to suggest a totally different one,
19 though. I didn't say it very well the first time.
20 One of the things that I'll say -- I think we're
21 pretty -- you know, I kind of know how to track
22 shifting fish stock distributions.

23 I kind of know how to track changing
24 oceanography. I can even see how to use that in
25 building it into doing the research to understand how

1 a degree change would affect the change in
2 reproduction in cod, or -- I can see building that in.
3 That's partly because I'm a marine ecologist and
4 oceanographer.

5 The big gap is, to me, is the social science
6 side of this problem. To me, the big gap is how do we
7 provide that information in a useful way to the
8 fishing sector and the fishing communities -- I know
9 those terms, we've got to figure out what that is, but
10 how do we provide that to people so they can begin
11 thinking about the decisions they're going to make?

12 I think that's a big gap. It's part of this
13 science and information continuum, but it's different
14 than focusing on a council, per se. It's really
15 talking about -- it might be framed as, you know, what
16 data information or tools are needed to help fishing
17 communities sectors assess their risks and then take
18 action to increase resilience in a changing climate?
19 See? I'm liking your tie it to a changing climate.

20 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So let me ask you a
21 question based on this.

22 MR. GRIFFIS: Could I play out the three
23 tasks underneath?

24 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

25 MR. GRIFFIS: All right. So, there's -- it

1 could be broken down to you guys -- because you
2 all -- I mean this group or the, even the climate
3 group represented, were intentionally selected to
4 represent different parts of that world, whether it be
5 recreational, commercial, big, small, right, so you're
6 ideally suited to perhaps answer a couple sub
7 questions like, well what are the perceived needs,
8 rec, commercial, what are some of the, you know, is
9 anyone even thinking about this? That's part of that
10 question.

11 What are the perceived information needs?
12 What would a -- what would recreational fishers need
13 to think about? Second, what are the tools and
14 approaches currently out there, i.e., there's some
15 nice case studies you could go look at, and what are
16 the lessons from those? Are they telling us anything?

17 Then, third, the big, the home run take home
18 message here, advice back to NMFS is, well here are
19 the key steps, based on that. What are the key steps
20 or actions that NMFS should be thinking about to help
21 address these needs?

22 With that package, you've helped the agency
23 structure our science, data, and information,
24 particularly on how we're going to help fishing
25 communities both think about risk, and then, design,

1 and think about options. See, it's that part of the
2 continuum that we're really weakest on now. I'll shut
3 up.

4 MS. BONNEY: Okay, but so, can I just go
5 back? Because it depends on how you define fishing
6 community, in my mind.

7 MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah.

8 MS. BONNEY: So, I was thinking of a
9 place-based fishing community. But if you're -- for
10 instance, like the Bering Sea pollock fishery, the
11 largest food fishery in the world, they've already
12 spent money on research to look at the effects of
13 acidification on pollock and starting to think about
14 what -- so if it was a -- instead of thinking about,
15 you know, Old Harbor on Kodiak Island, instead of
16 maybe going to more of a broader industry, sector.

17 Fishing community, in my mind, is a large
18 fishery and, that's hundreds of millions of dollars.
19 I mean you could do two different case studies, maybe
20 a place-based, and a sector, but if -- I was just
21 thinking if you go to Old Harbor, the fish moves and
22 it changes. I don't see what they can do.

23 MR. GRIFFIS: Right. And that's part of our
24 struggle. That's where we end up, too. But, you
25 know, that's what we need to know. What would be the

1 information they need in the first place, to plan
2 ahead? Or should we just let them, you know, wake up
3 one day and, sorry, you're out of luck? I think we
4 want the former, right? We've got to give them some
5 information --

6 MS. BONNEY: But how are you going to screen
7 those communities? Because I would argue that you'd
8 probably get more bang for your buck thinking about a
9 larger fishery group --

10 MR. GRIFFIS: Sure.

11 MS. BONNEY: -- or sector to think that, to
12 get them to start thinking about what they would need
13 because it would drill down to one local community. I
14 just don't know how you'd fix --

15 MR. GRIFFIS: Scale matters.

16 MS. BONNEY: -- lobster, fish.

17 MR. GRIFFIS: Scale matters. So, you know,
18 again, this would be a task -- I don't know what Keith
19 is thinking, what you all are thinking. This would
20 be, what, a six month, nine month, 12 month charge.
21 You obviously would pick a few case studies to look
22 at, maybe of some different sizes, and based on your
23 sampling, which you can't -- I mean, you guys only
24 have -- you're all volunteers, right? I mean, so
25 there's capacity limitation here. Based on --

1 MS. BONNEY: As long as you're paying, it
2 works fine.

3 MR. GRIFFIS: There you go. Well, and so,
4 based on some reasonable -- we'd figure out a
5 reasonable way to pursue, whether it be some case
6 studies or not, but, you know --

7 MR. SHELLEY: Roger, hasn't Sea Grant done a
8 lot of that? I mean, you're referring to some
9 projects they've done, but haven't they been working
10 on this sort of vulnerability analysis and risk
11 analysis for some time?

12 MR. GRIFFIS: Excellent question.

13 MR. SHELLEY: Maybe that's the thing to
14 extract from them, and try to understand what, the
15 recommendations we might make, based on that work.

16 MR. GRIFFIS: I want to answer that one, but
17 you've been raising your hand the whole time.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, we're looking at
19 major expansion projects. It's in the tens of
20 millions, not quite the hundred millions, but it's a
21 big deal. So, the first thing I get asked, since I
22 delve into this world of regulation and fish stocks,
23 can you give me your best -- this is what they're
24 asking me, the owner -- the best guess of what you
25 think we're going to have for this particular species

1 of fish over the next five years? Over the next 10
2 years? The second one is what's our access going to
3 be? The regulatory side.

4 Before they plunk down that kind of
5 money -- we're not -- that's a large sum of money.
6 So, those are the questions they ask. So, if you
7 say -- if you come out and you can predict, you're
8 going to -- it's like salmon runs, you know, you get
9 them right once in a while, but they -- if you can
10 give a prediction, okay, climate is going to be doing
11 this, and we expect this to happen, that's,
12 that -- you know, the probability factor is, we've got
13 to weigh it just like you do your, when you're doing a
14 stock assessment.

15 What are the realities there being
16 successful at your estimation? Then, we put a risk on
17 their money. You know, are we going to get it back,
18 number one. So, we're place-based, so that means if
19 we put \$100 million into one place, and the fish go
20 somewhere else, that's lost, that's stranded capital,
21 basically, unless something comes along to replace it.

22 So, those are -- that information is
23 critical. And it goes back to what Julie's talking
24 about. It's good stock assessments. So, there's
25 that, but the question that probably gets asked before

1 that is what's our access to the fish? What do we
2 need to do? Do we have to have IFQ? Do we have to
3 have these folks? How do we access that fish? That's
4 a regulatory thing.

5 MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah. So, two quick
6 responses. One, I'll bet that we're not doing the job
7 that you probably wanted in providing, answering those
8 questions, and so, part of what you guys could do is
9 do -- look at some case studies and say back to us,
10 NMFS, there's a critical need here, communities,
11 industries, they need this kind of information.

12 So, you see, help, tell us the kind of
13 forecast and kind of information that sectors,
14 communities, whatever, they come in different shapes
15 and sizes, are going to need to make climate-smart
16 decisions. There isn't one answer, because they all
17 are different shapes and sizes.

18 To your question, Peter, this is the time to
19 do it, because Sea Grant has invested -- and most,
20 most -- you know, if you look at our investment on
21 climate forecasting and advice, it's been to coastal
22 communities to get ready for rising seas.

23 Now, don't get me wrong, that's important,
24 but it's only just now are we beginning to say, well
25 wait a minute, that community needs to be thinking

1 about some other things, like shifting stocks and
2 changing abundance, as well as sea level rise, because
3 it isn't the only, sea level rise isn't the only
4 problem they need to be thinking about.

5 We've just begun -- Sea Grant has
6 just -- we've just funded a few projects, literally.
7 There's -- just beginning. So, this is an ideal time
8 for you all to help us look at what have we learned
9 from the couple pilot projects that are out there, and
10 give us that advice back that, you know, is this an
11 important thing we should be thinking about, or not?
12 If it is, then you can help leap frog this area for
13 us. See what I mean?

14 The other thing I'll throw into the mix is
15 we've got a dynamite workshop planned for February or
16 March, where we're going to bring the best minds on
17 this question of -- what am I trying to say --
18 resilient fishing communities. What do we know? What
19 are the approaches? What information? We're going to
20 be assessing these pilot projects, as well. So, this
21 is an ideal time --

22 MS. BONNEY: Is it based on climate?

23 MR. GRIFFIS: Based on climate. Sorry.
24 Sorry. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah, based on
25 climate. Basically, looking at those pilot projects

1 and coming out the other saying, well what are the
2 research needs? What are the communication needs?
3 Because, I think, you know, your illustration is
4 beautiful.

5 I mean, we may have information at this
6 point, but I don't think we're very -- we're not the
7 weather service, so we're not providing this kind of
8 forecast --

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think it would be better
10 than the weather service.

11 MR. GRIFFIS: Well, I know. I know. I
12 know. But the Gulf of Maine is a great example.
13 Again, I think two -- a year -- within the year, we're
14 going to have a forecast system for lobster fishermen
15 in the Gulf of Maine. I don't mean we. It's the Gulf
16 of Maine folks that are doing it. And it's going to
17 be a very interesting model.

18 MR. AMES: I find it interesting. If NMFS
19 could take a -- well, it's a 50 year overview of what
20 has happened with the lobster fishery, and you can see
21 where peak landings were moving consistently up the
22 coast, the interesting thing is the biological
23 temperature characteristics of codfish and lobster are
24 quite similar.

25 If you had gone with a traditional

1 prediction, you would have predicted that not only
2 would we have this pulse of lobster, but we would have
3 also had a pulse of gadids, probably codfish being up
4 amongst the top, when, in fact, we didn't.

5 But, if you create the projection so that
6 people can see what appears to be going on, then they
7 can put it in a perspective and say, well -- they can
8 say, maybe it won't come, but they, at the same time,
9 they can say maybe we just better set ourselves up to
10 address this problem when it gets here, or by the time
11 it gets here, what can we be doing. So, just that
12 timeline would, on a chart, would be valuable.

13 MR. GRIFFIS: And so, the value added
14 here -- I'm sorry -- is the recommendations you'd give
15 on this topic would help chart the course for Sea
16 Grant, as well. Because that workshop I'm talking
17 about is intended to guide -- we're trying to figure
18 out where both Sea Grant and NMFS should go, because
19 we're joined at the hip here.

20 Sea Grant has people on the ground that
21 actually get to communities. We're not so good on
22 that, but we have a lot of the science that's needed
23 to answer the information.

24 MR. AMES: They have the social scientists.

25 MS. BEIDEMAN: So, the only thing I really

1 wanted to add was probably, in the presentations that
2 were given on Tuesday, the most remarkable comment I
3 heard was that we could have told you six months ago
4 you were going to have that pulse. I don't know who
5 said it, but I was like, whoa, if we can predict and
6 early guess, or, you know, I don't know how far out.

7 I agree with Ted that diversity of the
8 management system now has put everybody pretty much in
9 boxes. If that fishery goes away, you're -- and you
10 don't have permits in another fishery, you know -- so,
11 the flexibility of that is not climate, that's not
12 science, but if we had some idea that these fish are
13 going away -- and you, council, you have to start
14 thinking about the fact that, you know, either the
15 fish are going away, or what they eat is going away,
16 and we're going to have maybe this coming, you might
17 have to work with the other council.

18 So, I think predictive, being able to kind
19 of predict what might happen, not that it will happen,
20 but if there's gaps in the science and if you're able
21 to do it -- and, you know, certain communities are
22 more vulnerable than others. They don't have as many
23 diverse types of fisheries.

24 The Coast of Maine. You know, something
25 happens, they get a big disease up there, they're

1 beat, or it gets too hot, they're done. So, I don't
2 know. That's my thinking. I don't know how to frame
3 that as a specific question, but I really feel like if
4 we can find a way to help the science through Sea
5 Grant, finding out from what's important, but also
6 being able to see the science actually show us what's
7 going to happen. What we think is going to happen.

8 MR. GRIFFIS: So, I just want to -- I mean,
9 the heart of what you just said, to be -- I mean, you
10 all -- if you all -- imagine you said back to NMFS
11 that you need to be much more in this business of
12 forecasting for communities what's going to happen.

13 I mean, we're not in that business right
14 now, and that's a very powerful thing to say as part
15 of perhaps recommendations on how, NMFS, you can be
16 helping fishing sectors, fishing communities begin to
17 prepare for a changing world. That is -- that's very
18 powerful.

19 I mean, you know, great, we came out with
20 our climate science trade. It says those things, but
21 to have you all perhaps underscore and -- I can't
22 emphasize enough how important that could be.

23 MR. AMES: Let me point out one
24 uncomfortable, but obvious, reality. For 20, more
25 than a quarter of a century, I had lobsters,

1 groundfish of various species, scallops, shrimp, et
2 cetera, and I was not the only fisherman in town, or
3 along the coast, that had that. Virtually every
4 fisherman had access to these various fisheries.
5 Others had mussel fishing, and quahogging, and you
6 name it, seining.

7 That pool of access rights has been
8 diminished in the council arena to a point where most
9 Maine fishermen, which are owner/operators, don't have
10 access, because they were seasonal participants in
11 these fishes. Their communities are at risk if, and
12 when, something happens to lobsters, because they no
13 longer have that versatility.

14 Somehow, it would be great to develop a
15 strategy that would provide that. That's 60
16 communities you could bail out in one fell swoop.

17 MS. BEIDEMAN: It's the same in other
18 places, you know. Like, there was always seasonal,
19 but then, you know, they put control dates, and then
20 people got shut out, and you have people that only can
21 fish for one thing, and if they get closed, they're
22 done.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I just want to point
24 out this whole conversation as a theme kept going back
25 to national standard eight, right? This has really

1 been a conversation about how do we make sure that we
2 have the information needed to ensure access to the
3 fishery, to minimize economic impacts on communities.

4 I took that as one of the threads that I incorporated
5 into a draft question that I've got on the screen.

6 I want to try to steer us to, recognizing
7 that it's 4:15, I want to work through three
8 questions, but I want to make sure I give Wendy her
9 chance to weigh in, so I can tweak this task a little
10 further, if I need to.

11 MR. MORRISON: Well, I was going to change
12 task --

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

14 MR. MORRISON: -- so you may not like me.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Shifting completely from
16 this?

17 MR. MORRISON: Kind of, sort of.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So then, can I
19 hold it?

20 MR. MORRISON: Well, I have to leave in 15
21 minutes --

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Go ahead.

23 MR. MORRISON: -- so, I'm just going to be
24 quick. I keep hearing the conversation going back to
25 flexibility, going back to limiting the options, and

1 so, you guys mentioned that that's too big of
2 something to bite off, so can we bite off the positive
3 aspect of that?

4 Can we get the group to look across
5 management that's out there now in the states, in the
6 federal, and say here are examples where there is
7 flexibility, here are examples where we're heading in
8 the right direction, so that we have positive examples
9 to say, okay, now we have an idea of what might work,
10 can we expand that. Instead of doing the whole
11 positive, negative, can you just give a few positives
12 that give the councils, or NMFS, an idea of which way
13 we need to go?

14 Is that a small enough bite to chew off?
15 From the management side of things, I would find that
16 useful.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That actually sounds
18 quite similar to what we've done in recovery effort,
19 too.

20 MR. MORRISON: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, we did a project
22 where we identified specific examples of how we dealt
23 with recovery for a list of species. And the
24 consultation project worked like that, too. We looked
25 at specific examples. So, I do think that's a

1 possible task --

2 MR. MORRISON: Okay. I know it's totally
3 different --

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: -- and I also think
5 that's one that could be done at the MAFAC level, as
6 opposed to giving it to any of the committees.

7 MR. MORRISON: All right.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I want to come back
9 to that, and I'm glad you flagged it. This was my
10 effort to kind of put a question on paper to send -- a
11 project on paper to send to the climate task force.

12 MR. MCCARTY: Does stock locations also
13 imply stock structure?

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I was actually just
15 thinking geography, and the northward shift of many
16 species was what was in my head. I'll change it to
17 whatever --

18 MR. MCCARTY: Well maybe --

19 MALE VOICE: Abundance and structure. Yeah.

20 MR. MCCARTY: -- that could be distribution.
21 I think structure is important, too.

22 MR. AMES: And, in some ways, in terms of
23 the Gulf of Maine, it might have been safer to have
24 said the fish moved east, because we're farther north,
25 and we have colder water, and we have none of the

1 gadids, until you get to eastern Georgia's bank, which
2 is 200 miles south.

3 So, there's a bunch of strange things going
4 on oceanographically that is affecting stock
5 distribution that I don't think we've sorted out yet.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, that sentence is all
7 just context for the committee anyway. At the end of
8 the day, I think what we're asking them to do is to
9 hone in. Then, one of the questions that you
10 identified for us in your set of questions, Roger, was
11 the data gaps. What I've done is, based on the
12 conversation, I sort of enhanced that question.

13 MR. GRIFFIS: So, I have a question for you,
14 Keith.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Pleased to change it
16 however you guys want.

17 MR. GRIFFIS: Well, it's still focused on
18 what -- it's pretty big, still.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah, it is.

20 MR. GRIFFIS: -- and it's focused on how
21 to --

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So is our discussion.

23 MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah. No, no. So, a key
24 question is who's the target here? This says to
25 empower the councils and that's --

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right.

2 MR. GRIFFIS: I was -- so, I just want to
3 clarify. So, I was really -- I was proposing, have it
4 focused on communities and sectors, rather than the
5 councils. It may be something -- it's like the same
6 information, but it's -- that way it's asking a
7 different set of decisionmakers -- how do we prepare a
8 different set of decisionmakers for change? How do we
9 build their awareness? What approaches are useful to
10 fishing sectors and communities?

11 You know, part of the vision here is, boy,
12 I'd love it if -- imagine a future three or five years
13 from now where it's actually fishing sectors and
14 communities that are leading, you know, the --
15 demanding on the table, we need forecasts for where
16 the fish are going to be, and how they're going to
17 change. You don't hear that now, right?

18 The answer right now is, you know, are
19 fishing sectors and communities engaged? Maybe Gulf
20 of Maine, I think Bering Sea, but beyond that, the
21 answer is not so much.

22 MR. AMES: What about a community quota for
23 the season's species that it currently has, and as the
24 availability of those species change, and something
25 else comes in, to allow the community to either trade,

1 or transfer, or swap them for species that are now
2 prevalent in the area?

3 MR. GRIFFIS: I don't know what the answers
4 are.

5 MR. AMES: I don't either.

6 MS. BEIDEMAN: I have a suggestion for the
7 editor.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm listening.

9 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. It says to empower
10 fishing communities. How about fishing communities
11 and fishery managers? Because we've got states, I've
12 got -- we've got NMFS for HMS, we don't have a
13 council, so, just more broadly, just say fishery
14 managers. That way, you're not specifically excluding
15 anyone, or including anyone for that matter.

16 MR. AMES: So, it could be state as well.

17 MS. BEIDEMAN: It could be a state that
18 would be making the decision. Whoever's managing the
19 fisheries. If so, the communities and the managers
20 need this information.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Done. Bob?

22 MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you.

23 MR. RHEAULT: So, you know, I mean a lot of
24 the community, people that I work with are in firm
25 denial that anything's happening. I think that, in

1 many respects, it's the data gaps that we need to fill
2 to inform them, so we could engage them. I've done a
3 lot of studying on OA, and we're the poster child for
4 OA, the shellfish aquaculture community.

5 You know, the data -- the science is very
6 clear: you add CO₂, the pH changes. That's not in
7 debate. The question is how that's going to affect
8 the biota.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right.

10 MR. RHEAULT: And the science there is crap,
11 quite soundly. So, I don't -- you know, it could
12 quite likely affect terapods and a couple other
13 things, and crush the base of the food web, but we
14 don't know. They could have huge impacts on sea
15 scallops or shellfish. We don't know. The science
16 has been lousy. I'm not going to get engagement,
17 until I can say with some confidence what the outcomes
18 are going to be.

19 We've got some really solid science showing
20 these couple of stocks moving northward. That's very
21 compelling data. You show that to fishermen, they are
22 going to see that this is, you know -- and we see it
23 on the ground with black sea bass and summer flounder
24 in New England. We've never seen it in our lives, yet
25 we're not allowed to fish them.

1 That is something that I can talk to my
2 communities about, and get an immediate reaction,
3 because they see it on the ground. Whether they're
4 deniers or scientists, they're going to buy into that.
5 So, I've got data gaps that are really critical before
6 I'm going to get engagement amongst my community.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, does the question on
8 the screen tee up that research question, or that --

9 MR. RHEAULT: It does.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

11 MR. RHEAULT: I just was pointing out the
12 one area where data gaps are, need to be filled,
13 before we can get engagement. It's all tied together.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just recognizing
15 we've got about 15 minutes, and we've got wrap this
16 one up, so --

17 MR. RHEAULT: Okay.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: What Ted's saying, it's
19 innovative and it's free thinking. All of a sudden,
20 you've got maybe a solution, where you didn't have
21 one, so I like that. If I take that to a council --

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: They might not do it.
23 Right.

24 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, probably you'll
25 get -- you're not going to walk up on the council

1 floor and present it. You've got to go through the
2 committees and all this stuff. You've got to get your
3 ducks in a row and do all this.

4 We're talking rapid decisions, and so, I'm
5 not going to pick on the councils, but just looking at
6 your management systems that are in place, the
7 combinations of different agencies and all the above,
8 how do you empower those rapid decisions where we
9 don't have it now?

10 Here, you've got a possibility that might
11 work. Is it going to take five years to set that up?
12 So, I think you hit on a point that I liked. What is
13 working? What is working out there in management
14 systems? Where is the most rapid response in a
15 management system we have anywhere?

16 If I had to choose out of all of them I've
17 seen, it -- and I could be dead wrong, but from what,
18 my point of view, maybe something like AFA and the
19 pollock fishery. Or some kind of organized approach
20 that takes in risk management for bycatch, it takes in
21 the market at all times, all the way down the supply
22 chain. There's things like that that already have to
23 be pretty responsive.

24 MS. BONNEY: To a point with what we --

25 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And they've got

1 a -- they've plotted out the value equation how to get
2 the most out of that fish. So, somebody comes along
3 and says, there's going to be a change in your stock,
4 you know, it's going to do this, but maybe this
5 species is going to move in, these guys are pretty
6 well-organized to start looking at that. Then you're
7 getting down to the level that you're talking about.

8 Right now, to start where we are in a
9 council process and start working through it all to
10 get an idea like is in place, it's either forget it,
11 or you've got to get a whole contingent of people,
12 political support, to start doing it. And it may go
13 as far as Congress before you get it done. That's not
14 rapid response, in my mind. So, that's it.

15 MS. BEIDEMAN: While it may be that things
16 get done quicker as the need becomes more obvious --

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right. As the data
18 starts to make a more compelling case.

19 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. Whether or not they
20 want to --

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right.

22 MS. BEIDEMAN: -- they may have to.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I hear your point,
24 but --

25 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm a cynic on that.

1 MS. BEIDEMAN: I am, too.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think the first thing
3 they're going to do is they're going to cut your
4 access to fishing when they have the uncertainty
5 factor. That's what they're going to do.

6 MR. AMES: What about ASMFC? Is that any
7 faster than these other processes?

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Can I beg? Hone in on
9 the language for a minute? Am I close enough --

10 MS. LUKENS: I'm just going to -- I went
11 through here and just trying --

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: If you can enhance,
13 please.

14 MS. LUKENS: -- I'm trying to be neutral
15 here --

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes. Please.

17 MS. LUKENS: -- and just observe in my
18 facilitator role, which I'm trying to be quiet, just
19 what I've heard from you and all see if it's up there.
20 I've heard focusing on -- it's -- community and
21 sector-specific is what we need to focus on, not
22 focusing on that viable business models.

23 The forecasting and the gap in the science
24 is very important to all of that, being able to also
25 help identify what those options are, management

1 options are, but also another key theme I -- and
2 thread I heard through all of this and yesterday was
3 the councils and, you know, the cry for that
4 yesterday.

5 I think one alternative that Wendy brought
6 up was looking at those models of what has worked,
7 much like the PR. I think those are -- that's kind of
8 what I went through. Those are the things that are
9 sticking in my mind from your conversation. This is
10 your conversation. I don't want to put anything in
11 there. I think that's close to the conversation as
12 the mutual facilitator, but I leave that up to you all
13 as the advisors.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I tweaked it based on
15 Jennifer's comments. Am I there? Is that a good
16 question and a good charge for us to kick over to the
17 climate and marine research task force?

18 Bye, Wendy. Thank you.

19 MR. MORRISON: Bye. Sure.

20 MR. MCCARTY: I think so.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes? Mike? I mean, I
22 want to make sure my question's close to where you
23 think we need to be. I mean, I recognize your point,
24 but that's just sort of what happens at the end of the
25 output process. So, if they give us the answer to

1 this, you're still cynical and suspicious as to
2 whether or not we'll do the right thing. I get that.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, regardless of what
4 you put up there, I'm still cynical and suspicious,
5 but not about you, it's just we're --

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I understand. You know,
7 I'm not -- I -- believe me, I'm not offended in the
8 slightest.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It's like that old Elvis
10 Presley song *We're Caught in a Trap*, and, you know, we
11 are.

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Am I close? We good to
13 run with this?

14 MS. BEIDEMAN: I support it.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Let me go back. The
16 first one I turned into this question, or this topic
17 here, project for the MAFAC ad hoc working group.

18 MALE VOICE: Sold.

19 MR. AMES: Could you define enterprise in
20 that phrase.

21 MR. SHELLEY: It's a secret organization.
22 It's a secret internal cabal.

23 MS. LUKENS: It's just terminology, so
24 everybody felt included. That's it. Everybody who
25 does habitat. It's an internal -- you don't know how

1 long it took to call it that. That's from my old life
2 in habitat. So, it's just a term.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Last one. And
4 this is the aquaculture question. The question to
5 take over the aquaculture task force.

6 MR. RHEULT: I'm willing to run with that.
7 I'll bring that message forth.

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: Cool.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. And again, I'll
10 tweak this however you guys say. I'm just trying to
11 capture the dialogue.

12 Jennifer, maybe you could take another look
13 at your chart, and see if there's anything in there
14 that I didn't adequately capture from the aquaculture
15 stuff.

16 MS. BONNEY: So, please scroll down to the
17 last one.

18 MR. GRIFFIS: Can I offer a friendly --

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes. Please.

20 MR. GRIFFIS: -- amendment on that one? So,
21 you all are in a position to advise this agency.
22 Right now, that's framed kind of as a science
23 question. How can aquaculture help, blah, blah, blah.
24 Do you -- were you -- it would be useful if that
25 actually would advise the -- what the -- what's the

1 agency going to do with that?

2 MR. RHEAULT: My vision is that we would
3 look around the globe at aquaculture approaches that
4 could be used to help these issues.

5 MR. GRIFFIS: And then -- so your advice
6 back would be NMFS here has some good practices and --

7 MR. RHEAULT: That might impact, you know,
8 ecosystems in a beneficial way, habitat in a
9 beneficial way, stocks in a beneficial way. These are
10 tools in the box that we could consider that are being
11 used around the globe. Not trying to identify
12 research questions that need to be solved, but things
13 that are being done now that, or are on the verge
14 reality.

15 MS. LUKENS: It's like maybe what some of
16 those options are for helping with the idea of
17 resilience to climate change, I think is what you're
18 talking about. The one word I have here is the nexus
19 between those two, so I'm going to put nexus in there.

20 MR. GRIFFIS: And if I heard right, Sea
21 Grant's shaping a 10-year aquaculture plan. Maybe Sea
22 Grant and them. So, you'd be helping inform and,
23 perhaps, shape that. Okay. I get it.

24 MR. MCCARTY: One of the suggestions I would
25 have is that aquaculture can be used for the

1 preservation of species that are at risk to both
2 climate change and ocean acidification.

3 MS. LUKENS: Yeah. That would be one of the
4 things that you would be identifying.

5 MR. MCCARTY: That needs to be an essential
6 part of our tool box.

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: And if a community was
8 heavily reliant on one species, and it's not going to
9 be there, then what might they think about possibly
10 changing their plan, and not be fishermen, but be
11 growers, if -- to survive and provide for their
12 communities and make a living.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think there's one key
14 missing point there.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It's the same one you had
17 in the other one. It's rapid response. If it takes
18 10 or 15 years, or 18 years in the one grower's case
19 in Washington State, to get the permitting process,
20 you're --

21 MS. BEIDEMAN: It's too late.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- too late. You could
23 just go find a gravestone. Yeah.

24 MS. LUKENS: So, are you talking about rapid
25 response in terms the bureaucracy or what not of

1 getting perm? It takes too long for right now? So
2 wouldn't that talk focusing on rapid response, would
3 that be as part of the report out from what the group
4 is looking at as one of, or is that part of the task
5 that we're asking you, is aquaculture going to be
6 rapid?

7 MALE VOICE: Things that could be
8 implemented in a generation.

9 MS. LUKENS: I'm just trying to figure out
10 what you're saying. Do you want -- do you --

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Okay. You're looking at
12 aquaculture to find some solution-based outcomes.

13 MS. LUKENS: Uh-huh.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But it doesn't do you any
15 good if you need a solution in one year, and it's 10
16 years before you get the solution.

17 MS. LUKENS: I see what you're saying.
18 Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, you have to have a
20 implementation plan that can keep, respond as quickly
21 as needed, in order to solve the issue at hand.

22 MS. LUKENS: I see what you -- I got it.
23 I'm slow. Eventually I get it.

24 MR. OKONIEWSKI: You're not slow.

25 MS. BEIDEMAN: Not at all.

1 MR. OKONIEWSKI: You're not at all.

2 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So, scroll down to the
3 next one.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So, are we good
5 on aquaculture? Jennifer's out of here, man.
6 She's --

7 MS. LUKENS: No. Hey, no. I've got all the
8 time in the world. I do.

9 MS. BONNEY: I'm just wondering --

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Here's the climate one.
11 The climate task force again.

12 MS. BONNEY: -- says there, structure and
13 distribution, aquatic ecosystems and fishing
14 communities "will all be affected by?" Is this -- I
15 think that's a little strong. I mean, every -- not
16 every community may be --

17 FEMALE VOICE: Say it may be affected, Bob?

18 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

19 MALE VOICE: Will likely be?

20 MS. BONNEY: Well, because, like pollock,
21 they're saying, is not really going to have an effect.

22 That's what the science is saying right now.

23 Kodiak's really diverse, so we may not be a community
24 that's affected. Otherwise, it sounds like every
25 fishing community and every fishing --

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I just don't like may,
2 because it sounds like we're denying.

3 FEMALE VOICE: How about will likely?

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I mean, may suggests
5 that some of them won't be --

6 MALE VOICE: Yeah, will likely.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: -- and they all will be.

8 MS. BONNEY: Well you said shall all.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: But they all will be in
10 some way. Some may be, see favorable effects, some
11 may see negative effects.

12 MS. LUKENS: How about will likely, and you
13 could split the middle there.

14 FEMALE VOICE: Without the all. You can say
15 will.

16 MALE VOICE: Without the all. You can say
17 will.

18 MS. LUKENS: Okay. That's good.

19 MS. BONNEY: Yeah, will. That works. It's
20 just all I think is a little --

21 MS. LUKENS: Okay.

22 FEMALE VOICE: Was a little over the top.

23 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

24 MALE VOICE: Will be affected is
25 encompassing, because if there's only a few strong

1 resilient communities left, they're going to have a
2 huge market share, so they'll be beneficial.

3 MS. BONNEY: I can live with will without
4 the all. No qualifier. I can live with will if the
5 all was gone.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All is gone.

7 FEMALE VOICE: Okay.

8 MS. LUKENS: I'm pretty impressed that you
9 guys got through all of these in the amount of time.

10 MR. RHEULT: It's a small group.

11 FEMALE VOICE: We all think alike.

12 MS. LUKENS: Wait until tomorrow. They're
13 going to tear it apart.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Last thing, is there
15 anything we can do with Wendy's comments?

16 MS. LUKENS: Well, I think part of Wendy's
17 comment is reflected in that last one there.

18 MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah, it's in there. Case
19 studies.

20 MS. LUKENS: For the management part. For
21 the council part.

22 MALE VOICE: That's up in the first --

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: In both of them.

24 Both -- we've asked both of the task forces to do the
25 exercise of identifying specific examples.

1 MR. RHEAULT: So, just a question. Do we
2 want to draw on international examples of fisheries
3 management that might be more flexible? Just throwing
4 it out there. For, with the task force.

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Definitely.

6 MR. RHEAULT: Go anywhere you need.

7 MS. BONNEY: Flexibility is where we all
8 need to go. That's for sure. For every regulation
9 they put in place, they should have to take one away.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That was meaningful to
11 you, Roger?

12 MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah. They're good. They're
13 big. The group will have to then kind of --

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely.

15 MR. GRIFFIS: -- come down and say, okay,
16 we're going to kind of bound this by this and this.
17 The only word in there that I keep wondering about is
18 rapid decisions. We're all -- you know, rapid
19 decisions, to me, it's, really, it's about effective
20 decisions, informed decisions, but I don't care. Go
21 with that. I mean, rapid was still left over for our,
22 from our conversation on wanting councils, the
23 management thing, to be able to be responsive and
24 nimble.

25 MR. OKONIEWSKI: How about expedient?

1 FEMALE VOICE: How about effective?

2 MS. LUKENS: Expedient.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Because if it's not
4 expedient it's, I mean it's not going to do much good.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. It still suggests
6 that it's more about effectiveness.

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: If it's not rapid enough,
8 it's not effective, so, effective --

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right.

10 MR. MCCARTY: If you want to put a real push
11 on the ability to respond quickly, then keep the rapid
12 term. I mean if you really --

13 MR. RHEULT: Well from my point of view,
14 yes, I do, because I've seen anything but.

15 MR. MCCARTY: Okay.

16 MALE VOICE: How about intergenerational?

17 FEMALE VOICE: Glacial.

18 MALE VOICE: Nonglacial.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So, I've got
21 three questions here. We can all live with these
22 three questions? These three projects? I would point
23 out that Terri Lea, this one, the first one is tight,
24 so by the next meeting you're done with this and then
25 you're moving on to the next piece of this resilience

1 project.

2 You're going to do another effort, just like
3 this, where your ad hoc working group is going to say,
4 okay, we tackled resilience, we have a better
5 understanding of this concept now, now what?

6 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. So, the people sitting
7 here are members of the ad hoc working group? Is that
8 the reality. I didn't --

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And anybody from the
10 other committee that wants to jump over.

11 MS. LUKENS: I think that's one of the
12 things that you would cover tomorrow, which is the
13 composition of the group, and then --

14 MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm going to get that, right?

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Of course.

16 MS. LUKENS: -- certainly -- well this is
17 what you would, you all would put up. Keith would
18 send this out tonight to everybody, so they have it to
19 look at this evening, and put this up for an action
20 tomorrow for all of them to look at.

21 Then, if -- that first one there, certainly
22 you'd have your group identified, and then, we will
23 have to identify how we can best support you all
24 staff-wise, expertise-wise, and with these charges.

25 MS. BEIDEMAN: When is the next scheduled

1 meeting, approximately?

2 MS. LUKENS: May-ish. Anywhere from April
3 to June. I'm working on trying to find the date right
4 now.

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: May-ish? Okay. All right.

6 MS. LUKENS: Spring-ish. Six months-ish.

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: Possibly, I can throw the
8 first pitch.

9 MS. LUKENS: With that -- with the habitat
10 one, I can follow up on that, and see when they are
11 planning on finalizing it. So, that --

12 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. That would be a
13 driver.

14 MS. LUKENS: I'll find that out.

15 MR. RHEAULT: I think, probably, get a draft
16 out of the aquaculture group for the next meeting in
17 April. I'm sorry.

18 (Whereupon, at 4:42 p.m., the meeting in the
19 above-entitled matter adjourned, to reconvene at 9:00
20 a.m. the following day, Thursday, October 15, 2015.)

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

DOCKET NO.: N/A
CASE TITLE: MAFAC Meeting
HEARING DATE: October 14, 2015
LOCATION: Silver Spring, Maryland

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Date: October 14, 2015

Margaret Blumenthal
Official Reporter
Heritage Reporting Corporation
Suite 206
1220 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018