U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

NOAA FISHERIES COUNCIL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
May 20, 2021

+ + + + +

The Council Coordination Committee met via video-teleconference, at 1:15 p.m. EDT, Marc Gorelnik, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT MARC GORELNIK, Chair SIMON KINNEEN CHRIS MOORE TOM NIES CHRIS OLIVER BRAD PETTINGER SAMUEL RAUCH CARRIE REID CARRIE SIMMONS KITTY SIMONDS ARCHIE SOLIAI CHUCK TRACY BILL TWEIT ED WATAMURA DAVE WITHERELL

ALSO PRESENT
BRETT ALGER
MORGAN COREY
KELLY DENIT
PAUL DOREMUS
ADAM ISSENBERG
JEN LUKENS
DAVID O'BRIEN

CONTENTS

Status of SCS-7
Seafood Competitiveness, Marketing and Economic Growth
Overview and Session Introduction 8
E.O. 13921 Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness and Economic Growth
Section 4 Councils' Recommendations Update11
Aquaculture Opportunity Areas Listening Sessions Feedback Update
Seafood Marketing efforts including MAFAC, National Seafood Council Recommendations
Electronic Monitoring Draft Electronic Monitoring Procedural Directive on applying information law (e.g. FRA, FOIA, MSA confidentiality)
Policy and Procedural Directives on Guidance for Financial Disclosures and Recusals
Wrap Up and Other Business

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

 1:31 p.m.
CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, good morning,

everyone. It is 1:30 in the east, 10:30 in the west, and even earlier in the Western Pacific.

We're going to get started now with Day 3 of this CCC Meeting and in a moment we'll pick up where we left off yesterday.

I just wanted to make an announcement that for those who wish to offer public comment, there'll be several opportunities today.

What you need to do is indicate in some way that you wish to speak on an agenda item and that means either raising your hand within, as an attendee or sending a chat to the SF Webex host indicating you want to speak on an agenda item.

Because we're running late, we'll probably have to limit public comment to about three minutes a person. This is our last day. We don't have any makeup time for tomorrow.

So before I start, before we return to an Agenda Item 9, let me see if there are any announcements, either from Chuck Tracy or anyone else and I'm not seeing any hands.

So when we left last evening or morning as the case may be, we had just finished the NEPA Subcommittee report and we'll finish the last two reports and then we will have any questions from the Committee, from the CCC.

We will then have public comment and then we'll have Council discussion and action on Agenda Number 9.

So I think, Chuck, you had finished your presentation on the NEPA Subcommittee and so we will move now to Dave Witherell, the status of the SCS-7 meeting.

MR. WITHERELL: Thank you, Mr.

I have this written briefing attached

to the Agenda on this item. If you recall, in 2020, the North Pacific Council was planning to host the Scientific Coordination Subcommittee meeting in Sitka, Alaska.

And when the pandemic hit we had to cancel that meeting. And I looked into, along with the Steering Committee, the possibility of hosting the meeting virtually in 2021. We have

since been convinced or come to the realization that a virtual meeting would not necessarily result in the benefits that we tend to get from those Scientific Coordination meetings.

So I'm looking to have that meeting in person, to hold that meeting in person in Alaska in 2022 and I'm committing to do that with North Pacific Council budget funds if necessary.

But we do have a funding issue. In 2019 the National Marine Fisheries Service did supplement our budget with \$60,000 which we successfully carried over in our no-cost extensions through 2021.

Now OMB released a memo in March that would authorize carrying over those funds for an additional year through 2022 if authorized by the funding agency.

Our NOAA grants person in the Alaska region has not had any guidance from OMB or NOAA grants further guidance on how to allow us to obtain funds to fund this SCS meeting.

So I'm basically requesting that NOAA Fisheries do what they can to help us secure those carryover funds and be able to have an in person meeting as envisioned for this scientific subcommittee.

Well, that's my report, Mr. Chairman. Bottom line is that we're planning to host that meeting in 2022 as opposed to 2020 as originally anticipated.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Thank you very much, Dave.

And the last Committee report is the COFI report, Kitty, and I think you have a presentation?

MS. SIMONDS: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, I'm ready.

So as you all know, councils participate in the U.N. COFI which is the Committee on Fisheries meetings on U.S. delegations and we take turns. East coast, West Coast, East Coast, West Coast.

So this year while it was supposed to be the East Coast, I took it because the, you know, many of the topics deal with AMBs which is one of our biggest interests for all of the councils.

So in your briefing book there is a

one-pager on our request to the U.S. Delegation.

So may I have the first slide, please? Okay. Second slide. Thank you, thank you.

So our request for area-based management guidelines is provided in the briefing book as well. We, the Council, held a workshop in June of last year and which included 30 experts from all over the world representing all the major RFMOS, academia and NGOs like Global Fish Watch, TNC, IUCN.

It was shared by Ray Hilborn and the FAO Fisheries Division Chief Vera Agostini. A report on that is available and linked to the documents on the WP Council Website.

So a peer, a review RFO is going to be published sometime this summer on this ABM workshop that the Council hosted and also a, well, a subcommittee on fisheries management will be developed at COFI35 which is where our needs to address these area-based management guidelines, could be enacted internationally.

Next slide, please?

So most of the focus was on improving the monitoring of small scale fisheries noting issues with IUU fishing and lack of input output controls.

The U.N. General Assembly declared 2022 the International Year of Artisanal Fisheries and Aquaculture. So obviously aquaculture was a focus specifically on the use of microbials, antibiotics, for purposes of food and ecosystem safety.

Next slide, please?

So the IMO, the International Maritime Organization and International Labor Organization's compliance regarding IUU fishing associated with labor and other issues, compliance issues, was another focus at this meeting.

So most important to us, the issue of main streaming biodiversity was covered at length to build future agreements regarding fisheries on preparing for climate change.

Next slide?

So FAO's work plan addresses regional issues regarding management practices to conserve biodiversity through regional learning events which was encouraged by the Canadian delegation.

These learning events allow for regional management objectives to be heard, considering priorities, defer across the many regions. So this is another opportunity for us to address our needs regarding area-based management.

Next slide, please?

So following on these, you know, learning events, exchange of ideas and experiences among the regions, they plan to hold these around the Asia-Pacific, Africa, Latin American, and the Caribbean. So this is another opportunity for councils to participate or share viewpoints, especially those of us who have international fisheries that we manage.

Next slide, please?

So lastly, the FAO work plan coincides with much of the proposal for an area-based working group that we heard yesterday.

So this is my report, Mr. Chairman. And while the U.S. did not intervene on this matter or make a request, it did circulate information on our Council's workshop in its written statement.

And on the paper we provided, the entire COFI report which is voluminous is, there's a link there for you all. So thank you very much.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay. Thank you very much, Kitty.

So we've had all the reports and let's first see if there are any questions from CCC members on any of the reports and we'll take these in the order they were given.

Are there any questions on the CMOD report? Okay.

Are there any questions on either the communications report or the NEPA Subcommittee report, both given by Chuck Tracy?

Okay. Are there any questions on Dave Witherell's report on the planning for SCS7?

And finally, are there any questions on the COFI report provided by Kitty Simonds? I guess the reports were so comprehensive we don't have any questions at least from the Committee which is good.

So before we go to Council discussion and action on these various reports, let's see if

we have any requests from the public to speak. I'm not seeing any hands raised in the attendee list.

And Nicholas, have you received any requests to speak?

THE OPERATOR: No, I haven't. CHAIR GORELNIK: All right, great.

So then that brings us to Council action on Agenda Item 9, the various reports of the CCC Committees. And so let's see if we have any hands raised.

Brad Pettinger?

MR. PETTINGER: Yes, thank you, Chair Gorelnik. I've got a motion for the NEPA Subcommittee.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Please go ahead.

MR. PETTINGER: Okay. I move the CCC recommend that the National Fisheries Service consider the report of the CCC NEPA Subcommittee and conduct a proposed NEPA workshop to extend development of agency guidance on the implementation of the new CDQ NEPA regulations and procedures or functional equivalence of MSA actions.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Well, let's see if we can't get that up on the screen.

MR. TRACY: Morgan, can you allow me to share my screen? This is Chuck.

MS. COREY: No problem, Chuck. CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Brad,

that's your motion on the screen there.

MR. PETTINGER: It is.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. I will look for a second? A second by Tom Nies. Thank you, Tom.

Brad, do you want to speak to your motion as necessary?

MR. PETTINGER: I don't think it's necessary. I'll think Chuck's overview and report was really good and I think we're a little behind here so I think I'll just go with that report that's there.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Let's see if there's any discussion on this motion.

MR. TRACY: Mr. Chair, I can't quite find my hand but I did have a question, I guess.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay.

MR. TRACY: Or maybe some discussion. I guess I was just kind of curious what, if NMFS had a status update on their plans for the workshop or anything else going forward? Sorry I didn't get that out there sooner.

CHAIR GORELNIK: MR. RUNNELS: Let's see if we can get someone to respond to your question.

MR. RAUCH: Mr. Chair, if I may? This is Sam Rauch.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Please go ahead, Sam. MR. RAUCH: Unfortunately I do not have a status update. I think as you indicated in your presentation yesterday, we are still evaluating what the overall response to the administration is going to be and still in our agenda it's something we'd like to pursue but exactly how we do that we do not currently have plans.

But I will give you a better, more directed update once I can consult with our NEPA folks about that.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you.

All right. Is there any further discussion, questions, comments on this motion? I'm not seeing any hands so please unmute your microphones so we can vote on this motion. All those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Opposed, no?

Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.

Thank you, Brad, for the motion.

We have several other reports here for discussion or any action as necessary. I will pause here to see a hand go up if it does for any further discussion or action on the other reports. And I'm not seeing any hands so I believe we have concluded our business on Agenda Number 9, the Reports of the CCC Committees.

Okay. And that takes us back to today's agenda. And with that, we will start with Agenda Item Number 10, Seafood Competitiveness, Marketing and Economic Growth.

And Paul, I think you have the floor here.

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's great to see everybody again today and be able to take up a very expansive topic.

I'll just provide some framing here for just a couple of minutes before we dig in to a couple of elements of Executive Order 13921 which was landed last May and has a range of different components that are broadly oriented around approving the competitiveness of the U.S. seafood, the U.S. fishing and seafood sectors as a whole.

And we're covering two of those here today, the components under Section 4 that you all have contributed to as well as latest on aquaculture opportunity areas.

Those are two pieces of a fairly comprehensive executive order that actually developed over a very long time period and with lots of input from industry as we've discussed before.

And in many respects, those components along with the third topic that we're going to be taking up today which is Part C of our agenda item on seafood marketing.

Our Marine Fisheries Advisory
Committee has spoken on that topic. We'll have a
little bit of a focus on that but also a number
of other aspects of the sort of demand side of
the equation with education, marketing and
promotion efforts that would complement a
National Seafood Council type effort, workforce
development, working waterfronts, a range of
issues that we'll cover there.

And really, this is really an opportunity to update the CCC on the status of this set of efforts what have been several of which are in motion and really think, I think, comprehensively here about where we are in terms of the resilience, overall competitiveness of the fishing and seafood sector of the United States.

We've had an enormous shock with COVID and, you know, in many respects, it accelerated a lot of changes and revealed a lot of weaknesses in the industry, broadly speaking, that we had known about and highlighted the need for strategic initiatives to build back better as is the charge and really kind of play for the longer term strengthening.

And so strategic management of a lot of very, very significant pressures on the industry, not only the economic pressures and

sort of market disruption and change in consumer dynamics, some positive, some negative coming out of COVID, but also a lot of the pressures that we've been talking about on uses of ocean space, on the changing environmental conditions that we're focusing on very heavily under Executive Order 14008, among other challenges.

So this is I think a part, a snapshot on key segments of what you could probably call a national seafood competitive strategy.

We'll get started with an update with Kelly Denit and on the Section 4 and David O'Brien on aquaculture opportunity areas.

And then we'll spend a little bit more time on the broad topic of seafood marketing, including but not limited to MAFAC's efforts.

So thank you for the opportunity to dig into this topic and I will turn it over to Kelly Denit for our first piece of the discussion here this afternoon.

MS. DENIT: Great, thanks, Paul. CHAIR GORELNIK: Welcome, Kelly. MS. DENIT: Thanks, Marc.

Good to see everybody this afternoon. From what I've been told, I am extremely sad that I missed the happy hour last evening. I look forward to at some point seeing the video that was shared.

So Morgan, could you please bring up the slides for me? You're a peach. Thank you.

So quickly, I'm going to run through

a little bit of a reminder on Section 4 of 13921.

Go ahead and go to the next slide,

Morgan?

 So you all recall that this was the section of the EO that was focused on soliciting a prioritized list of actions from you all to reduce burdens on the domestic fishing industry.

You were asked to focus on things that could be initiated within one year and you had a range of topic areas that you could cover, everything from specific regulatory actions, to guidance documents, to others.

It has to be consistent with our various statutory requirements. And then we were required to review that input and as appropriate update the unified agenda which is essentially the regulatory calendar with that input.

Next slide, please?

So just as a quick overview, this shows you a map of the number of actions that you all submitted by Council with the Mid-Atlantic leading the charge with 18.

Go ahead to the next slide, please? And click a couple times, we're in, because I think we, yes, thank you.

So as a reminder, you all submitted this information back in November to all of us. Since that time we've been reviewing all of the input.

And thank you all again for using the spreadsheet that we provided. That made it a lot easier for us to be able to sort through all of the input.

You'll see here in the pie graph, gives you just a general sense of how those suggestions broke down into the four different bins.

So we had one that was regulatory, actual changes to regulations which had about the 18 actions total.

Then the non-regulatory NMFS led, had about 51 actions in it and I'm going to talk a little bit more about what's included in that bucket in a second.

Then there were some recommendations for other agencies as well as we ended up with just a little bit of a catch-all other category.

Go ahead to the next slide, please,

Morgan?

So we have reviewed the regulatory action inputs.

Go ahead to the next slide?

And there were a total of 18
regulatory actions received. These were proposed or considered near term rate, i.e. that there's going to be a final rule or final Council action in the next six to 12 months.

So in terms of what we needed to provide for the unified agenda, there was one action up in the North Pacific that was approved in time to make the spring UA and then there are about nine I think actions of those 18 that you all provided that we anticipate will make the fall UA.

And so our plan is as your respective

councils move through your process then you are finalizing your actions, that based on those timelines we will add those regulatory actions or those regulatory changes to the unified agenda.

Go ahead to the next slide, Morgan?
Okay. In addition as I mentioned, we kind of had the big buckets of non-regulatory actions that you all provided.

And so since February, we've been working with the regional offices and our headquarters offices to review all of those non-regulatory actions.

Go ahead to the next slide, Morgan? Thank you.

So here these were just some general themes that came through in the buckets for Bins2 through 4.

Several of you expressed support for commercial electronic reporting programs, overall improvement in data collection. I'm sure you'll all be surprised that you separately advocated for support for the surveys and monitoring and observers in your respective regions.

You also included suggestions around National Standard 1, the Modernizing Fish Act and ACL flexibility.

We're going to talk more about the domestic seafood competitiveness but several of you had specific recommendations about recommendations to work with USTR to reduce trade barriers and other actions like that.

Paul has already alluded to the support you've indicated for the national seafood marketing program.

There was also support for climate scenario planning and then a couple specifics for reclassification of squid under specific regulatory actions the Fish and Wildlife Service took and lots of work for getting the next generation of fishermen out on the water.

Go ahead to the next slide, Morgan? Thank you.

So at this point here we are in May to update you all on where we stand. As we conclude the CCC meeting, we will continue to review those non-regulatory recommendations and talk with Sam and Paul further about that and then provide those recommendations to other agencies as

appropriate and incorporate those into our decision making as we move forward.

And so I think that's the last slide.

Be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Are there any questions of Kelly? Chuck Tracy, then Chris Moore.

MR. TRACY: Thanks, Kelly. Thanks for the presentation.

Just to make the last point I guess. So I take it that none of the non-regulatory items have been, there have been no results from any of those matters? If there hasn't been any action taken I guess I'm particularly interested in where the squid reclassification item stands.

MS. DENIT: Sure, Chuck. Yes, so certainly some of those recommendations have been taken into account. For example, like I mentioned many of you advocating for support for surveys and other particular funding priorities which have been considered.

But things like, yes, the Fish and Wildlife Service and actions on Squid, we have not forwarded that to the Fish and Wildlife Service yet.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Chris Moore?

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hi, Kelly. How are you?

MS. DENIT: Hey, Chris.

MR. MOORE: So one of the questions I was going to ask is the one you just addressed about squid. So that's good to hear. Can you put that timeline graphic up, please?

MS. DENIT: I'm sure Morgan with her magic powers can.

MR. MOORE: Oh, there you go. So the, a couple things that strike me. I don't remember and it could be that it wasn't asked, but you say in March and April there was a request of feedback from the regions.

So the councils weren't involved in that. That was the headquarters to region contact and we weren't involved, correct?

MS. DENIT: Correct.

MR. MOORE: It wasn't feedback from

us, it was the region, okay.

MS. DENIT: Correct.

MR. MOORE: The other thing, the last

highlighted green bullet, prepared to report, is 1 2 that report something that's available or is it 3 linked to your presentation? I didn't see a 4 report. 5 MS. DENIT: I think this slide deck is our report as far as I know, Chris. 6 7 MR. MOORE: Oh, okay. 8 MS. DENIT: Yes. 9 MR. MOORE: I get it. 10 MS. DENIT: Sorry, probably just a 11 little bit of poor wording choice there but the slide deck is really kind of our update for you 12 13 all on where everything stands. 14 MR. MOORE: Got you. And the last 15 So you used the term UA, Unified question. I probably should know what that is but 16 Agenda. 17 what is that and who's that for? 18 MS. DENIT: Awesome. Yes, Unified 19 Agenda is essentially the federal government's 20 list of all of the regulatory actions that it's 21 going to take or that it plans to take, comes out 22 of OMB. 23 The Office of Management and Budget is 24 part of the White House. All federal agencies 25 participate in it. You've had actions listed on it for 26 27 years and years, so. MR. MOORE: Oh, okay. 28 Yes, just 29 never, you know, it just never struck me, I never 30 thought of it that way so, yes, thanks. I mean, 31 yes, appreciate it. Thank you. 32 MS. DENIT: Sure. 33 CHAIR GORELNIK: Thanks, Kelly. further questions for Kelly? I'm not seeing any. 34 35 Thank you very much, Kelly. 36 Paul, back to you? 37 MS. DENIT: Actually, Mr. Chair, I'm 38 sorry --39 CHAIR GORELNIK: More, Kelly? 40 MS. DENIT: Yes, could I take us on 41 just a minor tangent to address some of the 42 issues that came up in the NS1 data poor conversation yesterday just while I have the 43 44 floor? It'll take two minutes. Sure. 45 CHAIR GORELNIK: 46 MS. DENIT: Great, thank you so much. So first of all, thank you all again 47

for your participation in the conversation

yesterday on the data poor tech memo.

I heard from folks that you all requested a little bit more time to review that document so we would like to get comments back from you all by early October.

We recognize that that's not as much time as you had asked for but we think that that will give us a little bit of time to at least be prepared to have a conversation with you all at the October CCC meeting rather than waiting to get all of the comments after that.

So I just wanted to share that very brief update, Mr. Chair, and of course if people have follow-up questions we can discuss them offline. Feel free to send stuff and either Mary or I an email.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Thank you for that, Kelly. Well, thanks for that report, Kelly.

Paul?

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let's turn the mic if we can over to David O'Brien who's currently acting as the director of our Office of Aquaculture for the second item here under this section.

David?

CHAIR GORELNIK: Welcome, David.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm happy to be here today. Thank you for the opportunity to come and speak to you today about where we stand with aquaculture opportunity areas.

And Morgan, if you're driving, great, thank you.

So I wanted to start by hopefully a brief presentation here to really do three things. One is to summarize our actions to date in the world of aquaculture opportunity areas, let you know where we stand.

Second is to talk about what comes next over the next few months. There'll be some significant steps along the way. We want to make sure that all the CCC and our councils are aware of these actions. And then also to talk about opportunities to engage in the process from the CCC as a group and also for the individual councils to engage in the process.

And it called for, had some fairly aggressive timelines and to be clear, these timelines would have been highly aggressive even if we're fully resourced to do this and we're not.

So these timelines will slip but we're doing the best we can with what we have to stay

order for seafood competitiveness, Section 7

calls for the establishment of aquaculture

doing the best we can with what we have to stay as aligned with these timelines as much as possible.

Morgan, next slide, please?

So as a reminder under the executive

It calls for within one year of the EO which by the way was signed just about a year ago today or 13 months ago it was signed, to establish two AOAs and then go through a process of establishing an EIS, programmatic EIS for each of them.

And then to have a furthermore established AOAs, a total of ten over five years. Again, we're not going to meet that timeline but that is what the executive order calls for.

Next slide, please?

And here's just graphically what the, again the timeline laid out for you. I won't go through it again except to note that Year 1 we're looking at the first two AOAs on that first row, so to speak.

We're right now about six months behind so we've not identified those first two AOAs yet but we hope to do so, well, at least the beginnings of doing so. Be prepared for the PEIS stage sometime this fall and I'll get to that a little further along the presentation.

Next slide, please?

So next few slides are a basic timeline. I'm not going to hit every one of these pieces in the interest of time but I will stop a few places along the way just for some highlights.

Back in the summer of, back in August of 2020 is when we first announced the two broad regions where we decided to establish some future AOAs in the Gulf of Mexico and in Southern California.

At that point we started doing our

outreach events with stakeholders including the councils, our stakeholders and partners including the councils and the Ocean Service, our partners in this effort began a very deliberate effort to look at all the data available to begin a spatial planning effort to help inform the AOA development as we move forward.

Next slide, please?

About last fall in October we published a request for information to gather public input and I will be going through some of the highlights of that public input later in my presentation.

And then we also began a very even more dedicated outreach campaign essentially to again working with the councils but also the general public.

We held a number of listening sessions mostly through November into early December as I recall, and tried to collect all that information to feed into the selection process for specific areas for future ALAs.

Next slide, please?

I won't really touch on anything particular too much right here other than to say that this is basically where we are now.

We're merging the information we got from the public comments as well as the preliminary atlases that NCCOS develops just for internal use for us to sort of digest certain aspects of what they are looking at. And that's all being merged at this point.

I will say also the RFI I mentioned the last slide really had two questions. I should have said that at the time.

One was to help us get more information on the first two AOAs but also more broadly to ask about looking forward as you look to AOAs Number 3 and beyond, where should we be looking at, any concerns, thoughts, that the public may have to inform that next step.

Next slide, please?

So these are the next steps that are coming down the pike. One is in the late, well, probably late summer, early fall, or maybe midfall, expect to see a draft or an atlas published by the Ocean Service that has preliminary areas for consideration for aquaculture opportunity

areas.

Let me say that again, it's a lot there. I think there's been some confusion on this front. The atlases themselves will not be the opportunity areas. That is the first or a key step along the way but there'll be multiple other steps between that process in the fall and the actual establishment of AOAs.

And there'll be at least two or three opportunities for the Council and others to weigh in on as you move in that process.

So I'll get to that a little bit later in the presentation as well but I want to highlight it here because it is a point I think of confusion effecting internally as well at times. We need to do a better job of messaging that.

Simultaneous or close to simultaneous with the publication of those atlases, there'll be a Notice of Intent published or to establish the EISs in the, both Gulf of Mexico and Southern California.

In the meantime, we'll continue to work with the councils and others to, for outreach to continue to let them know what's going on and what to expect next.

Next slide, please?

So here's a one slide summary of, or maybe there's two slides actually, a summary of where, of what we heard from the public during that public comment period.

Again, through both the Request for Information and the Federal Register as well as the listening sessions.

We got 73 unique comments from the public through regulations.gov and also quite a few from the public listening sessions.

A mix of federal and state agencies weighed in as well as councils, tribes, NGOs, and many individual comments.

There were two write-in campaigns which is not surprising, Friends of the Earth as well as Center for Food Safety, voicing some concerns about the process.

But actually when we get to the next slide, please, I'll go through some of the details about what they said.

Next slide, please, Morgan?

So there was a mix of opposition and support I think is the high level way of phrasing this. In general, much of the opposition was focused on finfish aquaculture which is not surprising given you've heard that over the years in many different contexts. That's where a lot of the opposition from those two environmental groups came from.

Then we got some very specific comments which was very helpful about areas in Southern California and Gulf of Mexico where people thought we should avoid or to focus on.

And in general the issues raised covered the wide gamut of things we've heard again many times, different contexts, for water quality, marine mammals, et cetera.

This is all very valuable information for us to include and we would have done it anyway but to see it in a public context, it would include these as part of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Next slide, please?

So next steps. We will be completing PEISs for the first two AOAs. As I said a moment ago, it starts with, well, if that starts with the next steps it will be the simultaneous publication of the atlases as well as the Notice of Intent sometime this fall and that kicks off the formal EIS process.

We can solve, there's a lot of public engagement built into it as does any EIS process.

These areas will be considered and the areas to be considered in PEISs will be based on the atlas but also further coordination with stakeholder input as well as from our own internal discussions with Protected Resources, Sustainable Fisheries, Habitat, et cetera.

Next slide, please?

As I said, our Notice of Intent had those two questions. One was on the first two AOAs, the second question's really on future AOAs. I did hear quite a bit on that front as well.

In general, there's been a lot of support for mariculture in Alaska, not finfish of course but shellfish and seaweed in a combination of state and federal waters.

And that's a point I wanted to

highlight. Well, the first two AOAs will be in federal waters. You think of water as agnostic as to whether they can be in state or federal waters.

We certainly are open to working with various states like Alaska if they want to establish AOAs in their waters in their state of course.

There's also support in the Western Pacific, USVI and Puerto Rico, and again in state waters off the coast of Florida.

Right now, the opposite, it's mostly the voices of opposition for AOAs in the Northeast given the things listed here, wind planning, the lobster industry, right whales. There's a lot going on up there.

That's the guidance we've received at this point is to not go to AOAs at least to the Northeast at least for the next round of AOA development. But there was some support. There's some support in favor of doing so.

In the Northwest, Oregon and Washington, there's general opposition at this time anyway for AOAs in their area.

Next slide, please?

So next steps, future AOAs. We're reviewing all the comments. We're working internally with our regional offices to look at opportunities and challenges for developing AOAs in their areas.

There'll be a leadership discussion before we announce any next AOA locations but really our primary focus right now is on the first two AOAs and making progress there so I don't expect to see any real announcement on the third AOA for some time.

We'll be sure to give the councils plenty of notice before we do so.

Next slide, please?

So she takes me to Opportunities for Coordination and Engagement with the Councils. I'd say up until now we've been working very closely.

I've tried to work very closely with the councils as we've gone through the AOA process, even more broadly in longer term on aquaculture development more broadly.

We think the councils have an

incredibly important voice in this process for aquaculture development generally and certainly for AOA development.

We want to maintain open lines of communication and I believe we've been through every or if not every, then close to every Council meeting and CCC meeting since the AOA process started to try to keep this open dialogue going. We want to maintain that as we move forward.

AOAs are a national initiative. However, for each individual AOA, it's one of the NMFS regional offices that will be taking the lead with headquarter support to develop the PEISs and to really drive the AOAs development team in their regions.

Next slide, please?

So here's some opportunities, this is not comprehensive I don't think but it's a good list of areas where the councils can engage, and have engaged, and will continue to engage we hope in this process.

Certainly when NCCOS, our partners at Ocean Service are gathering data for spatial analysis, during the request for public information, when the atlas is published there'd be a chance to weigh in at that point as well to help us inform what subset of those areas would be moving forward into the draft PEIS process and then through the PEIS process itself, is opportunities for public engagement, and in stakeholder engagement, and in partner engagement across the board.

So I'm saying this because I think because this is not a management action, it's not a fisheries management action, it's not even a management action. It's by definition of a planning effort.

The type of engagement may look a little bit different from what the councils are used to seeing but I don't want that to infer that it's no less important.

We really want to hear your voices loud and clear throughout the process and there's multiple opportunities to do so.

Next slide, please?

And at the national level, certainly meetings like this, CCC meetings, we are more

than happy to come and talk to you at any time about where things stand and get your thoughts as we continue to move forward through this process.

With that, next slide I think and the last one. Yes, that's it. So as time allows, I'm happy to take any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you very much, David.

Let's see if there are questions from the Committee here.

Carrie Simmons?

MS. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Carrie Simmons, Gulf Council.

Good to see you, O'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Carrie.

MS. SIMMONS: As you know, aquaculture is very important to us in the Gulf. Just curious, you know. This is a tremendous amount of work for you all with establishing these AOAs.

Have you thought about once those are set inside the Gulf or off in the Pacific, will there be any more, I guess, will there be a streamlined process for the other, for permits through the EPA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should a permitee that wants to put a facility in the AOA versus outside the AOA?

Will there be more coordination with that? Will that process be streamlined through this effort? Just curious.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's a great question and the short answer is we certainly hope so.

That is the intent of these AOAs is to do a lot of work up front to front load the process so that when an individual permit applicant does come forward in the Gulf of Mexico or anywhere else, much of the analysis has already been done so it makes it an easier process. And that's just from the NEPA lens alone.

I'll also say, well, I didn't really touch on it here today, the executive order also calls for those other agencies to work on nationwide permits for example to ease things on that front as well.

So the intent certainly is to make it easier down the road. It is a big lift for us right now but the intent is for it to be worth

the effort down the road, for both the applicants and for us.

MS. SIMMONS: Thanks.
CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you.
Eric Reid?

MR. REID: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I think my question might have just been answered with Carrie's question but I'll ask anyway. For entities that they want to start up an aquaculture adventure, are they required to use these AOAs, be within the AOAs that are going to be developed and identified through this giant lengthy process?

I think the answer is no. I just want to make sure that's right.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's accurate. Yes, there's no, certainly if folks do want to come in outside of AOAs they can.

As we develop more AOAs we will be looking for ways to incentivize people to move into those AOAs. It should be a more streamlined process. That alone hopefully is enough incentive.

But we'd like to talk about specific incentives beyond that but hopefully people will take advantage of the work, the preplanning work that's already been done to say we have sites that are selected that are suitable for aquaculture and that'd be easier for those applicants to go there rather than go outside where they're starting from square one, potentially.

So that is the intent. But no requirement certainly to say you must go into these AOAs.

MR. REID: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman? CHAIR GORELNIK: Please.

MR. REID: So my question being that I'm on a fisheries management council. What's the incentive for us to go through this giant exercise that one, be all the advisors, and two, to have it not even be required as a place these people are going to have to go?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I believe the input from the councils will be extremely important for us to, you know, as you try to avoid, these are conflicts including with the fishing industry, and work through these

complimentarities, your input will be essential.

It has been essential up to this point and will continue to be so. So I hope that that would be some incentive to continue this collaboration.

And again, we can't predict exactly how things are going to play out but the intent is I think that our anticipation is that once the AOAs are established, that alone will be a significant incentive for would be applicants to try to target a permit within the AOAs, again, which should be a streamlined process relative to going outside.

So we do expect that to happen. We'll see how it transpires.

MR. REID: Okay. Thank you very much. CHAIR GORELNIK: Carrie, followed by

Chuck?

MS. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just one more question. Do you have any more information on if you guys have discussed limitations on the programmatic EIS regarding the various species that you're recommending culturing?

Is that going to be based on public comment? Is that going to be based on the literature and what we know about culture of those various, maybe domestic species versus non-native species? Do you have any more information about that?

MR. O'BRIEN: We don't have all the specifics but certainly we will be looking for public comment on a range of options within each AOA, in the NEPA parlance various alternatives that will include things like what species should be grown, what gear types. So we'll be looking for public comment there.

As far as the domestic species go, I will point out that going back to our, was it 2011 I believe, no aquaculture policy where we said for a long time since that time, that we would only as a matter of policy encourage and allow only native or naturalized species in any given area.

So we would not, you know, we're cognizant of the potential for, we don't want to have species around the country growing in places they're not suitable barring, you know, unless

there's some very good reason to believe it could be done safely.

But as a general policy statement, we would encourage only the naturalized or native species.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Chuck?

MR. TRACY: Thank you, David, for the presentation.

I wanted to explore a little bit more about the atlas that is being developed. And first of all, when you say, I think here on the West Coast we do have a very good interaction with your aquaculture office in looking at some of the maps and data used to look at some of the layers that were being used to map out some of the issues associated with assigning aquaculture facilities.

So I think that was a great first step. I'm wondering if it looks like the next step is that the atlas is going to be published.

I was just wondering if there's any opportunities sort of in between that initial discussion and the publishing of the atlas for additional Council interaction or, you know, take a look at what data's being used or how the data is being used.

In particular I assume that, you know, some of the fishery effort layers will be part of that atlas in that.

So just wondering if there's another opportunity or if the atlas is sort of a living document type thing that can be modified, you know, as issues are developed and new data, if there is some. What's the story with the atlas? Thanks.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's a great question. So the atlas won't be a living document, first of all, so we, our partners at the Ocean Service are clutching every scrap of data they can that's relevant to feed into the process of developing the atlas.

It'll be peer reviewed. It's a scientific product and the atlas will come out sometime in, again, probably the fall at this point.

But I think it's important to note, I'm glad you said this because this a point I think it's worth reiterating.

The atlas is just the start or not the start but a chief milestone along the way. So between the atlas being developed and the AOAs being identified, there's a number of steps along the way where there will be opportunity for council input.

So for example, at the Notice of Intent stage happening sometime this fall, we'll say here's the atlas, here's where are some areas we intend to move forward but for the draft programmatic EIS, give us your thoughts.

At that point if you do see any discrepancies or issues, you can flag them and that will feed into our thinking going into the actual draft EIS stage.

And then again, once the draft is published, there'll be another opportunity for the councils and others to weigh in with anything they may see of either missing data, or misinterpreted data, or anything else that may be relevant for us as we develop the final EIS.

So I think the short answer, in some ways to answer to your question is, no, there won't be an opportunity before the atlas is published but there will be several key steps along the way before the AOAs are finalized.

MR. TRACY: Thank you.
CHAIR GORELNIK: Tom Nies?
MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Thank you, David, for the

presentation. I'd like to follow up a little bit on Carrie's question about native or domestic species in your reply.

You know, it struck me that you referred to a policy that was developed in I think you said 2011 which would try to discourage using non-native species and encourage domestic species.

But in light of the court decision in the Fifth Circuit which says fisheries, aquacultures stopped managing the Magnuson Act, is there any enforcement mechanism to make sure that happens?

MR. O'BRIEN: Certainly through the enforcement, I'd like to defer to others to weigh in on that and we can get back to you on that specific question.

But I will say at a minimum, I expect

and during the EIS process alone, that we will use that process to highlight that same point, may come on certain different wording.

But certainly we recognize the potential risks of non-native species nor naturalized species to any given area. And I expect that will come out loud and clear in the PEIS process.

I don't want to get too far down that path but I expect we would hear that loud and clear from the public and partners repeatedly.

So that'd be one way to just build it into the alternative structure, essentially. Here's the species that are allowed or not allowed.

And if they were not allowed they would not be covered by the EIS. It's really an unfortunate action but it's a way for us to influence and direct really what species could be allowed in a given area and what gear types and other things like that.

MR. NIES: So I may not be understanding this correctly. The PEIS though is for development of the aquaculture opportunity area, right? Or is it for a specific project?

MR. O'BRIEN: It would be for the area itself so any individual permit coming in under that AOA would almost certainly require some additional NEPA work associated for example with an Army Corps permit or an EPA permit that would be associated with it.

So there'd be some follow-up.

Hopefully a much more streamlined process as I
said a moment ago but likely some additional NEPA
work would be required.

At that point just say, for example, the Army Corps is in charge of that NEPA document for the individual application.

They'd be tiering off the AOA or the EIS which again, without getting too far ahead of ourselves, I think it's fair to say, you know, non-native and non-naturalized species probably would be, I expect, I have a hard time imagining that would be allowed.

And so for the Corps for example to issue a permit for a non-native, for a truly a non-native species in that area, they'd have to go through their own EIS process.

And again, it'd be difficult for me to imagine that barring some very strict permissions, you know, a sterilized species or something like that I could see, potentially see in an area where that could be allowed.

That's hard to imagine that happening any time in the near future and even that I think would be a bit of a stretch. So anyway, the EIS process and the permitting by the Corps, by the EPA would be, will provide those side boards.

MR. NIES: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR GORELNIK: Any further questions

of David?

Thank you, David.
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you very much.
CHAIR GORELNIK: Back to you, Paul?
DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thanks to all the participants in this other two sessions, and your questions.

So, we're going to switch to a discussion now on, and close out this agenda item on seafood marketing, broadly construed. Starting with some additional on the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee recommendations.

As you know, they were focused in their work, which was delivered to us last summer, on improving consumer confidence and, in and consumption of U.S. seafood, and enhancing the overall resilience of the U.S. seafood supply chain.

And made a number of different recommendations, and we really do appreciate the CCC's engagement on this front, and with their particular responsiveness to MAFAC recommendations itself, in their report. And we have been seeing a range of developments that are encouraging, I think.

And this is a very significant recommendation, we're continuing to evaluate some of them. And clearly there are a lot of major steps that would need to be endorsed by the administration, and ultimately by Congress to move down this path.

But it's been interesting to see the, what I would call the building support, particularly in the context that we are currently in for the proposal that MAFAC put out.

One of the most recent pieces of

evidence of that, which many of you I'm sure are aware of, was a letter orchestrated by the Seafood Nutrition Partnership that was signed by more than 60 leading organizations in the sector overall, representing the, really the diversity of the U.S. seafood sector, endorsing the National Seafood Council.

And this was sent to Congress and really supporting this whole concept of a comprehensive, nationwide seafood marketing public education campaign. Again, all focused on elevating U.S. seafood as a sustainable and healthy protein source in the marketplace.

And we, you know, we see they made specific recommendations about how to build out a National Seafood Council, possibly updating the Fish and Seafood Promotion Act of 1986. We see a great potential in achieving these kind of objectives.

And look forward to continued work with the administration, with Congress as this topic starts to become a more central part of the policy discussion around what it takes to get to a more resilient seafood future, for the industry, as well as what it takes to get the U.S. population to have a much richer component of seafood in their overall diet, true to the federal government's dietary recommendations.

The public benefits in terms of public health, in terms of planetary health, in terms of lower carbon footprint associated with seafood production, there's lots of public benefits here. And the case that MAFAC made was very persuasive and we look forward to continuing to look at ways that could be implemented with support, again from the administration and Congress.

Meanwhile, there are lots of other educational efforts that we've been continuing to advance. Some of which are recognized in the MAFAC report itself. Consumer confidence ultimately is the ticket to achieving some of these objectives. And that all requires sort of sorting out fact from fiction.

And we continue to try to establish our organization and some of the communication outlets that we have built, such as Fish Watch, to be the trusted sources of information on sustainability of U.S. seafood.

MAFAC recognized the value of Fish Watch and its availability to help consumers make informed choices. To provide up-to-date information about everything from the status of stock to how to prepare fish. It's a very comprehensive and extremely well-done site, provides nutrition information. We're trying to draw more people to it. MAFAC recognized the value of that.

And we're certainly dedicated to using Fish Watch for this core purpose of educating consumers about the sustainability of U.S. produced seafood. In effect, kind of like the overarching goal of a National Seafood Council, in MAFAC's eyes, these are mechanisms for both demonstrating U.S. leadership when it comes to sustainability, but also increasing consumer confidence.

And if you're purchasing seafood that was produced in the United States, whether it was wild cod or farmed, you can be confident in its sustainability. And it's value to you, and to the, in terms of your health benefits and of value to our country in terms of the environmental benefits.

So, that's an important tool. We have other tools as well that we're trying to use, again within our very limited resources. We're trying to use to greater effect all around sustainable seafood content. So, we're producing web stories, industry profiles, we're highlighting videos. Some we produce and some from external partners.

We use Fish News, our kind of flagship newsletter, goes out to over 60,000 people to draw out this kind of content. Again, increasingly using videos as a -- and we're getting really quite substantial evidence through our web usage statistics that these are working well.

And we're trying to use all the contemporary techniques of search engine optimization to make sure we understand that our contact not only is relevant and useful, but it's discoverable to seafood consumers.

And that we're channeling the right kind of information and getting the right layers of information orchestrated on the sustainable

seafood section of our website.

So, if you haven't, I encourage you to do that. If you just google sustainable seafood NOAA, that pops up. And these are, these are all areas where we're continuing to advance the ball as we grapple, as a policy matter with the very broad and very comprehensive proposal for a National Seafood Council.

We're continuing to work down the path of these consumer education efforts and we certainly welcome your feedback on those efforts. As well as your continued support for the idea of the National Seafood Council.

Also, on the kind of broader marketing front, we have been actively supporting a campaign that was started by the Seafood Nutrition Partnership. And full disclosure, I am on their advisory board.

And one of the things that came forward during the early stages of the COVID crisis, was a Eat Seafood America campaign that SNP started to pull a broad community of people together and in the kind of seafood stakeholder community, broadly construed, to amplify messages around the health and planetary benefits of seafood consumption.

And we've been supporting the efforts to sort of amplify that campaign and related marketing efforts across a number of social media platforms.

We're using, you know, the tools of the trade, Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn to promote not just, not only for that amplification, but also promote our own content, a link to key partners to get people directed to campaigns like National Seafood Month, Show Us Your Seafood, the Eat Seafood America effort.

All of this again is driven by our interest in kind of marketing and consumer education. And we welcome your continued ideas and thoughts and input related to that.

And we're also working with the Seafood Nutrition Partnership to explore generic marketing and outreach on the importance of seafood consumption. And increasingly linking the science around nutrition, health benefits, and the science around ecological benefits, sustainably sourced seafood. And trying to look

at different ways that these sorts of positive messages can be reinforced.

In addition to marketing, there's also understanding market dynamics, and that's been a big focus of our work, particularly in the aftermath of the early stages of COVID. When we started as you know, and we've talked on a number of occasions with you about the market snapshot reports we've done, to try to assess the impacts over time on our wild capture, aquaculture, seafood processing, charter boat, fishing businesses.

To understand how, where, and in what ways the segments of the fishing and seafood sector were affected by COVID. And we've, you know, done a lot of independent surveys as we do in this very diverse sector that has very uneven information available about it.

Our own fishery economists have been doing series of surveys, primarily on the wild capture side. On the aquaculture side, we have partnered with Virginia Tech and co-sponsored work with SeaGrant. Our SeaGrant partner, all around understanding that sector. And the latest update in this whole process of trying to gage impacts and think through sustainability, long-term resilience sustainability considerations.

That next data report is going to come out, we hope early this summer. We're targeting June, but definitely this summer. Along those lines, all of that is informing our understanding of market dynamics and we are working with internal and external economists to continue to understand where and in what ways, and where the barriers are to modernization throughout the seafood supply chain.

Looking at economic market and trade analyses and trying to get, look closely at the gathering and dissemination of price and supply data -- which during this period we have learned from a lot of folks in the Investor Inc. community in particular -- are often a challenge and a little bit of a barrier to investors getting into these modernization efforts and supporting them throughout the supply chain.

And we're looking at ways to collaborate more closely with the USDA, with the Economic Development Administration, the Minority

Business Development Administration Grant programs and tools, partly related to COVID recovery and partly related to, kind of long-term resilience considerations in the sector as a whole.

And when you think about that modernization, kind of a modernization trend, a growth strategy, what long-term resilience looks like. One of the things that quickly comes up in all of our conversations with industry, are concerns and issues around workforce development. So, this is yet another category where we welcome your input.

We are trying to look at issues around training, recruitment, the sorts of areas where modernization, innovation, new ideas are most needed and could draw in new people. We've got work going on.

You just heard from David O'Brien and his sort of capacity with aquaculture, Office of Aquaculture. He is also co-chairing an economic development task force under the National Science and Technology Council, Subcommittee on Aquaculture, which is co-chaired by USDA, by me for NOAA, and by OSTP.

And looking there at ways to pull together strategies that can address workforce development issues. And it's really helped deepen our relationship with USDA in particular. So, we're working now in that relationship on a range of issues related to fishing and seafood, and access to the USDA programs here at large.

And on the workforce front, we're categorizing inventory workforce development programs right now, training resources, trying to look at where there's gaps. And SeaGrant is our big partner on this and we expect to use its inventory for a bunch of purposes including the support for this taskforce that I just mentioned, economic development taskforce, as well as supporting SeaGrant's implementation role outlined in the Young Fishermen's Development Act.

So, we're hoping with this big need, of drawing new talent into all facets of the industry. We hope the councils can help us by reviewing the inventory, identifying programs that you know about in your states and regions.

There is really a plethora, but often not well known, communicated, or compiled. And we'd love to get, or become aware of what you know about in this category that we might not have covered.

And appreciate your views on the types of things that might be gaps, you know. Where are the needs? Where are the training needs mostly concentrated? How can we fill in those gaps?

How we can achieve other objects such as increasing access to work opportunities from diverse communities and deal with the issues of equity inclusion that are confronting all segments of the industry at this point in time. And likewise, provide assistance to underserved communities.

So, we hope to use this inventory and your input as well. That will kind of be a lens with which we look at the President's jobs plan, which as I mentioned yesterday has a big focus on infrastructure development and developing jobs programs. And that might provide additional opportunities coming up in the fishing and seafood sector as a whole.

So, that's an encouraging path and we could absolutely benefit from your assistance on this inventory gap identification and ideas around how best to advance workforce development programs nationally.

So, speaking of infrastructure, another big area to consider, and we'd love to hear your thoughts around as well, is the whole topic that has ebbed and flowed over time around working waterfronts. Also this, you know, kind of a key, a central hub in what you would call healthy resilient fisheries, at least from our perspective. And I would expect many of you would agree.

And we know that there's been a lot of pressure on working waterfronts. All of us understand that and we know that a lot has moved out over time, processing capacity, distribution capacity, storage capacity, you know, all fish auctions.

There's a lot of pressure on different points of the supply chain, but the working waterfronts are a key concern given this sort of pub nature that they serve. And so, we've got

social scientists, have been working for years now to improve our understanding of how working waterfronts function within the context of coastal fishing communities. And where, what sort of factors affect their liability?

And what kinds of things are creating the greatest vulnerabilities? And what can you do about it? So, these are all issues where you all, so can provide considerable perspective and thought and constructive suggestions on where we could build greater economic opportunity and bring these forward in our considerations, as well as with our engagements with our stakeholder community at large.

We are talking about a number of these things, workforce development, equity, working waterfronts, with MAFAC as we mentioned in our meeting next week, and we'll be seeking their advice and input similarly during that engagement. And look forward to continued work on these long-standing topics.

As I mentioned earlier in my opening comments, these are strategic issues. We're looking at major pressures on our fishing and seafood sector as a whole, particularly in the COVID context that we are still in.

And with substantial questions about the pathway to long-term resilience in the sector as a whole. And this is going to be a continued theme of our efforts and our discussions with all of you because it's, if you will, a front and center for our business, our work.

So, Mr. Chair, we would love to use the balance of our time to address questions in these areas, broadly, around how the councils see their role in these topics related to seafood marketing, education, public engagement, market dynamics, workforce development, working waterfronts, and your ideas on those topics.

But also, what you feel we could do more effectively with the councils and with any other external partners that you would recommend that we work with. And we are particularly interested in getting your focused feedback on our training, inventory, gap analysis as talked about earlier.

And your thoughts on some of these economic pressure points around working

waterfronts and around our overall concern with workforce dynamics and recruiting into the industry to ensure that sort of rejuvenation process as we're looking for growth opportunities and drawing people into the sector.

And looking for ways to increase capacities we've talked about before, whether it's increased efficiency that we're aiming at under Section 4 of the EO, or whether it's building new production capacity as we talked about under the EO with aquaculture opportunity areas and aquaculture development.

We're looking for strategies, interrelated strategies and sort of infrastructure support for the strengthening and long-term resilience of the fishing and seafood sector as a whole. And the central role that you play in it is the reason for raising these questions and I look forward to your thoughts and suggestions in the balance of our time. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you very much. So, now would be the opportunity for CCC Members to ask questions on this agenda item, either Paul, or Kelly, or David. And then after we have had our questions answered, we'll go to public comment and then council discussion and action.

So, let's see if we have some questions, clarifications, whatnot? Tom, your hand is up but I think that may have been from the last agenda item? Tom Nies.

(No audible response.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. So, Paul, I'm not seeing any hands with any -- well, Chris Moore, please go ahead.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hi, Paul. Thank you.

So, I had a couple things to talk with you about. So, ten years ago when I worked for, we worked for ourselves and I worked for NOAA, I knew about terms like UA, and used them frequently.

There was close coordination with NOAA SeaGrant that I don't see as much anymore. I'm wondering what happened to things like a, safe and sustainable seafood focus team? And we also had a focus team that dealt with working waterfronts, and I'm just curious if that stuff

still even exists?

I haven't looked recently to see what's going on with NOAA SeaGrant, but I do know that they've been involved in the aquaculture, they dabble in marketing, and I'm just curious about the interaction between NOAA fisheries and NOAA SeaGrant at this point?

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Chris. We look at SeaGrant as a really central partner in our work here. They have incredible capability both with research assistance and extension on the ground around the country. And our, it's a great two-way relationship working with them.

The complexion of the areas where we collaborated most closely has changed over time. And I do think we have extremely good interaction with them on the aquaculture front. And participated in that directly. We've been working with them and getting them a little bit more involved in, as you noted, in some of the marketing and kind of market dynamics of the industry.

They've been putting some significant grant resources into that territory. And some of the topics we've been pushing around in the last few days, have touched on a better understanding of market dynamics, particularly when you look at changing the composition of production over time.

They are also getting drawn more and more in part through Congressional direction, but also because of need in the workforce development. And we'll indeed be talking with our MAFAC Advisory Panel next week.

So, I think it's, it has, it varies over time, but I think we have a pretty strong relationship with them when we talk about a particular aquaculture in NOAA as a whole.

I am talking about the combined efforts of NOAA fisheries, our science enterprise, our folks in the region, our, obviously our Office of Aquaculture, both nationally and regionally instantiated, and as well, SeaGrant.

And the incredible capabilities that we also draw on in the National Ocean Service that support the industry as well. Partly, spatial planning, partly things like harmful algal bloom forecasts, which have a big

significance to industry.

 So, I think it's a pretty strong partnership, Chris. And I appreciate your bringing our attention to that. And we can include them in some of our future engagements around these topics.

And I expect that will particularly be the case on the workforce development front as we work through some of our discussions with MAFAC and figure out a stronger pathway towards workforce support and that related infrastructure considerations in the coming years.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Paul.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Any further questions on this agenda item of the presenters? Chris Moore, your hand's up.

MR. MOORE: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. Yes, so since no one else is asking questions, I'll ask another question.

So, my staff is now involved with MSE certification for stock. And we've been involved with MSE certification for surfclams and quahog,

squid and all those, you know, the interaction has been successful although it has taken up a lot of staff time.

So, working with them directly -- and we think from a council perspective that's important that we participate and help those folks get those, get that certification done.

We have recently, I think within the last couple of years -- or maybe this year, I can't even remember now, Paul, but the interaction related to Fish Watch, and potentially using that as some sort of label.

Have you folks experienced more sort of de facto use of the Fish Watch logo as sort of an indication of sustainability, or has anyone approached you about that? Again, you know, ten or so years ago, those folks were taking that particular logo and putting it on their packaging. They were told they couldn't use it as a particular certificate of sustainability, but we were indicating that that could be used as some sort of education tool, right?

In other words, here's the label. Go to the website and learn more about Fish Watch. So, is that still occurring? Do you guys have that interaction anymore? I'm just curious.

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Chris. Occasionally, that issue comes up, the issue of certification. And you're correct, Fish Watch is not designed to serve that function. And there is actually a really big difference between building a tool like that with our very lean resources, and having something function as a certification tool.

So, it hasn't been designed and we don't have the capability and right now, to turn Fish Watch into a more formal label, if you will. But its role in education and our encouragement, people pointing consumers to it, continues unabated.

So, we always look for opportunities to direct people to the site. It serves its purpose extremely well as an educational asset. And makes it very clear when you're looking at U.S. sourced seafood, what the sources of the sustainability equation are.

So, we think it serves that role very well, and I'm glad you've been able to make some use of it in that capacity.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Ed Watamura.

MR. WATAMURA: Yes, I wanted to piggyback onto Chris' comments and kind of explain some of the dynamics going on here in Hawaii.

As you're aware, the proportion of imported, foreign seafood is something like, I think 80 percent or close to it. And what we're finding is that a lot of the tuna especially coming in is frozen and gassed, with carbon monoxide.

This issue has been plaguing us because the consumer, at the consumer level, the frozen and gassed product is much cheaper. And so, the consumers tend to go with that product. That's kind of domino, the domino effect of it is that the supply and demand for the local fresh product is decreased by this factor, that they're purchasing the cheaper product.

And, you know, further along the domino effect, is that the prices, supply and demand price point, gets reduced for the local fishermen. And that even, you know, even cascades down to the fact that our commercial fishermen are basically dropping off, you know,

of the -- the list is getting smaller and smaller of the -- especially the local small boat fishermen.

There's just less and less commercial licenses being deployed. So, I just wanted to kind of bring that to your attention and hopefully, you know, U.S. is the only country that's allowing this frozen and gassed tuna in. And I would like to see that someday, that this come to a halt and we could all benefit from that. Thank you.

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Ed.

Appreciate your bringing that to our attention
and it is something that we're certainly aware
of. And I do recall the last time I was at the
fish auction, at the pier there. This topic came
up and people were pretty animated about it.

So, I certainly understand. These are all part of that consumer education driven effort to help shape market dynamics in a way that are favorable for U.S. producers. So, that's a big one and thank you for drawing it to our attention.

We also have, hear about very often and this was my last trip pre-COVID, I was able to do a stop while we had the Aquaculture America out in Honolulu in January of last year. And prior to that on the West Coast.

And one of the things around our lab that we've been doing is working with local fishing communities around trying to build local awareness of locally-sourced species that people haven't heard of. You know, and we're out there making, making fish tacos out of grenadier and things of that nature.

And even, you know, in Hawaii while some well-known species also available on the West Coast, but not very well known to consumers. So, I would love to hear your thoughts. We see these kinds of dynamics where there are species, where we're catching under quota, or they're underutilized species we're aware, there's just not much market for.

The Section 4 topic was intended to get at some of these things, but we'd love to hear your thoughts around where the barriers are for, you know, your mission one, in terms of this type of competition?

But where there are additional barriers we could address, and should be aware of and better understand, in terms of underutilized species. So, that's one area among the others already mentioned that we'd certainly welcome your input on.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you, Paul.

Archie.

MR. SOLIAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Paul. Really appreciate the presentation by Kelly and the team members on this agenda item.

If you all recall last year during our CTC meeting, Chris Oliver at the time, you know, basically instructed the councils to cast a wide net, you know, on the issues that are creating burdens on our domestic fisheries.

And I think, Ed Watamura just spoke to one of the concerns. And one of the other concerns I have is, you know, the domestic swordfish. The Hawaii market provides close to 50 percent of that consumption in the U.S. And cutting off that fishery basically results into importing, increasing imports.

One of the other challenges that we're facing in our region, as you know, is now the bottomfish. And I'm not going dwell on that, but you know, it's hard to get, be competitive and fulfill the obligations in the executive order when we're facing these challenges.

But I do have one question with regards to the recommendations from the council, looking at the numbers that Kelly had presented, it looks like there was a wide net that was cast. And one of the recommendations was, you know, how to deal with marine national monuments?

And now with the change in the administration, you know, they're pushing for more marine managed areas due to climate change. So Paul, I wanted to ask what your thoughts are in the recommendation to remove the marine national monument at PRIA, the Pacific Remote Island Areas?

DR. DOREMUS: Archie, thank you. And appreciate your comments around swordfish and bottomfish. And the whole issue around monuments and protected areas, I think is wide open now for kind of a new conversation and new input from our

council community and from our fishing community at large, as we talked about yesterday.

So, I don't have any, you know, particular solution to offer per se, because I think we're a little bit early in the process of really understanding what our options are. As all of you pointed to yesterday, we really need to think through what conservation means.

And what counts towards conservation? Where do you put different types of tools into place given the ecological functions that we're trying to ensure are sustainable and help support the sustainable management of our species over time?

So, these are very complicated questions but I'm encouraged by the steps that we've been taking forward in recent months, and certainly under the administration's new attention to this through the Executive Order 14008, which will allow for extensive stakeholder input and discussion about the options. How best to achieve these dual objectives, and where and in what ways those objectives could best be met?

So, it's a, I think, an encouraging sign, the path that we're on. And I hope that that path provides opportunities in the context of the Pacific Remote Islands for the types of thoughts and considerations that you'd like to bring into bear on that process. We'll have an opportunity to do that, and see what our options are. So, thank you, Archie.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you.

MR. SOLIAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Tom Nies, do you have a question?

MR. NIES: It's not really a question, Mr. Chair, it's more a comment.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, what I'd like to do preferably, is to hold our comments to our Council discussion which will be coming up in a moment, after public comment, if that's okay.

MR. NIES: Fine by me.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right, so let's see if there are any further questions on the presentations we've heard under Agenda Item 10. And if not, we will go to public comment, if there is any. As a reminder to the public, you need to indicate your interest in speaking by

either raising your hand, or chatting with SF Webex host.

Do we have any -- Nicholas, have we received any requests for public comment on this agenda item?

THE OPERATOR: Hi, Marc, no there are not any requests for public comment at this moment.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay, and I don't see any raised hands. So, Tom, right back to you. I just wanted to get things -- I just wanted to give the public an opportunity to provide comment before we go into discussion. We've done that, so please go ahead.

MR. NIES: Thank you. My comments are just directed more towards Dr. Doremus' last talk about some of the issues that are being faced. Particularly the issues of working waterfront, seafood competitiveness and marketing, and workforce development.

I think we all recognize that these are big issues for the fishing industry. But when I look at my council and my council staff, you know, not to diss anybody, but I'm not sure we're really constructed to be very informed commenters on that information, or those issues.

And I think we can certainly serve to facilitate discussions between the fishery service and members of the industry, or members of the public who have the knowledge, and have the expertise to comment authoritatively, on those issues.

You know, I think of things like working waterfront, which is tied up very tightly with a plethora of local land use regulations and objectives. And, you know, it quite honestly between complying with our assigned functions in the Magnuson Act as well as trying to address other things that come up like wind farms and aquaculture development, you know, our council doesn't really have a whole lot of time to spend trying to untangle that issue of working waterfronts.

The same is sort of true with workforce development, I think. You know, I sometimes think that if you're interested in workforce development, you're probably better off -- you might be better off going directly to the

industry people who have face it. And you know, we can probably facilitate those conversations, but I'm not sure we can provide much meaningful information.

With respect to marketing and competitiveness, you know I, you know a lot of people in our region take a look at the council and say, a lot of you guys know nothing about marketing.

And I certainly don't, having been in government service my whole career. I don't have any idea how marketing should be pursued. So, you know, I appreciate your asking us to give input, we'd love to work with you to facilitate the conversation. But, you know, I'm not sure that we are going to have a whole lot of expertise to provide you on some of these topics.

And, you know, just one last question I guess, you know, when you were talking some of the seafood competitiveness and marketing. It wasn't clear to me whether the agency went out and hired an external marketing consultant just for that? Or is that all being done in the house through advisory committee?

So, I guess I do have one question, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right, so there's your question maybe Paul can answer here.

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Tom. On the marketing, we are doing work with outside groups like the Seafood and Nutrition partnership. We have not hired external marketing consultants. We haven't taken on that role per se.

We are trying to make our information, the science and market knowledge that we have, readily available to use. Low cost but effective tools that we have at our disposal like Fish Watch to assist. And to contribute towards policy discussions as we're outlining around how the nation could really take this up in a big way, if it decides to do so.

There are other industries that are much more concentrated and have a lower barriered entry to standing up. National marketing efforts under the check-off program that USDA runs. The, I think it's well known and well described that the fragmentation and diversity in the seafood,

just characteristic of the industry as a whole, makes it very difficult to use those types of techniques.

That's why we asked MAFAC to look into this and they came back with that recommendation for a kick, a Congressionally kick-started effort that industry as it recovers and benefits from this effort more over time, would assume more of the cost.

So, we try to facilitate and work with our existing, our economists, our existing stake holders to understand where the needs are, what the solutions might look like, and help make them happen. We're not taking on the marketing job directly.

That's not our expertise anymore, that's a Council expertise. But we all have expertise in the sector. And we know where the pressure points are and how, who could be involved in helping us deal with those pressure points.

And to that point, I will comment on your comment, about the facilitation role. Don't underestimate the valued of that, would be my main response. The connectivity that the councils provide, the distinctive role that the councils play in the process of, in the kind of world of fisheries management, provides perspective that I think is enormously valuable.

We're not looking to the councils to take on these problems and solve them, but I think your perspective is valuable and that's why we're asking for it. And your ability to recommend approaches and facilitate conversations and connect us to those you think we should be working with, is extraordinarily value. So, I did want to emphasis that point in response to your comment, Tom. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Eric.

MR. REID: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I really appreciate this conversation about marketing. And I remember the spokesfish years ago and how that went. But it's a really complicated issue.

And the way I see it, it's a great effort, don't get me wrong. But where the council's role is, you know, our job is to provide, sorry, to provide and support the

5

development of stable and sustainable supply of raw material into the start of the supply chain under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. And that's how you build demand.

You get a stable supply, which normally would lead to a stable price. And some, you know, you can't sell out of a cart. And if you want to build an underutilized species, which I can't even think of one anymore, now they're called forage fish, you have to have a stable supply at a reasonable price if it's going to compete with many things.

You know, there are other organizations, there's the FBA, the USDA, the Exim Bank, Food Export USA and similar organizations to that, that are much more capable of developing a marketing tool.

And, you know, when you talk about the barriers, the barriers in my mind, supply and demand, finance, insurance, logistics, AR and AP management, access to capital both finance and human capital, competing proteins, an aging fleet, and the cost of replacing a current vessel, or upgrading a shoreside facility, competing interest for off-shore uses.

I mean we fight every day to try to keep the ground we've had. And we're not doing very good at that -- and gentrification of the waterfront. These are not within the council's ability to control.

And so, I really appreciate the effort, but I think the council's focus should be on a sustainable supply or raw material. That's what we manage. We manage raw material and that's where we should concentrate our efforts.

And we should also be able to get some support in trying to maintain our historical access to fishing grounds that supply that raw material to the American public. So, thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Bill.

MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree that the councils have very limited bandwidths to fully contribute to the discussion. I do though really value the kinds of presentations that we got today and would value more of those.

I think back to a time when the North Pacific Council had at least a couple members, at

least one member of our Advisory Panel, who was there largely to represent consumers and had a pretty clear understanding of the marketing challenges back then, which have changed completely since then.

But we've lost that voice in our council process. It's our own choice, but I think the -- as a result, many of the decisions that we're now making, we're making with less voice, less input, less voice from the consumer and less understanding of some of the potential marketing ramifications than I'm comfortable with anyway, as one council member.

And so, while I agree that we may not have the ability to really help shape marketing, the ability of the bandwidth or the resources. At the same time, I really appreciate the Agency's ability to contribute information, perspective, and particularly, sort of the voice of the consumer into our work as much as possible.

And I'm not quite sure where that leads in terms of a recommendation. In fact, I don't think it does. But I for one, at least I found today's walk through that you did Paul, on where you're at with this range of initiatives, I found that extremely valuable. And hopefully you'll continue to provide that not just at CCC meetings but at other times.

DR. DOREMUS: Mr. Chair, would you mind if I commented on the comments?

CHAIR GORELNIK: No, please.

DR. DOREMUS: And really a bit on the conversation thread from Tom and Eric, and Bill. And I do appreciate the perspective and want to clarify that we're not necessarily asking the councils to take on the definition or the process of defining solutions, and implementing them. But really to help serve as advisers to us on what we should be focused on.

Eric, the very pressures that you characterized, yes, the core functions of councils is sustainable seafood supply, but you in the course of describing the challenges the industry faces, are providing a very valuable perspective to us on where the pressure points are.

And if we're going to be looking at

nationally, the health and welfare of our fishing and seafood sector, we need to understand these pressure points. And all of you are sitting in a very distinctive place to see them, and to advise us on what we should be worried about, and what your thoughts are about, if you were to recommend solutions, we welcome them, but your thoughts on about how we should emphasis certain kinds of challenges more than others.

So, I do think that it's an extremely advisory -- extremely valuable advisory role. Don't underemphasis the resident knowledge that you all have from your deep participation in this sector. And that knowledge is very valuable to us.

To push or make a fine point on that, no one's asking the councils to take on marketing, but you all have weighed in on MAFAC's recommendations and have all broadly endorsed. The endorsement from this community makes a huge difference. If you can collectively say, this is a problem that the United States needs to address in some fashion, and MAFAC has made a reasonable recommendation. That carries a lot of weight, and your ability to develop a stronger common voice in the industry around collective needs.

The issues we're talking about with working waterfronts, with market dynamics, with workforce, recruitment and retention and development, these are things that touch the entire fishing and seafood sector. They relate, whatever your mode of production, whether you're wild capture, or aquaculture, we need to look at how the system is functioning and look at how to strengthen it as a whole.

And I just wanted to emphasize my particular view that the work that you do day in and day out, we're not asking to change that. But we're asking to benefit from your resident knowledge as we sort of identify these problems. Build consensus and commonality in industry's views about what problems we need to solve and what some of the solution paths might look like.

So, we don't want to burden you with non-core activities, we're just trying to take advantage of your considerable knowledge and expertise. Thank you, again.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, thank you Paul,

and thank you Kelly, and thank you David, for your presentations and this discussion. If any CCC Members have any further action on this agenda item, please raise your hand or we're going to move onto our break.

And I'm not seeing any hands. Thank you very much Paul and company.

We're going to take our break, our one break for the day here. Just a reminder we're running a little behind schedule here, so we'll have to make it up this afternoon or run late. And hopefully not run late.

So, we'll be back in about 15 minutes. I have 12:20 Pacific, so that'll be 12:35 Pacific or 3:35 Eastern, and we'll be back then. So, enjoy your break.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:20 p.m. and resumed at 3:36 p.m.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, welcome back, everyone, from your first and last break of the day. And we're now on agenda item 11, electronic monitoring. And we have a presentation from Brett Alger. I don't know if Paul or Sam want to do an introduction or not, but if not, we'll go straight to Brett.

MR. RAUCH: Mr. Chair, I think you can go straight to Mr. Alger.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right.

Brett, welcome.

MR. ALGER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. And thanks to the Committee. It looks like Morgan is pulling up my presentation. While that's being -- oh, we're good to go.

So, for those that haven't met me before, my name's Brett Alger. I'm the Electronic Technologies Coordinator for NOAA Fisheries. We've presented to this Committee a few times in the past, and I'll actually touch on a few of those issues. What I'm going to be presenting on encompasses several years of conversations and concern and feedback and things of the like around how we treat electronic monitoring data in our U.S. fisheries.

And so, even though my name is on the title slide, of course there's been a lot of people involved, and two specifically I want to make mention of before I move forward, which is

-- Laura Keeling works in the Offices of Sustainable Fisheries, and then Keith Hagg works in General Counsel, as well as number of other people. But those two specifically I wanted to make mention of because this has taken a lot of work to get to this point.

And lastly, I just want to say before I get started, of course, you do not have a document sitting in front of you. We are in the final stages of buttoning up that draft document and should be able to send it to the Councils within a matter of, say, a week or so.

Before I jump into the document itself -- next slide -- I just want to give you all a really quick high-level overview of where things stand in electronic monitoring right now in the U.S.

We've been starting to track projects and programs in three primary bins, projects and programs that are under regulation and have been implemented -- and right now we have seven of those, but based on our definition, which would be the six in the top left in Alaska, you'll see programs listed under regulation. And then in the bottom right, you'll see Atlantic HMS.

The next category of programs are programs that are under development by Councils that are using exempted fishing permits. And so the primary few that I would mention is on the left, in the West Coast, there are four programs under EFPs, and then up in the Northeast, groundfish and herring also are utilizing EFPs. And then through the balance of this map and even not listed are other types of pilot projects that are under development and working towards implementation.

So big takeaways here are that EM is being considered and developed in every region and just about every type of fishery and just about every primary gear type you're going to find in commercial fisheries.

Next slide.

So just a little bit of background on the procedural directive that I'm going to talk about. Back in 2013, the Agency published a National Electronic Technologies Policy Directive that was updated in 2019 that sets sort of a high-level framework for implementing

technologies for fisheries' data collection.

The next in that short list there is what is titled an EM Cost Allocation Procedural Directive, which we published a couple years ago. And that set up a high-level framework around expectations of how a program should be paid for and the different program responsibilities, in other words, some programs being entirely government run and, of course, some of them being industry funded and sort of breaking apart the two program functions into sampling and administrative.

And then the third in that list is a procedural directive that we actually published last year around this time, which are expectations for how long data should be retained by third parties and certain EM programs. But this current procedural directive -- just some high-level quick points to talk you through would be we tried to balance some of the legal analysis around how we would apply information a lot to raw EM data, but also being brief in getting to the punch line and the conclusion of some of our work and some of our guidance, trying to find national consistency while recognizing that regions need to have regional flexibility.

The document is informed by many regional and national workshops, many Council actions and rulemakings, and of course a lot of the feedback we've received on previous policies. There are two primary sections in the document. The first section are going to be the three laws that we've been analyzing, if you will, which would be the Magnuson-Stevens Confidentiality Act provisions, the Federal Records Act, and the Freedom of Information Act.

The second section of the document are issues and questions that have arisen in sort of more than one program; they seem to be of national relevance. And so we are making our best attempt to provide preemptive guidance on some of these issues in hopes that it will draw out feedback from Councils and others so that we can certainly set up better expectations of how data would be accessed and managed in different EM programs.

And then, lastly, I think it's a really important point, and I'll probably mention

it again somewhere along the line, is that this is guidance. It will require implementation by individual programs via rulemakings and adjustments to contracts and grants and other forms of specific and regional guidance to actually implement and see the effective change that you're going to see here.

Next slide.

So, jumping into the first section of the document, the question we often receive is what is a federal record? And so that is going to be data that is made or received by the Agency in conducting official business.

Right now, raw EM data is actually retained indefinitely. But as some of you will note or recall, the Agency published -- sorry, the Agency did not. The National Archives published a Federal Register notice last summer in taking comment on how long we should retain raw EM data.

NARA actually had a significant lawsuit, not associated with us, but it paused a lot of their actions in their record schedule publications. But we've recently been told that that has opened back up, and they will be publishing a new retention schedule for NOAA Fisheries signifying and noting that we would retain raw EM data for five years starting at the end of a given fishing year. The summary data, compliance reports, and data products like that, we expect to continue to retain indefinitely just like we do observer information.

What is not a federal record? That is going to be data made and/or retained by a third party. And I would pause here to define third party because it sometimes has different definitions. In this context, we mean EM service providers, but we also mean Commissions or other entities that are not the Agency. And so data made or retained by a third party in that context, meaning anybody that's not NOAA Fisheries. If the Agency receives a copy of a particular record, see above.

And then, lastly, just a quick reminder, going back to the data policy we published last year, raw EM data that will be stored by a third party should be guided by the procedural directive that we publish. Next slide.

In terms of applying Magnuson confidentiality provisions, when the Agency is part of some type of third-party agreement, we expect to include language in the applicable contracts and grants, and also noting that there are exceptions in the Magnuson Act that allow for disclosure, one example being court orders.

However, there are going to be instances where the Agency is not part of a third-party agreement. Those are situations where the fishing industry is contracting directly with a third party. Our guidance is that those contracts should include data security and confidentiality requirements.

NMFS would -- the Fisheries Service would include this requirement as part of regulatory framework when approving third-party service providers. But the Agency would not necessarily provide or enforce specific language in those private contracts. In other words, we would review the documentation and the procedures and the policies that the third parties have set up for maintaining data security, but we would not hand over or provide direct language to put in those contracts.

And then, lastly, the Agency expects to have access to all of the raw EM data even when it's held by a third party. An example of that would be, I believe, in the West Coast rulemaking a year or so ago, there's a specific piece of language in there that says the Agency would have access to the raw EM data even though it's held by a third party.

Next slide.

Applicability of FOIA. So when does FOIA apply? If data that are created or obtained by NOAA Fisheries -- again, there is specific exceptions that allow disclosure of this raw data. If we disclose some information, we would need to obscure the submitter and the vessel info to allow disclosure of that raw data.

This process could be, actually, really costly, it definitely would be very time intensive, and in some instances may leave the image almost entirely obscured. The example I would give you all would be that some camera views in electronic monitoring programs have the

entire deck of the fishing operations in full view of crew and others. And so, in order to actually make it releasable, you may need to obscure almost everything that you see in the image.

When does FOIA not apply? Those are going to be records, again, maintained by a third party. If the Agency obtains a copy of the record, see above.

Next slide.

So this table and set of footnotes is pulled directly from the draft directive. It summarizes everything that I just walked through. Across the columns are the three applicable laws that I've walked through, and then in the rows are the different situations where different parties are maintaining the raw EM data.

So when the Agency is maintaining it -- I mean, you can see contractor and Agency grant recipient, which is that third row, and then of course the fourth situation where the industry is contracting directly with a third party.

Next slide.

So I had mentioned at the beginning there are two sections of this document. We are now on the second section. The first question I want to walk through is we've received a lot of interest and questions around how the Agency would use web portals for conducting video review. And the example I would give all of you would be something like logging on to YouTube and watching a video even though it's not necessarily on your desktop computer. You're watching video from afar, through some type of web interface.

And so the purpose of conducting a secondary video review is to monitor the EM service provider's performance and data quality to ensure that EM systems are functioning properly, to verify that there's adherence to the vessel's monitoring plan.

At this moment, there is no national standard for conducting a secondary review, but we point out in the document that there are ways to maybe prioritize secondary reviews, such as onboarding new providers into a program, the quality of the individual video reviewers employed by the company if they're bringing new

vessels into a program.

Another example not listed here is that perhaps you should consider -- a program should consider the stock status of the program and the data that are being collected on, say, a stock that's in a rebuilding plan.

Typically, how that would -- how the web portal process works, though, is somebody from the Agency would go into the system, watch the same video, and then create their own summary report so that they can make a comparison to what the third party submitted.

And so, in those situations where those mechanisms are used, we advise or our guidance is that the EM program would need a mechanism for acquiring those records. Once that occurs, we would apply the Federal Records Act to the data that we receive.

The two really quick examples that I'll give you would be, of course, we can set up a system where somebody's just putting stacks of hard drives in a box and shipping them through FedEx to the Agency. Another means would be to actually transmit it electronically, so uploading data, uploading video to the cloud, and making that available for the Agency to access and download. There's probably some derivatives in there of both of those types of options.

Next slide.

Another set of questions and concern are around what can the Agency require for third parties to report? And, really, the question gets down to, in the course of collecting the raw video and raw imagery from commercial fishing operations, there's a lot of information being collected. So the question becomes what are the lines or what are the bounds around what the third party must report?

And so the document goes through and talks about, basically, the basics of an FMP and the requirements in an FMP that are going to then drive the different types of data and the different tools for reporting. And so we talk a little bit about MSA and MPA, ESA, but make specific note that in some industry-funded EM programs -- or let me take that back.

In some industry-funded monitoring programs, not just necessarily EM, those programs

have sometimes been created specifically for just monitoring catch and discards, say of a catcher fishery. And so, in those instances, the program may only be required to submit a subset of data.

Another thing I would pause and mention is that the reporting requirements actually apply to the vessel. And the vessel has regulations that it must follow, but then the vessel contracts with a company for logbook services, VMS services, and in this case, EM services.

And so we believe that the decisions around what must be reported by the third party on behalf of the vessel should be decided as the program is developed or revisited, and making note that setting aside EM, there are other forms of collecting and reporting information in fisheries, such as vessel logbooks, MMPA mortality/injury forms, and of course we have a robust and very highly qualified set of observers deployed around the country for collecting a lot of the information as well.

A follow-on question we've received is what are the video review standards and the sampling rates that you're going to apply to these third parties? We believe that those should be driven by the FMP and the monitoring objectives, they should be driven by the third party and the vessel performance, and they should not be driven by observations, catch events, and other types of things that are witnessed coincidentally outside the scope of the program.

I believe this is basically my last slide here. Getting a little bit into access and use of the information, I have a couple of sections here. So the first one is around non-fishing-related events. The Agency has limited jurisdictions for what it can enforce in terms of non-fishing events.

Next slide.

We may refer potential violations to the Coast Guard or other enforcement partners, and in doing so, we may apply certain Magnuson Act exceptions and disclose information. Again, the example I gave you earlier is a court order.

In terms of non-EM program use of data, which is a little bit fuzzy sometimes in terms of exactly what precise data is being

collected and how it's used -- but I think the take-home would be -- the previous slide that I just walked through is you have some core structure around the FMP and the requirements in the program. What are some of the other potential uses of the information outside of that?

So the document goes through and talks a little bit about the Agency may provide access to staff and contractors, similar to other forms of raw data that we gather and manage, such as observer data, economic data. We expect the EM programs to examine the nature of data requests to determine if raw data is even necessary to be provided versus some of the summary reports and compliance reports and things of that nature.

Programs may include, I guess, some type of agreement of nondisclosure. And then we point out that access may be given to other federal agencies, but that must be in support of fisheries' conservation and management.

Next slide.

So this here is a section in the document in terms of expectations on implementing these guidelines. As I said from the beginning, this is guidance. The Agency and Councils should develop appropriate regulations, adjustments to contracts and grants, guidance for EM programs to implement this. That process should include an opportunity for notice and comment.

In one of our previous policies, we actually set a harder deadline on trying to implement the guidance. In this particular case, we are advising that programs develop regulations as soon as practicable. Certainly, talking to a community of folks that recognize priority setting and timelines and agendas and things like that, it's not always as easy to jump off into rulemaking right away, so as soon as practicable.

And then the other thing is to examine the current practices that are happening in these pilot projects and these programs that are utilizing EFPs to understand how the data are being managed, how the laws are being applied, and to act accordingly on those types of data.

Next slide.

So we're going to be transmitting the draft directed to the Council shortly after this

meeting. The deadline to provide feedback listed here in this slide says July 15th of 2021. I already got a very friendly note from Tom in the Northeast that, hey, that's a pretty aggressive deadline; the Councils may push back on that. And we're happy to have that discussion.

But we're trying to find a balance between reacting to the feedback that we get in a timely manner and trying to publish this directive in the fall relative to setting a deadline that's much further back in the summer or even in the early fall, and perhaps putting a pinch on the back end of trying to publish this thing this year.

So, with that, next slide.

Thank you for your time. I've already been contacted by one Council to give basically the same or similar presentation. I'm happy to answer questions here but, of course, would like to make myself available as you hit your June Council cycles to be able to meet with your regional Councils and different constituencies.

So thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you, Brett. Yeah, I expect we'll get some comments on that schedule. Let me see if there are any questions from the CCC of Brett on his presentation.

Tom, please go ahead.

MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Brett already addressed one of my
questions, whether we could get more time. A
number of Councils meeting in June have already
published their agendas and may not have included
this on their agenda, which makes it difficult to
bring up for discussion. So that's one question.

The other question, I think, relates to either slide 7 or 8. I believe it's slide 8. And it's establishing standards for secondary review. I guess the question I have is who establishes those standards? Is that a determination that the Council has control over, or is that one where the regional office or the Science Center establishes the standards for secondary review?

This is somewhat a contentious issue in our area because, of course, the secondary review can lead to increased cost. The level of review initially also leads to increased cost.

And I guess the question is who establishes those standards?

MR. ALGER: Good question, Tom. I would say that the Agency is responsible for establishing that. But the primary reason is there's some performance standards, data quality standards, that are established, and then we are trying to make sure that those are being followed/met.

I see it akin to observer deployments and doing debriefings to make sure that that information is gathered at a sufficient quality. We hear a lot, just like you do, Tom, in terms of, well, we need to be mindful of costs and not creating some type of burdensome, overly zealous secondary review system. And I want Sam to chime in here because I believe that we should try to set standards or set review rates that are as minimal as possible, that keep costs down both for the Agency and the industry.

MR. RAUCH: Mr. Chair, since my name was mentioned, maybe I could interject.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Please, Sam. MR. RAUCH: Yes. Thank you.

And I do agree with what Brett said. Overall responsibility is to keep cost down. The amount of federal secondary review that is needed is going to depend in part on what the role of that secondary review plays in the process.

We do a lot of secondary review, as Brett said, of new programs, particularly under EFPs as things are getting set up, and things that may not need that later. To the extent that the federal government is expected to have a role -- and under our policy, we'd have a role -- in data quality and assurance, there needs to be some level of review.

You cannot review one hour of a video and say thousands of hours are fine. So, to the extent that the government is fulfilling that, the government is going to have to set that, and the government will have an opinion on how much it needs to review in order to do that.

But we do need to keep cost in mind. And I think we've been very forthright that we do not believe we need to view, on an ongoing program, 100 percent of all the data. I think if that is the system we're setting up, then we need

to question what the role of the federal government really is in that situation.

But it is a discussion to have based on the quality of the input of the data, how novel the program is, how seasoned the initial reviewers are, and it is a figure that could change over time. And I expect that the amount is ultimately a figure that the government would decide.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you.

Kitty, you have your question on this agenda item?

THE OPERATOR: Give us -- can we take somebody else before --

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay. Sure. Okay. We'll come back to Kitty.

Eric, what's your question for Brett? MR. REID: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

My question is about the quantity of video. If EM is required from the time you leave the dock to the time you return to the dock, there's going to be a substantial amount of footage of nothing, a nice boat ride, hopefully.

During the review process, is there the capability to edit out stuff that is not relevant to anything in order to cut down on the expense of a giant file that has to be stored for five years? Is that a capability?

And a question I've asked before is, if I own the cameras and I produce the data, who owns that data? That's a different question.

MR. ALGER: Thanks, Eric. I'll take your questions in reverse order. I would say that the fisherman, the vessel owner, owns the video. But the requirement in the program is to submit some or parts or whole to the Agency, depending on the program.

To take your second question, I think that's where AI and machine learning is actually starting to thankfully weave its way into our EM programs where, in addition to some of the sensor data and some of the GPS information is now we are advancing towards being able to cut out large portions of information. Only focus on when the gear is coming out of the water, when the gear is going in the water.

I know that folks are working on

technologies where you're focused on when there's crew on deck, which is of course a great indicator that there's fish on deck. So I can't necessarily with 100 percent certainty say in every EM program that they're not watching transiting footage, but we share the concern of industry of not wanting to watch all that either.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Eric, did that answer your question?

MR. REID: Yes, it did. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay.

Kitty, are you with us, and your question?

MS. SIMONDS: Yes, I am. So, for EM data for which NMFS maintains the raw data, can NMFS release that data to the vessel owner if requested? And if it can be released, how would that be done?

MR. ALGER: Thanks for the question, Kitty. I'm going to try to answer your question a couple of ways.

The first one is that, of course, in some of these situations, as Eric's question just pointed out, the vessel has -- owns the data. Now, that data might be sitting with some company, and within that contractual relationship, that vessel owner should be figuring out a way to review that video through a web portal or snippets of information or images, that the vessel owner can get access to that.

In the situations where the Agency owns the -- has the record -- it's a federal record -- we would need to develop some type of mechanism just like we do other forms of fisheries' dependent data that the vessel has requested, whether that's observer information, logbook information, and other forms of data.

I don't think that's necessarily always a technically easy thing to do, or inexpensive, in terms of standing up large streams of video to send back to or provide access to the fisherman. It's also probably fair to say, especially to this body, that that's not always consistently done, and we're striving towards trying to do that more consistently across the data that we manage and providing it back to fishermen.

So I can't say, again, at a national level exactly how each and every program is going to do that. But it certainly seems very reasonable that if fishermen want access to their information, they should be able to figure out a way to do that. We should be able to figure out a way to do that.

MS. SIMONDS: So the process would be for some arrangement to be made between the vessel owner and the National Fishery Service?

MR. ALGER: Essentially.

MS. SIMONDS: All right. Thank you.

MR. ALGER: I mean -- and just to --

I guess to belabor on it just a moment, that's one of the issues we are trying to figure out is how we access video footage that is maintained by another entity. And when you're talking about gigabytes of video, hundreds of hours, trying to stand that up on a web service is not inexpensive. It can be, actually, really expensive. And so we're endeavoring, but it's not an easy process all the time.

MS. SIMONDS: Right. So thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Are there any further questions of Brett on his presentation?

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you very much, Brett. And we look forward to that draft directive sooner rather than later. Thank you.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chair, just really briefly, so I have some -- I've got a lot of people working with the Agency trying to figure some of this stuff out. Can we come back to the comment period?

CHAIR GORELNIK: Yeah. What we'll do is we'll go to public comment, then we'll have Council discussion, and then we can have more interaction.

MR. ALGER: Fair enough.

CHAIR GORELNIK: And the CCC.

So I didn't see any other hands up, so now would be the time for public comment.

Hopefully folks have indicated their interest either by chatting with SF Webex Host or raising their hand in the attendee list. I'm going to scan the attendee list. I don't see any raised hands.

Nicholas, do you have any requests for public comment?

THE OPERATOR: No requests at this moment.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Well, now that brings us to Council discussion and action, if any. So who wants to get us started?

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Brett, did you have a question for us?

MR. ALGER: No. Well, I'll just make a comment. Back to the comment period. For the cost policy, we had set whatever the deadline was, and a few of the Councils had said, we'd like to have at least two council meetings before we provide feedback. And so we honored that and moved the deadline back preemptively.

Then, when the next directive came around, we said, oh, everybody's going to want two meetings. Let's set a deadline as appropriate. And then all the letters came in right away and we didn't need all that time. So we've done both, and I'll let you all discuss and figure out amongst the group kind of what seems reasonable relative to the tradeoffs I presented earlier.

Now, we share the urgency of the Councils in trying to get these issues resolved. These are the most important issues in the EM programs. And so moving the deadline back means pushing the final directive being published.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thanks.

Sam?

MR. RAUCH: Yeah. I would have put a somewhat finer point on it than Brett did. We know that there are certain Councils that are waiting for this guidance, and they believe that this guidance is critical for EM programs that are coming online next year.

And so I think the Agency is unlikely to agree on any schedule that delays the finalization of this document past this year to allow those Councils and the stakeholders involved in those programs to have some certainty about how data is going to be treated.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Chuck Tracy?

MR. TRACY: Thanks, Brett. Thanks,
Sam. I think I resemble that remark. And I

appreciate having an opportunity to comment on this.

If it is indeed released shortly after this meeting, I think that would be good for us in terms of getting something in our advance briefing book and getting an opportunity for people to review it and offer their comments to the Council, and then the Council could respond by July 15th.

So I think it works well for our schedule. I'm not sure about the other Councils. If they're meeting before we are, which -- we meet in late June -- then it's probably going to be tough for people to have the same opportunity. But I guess I'll see if there's any other Councils that want to comment on that.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thanks, Chuck. Tom?

MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Well, you know, I raised the question,
but to be honest, my Council is much like Chuck.
We meet late June on the prospect of finalizing
our agenda. So we can probably get this on the
agenda. But I raised the issue more thinking
about the other Councils, but if none of the
other Councils see a need for a delay, then we
can just move forward. I would suggest if any of
them want a delay, they speak up.

CHAIR GORELNIK: That's good advice. Simon?

MR. KINNEEN: Yeah, the North Pacific Council would need until at least October to have appropriate Committee review. So we'd at least like a little delay.

CHAIR GORELNIK: I think the date you had proposed, Brett, was in July. Is that right?

MR. ALGER: Yeah. I mean, the ingredients behind that was knowing that there's a big delay after this big June cycle of meetings. I think seven of the eight Councils meet in June, except for the Caribbean, and then they don't pick back up in August. So we figured if the June meeting cycle was adequate, then we could get the feedback in July.

If we move it back to accommodate one or more meetings in August and beyond, then we'd have to figure out a different deadline. That's also not to say that we couldn't set a deadline

for the majority of the Councils and then others try to get their feedback in as quickly as possible.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, the North Pacific Council does have that concern, but it seems to me, I think it's the only Council that's spoken up at this point. So I'm not sure where we leave this, other than just -- schedule it once the directive is finally available in draft, then for the Councils to respond as quickly as possible. It doesn't sound like you're going to get all your responses by July.

Folks, have any further comment on this?

Brad Pettinger?

MR. PETTINGER: Yeah. Thanks, Chair Gorelnik.

Brett, appreciate your presentation. I noticed early in that presentation, you said the regions were doing -- where they're at. And I noticed that pollock trawl catcher vessels is under development. And it's my understanding at the last meeting in the North Pacific that program is going to have cost recovery paying for the video reviews with Pacific states.

And I'm kind of curious if something's changed with the policy that we talked about earlier because it's my understanding that cost recovery wasn't going to be even considered for video review. I'm curious if something's changed or if that's specific to the North Pacific and what the rationale for that is as opposed to our West Coast EM program.

MR. ALGER: Well, first, Brad, it's nice seeing you. I'm really envious of your beard. It's pretty impressive.

I'm going to try to answer your question. I think the difference or the nuance is that in that -- and I don't even know the details. I think in that particular case, it's cost recovery to implement a monitoring program versus potentially, in the catch-share fishery on the West Coast, the cost recovery is for the Agency's cost to implement the program.

That's my gut reaction. And we spelled out -- tried to spell out those differences in our cost allocation policy, that there are situations where cost recovery as

approved through Magnuson is allowed to pay for the industry's sampling cost, monitoring cost -the Alaska fixed-year program is the perfect example.

We also note in the cost allocation policy that there are situations in a LAP, in a catcher fishery, where costs may be recovered to recoup the Agency's costs. And this is where we get into the primary review, the video review being the industry responsibility per the cost policy, the secondary video review being an Agency responsibility.

And so I think those cost-recovery mechanisms are filling the bucket of two different types of video review.

MR. PETTINGER: Okay. Well, I guess we'll get the document here in the next week or so and can dig into that. So okay. Thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Is there any further discussion or comments on this agenda item?

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you very much, Brett, for your presentation, and we look forward to continued discussions.

That will conclude this agenda item 11 and will bring us to agenda item 12, which is policy and procedural directives on guidance for financial disclosures and recusals.

And with that, I'll hand the floor to Adam Issenberg.

Adam?

MR. ISSENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Hello, everyone. I think this will be pretty quick. So, as folks may recall, last
September the Agency published the revisions to what we call the 235 regs, the financial disclosure and recusal regulations. We, over the preceding several years, talked quite often about the revised standards that the Agency would be using to make recusal determinations, and those regs incorporated new guidance on some aspects of that.

And I'm not really going to talk about that today. I think everybody's familiar with those issues. The other thing that the regs did, which was related, was to acquire development of a -- that each region develop a recusal

determination handbook that would describe the procedures applicable in each individual region or to each Council as necessary.

Two, (audio interference) -- I hope you can all still see and hear me. I just got some weird message about low bandwidth.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: -- for a moment.

You're --

MR. ISSENBERG: The Agency developed a draft -- okay. The Agency developed a draft revised policy directive and procedural documents on recusals and financial disclosures. That was circulated to you all at the end of March, March 30th. And we requested review and comments from you by July 5th.

Those documents provide some additional guidance on application of the standards for recusals, as we've discussed, and also provide guidance on the development of those regional recusal determination handbooks. And once we've got your comments on those two documents, we will work to finalize the policy directive and procedural document. And then, once those are finalized, there will be a two-year period for finalization of the handbooks, the regional handbooks.

So that's all I've got. That's just sort of the overview of where we are on that. I'm happy to take any questions. Otherwise, we look forward to seeing your comments and getting to work finalizing the directive. Thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you, Adam, for your concise report.

Let's see if there are any questions from the CCC.

Tom Nies?

MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Adam. I do have a couple questions on the policy directive, two or three. The recusal determinations can be difficult, particularly if you have a very complicated ownership in your Council or with your Council members. And not only can they be difficult, but the idea that somebody may have to recuse themselves from a vote can be a pretty fraught decision.

And I guess my question is why does

the policy directive put at least part of that onus on the Executive Directors, who officially work for the Council, to get involved in that when they don't really have the data to track down the ownership thing, and it puts them in a tough position with respect to suggesting whether or not a Council member should be allowed to vote?

So what's the reason for putting that onus on the Executive Directors? That's my first question.

MR. ISSENBERG: You know, Tom, I didn't see the directive as really putting any onus on the ED to make a substantive determination. I guess we can -- you know, we can take a look at that language and are certainly sensitive to your concerns.

I mean the goal is not to put the Executive Directors in a difficult position. I think it's more a question of making sure that NOAA GC, as the responsible official, has the information needed. So we can take a look at that.

MR. NIES: Thank you. So my second question is I think the Magnuson Act requires you guys to send a report to Congress every year on recusals and Council meetings and SSC meetings, so I understand why we have to report those things.

But the draft document says something like you're supposed to report discussions about recusals as well, which I don't think is a statutory requirement and is a pretty broad topic. And it's not clear to me what you mean by -- and I may not be quoting it exactly correctly, but there's language that says report recusals and discussions about recusals. So I don't understand what that means.

MR. ISSENBERG: Yeah. Well, we can try and provide some clarity on that point. I think the idea is -- it's not intended to encompass every discussion about recusals. I think the idea was to make sure that there's full transparency when there's a substantive issue or concern about recusals.

So, as you know, some recusal discussions are resolved informally. I think the idea is to try to capture at least the more

significant controversies around recusal. But we can try and make sure that there's some clarity on that.

MR. NIES: Thank you, Adam.
Those are all my questions, Mr. Chair.
CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Thank

you, Tom. Thank you, Adam.

Are there further questions for Adam? Carrie?

MS. SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

Chair.

I have a question on the policy, on the Objective section on page 2. It talks about the SSC there and the Council, and it talks about making the SOFIs publicly available -- or available to the public. And so we currently post our appointed Council members' SOFIs to the website, but we do not do that for the SSC. Is that the intent of what's written in this objective?

MR. ISSENBERG: I'd have to go back and look at the document, but I believe that is the intent. Yes. And, again, I think the idea is to promote transparency.

MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, he cut out a little bit. Could you repeat the last part again?

MR. ISSENBERG: I'm sorry. Yes. I think that is the intent, and the idea is to promote transparency.

MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, just to follow up, so that would be quite a change to the way we're currently operating. We do not post our SOFIs currently for our appointed SSC members. If someone is to ask for those, we would of course provide them. It is provided to the Council in a closed session.

So that would be fairly different way from how we're currently operating, just to let you know. Thank you.

MR. ISSENBERG: Thank you. We'll give that some thought.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Any further questions of Adam on his presentation?

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: Okay. Then we all know the drill. We'll go from questions to public comment.

you.

Nicholas, do we have any requests for public comment?

THE OPERATOR: There is no request for public comment.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Thank

So we will now go to Council discussion on this agenda item. We had some really good questions posed. I don't know if there is a need for further discussion, but I want to provide that opportunity.

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Is there anything further from the CCC on this agenda item 12?

(Pause.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. So that concludes this agenda item and will take us to our general public comment for any items that are not on the agenda. So are there any requests from the public to speak to items that are not on the agenda?

And, Nicholas, I'll ask if you've received any. I think I do see one hand, a name that's all familiar to us, Chris Oliver.

So, Chris, welcome.

MR. OLIVER: Can you hear me? CHAIR GORELNIK: I can.

MR. OLIVER: I just wanted to say hello to all of you. I was tempted to raise my hand on the last agenda item. You know it's near and dear to my heart.

But I just wanted to let you guys know I've been listening in on you the last few days. It's kind of strange that my microphone lights are a little different than they used to be. But I just want to say hi to all of you and say good luck with everything. And it's been really interesting listening in on the conversation, and miss all of you.

That's all I wanted to say. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thanks, Chris. It's really great to hear from you.

Chuck Tracy?

MR. TRACY: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Thanks, Chris, for chiming in. I'm glad you did. I just had one follow-up question,

maybe two. But just wondering where you're 1 2 calling in from these days. 3 MR. OLIVER: I'm in Alaska right now, 4 Chuck. 5 MR. TRACY: Okay. 6 (Simultaneous speaking.) 7 MR. OLIVER: As some of you know, I 8 had some fairly major surgery recently, and I'm 9 recovering nicely. 10 MR. TRACY: Good. Glad to hear it. Okay. Well, thank you for joining us, 11 12 and it's good to hear your voice. And I hope you continue to join in when you can. 13 14 MR. OLIVER: I will. I miss you guys. 15 MR. TRACY: All right. Thank you. CHAIR GORELNIK: Hope to see you 16 17 Feel free to drop in on a Council around. 18 meeting. 19 MR. OLIVER: Will do. 20 CHAIR GORELNIK: Are there any 21 questions of Chris? 22 (Pause.) 23 CHAIR GORELNIK: Chris, be well. 24 MR. OLIVER: Thank you, Chair. 25 CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. 26 Nicholas, are there any further requests for 27 public comment? THE OPERATOR: 28 I'm not seeing any come 29 in, no. 30 CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. 31 you. 32 So that concludes our last open public 33 comment period of the meeting and takes us to, I 34 guess, a break. And when we come back from the 35 break, we will have -- we'll wrap up and cover 36 any other business that we have, for example, 37 discussing our next meeting. So, right now, it is 1:30 in the 38 39 Pacific. It is 4:30 Eastern, which brings us to 40 precisely on schedule. 41 Thank you, Adam. 42 And so we'll come back at 2:00 43 Pacific, 5:00 Eastern, to conclude our meeting. 44 So we'll see you all then. 45 MR. TRACY: Mr. Chair? 46 CHAIR GORELNIK: Yes, sir. 47 MR. TRACY: Just a note, I will be

putting together kind of a summary of the meeting

here over the next half hour. So if any Executive Directors or folks want to help with that, I'll be working in that Google Doc with the recommendations and going from that.

So if you have anything you'd like to contribute to that, that would be appreciated. Thanks.

(Pause.)

THE OPERATOR: Marc, I think you're

muted.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you.

So we'll see you in half an hour, at 2:00 Pacific, 5:00 Eastern, or whatever time zone applies.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:32 p.m. and resumed at 5:01 p.m.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. It's 2:00 here in California, 5:00 in the East. And we're on our last agenda item, which is wrap-up and other business. And I'm going to turn to Chuck Tracy to get us started here, if Chuck is available.

MR. TRACY: Mr. Chairman, I could use about three more minutes, I think.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Why don't you take four minutes?

MR. TRACY: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. 2:04.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter e record at 5:02 p.m. and resumed at

went off the record at 5:02 p.m. and resumed at 5:05 p.m.)

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Well, welcome back to our spring CCC meeting. We're on agenda item 13, wrap-up and other business. And I will turn to Executive Director Chuck Tracy.

MR. TRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks, everybody, for a really good meeting with a lot of good information.

I put together a quick summary of some of the discussions and outcomes of the meeting. It's far from comprehensive but just is a good reminder of what we've accomplished here and what we will be following up on as we move forward.

So if I could share my screen. I can, apparently. Let me just run through this real quick.

(Pause.)

MR. TRACY: Okay. So, again, far from comprehensive. But on the Fisheries update, the science update, we had a report from Dr. Werner on the survey plan for 2021 and from Dr. Howell on COVID impacts to the recreational catch estimation.

The main question the CCC had was whether potential revisions to the 2020 MRIP estimates would impact their use in ACL and status evaluations. The Agency replied then that there shouldn't be too much of an impact, that the estimates, while not as certain as they have been in the past, are considered best available science at this time and would be unlikely to change very much.

There were some concerns from the CCC about the long-term implications of these uncertain estimates that may affect things going into the future, but nothing can be done about that. The CCC did recommend resuming data collection activities should be a priority as the Agency resumes normal operations.

Now, for the legislative outlook, we did have some good discussions, and we want to say thank you to Representative Huffman and Case, who came and spoke to us in person, and Representative Stevens, who provided us a video message on the Magnuson Act reauthorization issues. And so that was very much appreciated, as well as all of the Committee staffers that came and gave us their views on the Magnuson Act and other fisheries-related legislation.

The only real business that the Council was able to, or the CCC was able to, engage in was reviewing the consensus statement on aquaculture, an updated consensus statement that the legislative work group had been working on. The CCC did approve that.

There was quite a bit of discussion on recent executive orders regarding EO 14008, attacking the climate crisis at home and abroad. There was a lot of discussion about the 30 By 30 objective of conserving 30 percent of the land and water's resources in the U.S. by the year 2030.

To that end, the CCC established an Area-Based Management Subcommittee to develop a common understanding among Councils of area-based

management measures and assist the regional Councils in coordinating with NOAA to achieve the goals set forth in the executive order and report to the Climate Change Task Force. So the Subcommittee is intended to develop a report on ABM measures in the U.S. EEZ, including a comprehensive evaluation of all existing EEZ federal fishery area closures and other areabased measures in the U.S.

Discussion of the pros and cons of area-based management approaches -- and also taking a look at management objectives and expected benefits of area-based management tools for the diversity of ecosystems under the Council jurisdictions.

The Subcommittee will produce, or attempt to produce, a journal article on the conservation benefits of area-based management measures for marine fisheries in the U.S., and Eric Reid has agreed to chair that Subcommittee.

Regarding offshore wind development, also a lot of discussion on this. Very good presentations from BOEM. We appreciated that input from them. However, the CCC and the Habitat Group provided some ideas about how to further that integration or that interaction with BOEM and the Councils. They read a good report on that.

The CCC's guidance to the Habitat Work Group, however, was that the offshore wind issues would become secondary to that of the Area-Based Management Subcommittee that we just discussed, but that in 2021, if resources are available, they should continue to meet and focus on the development and sharing of best management practices related to offshore wind issues. However, they should not plan on a Habitat Science Forum this year, and that they can look forward to some further guidance from the CCC at our October meeting.

For the National Standard 1 draft technical memorandum on managing with ACLs for data-limited stocks, we received a presentation from Marian MacPherson giving an overview of the memo. CCC noted that some portions of the document still need more work to provide effective guidance and ensure there is clear distinction between guidance and requirements.

They also requested an extension of the comment deadline on the draft memo to allow time to schedule, review, and develop comments. I think they asked for something in November. NMFS indicated that they would at least try to accommodate an extension into sometime in early October.

On our CCC's Subcommittee on Council Member Ongoing Development Committee, the Steering Committee reported their first CMOD workshop is scheduled to occur in person in the first week of November. I believe that's -- the plan is to have that in Denver, if I'm not mistaken. I'm not sure if that was in the report, but that's my understanding.

Scoping is underway to refine the agenda, which focuses on the theme of new approaches to ecosystem-based fishery management and ecosystem approaches to fishery management. The Steering Committee is going to be reaching out for presenters both within the Council family and elsewhere as its next step over the course of the summer as they plan for that.

The NEPA Subcommittee provided a report to the CCC which recommended NMFS consider the report, which included guidance and ideas and issues for conducting the proposed workshop to consider Council and Agency guidance on implementation of the new CDQ NEPA regulations as well as procedures for functional equivalents of MSA actions.

And then the SCS-7 Subcommittee, their seventh national meeting has been again postponed at this time until the summer of 2022 so that it can take place in person. The North Pacific Council is the host of that meeting, and they asked for assistance from NMFS to approve a nocost extension through 2022 of existing funds intended to support that workshop. And they're looking for some feedback from Grants Division and NMFS headquarters on that, whether that could be accommodated.

Seafood competitiveness, marketing, and economic growth, Dr. Doremus requested comments and feedback from the Councils on working waterfronts, workforce development, sustainability, resiliency, marketing, supply chains, and young fishermen's education programs.

The CCC and the Northeast -- New England Fishery Management Council noted that Councils may be unprepared to answer all these difficult issues at this time, and that perhaps, at least initially, the Council's focus should be on the sustainable supply of fishery resources for the American public.

Western Pacific noted that the supply chain and inferior imported tuna products was a large issue for their Council. They also requested removal of the monument closures by the executive order that were put in place by the Antiquities Act.

Regarding the electronic monitoring agenda item, Brett Alger provided an overview of the draft procedural directive on applying information law to electronic monitoring data. The directive will establish requirements for electronic monitoring programs to address data confidentiality, federal records, and FOIA issues.

The draft is not quite yet available but should be released to the Councils shortly, by early June, with comments due by July 15th. It says the NPFMC requested an extension until October. I think that's the CCC -- it's probably my typo there -- requested an extension until October 2021 for more opportunity to get that put on a new agenda and develop comments.

I think the NMFS's response was that they would prefer to get comments earlier so that they could utilize the document for implementation of programs that were scheduled to come online January 1 of next year, but that they would continue to take comments as they were provided moving forward, but that they would definitely prefer to have that sooner rather than later if possible.

And then the, finally, policy and procedural directives on guidance for financial disclosure and recusals, Adam Issenberg gave an overview of the draft policy directive and procedural directive. Both provide guidance on fishery management, Council disclosure, and recusal requirements.

There were some questions that were posed that Mr. Issenberg agreed to investigate and report back on, primarily about the role of

Thank

Like I

Are there

Chuck,

So I

the Executive Directors in identifying potential 1 2 recusal issues and also on reporting discussions 3 about recusal. 4 So that, Mr. Chairman, is my brief and 5 spectacular summary of our CCC meeting so far 6 this spring. Happy to answer questions if there 7 are any. 8 CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. 9 you, Chuck. 10 Now would be time for questions or 11 comments. 12 Kitty? 13 MS. SIMONDS: Not so spectacular, 14 You missed my entire ESA and MSA 15 integration. 16 MR. TRACY: Is it in -- sorry, can 17 you --18 MS. SIMONDS: And the most wonderful thing about that is that Sam Rauch agreed to look 19 20 into staff receiving drafts of BiOps. So thank 21 you. 22 MR. TRACY: My apologies. 23 said, far from comprehensive. But yeah, I did miss that one. 24 I whiffed on that one completely. 25 MS. SIMONDS: No, but I thought your 26 report is really good. You just forgot about me. I didn't see it in my 27 MR. TRACY: source document, so -- but I do recall seeing you 28 29 submit something to me. So my apologies. 30 CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. 31 further questions or comments on the wrap-up 32 provided by Chuck Tracy? (Pause.) 33 34 CHAIR GORELNIK: Any further 35 recommendations? 36 (Pause.) CHAIR GORELNIK: 37 All right. 38 thank you very much for that wrap-up. And I 39 guess you can amend it to include the material 40 Kitty mentioned. 41 And that brings us to our discussion 42 of next meeting dates. So, Chuck, do you want to 43 let everyone know about our October meeting? 44 MR. TRACY: Yes. Let me see if I can 45 find that on my screen here someplace without 46 accidentally exiting the -- I guess I'll have to 47 do it this way. 48 Okay. Let's try this again.

Washington DC

just wanted to remind people that we will be having our next meeting in Monterey in October, 19th through the 21st. It will be an in-person meeting. That's our fervent hope.

There's some contact information. You can expect to see invitations by no later than August 1st. We will have opportunity to stay on or come early a few days before or after the CCC meeting based on room availability.

And then, secondly, Mid-Atlantic will be hosting next year's CCC meeting, and they've set the dates of May 17th through 19th. And it will be in Annapolis, Maryland, at the Waterfront Hotel. So that is next year's business.

CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. Thanks,

Chuck.

 Any questions from the CCC on plans for the October meeting? Really look forward to seeing everyone in person for a change.

Chuck, do you have anything else?
MR. TRACY: No, Mr. Chair.
CHAIR GORELNIK: All right.
Chris Moore?

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, just to let folks know for those folks that plan way ahead, we also have a meeting date already scheduled for October, CCC meeting. It's the week of October 17th, 2022. So just to let folks know. Thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: I'm going to get that on my calendar.

Anything else from around the virtual table here, from the CCC, before we adjourn?

Sam Rauch?

MR. RAUCH: Given that we are likely to adjourn very soon, on behalf -- I do not see that Paul is still here, but on behalf of Paul and the rest of the National Fisheries Service, I do want to thank the CCC for participating. We always find this is very constructive, and I appreciate all of the hard work that goes into these meetings. But I did want to thank everybody for being here and joining in this good conversation. Thank you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thanks, Sam. And on behalf of the CCC, thank you to NMFS and all the staff that participated in making the presentations and the helpful discussion we had

here today.

Chuck and then Kitty. MR. TRACY: Thanks.

Yeah, one other thing that is on our agenda was kind of maybe if there's a desire to talk about the frequency of schedule for future Council check-in calls. We've been sort of having monthly calls for quite a while. And so there was some interest in maybe discussing whether to continue that schedule or modify that somehow, or if those meetings are -- if there's a desire to continue those at all.

So I'll just put that out there and see if there's any thoughts about that.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Well, I think they've been helpful, at least until we get back to a normal operating environment.

Anyone have a comment on that particular topic?

Kitty and then Sam.

MS. SIMONDS: Well, I think they are very, very, very, very, very, very useful, and I hope that the NMFS agrees to continue to have these meetings. It's just not so much bringing us, really, closer, but we have that opportunity to talk about whatever we need to talk about with headquarters. We don't have that opportunity.

And so that is every month. That time is when I fully take advantage of that great opportunity. I did have something to say at the end, though, but --

CHAIR GORELNIK: I'll come right back to you, okay, Kitty?

MS. SIMONDS: Okay. Yeah. Thanks. CHAIR GORELNIK: Sam?

MR. RAUCH: Yes. I would like to remind the CCC that those are not actually CCC meetings. And so the provisions -- if you were going to have monthly CCC meetings, they'd need to be properly noticed and follow the formal rules.

Given that they are not formal CCC meetings but they're just discussions on operational issues and information with the Council, that has limited what you can do in those meetings to sharing certain background information, discussing operational issues.

So I just want to -- we've discussed

that before, but it is not correct -- and sometimes we are even not accurate. Those have not been CCC meetings, and they are not CCC meetings. They're not noticed as such, and we do not conduct CCC business in those discussions. You could if the CCC wanted to have monthly meetings, but you'd have to follow the proper procedure to do that.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you, Sam, for that clarification.

Kitty, right back to you.

MS. SIMONDS: Okay. Well, they are -- I consider them informal discussions about issues. And so, yeah -- I wouldn't like to see formal monthly meetings, obviously, because then we'd have to speak formally.

So, anyway, my last comment is I'm responding to Kelly's comment at the very beginning of this session today. She said that she was very sorry that she missed the social hour yesterday and was hoping to have another opportunity.

So I was going to -- you know, I will confer with Sam because we could put it on YouTube, you know.

Hi, Sam.

Just joking. But Kelly, anytime,

we'll send it to you.

CHAIR GORELNIK: Sam, your hand is up. Do you have a further comment?

Oh, it's down. All right. Thank you.
All right. Carrie?

MS. SIMMONS: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

No, I just want to say thank you all for the materials that were provided ahead of time and for the good conversation that we've had here, and Chuck for all his work and his staff have done, and you, Mr. Chair, for your hard work and keeping us on schedule.

That being said, I do find the monthly meetings helpful. I think as we work our way through this pandemic issue and we start to ease back into travel, I would prefer that we have those monthly meetings still. I think it's very important to understand how the travel schedule is going to unfold for the federal staff just as much as the other Councils.

Thank you.

1 CHAIR GORELNIK: Thank you, Carrie. 2 Anything further from the CCC before 3 we adjourn? 4 (Pause.) 5 CHAIR GORELNIK: Would anyone like to 6 make a motion? 7 (Pause.) 8 CHAIR GORELNIK: We need a motion. 9 Chris Moore? 10 MR. MOORE: So moved. CHAIR GORELNIK: Is there a second? 11 12 MR. NIES: Second. Tom Nies. 13 CHAIR GORELNIK: Second by Brad 14 All those in favor, say aye. Pettinger. 15 (Chorus of aye.) 16 CHAIR GORELNIK: Opposed? Can't 17 imagine. 18 (Pause.) 19 CHAIR GORELNIK: All right. We are 20 adjourned. Once again, thank you, everyone, for 21 your participation and your work, and we look 22 forward to seeing you in Monterey in October. 23 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 24 went off the record at 5:28 p.m.) 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48

A
ability 46:33 47:30 48:15,16,18 49:25
able 5:24 9:48 12:15
40:22 41:25 47:36
51:11 59:21 61:44
63:5,6 74:34,34
ABM 6:16 75:6 above-entitled 50:17
73:15,30 82:23
abroad 74:41
absolutely 35:26
Abstentions 9:31 academia 6:9
accelerated 10:39
access 34:32 35:11
47:21,38 54:28,33
56:26 57:35 58:9,19
62:31,43 63:4,16 accessed 52:45
accidentally 78:46
accommodate 65:45
76:6
accommodated 76:42 accomplished 73:43
account 14:18
accurate 24:16 81:2
achieve 35:10 43:22 75:2
achieving 30:18,41
ACL 13:26 74:9
ACLs 75:42
acquire 67:47 acquiring 56:16
act 13:25 27:41 30:17
34:43 44:38 47:3
52:34,35,36 54:7
56:17 57:44 58:45 69:25 74:28,31 77:13
acting 16:24
action 4:32 7:48 8:9
9:34,36 12:34,39,43
14:14 22:35,36,37 28:18 37:27 50:3 64:6
actions 8:25 11:37,42
12:3,23,25,37,45 13:2
13:3,8,12,31,38 14:23
15:20,26 16:38,45
52:29 53:23 76:31 actively 32:15
activities 49:45 74:21
actual 12:22 19:8 27:15
Adam 2:11 67:31,32
68:33,39 70:4,7,8,44 72:41 77:41
add 13:3
addition 13:6 33:3
61:42

additional 5:16 26:24 28:29,34 29:23 35:22 42:1 68:18 address 6:20 7:5 15:41 34:27 36:34 42:2 44:38 49:22 77:19 addressed 14:31 59:30 addresses 6:45 adequate 65:43 adherence 55:40 adjourn 79:33,36 82:3 adjourned 82:20 adjustments 53:4 58:27 administration 1:8 9:16 29:42 30:21,36 33:48 34:1 42:38 administration's 43:18 administrative 52:12 advance 30:39 32:5 35:28 65:5 advancing 61:44 advantage 24:26 49:46 80.29 adventure 24:10 **advice** 36:19 65:29 advise 49:4 56:14 advisers 48:39 advising 58:34 advisors 24:41 advisory 10:22 29:24 32:18 38:33 45:24 48:1 49:11,11 advocated 13:21 advocating 14:19 afar 55:35 affect 36:5 74:18 Africa 7:11 aftermath 33:6 afternoon 11:20,24 50:11 agencies 12:29 13:48 15:24 19:38 23:43 58:20 agency 5:17 8:22 45:21 51:45 53:12,16,17,39 53:42 54:3,10,19,27 54:32 55:8,18,19,29 56:9,23,26,31 57:38 58:9,26 60:4,20 61:37 62:32 63:33 64:40 67:12,36,40 68:10,11 74:10,22 76:28 **Agency's** 48:18 66:44 67:8 agenda 4:13,16,23,33 4:41 8:9 9:17,38,41 9:42 10:20 11:47

29:21 37:24,31 39:15 42:12 43:45 44:5 50:4 50:22 59:34 61:12 65:23,24 67:20,26,27 71:8,14,18,20,22,31 73:20,35 76:17 77:15 77:29 80:5 agendas 58:37 59:33 aggressive 17:7,8 59:4 aging 47:22 agnostic 21:2 ago 17:16,17 20:25 28:34 37:39 39:39 46:43 52:4 54:31 Agostini 6:12 **agree** 35:38 47:42 48:14 60:25 64:41 agreed 75:20 77:47 78:19 agreement 54:4,11 58:18 agreements 6:42 agrees 80:23 ahead 8:17 9:11 11:33 12:6,31,35 13:5,13,41 28:40 37:35 44:14 59:28 79:26 81:35 **AI** 61:40 aiming 37:8 **akin** 60:10 **ALAs** 18:22 **Alaska** 4:44 5:6,18 20:45 21:6 51:23 67:3 72:3 algal 38:48 Alger 2:7 50:24,28,31 50:36 60:3 61:33 62:20 63:11,13,31,40 64:11 65:37 66:34 77:15 aligned 17:13 allocation 52:3 66:47 67:5 allow 5:20 7:1 8:28 25:43 43:20 54:7,39 54:42 64:43 76:2 allowed 28:14,15,16,20 28:44 29:5 67:1 69:7 allowing 41:8 **allows** 23:5 alluded 13:32 alternative 28:13 alternatives 25:34 **AMBs** 5:45 amend 78:39 **America** 32:21,37 41:26 **American** 3:19 7:12 47:39 77:7

amount 23:19 60:27 61:7,23 amplification 32:34 amplify 32:24,28 analyses 33:38 analysis 22:25 23:37 36:45 52:20 analyzing 52:33 and/or 53:34 animated 41:17 Annapolis 79:13 announce 21:32 announced 17:44 announcement 4:9 21:35 announcements 4:24 answer 14:4 23:32 24:14 27:22,23 45:28 59:19 62:8,21 66:37 77:3 78:6 answered 24:7 37:26 antibiotics 6:31 anticipate 12:46 anticipated 5:30 anticipation 25:8 Antiquities 77:13 anybody 44:24 53:41 anymore 37:44 39:48 46:16 47:9 anytime 81:27 anyway 20:19 21:24 24:8 29:8 48:13 81:17 **AOA** 18:6 21:19,32,36 21:45 22:3,7,12 23:27 23:27 25:34 28:28,39 **AOAs** 17:18,22,29,33 17:46 18:37,39 19:8 20:24,41,42 21:1,7,13 21:18,24,26,29,34 22:11,15 23:20,33 24:11,11,18,19,21,35 25:9,11 27:3,26 **AP** 47:20 apart 52:10 apologies 78:22,29 apparently 73:46 Applicability 54:36 **applicable** 54:5 55:14 68:2 applicant 23:36 applicants 24:1,30 25:10 application 28:38 68:18 applied 58:44 **applies** 73:14 apply 52:21 54:37 55:6 56:17 57:7,25,43 applying 3:32 54:2

12:42 13:4 15:16,19

II			_
77:16	49:39	53:25,45 56:46 59:5	65:39,39
appointed 70:17,34	aspects 10:25 18:31	59:11,13 61:16 62:42	biggest 5:46
appreciate 15:31 29:32	67:42	62:48 63:34 64:12,17	Bill 1:44 47:40 48:34
35:5 39:3 41:13 42:10	Assembly 6:27	64:30 65:42,45 70:21	bins 12:20 51:19
42:45 45:13 46:41	assess 33:9	72:34,42 73:34 77:48	Bins2 13:16
47:31 48:17,35 65:1	asset 40:17	80:16,32 81:11,43	biodiversity 6:41,47
66:18 79:41	assigned 44:37	background 51:43	BiOps 78:20
appreciated 73:6 74:29	assigning 26:16	80:46	bit 10:24 11:14,32
75:23	assist 45:39 75:1	balance 36:34 37:20	12:26,30 15:11 16:3,8
approached 39:38	assistance 35:15,26	51:33 52:20 59:7	19:12 20:42 22:40
approaches 46:34	38:11 76:37	ball 32:5	26:9 27:31 29:8 33:43
75:11 76:18,19	associated 6:37 26:16	bandwidth 48:16 68:6	38:19 43:5 48:33
appropriate 11:46 14:1	28:29,31 30:31 53:22	bandwidths 47:43	51:43 56:44 57:35,47
58:27 64:21 65:33	assume 26:27 46:8	Bank 47:15	58:9 70:26 74:39
approve 74:38 76:37	assurance 60:36	barrier 33:43	bloom 38:48
approved 12:43 67:1	Atlantic 51:25	barriered 45:44	board 22:33 32:18
approved 12.43 67.1 approving 10:6 54:18	atlas 18:46 20:34 22:26	barriers 13:31 33:35	boards 29:10
April 14:39	26:10,20,23,29,31,34	41:46 42:2 47:19,19	boat 33:11 41:2 61:24
aquaculture 3:24 6:29	26:37,41,43 27:1,3,9	barring 25:48 29:2	body 62:44
6:30 10:12 11:13	27:24	based 13:2 20:33 25:25	BOEM 75:23,27
16:25,32,39 17:4	atlases 18:29 19:4,19	25:26 51:22 61:3 75:9	book 5:48 6:6 65:6
18:48 20:4 21:47 22:2	20:27	79:9	bottom 5:28 51:25
23:17 24:10,29 25:40	ATMOSPHERIC 1:8	basic 17:38	bottom 5.20 51.25 bottomfish 42:27,46
26:13,16 28:24 33:10	attached 4:40	basically 5:22 18:26	bounds 56:37
33:21 34:20,21,24	attacking 74:41	40:48 42:15,23 56:40	box 56:22
37:11,12 38:4,17,37	attempt 52:41 75:17	57:34 59:17	Brad 1:37 8:12,31,37
38:41 41:26 44:40	attendee 4:15 8:2 63:46	basics 56:40	9:32 66:15,34 82:13
49:33 74:36	63:47	bear 43:29	break 50:5,8,9,16,21
aquacultures 27:41	attention 39:4 41:6,13	beard 66:36	72:34,35
AR 47:20	41:23 43:19	began 18:4,14	breaking 52:10
Archie 1:42 42:8,44	auction 41:16	beginning 55:25 58:25	Brett 2:7 50:24,26,30
43:31	auctions 35:44	81:19	50:36 59:24,27,30
Archives 53:17	audible 37:32	beginnings 17:34	60:25,31 61:17 63:25
area 21:24 25:44 28:6	audio 68:4	behalf 57:14 79:36,37	63:29 64:9,35,47
28:20,25,26,47 29:5	August 17:43 65:42,46	79:46	65:36 66:18 67:24
35:31 42:4 59:46 75:8	79:7	belabor 63:14	77:15
area- 75:8	authoritatively 44:31	believe 9:38 22:5 24:44	brief 16:13,37 52:22
area-based 6:4,20 7:5	authorize 5:15	25:40 26:1 54:30	78:4
7:18 74:47,48 75:11	authorized 5:16	57:12,26,34 59:37	briefing 4:40 5:48 6:5
75:13,18,31	availability 31:2 79:9	60:17,46 64:37 70:22	65:6
areas 3:24 10:12 11:13	available 6:13 15:2 18:5	76:12	briefly 63:32
11:41 16:33,39 17:5	33:18 41:37 45:37	benefit 35:26 41:10	bring 11:29 36:12 41:6
18:22,47 19:1,5 20:10	56:26 59:20 66:9	49:39	43:29 59:35 67:27
20:32,33 21:30 22:20	70:15,16 73:23 74:13	benefits 5:3 30:29,32	bringing 39:4 41:13
22:28 27:9 32:5 34:15	75:33 77:22	31:23,25 32:25,46,47	55:48 80:24
36:35 37:12 38:14	avoid 20:12 24:47	46:7 75:13,18	brings 8:8 64:6 72:39
42:39,43,47	aware 16:44 30:2 35:3	best 17:12 35:28 43:21	78:41
arisen 52:38	40:29 41:14,42 42:2	43:23 52:41 74:13	broad 11:15 17:44 32:7
Army 23:25 28:30,37	awareness 41:32	75:35	32:22 69:33
arrangement 63:9	Awesome 15:18	better 9:20 10:43 19:16	broader 32:14
article 75:17	aye 9:28,29 82:14,15	38:26 42:3 44:47,48	broadly 10:5,41 18:38
Artisanal 6:28		52:44	21:46,47 29:22 32:24
Asia-Pacific 7:11	<u>B</u>	beyond 18:39 24:25	36:35 49:19
aside 57:16	back 9:40 10:43 12:10	65:46	broke 12:19
asked 11:39 14:38 16:7	15:36 16:4 17:43,43	big 13:7 23:47 33:5	bucket 12:27 67:14
46:4 61:30 76:4,37	25:39 27:46 29:16	34:37,44 35:20,31	buckets 13:7,16
asking 39:18 45:13	44:10 46:5 47:47 48:4	38:48 40:5 41:21	budget 5:8,11 15:23
46:33 48:36 49:17,38	50:13,15,20 51:45	44:22 45:41 51:37	build 6:42 10:43 28:12
II	Į.	I	I

30:15 36:11 41:31 47:4,8 49:41 building 29:45 37:10 built 20:31 30:46 **bullet** 15:1 bunch 34:38 **burden** 49:44 burdens 11:38 42:17 burdensome 60:15 **business** 3:39 9:38 34:1 36:32 53:13 72:36 73:21,35 74:33 79:14 81:5 businesses 33:12 **buttoning** 51:10 C C 10:20 calendar 11:48 79:31 **California** 17:47 19:22 20:11 73:19 call 11:9 29:45 35:35 67:37 called 17:6 47:10 calling 72:2 calls 3:43 17:4,15,24 23:43 80:7,8 **camera** 54:47 **cameras** 61:31 campaign 18:15 30:11 32:16,21,28 campaigns 19:41 32:36 Canadian 6:48 cancel 4:46 capabilities 38:44 capability 38:10 40:10 61:26,29

capable 47:16 capacities 37:7 capacity 34:20 35:42 35:43,43 37:10 40:23 capital 47:21,22 capture 33:10,21 49:33 69:48 carbon 30:31 40:33 **career** 45:11 Caribbean 7:12 65:41 Carrie 1:39,40 23:12,14 23:16 25:17 70:9 81:32 82:1 Carrie's 24:8 27:32 carried 5:12 carries 49:24 carrying 5:15 carryover 5:24 cart 47:7 cascades 40:47

case 4:27 30:33 39:8 57:10 58:33 66:40 74:25 cast 42:15,34 catch 57:2,30 74:5 catch-all 12:30 catch-share 66:42 catcher 57:2 66:21 67:7 catching 41:41 categorizing 34:34 category 12:30 34:12 35:4 51:26 **CCC** 3:40 4:7,30 7:32 8:10,18,20 9:39 10:32 13:45 16:10,44,47 22:7,48 37:23 48:28 50:3 59:27 63:41 68:36 71:14 73:34 74:7,16,20,34,38,46 75:24,39,45 76:25 77:1,26 78:5 79:8,11 79:17,27,33,39,46 80:37,37,39,42 81:3,3 81:5,6 82:2 **CCC's** 29:33 75:29 76:8 CDQ 8:23 76:29 center 19:43 36:32 59:43 central 30:22 35:35 37:17 38:9 certain 18:30 28:3 49:8 52:17 57:43 64:36 74:12 80:46 **certainly** 14:17 21:5 22:2,23,47 23:32,46 24:17,34 25:32 27:44 28:4,28 31:10 32:11 41:14,18 42:5 43:18 44:27 45:10 52:44 58:35 63:3 69:17 certainty 62:4 64:44 certificate 39:42 certification 39:21,22 39:29 40:3.8 cetera 20:16,37 **chain** 29:30 33:36,45 35:46 47:2 77:9 **chains** 76:48 Chairman 4:39 5:27.36 7:20 14:27 24:36 37:36 39:18 46:41 61:19 71:42 73:24

78:4 79:24

chance 22:27

challenge 33:42

challenges 11:7 21:29

change 6:43 11:1 42:37

42:25,30 48:4,44 49:9

42:39 49:38 53:6 61:7 70:32 74:15 75:4 79:19 **changed** 38:15 48:4 66:27,30 changes 10:40 12:22 13:4 changing 11:5 38:28 channeling 31:46 characteristic 46:1 characterized 48:42 **charge** 10:44 12:5 28:37 charter 33:11 **chat** 4:15 **chatting** 44:1 63:45 **cheaper** 40:37,42 **check-in** 3:43 80:7 check-off 45:46 **chief** 6:12 27:2 **chime** 60:16 chiming 71:47 **choice** 15:11 48:7 choices 31:3 **Chorus** 9:29 82:15 **Chris** 1:34.36 14:6.26 14:29 15:6 37:34 38:8 39:3,15 40:1 42:14 71:25,26,43,47 72:21 72:23 79:23 82:9 Chris' 40:26 Chuck 1:43 4:24,34 7:39 8:29,30 14:6,16 25:18 26:6 64:46 65:17,21 71:45 72:4 73:21,22,36 78:9,14 78:32,37,42 79:16,20 80:2 81:37 Chuck's 8:40 **Circuit** 27:40 circulate 7:22 circulated 68:14 clarification 81:10 clarifications 37:29 clarify 48:36 clarity 69:40 70:2 clear 17:7 22:44 28:7 28:11 40:18 45:21 48:3 69:34 75:47 clearly 29:40 **click** 12:7 **climate** 6:43 13:35 42:39 74:41 75:4 close 19:18 22:6 29:21 37:43 40:31 42:21 **closed** 70:37 closely 21:43,44 33:38 33:47 38:15

closer 80:25 closures 75:8 77:11 **cloud** 56:25 clutching 26:39 **CMOD** 7:35 76:10 co-chaired 34:24 co-chairing 34:21 co-sponsored 33:22 coast 5:41,42,42,42,44 21:11 26:12 41:28,38 51:30 54:30 57:42 66:33,43 coastal 36:4 cod 31:21 COFI 3:12 5:34,39 7:26 7:43 **COFI35** 6:19 cognizant 25:46 coincidentally 57:32 coincides 7:17 collaborate 33:47 collaborated 38:15 collaboration 25:5 collect 18:20 **collected** 56:5,36 58:1 collecting 56:33 57:17 57:21 collection 13:20 52:1 74:21 collective 49:26 collectively 49:21 **columns** 55:14 combination 20:46 combined 38:38 come 5:1 16:31 23:1.36 24:17 26:43 28:3,7 33:28 41:10 44:39 61:16 63:34 72:28,34 72:42 77:34 79:8 80:32 comes 15:21 16:41 31:16 34:9 40:2 comfortable 48:12 coming 11:2 18:44 28:27 35:23 39:12 40:33 43:40 61:46 64:39 comment 4:10,19,31 19:31 25:26,33,37 37:27 43:37,41,46 44:4,7,12,31 46:22,23 46:38 53:19 58:30 63:35,37,43 64:2,12 64:12 65:1,16 66:13 70:48 71:2,4,19 72:27

72:33 76:2 80:18

81:17,18,30

commented 48:31

commenters 44:26 comments 9:25 16:4,11 18:28 19:35,40 20:10 21:27 36:23 40:26 42:45 43:39 44:15 48:31 59:25 65:7 67:20 68:15,22,31 76:3,45 77:24,29,31 77:35 78:11.31 **COMMERCE 1:7** commercial 13:19 40:47 41:4 51:41 56:34 Commissions 53:38 committee 1:13,26 4:30 4:47 5:33,40 7:45 10:23 23:11 29:24 45:24 50:32,38 65:33 74:30 76:9,10,20 **Committees** 8:10 9:39 committing 5:7 common 49:25 74:48 commonality 49:41 communicated 35:2 communication 22:5 30:45 communications 7:38 **communities** 35:12,16 36:4 41:31 **community** 32:22,24 33:42 36:14 43:1,1 49:20 58:36 company 50:7 55:48 57:9 62:27 comparison 56:11 compete 47:12 **competing** 47:22,25 competition 41:48 competitive 11:10 42:28 competitiveness 3:14 3:20 9:43 10:6,36 13:28 17:3 44:19 45:6 45:20 76:43 compiled 35:2 complement 10:27 **completely** 48:5 78:24 completing 20:23 complexion 38:14 compliance 6:36,38 53:30 58:16 complicated 43:15 46:44 68:42 complimentarities 25:1 complying 44:37 component 30:26 components 10:5,10 10:18

composition 38:28 comprehensive 7:44 10:14 22:19 30:10 31:6 32:7 73:42 74:2 75:7 78:23 comprehensively 10:35 computer 55:34 concentrate 47:35 concentrated 35:8 45:44 concept 30:9 concern 35:47 37:1 50:42 56:30 62:6 66:5 69:45 concerns 18:40 19:44 34:11 42:19,20 69:17 74:16 **concise** 68:34 conclude 13:44 67:26 72:43 concluded 9:38 concludes 71:18 72:32 conclusion 52:23 conditions 11:5 conduct 8:21 81:5 conducting 53:13 55:30,36,43 76:27 confer 81:24 confidence 29:27 30:40 31:18 confident 31:21 confidentiality 3:33 52:34 54:3,15 77:20 conflicts 24:47 confronting 35:13 confusion 19:3,15 Congress 29:42 30:8 30:21,36 69:26 Congressional 38:30 Congressionally 46:6 connect 46:35 connectivity 46:25 cons 75:10 consensus 49:41 74:35 74:36 conservation 43:8,9 58:21 75:18 conserve 6:46 conserving 74:43 consider 8:20 35:31 56:3,4 76:25,28 81:13 considerable 36:9 49:46 consideration 18:48 considerations 33:27

34:4 36:12 39:12

43:28

considered 12:38 14:21 20:32,33 51:38 66:29 74:13 considering 7:3 consistency 52:25 consistent 11:44 consistently 62:45,46 constituencies 59:22 constructed 44:25 constructive 36:10 79:40 construed 29:22 32:24 consult 9:21 consultant 45:22 consultants 45:33 consumer 11:1 29:27 30:40 31:17 32:10,39 40:36,36 41:19 48:10 48:20 consumers 31:2,12,45 40:13,38 41:38 48:2 consumption 29:28 32:26,45 42:22 contact 14:43 31:44 79:5 contacted 59:17 contemporary 31:42 content 31:30,36 32:34 contentious 59:45 **CONTENTS** 3:9 context 20:19 29:46 36:3.26 43:26 53:37 53:41 **contexts** 20:6,15 continue 13:45 19:23 19:25 22:21 23:3 25:3 25:4 30:44 33:33 48:28 53:31 72:13 75:34 77:35 80:10,12 80:23 **continued** 30:20 32:12 32:40 36:20,29 67:25 continues 40:13 continuing 29:39 30:34 30:38 32:5,9 contracting 54:12 55:22 contractor 55:19 contractors 58:10 contracts 53:4 54:6,14 54:21,26 57:9 58:28 contractual 62:27 contribute 45:39 47:43 48:18 73:6 contributed 10:11 control 47:30 59:41 controls 6:26 controversies 70:1

conversation 15:43.48 16:9 42:48 45:15 46:42 48:34 71:39 79:44 81:36 conversations 34:10 45:2 46:34 50:42 convinced 5:1 coordinating 75:2 coordination 1:13,26 4:43 5:4 20:34 21:41 23:28 37:43 Coordinator 50:37 copy 53:42 55:8 core 31:11 48:42 58:3 **COREY** 2:8 8:30 Corps 23:25 28:30,37 28:45 29:9 **correct** 14:43,44,47 40:3 81:1 correctly 28:23 69:35 cost 45:37 46:9 47:23 52:3 59:47,48 60:26 60:44 64:13 66:24,28 66:41,43,44,47,48 67:2,2,5,10 76:38 cost-recovery 67:13 costly 54:44 costs 60:14,19 67:7,8 **council** 1:13,26 3:28,43 4:32,42 5:8 6:6,14,17 7:47 8:8 10:28 12:4 12:39 19:10 22:7 23:14 24:39 26:24 27:6 30:7,16 31:14 32:8,13 34:23 37:27 39:27 42:32 43:1,40 44:23,23,40 45:7 46:17 47:48 48:7,13 52:28 58:48 59:17,21 59:41 63:38 64:6,15 65:8,8,21,32 66:5,6 68:3,43,43 69:3,7,27 70:14,17,37 71:7 72:17 74:34 75:14 76:8,21,28,36 77:2,10 77:44 80:7,45 council's 7:23 46:47 47:29,32 77:5 **councils** 5:38,47 7:13 13:1 14:41 16:44,48 18:2,3,16 19:24,39 21:37,41,45,48 22:20 22:40 24:45 27:18 34:46 36:35,41 42:15 46:26,27,30 47:42 48:37,43 49:17 51:11 51:27 52:43 58:26 59:5,22,32 64:14,28

64:36,43 65:11,16,25 65:26,40 66:1,10 74:48 75:2,27 76:45 77:3,23 81:47 Councils' 3:22 Counsel 51:3 country 25:47 31:24 38:12 41:7 57:21 **counts** 43:9 couple 10:2,3 12:7 13:36 14:37 37:38 39:31 47:48 52:4 57:36 62:22 68:39 course 16:13 20:46 21:8 48:44 50:46 51:8 52:9,29 55:21 56:20 56:33 57:19 59:19,46 62:2,23 70:36 76:22 court 27:39 54:8 57:45 cover 10:30 11:41 72:35 covered 6:41 20:14 28:17 35:4 covering 10:9 **COVID** 10:38 11:3 32:20 33:6.15 34:2 36:26 74:5 create 56:10 created 54:37 57:1 creating 36:6 42:16 60:15 crew 55:2 62:2 crisis 32:21 74:41 critical 64:38 **CTC** 42:14 culture 25:27 culturing 25:24 **curious** 9:2 23:19,30 37:48 38:5 39:48 66:26,30 current 47:23 52:18 58:41 currently 9:18 16:24 29:46 70:16,33,34,39 cut 61:27,44 70:25 cutting 42:23 **cycle** 65:39,43 cycles 59:21 D

dabble 38:5 data 13:20 15:42 16:1 18:5 22:24 26:14,25 26:33,39 27:19,20 33:28,40 50:44 52:1 52:16,22,45 53:12,14 53:20,28,29,30,34,39 53:45,46 54:14,24,28

54:33.37.40.42 55:17 55:38 56:5,18,25,42 57:4,47,48 58:11,12 58:12,13,14,43,45 60:6,36,47 61:4,31,32 61:43 62:16,16,17,25 62:26,36,38,47 64:45 69:4 74:20 77:17,19 data's 26:25 data-limited 75:43 date 16:38 65:35 79:26 dates 3:41 78:42 79:12 Dave 1:46 4:36 5:32 7:40 David 2:13 11:12 16:23 16:27,28 23:9 26:7 27:30 29:13,14 34:19 37:25 50:1 day 4:7,20 47:26 49:37 49:38 50:9,22 days 38:26 71:34 72:2 79:8 de 39:36 deadline 58:32 59:1,5 59:11 64:13,17,20,30 65:47.48 76:2 deal 5:45 35:12 42:36 46:20 dealt 37:47 dear 71:32 debriefings 60:11 December 18:19 decide 61:9 decided 17:45 57:14 decides 45:42 decision 14:2 27:39 68:47 decisions 48:8 57:12 deck 15:5,12 55:1 62:2 62:3 declared 6:27 decreased 40:41 dedicated 18:15 31:10 deep 49:13 deepen 34:29 defer 7:3 27:45 **define** 53:35 defining 48:38 definitely 33:30 54:44 77:37 definition 22:37 48:37 51:22 definitions 53:37 delay 65:26,28,34,39 delays 64:41

delegation 6:1,48

delegations 5:41

deliberate 18:4

delivered 29:26 demand 10:25 40:40,45 47:4,20 demonstrating 31:16 **Denit** 2:9 11:12,19,21 11:23 14:16,29,34,44 14:47 15:5,8,10,18,32 15:37,40,46 **Denver** 76:13 **DEPARTMENT** 1:7 **depend** 60:28 dependent 62:36 depending 61:38 deployed 41:5 57:21 deployments 60:10 derivatives 56:27 describe 68:1 described 45:47 describing 48:44 designed 40:4,9 **desire** 80:5,12 desktop 55:34 details 19:47 66:40 determination 59:41 68:1.21 69:15 determinations 67:41 68:41 determine 58:14 develop 22:14 24:19 27:21 49:25 58:27,34 62:34 67:48 74:47 75:5 76:3 77:29 **developed** 6:19 10:15 24:12 26:10,33 27:3 27:35 51:38 57:15 68:10.11 developing 21:29 26:40 35:21 47:17 development 8:22 10:29 18:7 21:20,47 22:2,3,15 28:24 33:48 34:1,11,22,28,34,40 34:42 35:21,28 36:16 36:38 37:12 38:32 39:8 44:20,40,45,47 47:1 49:30 51:27,35 66:22 67:47 68:20 75:21,35 76:9,46 developments 29:36 develops 18:29 dialogue 22:8 diet 30:27 dietary 30:28 difference 40:5 49:21 66:38 differences 66:47 different 10:5 12:19 20:6,15 22:40 28:3

29:31 33:1 35:45 43:10 52:7,45 53:36 55:16,16 56:42,43 59:22 61:32 65:47 67:15 70:38 71:36 difficult 29:1 46:2 59:34 68:41,44 69:19 77:4 dig 10:2 11:18 67:18 digest 18:30 direct 28:19 40:16 54:25 directed 9:21 32:35 44:16 58:48 direction 38:30 directive 3:32 51:44,46 52:4,14,18 53:48 55:12 59:10 63:30 64:18,31 66:9 68:12 68:24,32,40 69:1,13 77:16,18,42,43 directives 3:35 67:28 77:40 directly 38:18 39:26 44:48 46:15 54:13 55:12.22 director 16:24 73:36 **Directors** 69:2,10,19 73:2 78:1 discards 57:2 disclose 54:40 57:44 disclosure 32:17 54:8 54:39.42 67:38 77:41 77:44 disclosures 3:36 67:29 68:13 discourage 27:36 discoverable 31:45 discrepancies 27:13 discuss 16:14 64:23 discussed 10:16 25:22 68:19 75:32 80:48 discussing 72:37 80:9 80:47 **discussion** 3:41 4:32 7:47 8:45 9:1,25,34 9:36 11:19 21:31 26:23 29:21 30:23 37:27 43:21,40 44:13 47:43 50:2 59:6,35 61:3 63:38 64:6 67:20 69:42 71:8,10 74:39 74:42 75:10,22 78:41 79:48 discussions 20:36 36:30 39:9 44:28 45:40 67:25 69:31,37 69:47 73:41 74:24

78:2 80:43 81:5,13

driving 16:34 disposal 45:38 disruption 11:1 drop 72:17 diss 44:24 dropping 40:48 dissemination 33:39 dual 43:22 due 42:39 77:24 distinction 75:48 **distinctive** 46:26 49:4 dwell 42:27 distribution 35:42 dynamics 11:2 33:4,32 diverse 33:17 35:12 36:38 37:2 38:21,27 40:27 41:20,40 49:28 diversity 30:5 45:48 75:14 **Division** 6:12 76:40 **Doc** 73:3 **e.g** 3:33 dock 61:22,22 **E.O** 3:19 earlier 4:5 36:22,46 document 16:4 26:32 26:37 28:37 51:9,10 57:45 64:26 66:28 51:13 52:27,31,37 77:31 53:10 55:26,44 56:39 early 16:5 18:19,45 58:8,24 64:42 67:17 32:20 33:6,29 43:5 68:24 69:30 70:22 59:12 66:19 76:6 75:46 77:32 78:28 77:24 79:8 documentation 54:22 **Earth** 19:42 documents 6:14 11:43 ease 23:44 81:42 68:12,17,23 easier 12:15 23:38,47 doing 17:12,34,48 24:29 21:21 33:20 41:30 east 4:4 5:41,42,44 45:30 47:27 57:43 73:19 60:11 66:20 Eastern 50:15 72:39.43 domestic 11:38 13:28 73:13 25:28,38 27:32,37 easy 58:38 62:40 63:22 42:17,20 Eat 32:21.37 domino 40:39.39.44 **ebbed** 35:33 **Doremus** 2:10 9:46 ecological 32:47 43:11 16:22 29:17 38:8 40:1 economic 3:15,20 9:43 41:12 42:44 45:29 10:48 33:37,48 34:21 48:30,33 76:44 34:40 36:11,48 58:12 **Doremus'** 44:16 76:44 download 56:27 **economists** 33:19,33 **Dr** 9:46 16:22 29:17 46:11 38:8 40:1 41:12 42:44 ecosystem 6:32 76:19 44:16 45:29 48:30,33 ecosystem-based 76:18 74:3,4 76:44 draft 3:31 18:46 22:29 ecosystems 75:14 27:10,15,16 51:10 **Ed** 1:45 40:24 41:12 55:12 58:48 63:29 42:18 69:14 66:9 68:11,11 69:30 edit 61:26 75:41 76:2 77:16,22 **EDT** 1:27 77:42 educating 31:11 drafts 78:20 education 10:26 30:11 draw 31:8,36 34:17 32:10,40 36:37 39:44 38:45 52:42 40:12 41:19 76:48 drawing 34:45 37:5 educational 30:38 41:22 40:17 drawn 38:29 **EEZ** 75:6,7 drill 70:47 effect 31:13,29 40:39 drive 22:15 56:42 40:44 driven 32:38 41:19 effecting 19:15 **effective** 45:37 53:6 57:27,28,30 drives 56:22 75:47

effectively 36:41 efficiency 37:8 **effort** 10:28 18:4,4,6 22:38 23:30 24:1 26:28 32:37 41:19 46:6,8,46 47:32 efforts 3:27 10:27,33 11:16 30:38 32:10,11 32:27,29 33:44 36:30 38:39 45:45 47:35 **EFPs** 51:31,32 58:43 60:32 eight 65:40 **EIS** 17:19,19 20:29,31 25:22 27:11,15,21 28:1,17,40,48 29:8 **EISs** 19:21 either 4:14,24 7:37 16:15 27:19 37:24 44:1 59:37 62:7 63:45 electronic 3:30,31 13:19 50:22,37,43 51:16,46 54:48 77:14 77:17,19 electronically 56:24 elements 10:3 elevating 30:12 EM 51:37 52:3,17,22,46 53:14,20,28,37,46 54:28,33 55:17,37,39 56:15,45,48 57:10,16 58:12,28 61:21,41 62:5,15 64:29,38 66:33 email 16:16 **emphasis** 46:37 49:8 emphasize 49:36 employed 55:48 enacted 6:21 encompass 69:42 encompasses 50:41 **encourage** 25:42 26:4 27:37 32:2 encouraged 6:48 43:16 encouragement 40:12 encouraging 29:37 35:25 43:24 endeavoring 63:21 ended 12:29 endorsed 29:41 49:19 endorsement 49:20 endorsing 30:6 enforce 54:20 57:39 enforcement 27:42,45 57:42 engage 16:46,48 22:20 22:21 74:35

engagement 20:31 21:41 22:31,32,32,39 29:33 36:20,37 engagements 36:13 39:5 **engine** 31:42 Engineers 23:25 England 77:2 enhancing 29:28 enjoy 50:16 enormous 10:38 enormously 46:29 ensure 37:3 43:12 55:39 75:47 enterprise 38:40 entire 7:26 49:31 55:1 78:14 entirely 52:8 54:46 entities 24:9 53:39 **entity** 63:17 entry 45:45 **envious** 66:35 environment 80:17 environmental 11:5 20:7.21 31:25 envisioned 5:25 **EO** 11:36 17:15 37:9.11 74:40 EPA 23:25 28:30 29:10 **equation** 10:26 40:20 equity 35:13 36:16 equivalence 8:24 equivalents 76:30 Eric 24:5 46:39 48:34 48:41 61:17,33 62:8 75:20 Eric's 62:24 **ESA** 56:44 78:14 **especially** 7:14 40:32 41:2 62:44 essential 25:1,2 **essentially** 11:47 15:19 18:15 28:13 63:11 **establish** 17:18.45 19:20 21:7 30:44 77:18 **established** 17:22 25:9 60:7 74:46 establishes 59:40,43 60:1 establishing 17:19 23:20 59:38 60:5 establishment 17:4 19:8 **estimates** 74:9,12,18 estimation 74:6 et 20:16,37 evaluate 29:39

engaged 22:21

evaluating 9:15 evaluation 75:7 evaluations 74:10 evening 4:26 11:26 events 6:47 7:1,9 18:1 57:30,38,40 everybody 9:47 11:24 73:38 79:43 everybody's 64:19 67:45 evidence 30:1 31:38 **exactly** 9:18 25:6 57:48 63:2 69:35 examine 58:13,40 example 14:18 23:44 27:7 28:29,36,45 54:8 54:29,46 55:31 56:2 57:45 67:4 72:36 examples 56:19 **exceptions** 54:7,39 57:44 exchange 7:9 executive 10:3,14 11:6 17:2,24 23:42 42:29 43:19 69:2.10.19 73:2 73:36 74:40 75:3 77:12 78:1 exempted 51:28 exercise 24:41 Exim 47:15 existing 46:11,11 75:7 76:38 **exists** 38:1 exiting 78:46 expansive 9:48 **expect** 18:46 19:26 21:35 25:14 27:48 28:7,10,43 34:37 35:37 39:7 53:31 54:5 58:12 59:25 61:7 79:6 expectations 52:6,16 52:44 58:24 expected 60:34 75:13 expects 54:27 expense 61:28 expensive 63:21 experienced 39:35 experiences 7:10 expertise 44:31 45:17 46:16,17,18 49:47 experts 6:8 explain 40:27 **explore** 26:9 32:43 **Export** 47:15 expressed 13:18 extend 8:21 extension 38:11 76:1,6 76:38 77:25,27

extensions 5:13 extensive 43:20 **extent** 60:33,40 external 31:33 33:33 36:42 45:22,33 extraordinarily 46:36 **extremely** 11:25 24:45 31:6 38:16 40:17 48:27 49:10.11 eyes 31:15

F

face 45:1 Facebook 32:32 faced 44:17 faces 48:45 facets 34:45 facilitate 44:28 45:2,14 46:10,34 facilitation 46:23 facilities 26:17 facility 23:26 47:24 facing 42:26,30 fact 30:43 40:47 48:23 facto 39:36 factor 40:41 factors 36:5 fair 28:41 62:43 63:40 fairly 10:13 17:6 70:38 72:8 fall 12:47 17:35 18:9.45 18:46 19:7 20:28 26:44 27:8 59:10,12 familiar 67:45 71:25 family 76:21 **FAO** 6:12 7:17 **FAO's** 6:45 far 15:6 25:38 28:9,40 73:42 74:1 78:5,23 **farmed** 31:21 farms 44:39 fashion 49:23 favor 9:28 21:21 82:14 favorable 41:21 **FBA** 47:14 February 13:9 federal 15:19,24 19:33 19:38 20:47 21:2,3 30:28 52:35 53:11,18 53:33 56:17 58:20 60:27,34 61:1 62:33 75:8 77:20 81:46 FedEx 56:23 feed 18:21 26:40 27:14 feedback 3:25 14:40,45 fisheries' 52:1 58:21 32:11 36:44 50:42 52:30,43 59:1,8 64:16 65:44 66:2 76:40,45 fisheries-related 74:32

feel 16:15 36:40 72:17 fervent 79:4 **fiction** 30:43 **Fifth** 27:40 fight 47:26 figure 39:10 61:6,8 63:5 63:6,15,33 64:24 65:47 figured 65:42 figuring 62:29 file 61:28 fill 35:8 **filling** 67:14 final 12:39,39 27:21 51:10 64:31 finalization 64:42 68:26 finalize 68:23 finalized 27:26 68:25 **finalizing** 13:2 65:22 68:32 **finally** 7:42 66:9 77:39 finance 47:20,21 financial 3:36 67:29,37 68:13 77:40 find 8:47 51:41 52:24 59:7 78:45 79:40 81:40 **finding** 40:32 fine 43:42 49:16 60:39 finer 64:35 finfish 20:4.45 finish 4:28 finished 4:27,34 first 6:2 7:32 11:19 15:47 17:29,29,32,44 18:37 19:5 20:24,40 21:1,34 26:11,18,37 50:21 52:32 53:9 55:27 57:37 62:23 66:34 69:10 76:10,12 **fish** 6:10 13:25,38 14:22,24 30:17,46 31:1,5,11,34 35:43 39:33,36,46 40:3,11 41:16,34 45:38 47:10 62:3 fisheries 1:12 5:10,23 5:40 6:12,18,24,29,42 7:15 8:19 10:22 20:37 22:36 24:39 27:40 29:24 35:36 38:6,39 42:17 46:28 50:38,44 51:2,41 53:27,42 54:16,38 57:18 74:2

fisherman 61:35 62:43 fishermen 13:40 40:46 40:48 41:3 62:48 63:4 fishermen's 34:42 76:48 **fishery** 26:28 33:19 42:23 44:28 51:39 57:3 63:10 66:42 67:7 75:8 76:18,19 77:2,6 77:44 fishing 6:25,36 10:7,37 11:38 24:48 33:11,14 34:31 35:23 36:4,24 37:16 41:31 43:1 44:22 47:38 49:1,31 51:28 53:29 54:12 55:1 56:34 fishing-related 57:38 five 17:22 53:28 61:29 fixed-year 67:3 flag 27:13 flagship 31:34 fleet 47:23 flexibility 13:26 52:26 floor 9:44 15:44 67:30 Florida 21:11 flowed 35:33 **FMP** 56:40,41 57:27 58:4 focus 6:23,30,38 10:24 11:39 20:12 21:33 33:5 35:20 37:46,47 47:32 61:45 75:34 77:5 focused 11:36 20:4 29:25 30:11 36:44 48:40 62:1 focuses 76:17 focusing 11:6 **FOIA** 3:33 54:36,37 55:6 77:20 folks 9:22 16:2 24:17 33:41 38:40 39:29,35 39:39 58:36 61:48 63:44 66:13 67:35 73:2 79:25,25,29 follow 27:31 57:8 70:32 80:40 81:7 **follow-on** 57:23 follow-up 16:14 24:36 28:32 71:48 followed 25:17 followed/met 60:9 following 7:8 73:44 **food** 6:31 19:43 47:15 footage 61:24 62:6 63:16 footnotes 55:11

75:19 79:38

62:36

footprint 30:31 76:38 **goals** 75:3 81:29 **forage** 47:10 further 5:20 9:24,36 google 32:3 73:3 hand's 39:16 force 34:22 75:4 13:47 15:34 17:36 government 45:11 52:9 handbook 68:1 20:34 29:12 39:14 60:34,40,41,42 61:2,8 forecasts 38:48 handbooks 68:21,26,27 foreign 40:30 40:43 43:44 50:3 government's 15:19 hands 4:25 8:2,11 9:26 59:11 63:25 66:13 forgot 78:26 9:37 37:34 44:10 50:6 30:28 formal 20:29 40:11 67:20 70:8,43 71:10 **GPS** 61:43 63:42,48 80:40,42 81:15 71:14 72:26 75:26,39 grant 34:1 38:24 55:20 happen 25:14 46:14 formally 81:16 78:31,34 81:30 82:2 grants 5:18,20 53:4 happened 37:45 furthermore 17:21 **forms** 53:5 57:16,19 54:6 58:28 76:40 happening 27:8 29:6 **future** 3:43 6:42 17:45 graph 12:17 58:10 62:35,38 58:41 forth 75:3 18:22 20:41 21:26 graphic 14:33 **happens** 27:43 forthright 60:45 29:7 30:24 39:5 74:19 graphically 17:26 happy 11:26 14:4 16:30 Forum 75:38 80:6 23:1,6 59:6,18 68:30 grapple 32:6 forward 9:4 11:27 14:2 fuzzy 57:47 greater 31:29 36:11 hard 28:43 29:6 42:28 18:7,38 22:10,29 23:3 greatest 36:7 G 23:36 27:10 30:20,34 green 15:1 56:22 79:41 81:38 gage 33:25 32:20 36:12,20 37:19 grenadier 41:34 **harder** 58:32 **harmful** 38:47 43:17 50:48 63:29 gamut 20:14 ground 38:12 47:27 Hawaii 40:28 41:36 65:27 67:24 68:31 groundfish 51:32 gap 35:27 36:45 73:44 75:39 77:36 gaps 34:36 35:6,9 **grounds** 47:38 42:21 group 7:19 16:47 64:24 headquarter 22:14 79:18 82:22 gassed 40:33,37 41:8 forwarded 14:24 74:37 75:25,30 headquarters 13:11 gather 18:10 58:11 found 48:25,27 groups 20:8 45:31 14:42 76:41 80:27 gathered 60:12 four 12:19 51:30 73:27 gathering 22:24 33:39 growing 25:47 health 30:30.30 31:23 fourth 55:21 grown 25:36 32:25.46 49:1 GC 69:21 **FRA** 3:33 gear 25:36 28:20 51:40 growth 3:15,20 9:43 healthy 30:13 35:36 fragmentation 45:48 34:8 37:4 76:44 hear 14:32 20:42 22:43 61:46,46 framework 51:48 52:5 28:10 35:32 41:24,39 general 6:27 12:18 **Guard** 57:42 54:18 13:15 18:17 20:3.13 quess 7:44 8:47 9:2 41:46 60:13 68:5 framing 10:1 20:44 21:23 26:3 51:3 14:10,14 23:23 45:19 71:27.44 72:10.12 fraught 68:46 71:19 45:25 58:17 59:39 heard 7:2,19 16:2 19:30 free 16:15 72:17 generally 22:2 60:1 63:14 65:15 20:5,14 34:19 41:33 **Freedom** 52:36 generation 13:40 67:16 68:48 69:15 43:45 frequency 3:42 80:6 generic 32:43 72:34 78:39.46 heart 71:32 frequently 37:42 gentrification 47:28 quidance 3:36 5:19,20 heavily 11:6 fresh 40:40 getting 13:39 28:40 8:22 11:43 21:17 **held** 6:6 18:18 54:29,34 friendly 59:3 31:38,47 33:44 36:44 52:24,41 53:2,5 54:13 **hello** 67:34 71:30 **Friends** 19:42 38:19,29 41:1 52:22 56:15 58:26,28,33 help 5:23 18:6,36 22:28 front 19:4 20:42 23:34 57:35 60:32 65:5,6 64:37,38 67:28,42 31:2 34:46 39:28 68:18,20 75:29,39,47 23:34,45 29:33 32:15 41:20 43:12 46:13 68:31 34:33 36:31 38:17 48:15,39 73:2 75:48 76:26,28 77:40 giant 24:12,40 61:28 39:8 51:9 gigabytes 63:18 77:43 helped 34:28 frozen 40:33,37 41:8 **guided** 53:47 helpful 20:10 79:48 give 9:20 16:8 21:37 fulfill 42:29 guidelines 6:5,21 58:25 80:16 81:41 27:11 44:12 45:13 Gulf 17:46 19:21 20:11 fulfilling 60:40 51:14 54:47 55:31 **helping** 46:20 full 32:17 55:1 69:43 56:20 59:17 61:13 23:14,18,22,36 herring 51:32 fully 17:9 47:43 80:29 hey 14:29 59:4 70:41 **gut** 66:45 function 36:3 40:4,7 given 7:34,39 20:5 hi 14:28 37:37 44:6 Н functional 8:24 76:30 71:37 81:26 21:14 25:44 28:6,20 functioning 49:34 35:47 43:11 53:29 high 20:2 Habitat 20:37 75:25,29 55:39 58:19 79:35 80:42 75:37 high-level 51:15,48 functions 43:11 44:37 gives 12:18 Hagg 51:2 52:5,19 highlight 19:14 21:1 48:42 52:11 half 73:1,12 **giving** 75:44 glad 26:47 40:22 71:48 fund 5:21 28:2 **halt** 41:10 funded 52:10 72:10 hand 4:14 8:47 9:35 highlighted 10:42 15:1 Global 6:9 **funding** 5:9,17 14:20 37:30 44:1 50:4 54:25 highlighting 31:32 **funds** 5:8,15,21,24 goal 31:14 69:18 63:46 67:30 71:24,31 highlights 17:42 18:12

highly 17:8 57:20 Hilborn 6:11 hired 45:22,32 historical 47:37 hit 4:45 17:39 59:20 **HMS** 51:25 hold 5:6 7:10 43:39 **holders** 46:12 home 74:41 honest 65:21 honestly 44:36 Honolulu 41:27 honored 64:16 hope 17:33 22:21 23:32 25:3 33:29 34:46 35:17 43:25 68:4 72:12,16 79:4 80:23 hopefully 16:36 24:22 24:25 28:33 41:7 48:27 50:12 61:24 63:44 hopes 52:42 hoping 34:44 81:21 host 4:16,43 5:28 44:2 63:45 76:36 hosted 6:17 hosting 4:48 79:11 Hotel 79:14 hour 11:26 60:38 73:1 73:12 81:21 hours 60:39 63:18 house 15:24 45:23 Howell 74:4 hub 35:35 **Huffman** 74:25 huge 49:20 human 47:22 hundreds 63:18 i.e 12:38 idea 32:12 45:12 68:45 69:41,43,48 70:23,29 ideas 7:9 32:40 34:16 35:27 36:39 75:25 76:26 identification 35:27

i.e 12:38 idea 32:12 45:12 68:45 69:41,43,48 70:23,29 ideas 7:9 32:40 34:16 35:27 36:39 75:25 76:26 identification 35:27 identified 17:32 24:12 27:4 identify 49:40 identifying 34:47 78:1 image 54:46 55:5 imagery 56:34 images 62:30 imagine 29:2,6 82:17 imagining 28:43 IMO 6:34 impact 20:21 74:9,11

impacts 33:9,26 74:5 **implement** 53:6 58:29 58:33 66:41,44 implementation 8:23 34:41 51:36 53:2 76:29 77:33 implemented 30:35 51:21 implementing 48:38 51:48 58:24 implications 74:17 importance 32:44 important 6:40 22:1,42 23:18 24:46 26:46 31:26 39:28 52:48 64:29 81:45 **imported** 40:30 77:9 importing 42:24 imports 42:24 impressive 66:36 improve 36:2 improvement 13:20 improving 6:23 29:27 in-person 79:3 incentive 24:23,40 25:4 25:10 incentives 24:25 incentivize 24:20 include 20:18,20 25:35 39:5 54:5,14,17 58:17 58:29 78:39 included 6:7 12:26 13:24 59:33 76:26 including 3:27 11:16 18:1,2 24:47 34:38 75:6 inclusion 35:13 incorporate 14:1 incorporated 67:42 increase 37:6 increased 37:8 59:47 59:48 increasing 31:17 35:11 42:24 increasingly 31:37 32:45 incredible 38:10,44 incredibly 22:1 indefinitely 53:15,31 independent 33:16 indicate 4:12 43:48 indicated 9:13 13:33 63:44 76:5 indicating 4:16 39:43

indication 39:37

individual 16:47 19:40

22:12 23:35 28:27,38

indicator 62:3

53:3 55:47 68:2 industries 45:43 industry 10:16,41,48 11:38 21:15 24:48 30:25 31:31 34:10,46 35:14 37:3 38:22,46 39:1 44:22,29 45:1 46:1,7 48:45 49:26 52:10 54:12 55:22 60:20 62:7 67:10 industry's 49:41 67:2 industry-funded 56:45 inexpensive 62:41 63:20 infer 22:41 inferior 77:9 influence 28:19 info 54:41 inform 18:6,41 22:28 informal 81:13 informally 69:47 **information** 3:32 7:23 12:10 18:10,20,27,37 19:33 20:17 22:26 25:21,29 30:47 31:4,7 31:47.48 33:18 44:26 45:4,35 48:18 52:21 52:36 53:32 54:40 56:35 57:17,22,36,44 58:6 60:12 61:43,45 62:30,37,38 63:5 69:22 73:39 77:17 79:5 80:44.47 informed 31:3 44:25 52:27 informing 33:31 infrastructure 35:21,30 37:15 39:11 ingredients 65:38 initial 26:22 61:5 **initially** 59:48 77:5 initiated 11:40 initiative 22:11 initiatives 10:43 48:26 innovation 34:16 **input** 6:25 10:16 11:46 11:48 12:12,16 18:11 18:12 20:35 24:45 25:1 27:6 32:41 34:13 35:18 36:19 42:6,48 43:21 45:14 48:10 61:4 75:24 **inputs** 12:34 **inside** 23:22 Instagram 32:32 **instances** 54:10,45

instantiated 38:42 instructed 42:15 insurance 47:20 integration 75:26 78:15 intend 27:10 intended 41:44 69:41 75:5 76:39 intensive 54:45 intent 19:20 20:28,39 23:33,46,48 24:33 25:7 27:8 70:19,23,29 interaction 26:12,24 38:6,16 39:24,33,48 63:39 75:26 interest 17:40 32:39 43:48 47:25 55:29 63:44 80:9 interested 14:14 36:44 44:46 interesting 29:44 71:39 interests 5:46 interface 55:35 interference 68:4 interject 60:22 internal 18:30 20:36 33:33 internally 19:15 21:28 international 6:28,34 6:35 7:15 internationally 6:21 interrelated 37:14 intervene 7:21 introduction 3:17 50:25 inventory 34:34,38,47 35:17,27 36:45 investigate 77:47 Investor 33:41 investors 33:43 invitations 79:6 involved 14:41,43 38:4 38:20 39:20,21 46:20 50:47 64:44 69:3 **Island** 42:43 **Islands** 43:27 **Issenberg** 2:11 67:31 67:33 68:10 69:12,39 70:21,28,41 77:41,47 issue 5:9 6:40 28:46 40:2,2,35 42:46 44:42 46:44 59:45 65:24 69:44 77:10 81:42 issues 6:25,37,38,46 10:30 15:42 20:13 26:16,33 27:13 34:11 34:14,28,31 35:12 36:8,23 42:16 44:17 44:18,22,26,32 49:27 50:40 52:38,42 63:15

57:3

64:28.29 67:46 74:29 75:30,36 76:27 77:4 77:21 78:2 80:44,47 81:14 it'd 29:1 It'll 15:44 26:42 item 4:13,17,23,41 8:9 9:42 10:21 14:15 16:25 29:21 37:24,31 39:15 42:12 43:45 44:5 50:4,22 61:12 67:21,26,27 71:8,14 71:18,31 73:20,35 77:15 items 14:12 71:19,21 **IUCN** 6:10

IUU 6:25,36

January 41:27 77:34 **JEN** 2:12 **iob** 19:16 46:14.47 jobs 35:19,21 join 72:13 joining 72:11 79:43 joking 81:27 journal 75:17 July 59:2 65:9,36,44 66:12 68:16 77:24 iump 51:13 58:38 jumping 53:9 June 6:7 33:30 59:20 59:32 65:13,22,39,41 65:43 77:24 jurisdictions 57:39

75:15

Κ Keeling 51:1 keep 22:8 47:27 60:19 60:26,44 **keeping** 81:39 **Keith** 51:2 Kelly 2:9 11:12,19,22 14:6,8,28 15:33,34,35 15:39 16:19,20 37:25 42:11,33 50:1 81:27 Kelly's 81:18 **key** 11:9 19:6 27:25 32:35 35:35,47 kick 46:6 kick-started 46:6 kicks 20:28 kinds 36:6 41:40 47:44 49:8 KINNEEN 1:33 65:31 **Kitty** 1:41 5:34 7:30,43

61:11,16 62:13,21

78:12,40 80:2,20,33 81:11 knew 37:41 knowing 65:38 knowledge 44:30 45:36 49:12,14,40,46 known 10:42 35:2 41:38 45:47

lab 41:29 label 39:34,45 40:11 labor 6:35.37 lack 6:25 laid 17:27 land 44:35 74:43 landed 10:4 language 54:5,20,25,32 69:16,36 **LAP** 67:6 large 34:32 36:14 43:2 61:44 62:41 77:10 largely 48:2 lastly 7:17 51:7 52:47 53:44 54:27 late 4:18 18:44.45 50:11 50:12 65:13.22 latest 10:11 33:24 **Latin** 7:11 Laura 51:1 law 3:32 77:17 laws 52:32 55:14 58:44

layers 26:15,28 31:47 lead 22:14 47:6 59:47 leadership 21:31 31:16 leading 12:5 30:4 leads 48:23 59:48 lean 40:6 learn 39:46 learned 33:40 **learning** 6:47 7:1,9 61:40 leave 54:45 61:21 66:8 **led** 12:24 left 4:8,26 51:23,30 legal 52:20 legislation 74:32 legislative 74:23,37 length 6:41 lengthy 24:13 lens 23:39 35:18 **let's** 7:31,48 8:10,27,44 9:6 16:23 23:10 37:28 43:43 64:20 68:35 78:48 letter 30:2 **letters** 64:21

lawsuit 53:22

lift 23:47 light 27:39 lights 71:35 likewise 35:15 limit 4:19 limitations 25:22 **limited** 11:16 31:28 47:42 57:38 80:45 line 5:28 52:23 53:1 lines 22:4 33:31 56:37 link 7:27 32:35 linked 6:13 15:3 LinkedIn 32:32 **linking** 32:45 list 8:3 11:37 15:20 22:20 41:1 52:2,13 63:46,47 listed 15:26 21:14 51:24,34 56:2 59:1 listening 3:24 18:18 19:34,37 71:34,39 literature 25:27 little 8:41 10:24 11:14 11:32 12:26,30 15:11 16:3,8 17:36 19:12 22:40 26:9 27:31 33:43 38:19 43:5 50:10 51:43 56:44 57:35,47 58:9 65:34 70:26 71:36 living 26:31,37 load 23:34 **lobster** 21:15 **local** 40:40,45 41:2,30 41:31 44:35 locally-sourced 41:32 locations 21:32 logbook 57:9 62:38 logbooks 57:18 logging 55:32 logistics 47:20 **logo** 39:36,40 long 10:15 25:41 52:16 53:19 long-33:26 long-standing 36:21 long-term 34:3,8 36:28 37:16 74:17 longer 10:44 21:46 look 8:35 11:26 18:5,38 21:28 22:39 26:14,25 30:20,34,34 32:48 33:38 34:14,36 35:19 36:20 37:19 38:9,27

level 20:2 22:47 40:36

59:47 60:37 63:2

liability 36:5

licenses 41:5

40:15 44:23 45:7 46:4 46:13 49:33,34,43 63:29 67:24 68:31 69:16,22 70:22 75:12 75:38 78:19 79:18 82:21 looked 4:46 38:2 looking 5:5 17:29 18:31 18:38,40 24:20 25:32 25:36 26:13 33:37,46 34:26 36:24 37:4,6,13 40:18 42:33 46:30 48:48 76:40 looks 26:19 34:8 42:34 50:32 lost 48:6 lot 10:40,40,46 11:3 12:14 19:2 20:6,30,44 21:16 23:34 29:40 33:16,41 35:39,41,45 39:25 40:32 44:41 45:6,8,16 49:24 50:46 51:5 52:21,29 53:23 55:28 56:35 57:21 60:13.30 63:32 73:39 74:42 75:22 lots 10:16 13:39 30:32 30:37 **loud** 22:44 28:7,10 **love** 35:2,31 36:33 41:39.45 45:14 low 45:37 68:6 lower 30:31 45:44 luck 71:38 **LUKENS** 2:12

М

machine 61:40 MacPherson 75:44 **MAFAC** 3:27 29:34,47 30:33,40 31:1,8 36:17 38:33 39:9 46:4 49:23 MAFAC's 11:16 31:15 49:18 magic 14:35 Magnuson 27:41 44:38 54:2,7 57:43 67:1 69:25 74:28,31 Magnuson-Stevens 47:3 52:34 main 6:41 46:25 74:7 maintain 22:4,9 47:37 maintained 55:7 63:16 maintaining 54:24 55:17,18 maintains 62:16 major 6:9 29:40 36:24

72:8

majority 66:1 makeup 4:21 making 14:2 21:34 41:34,34 48:9,9 52:40 56:25 57:15 69:20 70:15 79:47 **mammals** 20:16 manage 7:15 47:34,34 58:11 62:47 managed 42:39 52:45 58:44 management 6:5,18,20 6:46 7:2,6 10:46 15:23 22:35,36,37 24:39 43:13 46:28 47:21 58:21 74:47 75:1,11,12,13,18,32 75:35 76:18,19 77:2 77:44 managing 27:41 75:42 manner 59:9 map 12:3 26:15 51:33 maps 26:14 Marc 1:27,32 11:23 44:6 73:9 March 5:14 14:39 68:14 68:14 **Marian** 75:44 mariculture 20:45 marine 5:10 10:22 20:16 29:23 42:36.39 42:41 75:19 Maritime 6:34 market 11:1 33:4,8,32 33:37 36:37 38:21.27 41:20,43 42:21 45:36 49:28 marketing 3:14,27 9:43 10:21,26 11:15 13:34 29:22 30:10 32:14,29 32:39,44 33:3 36:37 38:5,21 44:19 45:5,9 45:12,20,22,30,33,45 46:14.42 47:17 48:3 48:12,15 49:18 76:43 76:47 marketplace 30:13 Mary 16:15 Maryland 79:13 material 47:2,33,34,39 78:39 materials 81:35 matter 7:22 25:42 32:6 50:17 51:12 73:15,30 82:23 **matters** 14:13 mean 15:30 47:26

65:37 69:18.34 meaning 53:41 meaningful 45:3 means 4:14 43:8 56:23 64:30 69:38 measures 75:1,6,9,19 mechanism 27:42 56:16 62:35 mechanisms 31:15 56:14 67:14 media 32:29 meet 17:23 59:21 65:13 65:22,41 75:34 meeting 1:17 3:41 4:7 4:37,44,46,48 5:2,5,6 5:21,25,29 6:39 13:45 16:10 22:7,7 36:18 42:14 59:1,32 65:4,12 65:43 66:23 72:18,33 72:37,43,48 73:34,38 73:41 75:40 76:33,36 78:5,42,43 79:2,4,9 79:11,18,26,27 meetings 5:4,40 22:48 22:48 48:29 64:15,20 65:40.46 69:27.27 79:42 80:11,24,38,39 80:43,46 81:3,4,7,15 81:41,44 member 48:1,13 69:7 76:9 members 7:33 37:23 42:11 44:29,29 47:48 50:3 68:44 70:35 **members'** 70:17 memo 5:14 16:1 75:45 76:2 memorandum 75:42 mention 50:48 51:5,29 52:48 57:6 mentioned 13:6 14:19 18:33 34:39 35:20 36:17,22 42:5 55:25 60:22 78:40 merged 18:32 merging 18:27 message 68:6 74:28 messages 32:24 33:2 messaging 19:16 met 1:26 43:23 50:35 **Mexico** 17:46 19:21 20:11 23:36 mic 16:23 microbials 6:31

microphone 71:35

microphones 9:27

Mid-Atlantic 12:4 79:10

mid- 18:45

mind 47:19 48:31 60:44 **mindful** 60:14 **minimal** 60:19 **minimum** 27:48 minor 15:41 Minority 33:48 minutes 4:20 10:2 15:44 50:13 73:25,27 misinterpreted 27:20 missed 11:26 78:14 81:20 **missing** 27:19 **mission** 41:47 mistaken 76:14 mix 19:38 20:1 **MMPA** 57:18 **mode** 49:32 modernization 33:35 33:44 34:7,7,16 Modernizing 13:25 modified 26:32 **modify** 80:10 moment 4:7 20:24 28:34 43:41 44:8 55:42 63:14 64:4 68:8 monitor 55:37 monitoring 3:30,31 6:24 13:22 50:23,44 51:16 54:48 55:41 56:47 57:2.27 66:41 67:2 77:14,17,19 monoxide 40:34 Monterey 79:2 82:22 month 32:36 80:28 monthly 80:8,39 81:6 81:15,40,44 months 12:40 16:42 17:17,31 43:17 monument 42:42 77:11 monuments 42:36,46 Moore 1:34 14:7,26,27 14:30,36,45,48 15:7,9 15:14,28 37:35,36 39:13,16,17 79:23,24 82:9,10 Morgan 2:8 8:28 11:29 11:34 12:32 13:5,13 13:41 14:34 16:34 17:1 19:48 50:32 morning 4:3,27 mortality/injury 57:19 motion 8:14,32,38,45 9:25,27,31,32 10:34 82:6,8 move 4:36 8:18 13:1 14:2 18:7 19:11 22:9 23:3 24:20 27:10

milestone 27:2

29:43 50:5,48 65:27 65:45 73:44 moved 35:41 64:17 82:10 moving 22:29 64:30 77:36 MPA 56:44 MRIP 74:8 MSA 3:33 8:24 56:44 76:31 78:14 MSE 39:20,22 multiple 19:6 22:45 muted 73:10

Ν

name 50:45 60:21 71:24 name's 50:36 **NARA** 53:21 **nation** 45:41 national 1:8 3:28 5:10 8:19 10:28 11:10 13:25,33 22:11,47 30:7,16 31:14 32:8,13 32:36 34:22 38:45 42:36,42 45:45 51:46 52:25,28,40 53:17 55:42 63:1,10 75:41 76:33 79:38 nationally 35:29 38:42 49:1 nationwide 23:44 30:10 native 25:29,43 26:4 27:32 naturalized 25:43 26:4 28:6 nature 35:48 41:35 58:13,16 NCCOS 18:29 22:23 near 12:38 29:7 71:31 necessarily 5:2 48:36 54:20 55:33 56:48 62:4.39 necessary 5:8 8:38,40 9:34 58:14 68:3 need 4:12 10:42 19:16 29:41 34:44 38:31 43:7,48 49:2,33,42 52:26 54:41 55:3 56:15 60:14,33,44,46 60:48 62:34 64:22 65:26,32 71:10 75:46 80:26,39 82:8 needed 12:41 34:17 60:27 69:22 needs 6:19 7:5 35:7,7 46:12 49:22,26 60:36 60:43

53:37,38 55:19 63:13

noted 38:20 75:45 77:2 off-shore 47:25 43:30 56:28 negative 11:2 offer 4:10 43:4 65:7 **NEPA** 4:28,35 7:38 8:14 77:8 orchestrated 30:2 8:20,21,23 9:21 23:39 **office** 15:23 16:25 **notice** 19:20 20:27,39 31:48 26:13 34:20 38:41 25:34 28:29,34,37 21:38 27:7 53:18 order 7:34 10:3,14 11:7 76:24,29 58:30 59:42 17:3,24 23:42 42:29 net 42:16,34 noticed 66:19,21 80:40 offices 13:10,11 21:28 43:19 55:2 57:45 **never** 15:29,29,29 22:13 51:1 60:43 61:27,34 75:3 81:4 new 8:23 26:33 34:16 noting 6:24 53:27 54:6 official 53:13 69:21 77:12 34:17,45 37:10 42:48 **novel** 61:5 officially 69:2 orders 54:8 74:40 42:48 43:18 53:26 November 12:10 18:19 **offline** 16:15 **Oregon** 21:22 organization 6:35 55:46,48 60:31 67:42 76:4,12 offshore 75:21,30,36 **NPFMC** 77:25 Oliver 1:36 42:14 71:25 30:45 76:17,29 77:1,29 **News** 31:34 **NS1** 15:42 71:27,29 72:3,7,14,19 Organization's 6:36 newsletter 31:35 nuance 66:38 72:24 organizations 30:4 **NGOs** 6:9 19:39 number 4:33 9:39,42 **OMB** 5:14,19 15:22 47:14,16 10:24 12:3 18:18,39 nice 61:24 66:35 onboarding 55:46 oriented 10:5 nicely 72:9 27:4 29:31 32:29 33:7 once 9:21 23:21 25:8 originally 5:29 **OSTP** 34:25 Nicholas 8:4 44:3 64:1 36:15 51:3 59:32 27:16 56:16 66:9 71:1,23 72:26 **numbers** 42:33 68:22,25 82:20 outcomes 3:40 73:41 **nutrition** 30:3 31:7 **outlets** 30:46 Nies 1:35 8:35 27:28,29 one's 49:17 28:22 29:11 37:31 32:17,43,46 45:32 one-pager 6:1 outlined 34:42 43:34,36,42 44:15 ongoing 60:46 76:9 outlining 45:40 59:29 65:19 68:37,38 0 online 64:39 77:34 **outlook** 74:23 69:24 70:4 82:12,12 **O'Brien** 2:13 11:13 onus 69:2,10,14 output 6:25 open 21:5 22:4,8 42:47 nine 12:45 16:24,29 23:15,16,31 outreach 18:1,15 19:25 NMFS 9:2 12:24 22:13 24:16,44 25:31 26:36 72:32 32:44 54:16 62:16,17 76:5 27:44 28:26 29:15 **opened** 53:25 outside 23:27 24:18.30 76:25,37,41 79:46 34:19 opening 36:22 25:13 45:31 57:32 **objective** 70:13,20 operating 70:33,39 58:6 80:23 **NMFS's** 77:30 74:43 80:17 overall 9:15 10:36 **no-** 76:37 **objectives** 7:2 30:19,42 operational 80:44.47 13:19 29:29 30:5,27 **no-cost** 5:12 43:22,23 44:36 57:28 **operations** 55:1 56:35 37:1 60:26 **NOAA** 1:12 5:18,19,22 75:12 74:22 overarching 31:14 32:4 34:25 37:40,43 **objects** 35:10 **OPERATOR** 8:6 44:6 overly 60:15 38:3,6,7,37,39 50:37 obligations 42:29 61:13 64:3 71:3 72:28 overview 3:17 8:40 53:26,41 54:38 69:21 **obscure** 54:41 55:4 73:9 12:2 51:15 68:29 75:2 obscured 54:46 **opinion** 60:42 75:44 77:15,42 non-13:11 25:28 57:37 owner 61:35 62:17,28 observations 57:30 opportunities 4:11 non-core 49:45 **observer** 53:32 58:12 16:46 19:10 21:29,40 62:31 63:10 **non-EM** 57:46 60:10 62:37 22:18,31,45 26:22 ownership 68:43 69:5 non-fishing 57:40 observers 13:23 57:20 35:11,23 37:4 40:15 **owns** 61:32,35 62:25,33 non-native 27:37 28:5 43:26 obtain 5:21 28:42,46,47 obtained 54:37 opportunity 3:24 7:4,13 10:12,32 11:13,17 non-naturalized 28:42 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S obtains 55:8 non-regulatory 12:24 obviously 6:29 38:41 16:31,32,39 17:5 13:7,46 14:11 18:48 19:5 26:31 27:5 81:15 **p.m** 1:27 4:2 50:18,19 nondisclosure 58:18 Occasionally 40:2 27:17,24 28:24 36:11 73:16,17,31,32 82:24 normal 74:22 80:17 occasions 33:8 37:11,23 43:30 44:12 Pacific 4:5,42 5:8 12:43 normally 47:6 occur 76:11 58:30 65:1,6,14 71:11 21:10 23:22 42:42 77:28 79:7 80:25,27 North 4:42 5:7 12:43 occurring 39:47 43:27 47:48 50:14,14 47:47 65:31 66:4,23 80:30 81:22 65:31 66:5,23,25,31 occurs 56:17 66:31 76:35 ocean 11:4 18:3,47 opposed 5:29 9:30 72:39,43 73:13 76:35 **Northeast** 21:14,19 22:24 26:38 38:45 66:32 82:16 77:8 51:31 59:4 77:1 OCEANIC 1:8 opposite 21:12 packaging 39:41 Northwest 21:22 **opposition** 20:1,3,7 October 16:5,10 18:9 page 70:13 **note** 17:28 26:46 53:16 65:32 75:40 76:7 21:13,23 **paid** 52:6 pandemic 4:45 81:42 56:45 57:16 59:3 67:5 77:26,28 78:43 79:2 optimization 31:43 72:47 79:18,27,28 82:22 options 25:33 43:6,21 Panel 38:33 48:1

paper 7:25 parlance 25:34 part 10:20 11:8 15:24 20:20 26:28 30:22 38:30 41:19 54:4,10 54:17 60:28 69:1 70:26 participants 29:18 participate 5:39 7:13 15:25 39:28 participated 38:18 79:47 participating 79:39 participation 15:48 49:13 82:21 particular 14:20 18:25 26:27 29:34 33:42 34:29 38:37 39:40,42 43:4 49:37 53:43 58:33 66:40 80:19 particularly 14:14 29:46 33:5 36:25,43 38:27 39:7 44:18 48:19 60:31 68:42 parties 52:17 54:23 55:17 56:32 57:26 partly 34:2,3 38:46,47 partner 22:32 33:23 34:37 38:9 partnered 33:22 partners 18:2,3 22:23 26:38 28:11 31:33 32:35 36:42 57:42 partnership 30:3 32:17 32:43 39:3 45:32 parts 61:37 party 53:35,36,40,47 54:13,29,34 55:8,23 56:12,38 57:13,29 **passes** 9:31 path 28:10 29:43 32:9 35:25 43:25,26 paths 49:43 pathway 36:28 39:10 Paul 2:10 9:44 11:21 13:32,47 15:36 16:21 29:16 37:25,33,37 39:13,32 42:7,10,40 45:28 48:25 49:48 50:7,24 79:37,37 pause 9:35 53:35 57:5 63:27 64:8 67:22 70:45 71:12,16 72:22 73:8,48 78:33,36 82:4 82:7,18 **paused** 53:22 **pay** 67:1 **paying** 66:24

peach 11:30 peer 6:15 26:42 **PEIS** 17:34 22:29,30 28:8,23 **PEISs** 20:24,33 22:15 **people** 16:13 20:12 24:20,25,43 31:8,35 32:22,35 34:17 37:5 40:13,16 41:17,32 45:1,7 50:47 51:4 63:33 65:7,14 79:1 percent 40:31 42:22 60:47 62:4 74:43 perfect 67:3 performance 55:38 57:29 60:6 period 10:15 19:31 33:40 63:35 64:12 68:26 72:33 permissions 29:3 permit 23:35 25:11 28:27,30,30,46 permitee 23:26 permits 23:24,44 51:28 permitting 29:9 person 4:20 5:6,6,18,25 74:26 76:11,35 79:19 **perspective** 35:37 36:9 39:27 46:29,32 48:19 48:35,46 persuasive 30:33 **Pettinger** 1:37 8:12,13 8:18,33,39 66:15,16 67:16 82:14 phrasing 20:2 pick 4:8 65:42 pie 12:17 piece 11:19 54:32 pieces 10:13 17:40 29:48 pier 41:16 piggyback 40:26 **pike** 18:44 **pilot** 51:34 58:42 pinch 59:13 place 24:42 43:11 49:4 76:35 77:12 places 17:41 25:47 plaguing 40:35 **plan** 6:45 7:10,17 12:48 35:19 55:41 56:6 74:4 75:37 76:13,23 79:26 planetary 30:30 32:25 planning 4:42 5:28 7:41 13:36 18:6 21:15 22:38 38:47

platforms 32:30 **play** 10:44 25:7 37:18 46:27 **plays** 60:29 please 6:2,22,33 7:7,16 8:16 9:11,26 11:29 12:1,6,31 14:33 17:1 17:25,37 18:8,23,42 19:27,46,48 20:22,38 21:25,39 22:17,46 24:37 37:35 44:14 48:32 50:4 59:28 60:23 **plenty** 21:38 plethora 35:1 44:35 point 11:27 13:43 14:10 17:48 18:32 19:14 20:48 21:18 22:27 25:2,39 26:45,47 27:12 28:2,36 35:14 38:7 40:45 46:22,37 49:16 51:6 52:48 55:44 58:19 64:35 66:7 69:40 pointed 43:7 62:25 pointing 40:13 points 35:46 36:48 46:19,21 48:46 49:3 52:19 policies 52:30 54:23 58:31 **policy** 3:35 25:40,42 26:3 27:35 30:23 32:6 45:40 51:46 53:45 60:35 64:13 66:27.47 67:6,11,28 68:12,23 68:40 69:1 70:12 77:39,42 **pollock** 66:21 poor 15:11,42 16:1 **pops** 32:4 population 30:26 portal 56:8 62:30 portals 55:30 portions 61:45 75:45 posed 71:9 77:47 **position** 69:6,19 positive 11:2 33:1 possibility 4:47 possible 17:14 48:21 60:19 66:3,11 77:38 possibly 30:16 **post** 70:17,33 postponed 76:33 potential 25:46 28:5 30:18 48:11 57:41 58:6 74:8 78:1

39:34 66:42 **powers** 14:35 practicable 58:35,39 practices 6:46 58:41 75:36 pre-COVID 41:25 preceding 67:39 precise 57:48 precisely 72:40 predict 25:6 preemptive 52:41 preemptively 64:17 prefer 77:31,37 81:43 preferably 43:39 preliminary 18:29,47 prepare 31:5 prepared 15:1 16:9 17:34 preparing 6:43 preplanning 24:26 **PRESENT** 1:31 2:6 presentation 4:35 5:35 9:14 14:9 15:3 16:37 17:36 18:13 19:13 26:8 27:31 42:11 50:23.33 59:18.27 63:26 66:18,19 67:24 70:44 75:43 presentations 43:45 47:45 50:2 75:23 79:48 presented 42:33 50:38 64:25 presenters 39:15 76:21 presenting 50:41 President's 35:19 presiding 1:28 pressure 35:40,45 36:48 46:19,20 48:46 49:3 **pressures** 10:47,48 11:3 36:24 48:41 pretty 38:35 39:2 41:17 48:3 59:4 66:36 67:35 68:46 69:33 previous 52:30 58:2,31 **PRIA** 42:42 price 33:39 40:45 47:6 47:11 prices 40:44 primarily 33:20 77:48 primary 21:33 51:19,29 51:40 52:31 60:5 67:9 prior 41:28 **priorities** 7:3 14:20 prioritize 55:45 prioritized 11:37

potentially 24:32 29:4

plans 9:3,19 15:21

79:17

priority 58:36 74:21

private 54:21 58:42 59:33 64:31 67:36 79:17 probably 4:19 11:9 promote 32:33,34 publishing 26:23 53:26 quick 12:2 51:15 52:19 15:10,16 18:45 26:44 70:24,30 **Puerto** 21:10 53:44 56:19 67:35 Promoting 3:19 28:42 44:47 45:2 pull 32:22 34:26 73:40,47 52:48 56:27 62:43 promotion 10:27 30:17 **pulled** 55:12 quickly 11:31 34:9 66:2 65:13,23 77:26 pulling 50:33 proper 81:7 66:10 problem 8:30 49:22 properly 55:40 80:40 quite 8:46 19:36 20:42 **punch** 52:23 **problems** 46:31 49:40 proportion 40:29 purchasing 31:19 31:38 44:36 48:22 67:39 70:32 74:39 49:42 proposal 7:18 29:47 40:42 77:22 80:8 procedural 3:31,35 32:7 purpose 31:11 40:17 51:44 52:3,14,18 proposed 8:21 12:37 quota 41:41 55:36 53:48 67:28 68:12,24 65:36 76:27 purposes 6:31 34:38 quoting 69:35 pros 75:10 77:16,40,43 **pursue** 9:17 R procedure 81:8 prospect 65:22 **pursued** 45:12 procedures 8:24 54:22 protected 20:36 42:47 raise 50:4 71:30 **push** 49:16 59:5 68:2 76:30 pushing 38:25 42:38 protein 30:13 raised 8:2,11 20:13 process 13:1 16:46,48 proteins 47:22 44:10 63:47 65:20,24 17:18 18:21 19:7,11 **provide** 10:1 12:42 put 14:33 23:26 29:47 raising 4:14 37:18 44:1 19:44 20:29,31 21:46 13:47 29:10 31:3 43:10 54:25 64:34 63:45 35:15,22 36:9 44:12 69:1,18 73:40 77:12 ramifications 48:12 22:1,8,22,29,30,44 23:3,24,29,35,39 45:3,17 46:26,48,48 77:28 80:13 81:24 range 10:4,29 11:41 24:13,22 25:12 26:40 48:28 52:41 54:20,25 **puts** 69:5 25:33 29:36 34:31 28:1,2,8,33,48 29:9 58:9 59:1 62:42 64:16 putting 38:23 39:40 48:26 33:25 37:4 43:5,29 68:17,20 69:40 70:36 56:21 59:12 69:9,13 rate 12:38 46:27 48:7,37 54:43 rates 57:25 60:18 71:11 75:46 77:43 72:48 56:8 58:29 60:29 provided 6:5 7:25.43 rationale 66:32 Q 61:25 63:8.22 12:14.46 13:8 58:15 Rauch 1:38 9:9,10,12 70:36 74:27 75:25 processing 33:11 35:42 **quahog** 39:22 50:27 60:21,24 64:34 produce 31:32 61:31 76:24 77:15,36 78:32 qualified 57:20 78:19 79:34,35 80:36 75:16,17 81:35 quality 20:16 55:38,47 raw 47:2.33.34.38 52:22 **produced** 31:13,20 provider's 55:38 60:6,12,36 61:4 53:14,20,28,46 54:28 producers 41:21 providers 53:38 54:19 quantity 61:20 54:33,39,42 55:17 producing 31:30 55:46 question 8:47 9:8 15:15 56:33,34 58:11,14 **product** 26:43 40:37,38 provides 31:7 42:21 23:31 24:7,8,38 25:20 62:16 40:41.42 43:26 46:28 26:36 27:23,32,47 **Ray** 6:11 production 30:32 37:10 providing 48:45 62:47 39:19 42:31 43:35,36 reaching 76:20 38:28 49:32 **provisions** 52:35 54:3 45:18,25,28 53:10 reacting 59:8 products 53:30 77:9 80:38 55:27 56:32,36 57:23 reaction 66:45 profiles 31:31 **pub** 35:48 59:35,36,39 60:1,3 read 75:27 program 13:34 45:46 **public** 4:10,19,31 8:1 61:1,11,17,20,30,32 readily 45:37 52:6,7,11,39 55:46 18:11,12,17,28,41 ready 5:37 61:39 62:9,14,20,21 56:1,3,4,15 57:3,15 19:30,31,36,37 20:19 real 21:35 73:46 74:33 62:24 64:10 65:20 57:32,46 58:5 60:47 20:30 22:25,31 25:25 66:38 68:48 69:11,20 realization 5:1 69:25 70:12 71:48 61:5,36,38 62:5 63:2 25:33,37 28:11 30:11 reason 26:1 37:18 60:5 66:24,33,41,44 67:3 30:29,29,32 36:37 74:7 69.9 37:26 43:41,46,47 programmatic 17:19 question's 20:41 reasonable 47:11 49:23 20:20 25:22 27:11 44:4,7,12,30 47:39 questions 4:30 7:32,35 63:4 64:25 programs 13:19 34:2 63:37,43 64:2 70:16 7:37,40,42,45 9:25 reauthorization 74:28 34:32,35,47 35:22,29 70:48 71:2,4,19,21 14:4,6,30 15:34 16:14 rebuilding 56:6 51:19,20,24,26,27,30 72:27,32 77:7 18:34 20:40 23:6,10 recall 4:41 11:35 18:20 publication 19:19 20:27 41:15 42:13 53:16 52:8,17,46 53:3 54:48 29:12,19 36:27,34 56:46,48,48 58:13,17 publications 53:24 37:19,24,26,29 39:14 67:35 78:28 58:28,34,42 60:31 publicly 70:15 39:19 43:16,44 52:38 receive 53:10 56:18 publish 53:48 59:9,13 61:42 64:30,38,44 55:29 56:30 59:19,26 received 8:4 12:37 76:48 77:19,33 **published** 6:16 18:10 21:17 44:4 52:30 59:31 61:34 63:25 progress 21:34 18:46 19:20 22:26 68:30,35,40 70:5,8,43 53:12 55:28 57:23 26:20 27:17,25 51:45 71:24 75:43 project 28:25 70:47 71:9 72:21 projects 51:18,19,34 52:4,14 53:16,18,46 77:46 78:6,10,31 receives 53:42

receiving 78:20 recipient 55:20 reclassification 13:37 14:15 recognize 16:6 28:4 44:21 58:36 recognized 30:39 31:1 recognizing 52:25 recommend 8:19 36:42 46:34 49:6 74:20 recommendation 29:39 42:41 46:5 48:23 49:24 recommendations 3:22 3:28,40 12:28 13:29 13:30,46,48 14:17 29:24,32,35 30:15,28 42:32,35 49:19 73:4 78:35 recommended 76:25 recommending 25:24 record 50:18 53:11,23 53:33,43 55:9 62:33 62:34 73:16.31 82:24 records 52:35 55:7 56:16,17 77:20 **recoup** 67:8 recovered 67:7 recovering 72:9 recovers 46:7 recovery 34:3 66:24,29 66:41,43,48 recreational 74:5 recruiting 37:2 recruitment 34:15 49:29 recusal 67:38,41,48 68:21,41 69:46 70:1 77:45 78:2.3 recusals 3:37 67:29 68:13,19 69:27,32,36 69:37,42,45 77:41 recuse 68:45 reduce 11:38 13:30 **reduced** 40:45 refer 57:41 referred 27:35 **refine** 76:16 regarding 6:36,42,46 7:5 25:23 74:40 75:21 77:14 regards 42:32 region 5:19 14:42,46 38:40 42:26 45:7 51:38 67:48 68:2 regional 6:45,47 7:2 13:10 21:28 22:13

52:26.28 53:5 59:22 59:42 68:21,27 75:1 regionally 38:42 regions 7:4,10 13:23 14:40 17:45 22:16 34:48 52:26 66:20 Register 19:33 53:18 regs 67:37,42,46 regulation 51:20,24 regulations 8:23 12:22 44:35 57:8 58:27,34 67:38 76:29 regulations.gov 19:36 regulatory 11:42,48 12:21,33,37 13:3,4,12 13:38 15:20 54:18 **Reid** 1:39 24:5,6,36,38 25:16 46:40 61:18 62:10 75:20 reinforced 33:2 reiterating 26:48 rejuvenation 37:3 relate 49:31 related 32:28,41 34:2.3 34:31 36:36 39:11,33 67:47 75:36 **relates** 59:36 relationship 34:29,30 38:13,36 62:28 relative 25:12 59:10 64:25 releasable 55:3 release 62:17 released 5:14 62:18 65:3 77:23 relevance 52:40 relevant 26:40 27:21 31:44 61:27 remark 64:48 remember 14:37 39:32 46:42 remind 79:1 80:37 reminder 11:32 12:9 17:2 43:47 50:9 53:45 73:43 Remote 42:42 43:27 removal 77:11 remove 42:41 repeat 70:26 repeatedly 28:11 replacing 47:23 **replied** 74:10 reply 27:33 report 3:12 4:28 5:27 5:33,34 6:13 7:20,26 7:36,38,39,41,43 8:20 8:41,43 15:1,2,4,6 16:19 29:35 30:40

33:28 56:11,32,38 68:34 69:26,28,31,36 74:3 75:3,5,27 76:15 76:25,26 77:48 78:26 reported 57:13 76:10 reporting 13:19 56:43 57:6,17 78:2 reports 4:29 7:31,33,44 7:48 8:9 9:33,37,39 33:9 53:30 58:15,16 represent 48:2 Representative 74:25 74:27 representing 6:8 30:5 request 6:1,4 7:22 14:39 18:10 19:32 22:25 71:3 requested 16:3 62:18 62:37 68:15 76:1,44 77:11,25,27 requesting 5:22 requests 8:1,5 44:4,7 58:13 64:1,3 71:1,20 72:26 require 28:28 53:2 56:31 required 11:46 24:10 24:42 28:35 57:4 61:21 requirement 24:34 54:17 61:36 69:33 requirements 11:45 54:15 56:41 57:6 58:4 75:48 77:18,45 requires 30:42 69:25 research 38:11 resemble 64:48 resident 49:12,39 resilience 10:36 29:29 33:27 34:4,8 36:28 37:16 resiliency 76:47 resilient 30:24 35:36 resolved 64:28 69:47 resourced 17:9 resources 20:36 31:28 34:35 38:24 40:7 48:16 74:44 75:33 77:6 respect 45:5 69:6 respective 12:48 13:23 respects 10:18,39 respond 9:7 65:8 66:10 responding 81:18 **response** 9:15 37:32 46:25,37 77:30 responses 66:12 responsibilities 52:7

responsibility 60:26 67:10,12 responsible 60:4 69:21 responsiveness 29:34 rest 79:38 result 5:3 48:8 results 14:12 42:23 resumed 50:18 73:16 73:31 **resumes** 74:22 resuming 74:20 retain 53:19,28,31 retained 52:16 53:15,34 53:40 retention 49:29 53:26 return 4:22 61:22 revealed 10:40 reverse 61:34 review 6:15 11:46 13:11 13:45 16:3 54:22 55:31,37,43 57:24 59:39,44,47,48 60:16 60:18,27,29,30,37,38 60:43 61:25 62:29 65:7,33 66:30 67:9,9 67:11.15 68:15 76:3 reviewed 12:33 26:42 reviewers 55:47 61:6 reviewing 12:11 21:27 34:47 74:35 reviews 55:45 66:25 revised 67:40 68:12 revisions 67:36 74:8 revisited 57:15 **RFI** 18:33 **RFMOS** 6:9 **RFO** 6:15 richer 30:26 **Rico** 21:10 ride 61:24 risks 28:5 road 23:47 24:1 robust 57:20 role 34:41 36:36 37:17 40:12,21 45:34 46:23 46:26,47 49:11 60:28 60:34,35 61:1 77:48 room 79:9 round 21:19 row 17:29 55:20 rows 55:15 rule 12:39 rulemaking 54:31 58:39 rulemakings 52:29 53:3 rules 80:41 run 11:31 50:11,12 52:9 73:46 **RUNNELS** 9:6

	I	I	I
running 4:18 50:10	34:36 37:44 38:3,7,9	63:19 79:38	situation 55:21 61:2
runs 45:46	38:43	services 57:10,10,11	situations 54:11 55:16
	SeaGrant's 34:41	session 3:17 70:37	56:13 62:24,32 66:48
S	search 31:42	81:19	67:6
sad 11:25	seasoned 61:5	sessions 3:24 18:18	six 12:40 17:31 51:23
safe 37:45	seaweed 20:46	19:34,37 29:19	slide 6:2,3,22,33,44 7:7
safely 26:2	second 6:3 8:35,35	set 10:33 23:22 52:5,44	7:16 11:33 12:1,6,31
safety 6:32 19:43	12:27 16:25,41 20:41	54:23 55:11 56:20,30	12:35 13:5,13,41 14:3
Sam 9:10,11 13:46	52:37 55:27 61:39	57:20 58:32 60:18,18	15:5,12 17:1,25,37
50:24 60:16,23 64:33	69:24 82:11,12,13	60:32,41 64:13,20	18:8,23,34,42 19:27
64:48 78:19 79:34,45	secondary 55:37,43,45	65:48 75:3 79:12	19:28,46,48 20:22,38
80:20,35 81:9,24,26	59:38,44,46 60:16,27	sets 51:47	21:25,39 22:17,46
81:29	60:29,30 67:11 75:31	setting 57:16 58:37	23:4 50:46 51:14,42
sampling 52:11 57:25	secondly 79:10	59:10 60:48	53:8 54:1,35 55:10,24
67:2	section 3:22 10:10	seven 51:21 65:40	56:29 57:33,35 58:2
SAMUEL 1:38	11:12,32,36 16:26	seventh 76:33	58:22,46 59:2,15,37
saying 22:34 says 27:40 54:32 59:2	17:3 32:1 37:9 41:44 52:32,37 53:9 55:27	SF 4:15 44:1 63:45	59:37 slides 11:30 17:38
69:30,36 77:25	58:23 70:13	shape 41:20 48:15 share 7:13 8:29 16:12	19:29
scale 6:24	sections 52:31 55:26	62:6 64:27 73:45	slip 17:11
scan 63:47	57:37	shared 6:11 11:28	small 6:24 41:2
scenario 13:36	sector 10:37 30:4,6	sharing 75:35 80:46	smaller 41:1,1
schedule 3:42 50:10	33:15,17,24 34:4	shellfish 20:46	snapshot 11:8 33:8
53:23,26 59:26 64:41	35:24 36:25,28 37:5	shipping 56:22	snippets 62:30
65:11 66:8 72:40 76:3	37:17 46:18 49:2,14	shock 10:38	SNP 32:22
80:6,10 81:39,45	49:31	shoreside 47:24	social 32:29 36:1 81:20
scheduled 76:11 77:33	sectors 10:7	short 23:32 27:22 52:2	SOFIs 70:15,17,34
79:27	secure 5:23	shortly 58:48 65:3	SOLIAI 1:42 42:9 43:33
science 32:46,47 34:22	security 54:14,24	77:23	soliciting 11:36
38:39 45:36 59:43	seeing 4:25 8:2 9:26,37	Show 32:36	solution 43:4 49:43
74:3,14 75:38	11:27 15:34 22:41	shows 12:3	solutions 46:13 48:38
scientific 4:43 5:4,25	29:36 37:34 50:6	side 10:25 29:10 33:21	49:7
26:43	66:35 68:31 72:28	33:21	solve 20:30 46:31 49:42
scientists 36:1	78:28 79:19 82:22	sign 43:25	somebody 56:8 61:14
scope 57:32	seeking 36:18	signed 17:16,17 30:3	68:45 somebody's 56:21
Scoping 76:16 scrap 26:39	segments 11:9 33:14 35:14	significance 39:1 significant 10:47 16:43	someday 41:9
screen 8:27,29,32	selected 24:28	25:10 29:38 38:23	someplace 78:45
73:45 78:45	selection 18:21	53:21 70:1	something's 66:26,30
SCS 5:21	sell 47:7	signifying 53:27	somewhat 59:45 64:35
SCS-7 3:11 4:37 76:32	send 16:15 51:11 62:42	similar 47:15 58:10	soon 58:35,39 79:36
SCS7 7:41	69:26 81:28	59:18	sooner 9:5 63:30 77:37
se 43:4 45:34	sending 4:15	similarly 36:19	sorry 9:4 15:10,38
seafood 3:14,19,27,28	sense 12:18	Simmons 1:40 23:12,13	46:48 53:16 70:28
9:42 10:7,7,21,28,37	sensitive 69:17	23:14,17 24:3 25:19	78:16 81:20
11:10,15 13:28,33	sensor 61:42	70:10,25,31 81:33	sort 10:25 11:1 12:15
17:3 29:22,28,29 30:3	sent 30:8	Simon 1:33 65:30	18:30 26:22,31 30:42
30:6,7,10,12,16,17,24	separately 13:21	Simonds 1:41 5:36 7:43	32:28 34:20 35:47
30:27,31,48 31:13,14	September 67:36	62:15 63:8,12,23	36:5 37:3,14 39:34,35
31:19,30,45 32:1,3,8	series 33:20	78:13,18,25 80:21,34	39:36,44 44:44 48:19
32:13,16,21,23,26,36	serve 35:48 40:4 44:27	81:12	49:40 51:47 52:10,38
32:37,37,43,45,48	48:39	simultaneous 19:18,18	68:29 80:7
33:11,14,36 34:31	serves 40:16,21 service 5:10 8:19 13:38	20:26 68:7 72:6 sir 16:17 72:46	sorting 30:43 sorts 33:1 34:15
35:24 36:25,36 37:16 37:46 40:19,30 44:19	14:23,25 18:3,47	site 31:6 40:16	sound 66:11
45:20,31,48 48:43	22:24 26:38 38:45	sites 24:27	source 30:13 78:28
49:2,31 76:43	44:29 45:11 53:37	Sitka 4:44	sourced 32:48 40:19
SeaGrant 33:23,23	54:16,19 55:38 63:10	sitting 49:3 51:9 62:26	sources 30:47 40:19
		J J T T T T T T T T	
II .			

Southern 17:46 19:21 20:11 **space** 11:4 spatial 18:5 22:24 38:47 speak 4:13,16 8:1,5,37 16:31 17:30 65:28 71:21 81:16 speaking 10:41 35:30 43:48 68:7 72:6 **species** 25:23,28,29,35 25:38,43,47 26:5 27:33,37,38 28:5,6,14 28:19,42,47 29:3 41:32,37,40,42 42:4 43:13 47:8 **specific** 11:42 13:29,37 18:21 20:9 24:24 27:47 28:25 30:15 53:5 54:20,31,38 56:45 66:31 **specifically** 6:30 50:47 51:4 57:1 **specifics** 13:36 25:32 spectacular 78:5,13 spell 66:46 spelled 66:46 spend 11:14 44:41 spoke 42:18 74:26 spoken 10:23 66:7 spokesfish 46:43 spreadsheet 12:14 **spring** 12:44 73:34 78:6 **square** 24:31 squid 13:37 14:15,23 14:32 39:23 **SSC** 69:27 70:14,18,34 **stable** 47:1,5,6,10 stacks 56:21 staff 39:20,25 44:23 58:10 78:20 79:47 81:37,46 staffers 74:30 **stage** 17:35 27:8,15 stages 32:20 33:6 51:10 **stake** 46:11 stakeholder 20:35 22:32 32:23 36:13 43:20 stakeholders 18:1,2 64:43 stand 13:44 16:32,40 23:2 51:16 63:19 **standard** 13:25 55:43 75:41 standards 57:24 59:38 59:40,43 60:2,6,7,18

67:40 68:19 standing 45:45 62:41 **stands** 14:15 15:13 **start** 4:22 9:41 16:36 24:9 27:1,2 47:2 81:42 started 4:6 11:11 17:48 22:8 32:16,22 33:7 51:8 64:7 73:22 starting 24:31 29:23 51:18 53:28 61:41 **starts** 20:25,25 30:22 state 19:38 20:47 21:3 21:7,10 statement 7:24 20:21 26:3 74:35,36 states 10:37 21:6 31:20 34:48 49:22 66:25 statistics 31:39 **status** 3:11 4:36 9:3,13 10:32 31:4 56:4 74:10 statutory 11:45 69:33 stay 17:12 79:7 **Steering** 4:47 76:10,20 **step** 18:41 19:6 26:19 26:20 76:22 steps 16:43 18:43 19:7 20:23,26 21:26 27:4 27:25 29:41 43:16 sterilized 29:3 **Stevens** 74:27 stock 31:5 39:21 56:4,6 **stocks** 75:43 **stop** 17:41 41:26 stopped 27:41 storage 35:43 stored 53:47 61:28 **stories** 31:31 **story** 26:34 straight 50:26,28 strange 71:35 **strategic** 10:43,46 36:23 **strategies** 34:27 37:13 37:14 **strategy** 11:10 34:8 streaming 6:41 streamlined 23:24,29 24:21 25:12 28:33 streams 62:42 strengthen 49:35 strengthening 10:45 37:15 stretch 29:8 strict 29:2

strike 14:37

striving 62:45

strong 38:35 39:2

structure 28:13 58:4 stuff 16:15 37:48 61:26 63:34 subcommittee 4:28,35 4:43 5:26 6:18 7:38 8:15,20 34:23 74:47 75:5,16,20,32 76:8,24 76:32 submit 57:4 61:37 78:29 submitted 12:4,9 56:12 submitter 54:41 subset 22:28 57:4 substantial 31:38 36:27 61:23 substantive 69:14.44 successful 39:24 successfully 5:12 sufficient 60:12 suggest 65:27 suggesting 69:6 suggestions 12:19 13:24 36:10 37:20 suitable 24:28 25:48 summarize 16:38 summarizes 55:13 **summary** 19:28,29 53:29 56:10 58:15 72:48 73:40 78:5 summer 6:16 17:43 18:45 29:27 33:29,30 53:18 59:11 76:23,34 supplement 5:11 **supply** 29:29 33:36,39 33:45 35:46 40:40,44 47:1,2,5,11,19,33,38 48:43 76:47 77:6,8 support 13:18,22,33,35 14:19 20:2,45 21:9,20 21:21 22:14 29:45 30:35 32:12 34:39 37:15 38:46 39:11 43:12 46:48 47:37 58:20 76:39 **supporting** 30:9 32:15 32:27 33:45 34:41 **supposed** 5:43 69:31 surfclams 39:22 surgery 72:8 surprised 13:21 **surprising** 19:42 20:5 survey 74:4 **surveys** 13:22 14:20 33:16,20 sustainability 30:48 31:12,17,22 33:26,27

stronger 39:10 49:25

struck 15:29 27:34

39:37,42 40:20 76:47 sustainable 20:37 30:12 31:30,48 32:3 37:46 43:12,13 47:1 47:33 48:43 51:2 77:6 sustainably 32:48 switch 29:20 swordfish 42:21,45 system 49:34 56:9,21 60:16,48 systems 55:39

Т table 55:11 79:33 tacos 41:34 take-home 58:2 takeaways 51:37 taken 14:14,18 39:25 45:33 51:5 takes 9:40 21:40 30:23 30:25 72:33 talent 34:45 talk 12:25 13:27,46 16:41,45 23:1 24:24 37:38 38:36 44:16 47:18 51:44 52:19 56:43 67:44 80:6,26 80:26 talked 33:7 36:45 37:7 37:10 43:2 66:27 67:39 talking 11:4 36:15 38:32,38 45:19 49:27 58:35 63:17 talks 56:40 58:8 70:13 70:14 tangent 15:41 target 25:11 targeting 33:29 task 34:22 75:4 taskforce 34:39,40 team 22:16 37:46,47 42:11 tech 16:1 33:22 technical 75:42 technically 62:40 **techniques** 31:42 46:3 technologies 50:37 51:46 52:1 62:1 Technology 34:23 tempted 71:30 ten 17:22 37:39 39:38 tend 5:3 40:38 term 10:45 12:38 15:15 21:46 33:27

terms 10:35 12:41

37:41 41:47 42:3

30:29,30,30 31:23,24

	I	I	I
48:23 54:2 57:39,46	title 50:46	tribes 19:39	unabated 40:14
57:48 58:24 60:13	titled 52:3	tried 18:20 21:44 52:20	unanimously 9:31
62:41 65:5	TNC 6:10	66:46	uncertain 74:18
territory 38:24	today 4:11 9:47 10:10	trip 41:25	underemphasis 49:12
thankfully 61:41	10:20 16:30,31 17:17	true 30:27 44:44	underestimate 46:24
thanks 11:21,23 14:8,8	23:42 47:45 67:45	truly 28:46	underserved 35:15
15:30,33 16:19 24:3	80:1 81:19	trusted 30:47	understand 31:43
26:35 29:18 50:31,32	today's 9:41 48:25	try 22:8 24:46 25:11	33:13,34 35:41 41:18
61:33 62:20 64:32,47	told 11:25 39:41 53:24	27:36 30:44 33:9	42:3 46:12 49:2 58:43
64:47 65:17 66:16	Tom 1:35 8:35,36 27:28	46:10 47:26 60:17	69:28,38 81:45
71:43,46,47 73:7,28	37:29,31 43:34 44:10	62:21 66:2,37 69:40	understanding 28:23
73:38 79:15,45 80:3	45:30 46:38 48:34	69:48 70:2 76:5 78:48	33:4,24,31 36:2 38:26
80:34 81:33	59:3,28 60:3,13 65:18	trying 31:7,27,29,41	43:6 48:3,11 66:22,28
that'd 24:29 28:12	68:37 69:12 70:7	32:48 33:25,38 34:14	74:48 76:15
theme 36:30 76:17	82:12	34:35 41:31 43:12	underutilized 41:42
themes 13:16	tomorrow 4:21	44:38,42 45:35 47:37	42:3 47:8
they'd 28:39,47 80:39	tool 31:26 39:44 40:6,8	49:45 52:24 58:32	underway 76:16
things 11:39 14:22,37	47:17	59:7,9,13 60:8 62:46	uneven 33:17
16:38 20:14 21:14	tools 31:27 32:31 34:2	63:15,18,33 64:28	unfold 81:46
23:2,44 25:7,35 28:21	43:10 45:38 56:43	tuna 40:32 41:8 77:9	unfortunate 28:18
32:19 34:9 35:6 36:6	75:13	turn 11:18 16:23 40:10	Unfortunately 9:12
36:16 37:38,45 38:47	top 51:23	73:21,36	unified 11:47 12:42
41:29,35,45 44:11,33	topic 9:48 10:19,23	turns 5:41	13:4 15:15,18
44:39 47:12 49:30	11:15,18,41 30:22	TWEIT 1:44 47:41	unique 19:35
50:42 51:15 57:31	35:33 41:16,44 69:34	Twitter 32:32	United 10:37 31:20
58:16,37 60:32,32	80:19	two 4:29 10:9,13 15:44	49:22
69:29 74:18	topics 5:45 36:21,36,39	17:18,29,32,44 18:34	unmute 9:26
third 10:19 21:36 52:13	38:25 39:6 45:17	18:37 19:9,29,41 20:7	unprepared 77:3
52:17 53:34,35,40,47	total 12:23,36 17:22	20:24,40,40 21:1,34	untangle 44:42
54:13,23,29,34 55:7	touch 18:24 23:42	24:41 29:19 50:47	up-to-date 31:3
55:20,22 56:12,31,38	49:30 50:39	51:4 52:11,31 55:26	update 3:22,25 9:3,13
57:13,26,28	touched 38:26	56:19 64:15,20 67:14	9:21 10:32 11:11,47
third-party 54:4,11,18	tough 65:14 69:6	68:4,22,40 72:1	13:44 15:12 16:13
thought 15:30 20:12	track 51:18 69:4	two- 68:25	33:25 74:2,3
23:21 36:10 70:42	Tracy 1:43 4:24 7:39	two-way 38:13	updated 51:47 74:36
78:25	8:28,46 9:1 14:6,8	type 10:28 22:39 26:32	updating 30:16
thoughts 18:40 23:2	26:7 27:27 64:46,47	41:48 51:39,40 54:4	upgrading 47:24
27:11 32:41 35:32	71:45,46 72:5,10,15	55:35 58:18 60:15	uploading 56:24,25
36:47 37:19 41:39,46	72:45,47 73:22,24,28	62:34	urgency 64:27
42:40 43:28 49:6,7	73:36,37 74:1 78:16	types 25:36 28:20 35:5	USA 47:15
80:14	78:22,27,32,44 79:21	43:10,27 46:2 51:34	usage 31:39
thousands 60:39	80:3	56:28,42 57:31 58:45	USDA 33:47 34:24,29
thread 48:34	trade 13:30 32:32 33:37	67:15	34:32 45:46 47:14
three 4:20 16:37 19:9	tradeoffs 64:25	Typically 56:7	use 6:30 18:30 24:10
51:19 52:32 55:14	training 34:15,35 35:7	typo 77:27	28:2 31:27,29,34,41
68:40 73:25	36:45		34:37 35:17 36:33
THURSDAY 1:21	transiting 62:6	U	39:36,41 40:23 44:35
ticket 30:41	transmit 56:24	U.N 5:39 6:27	45:37 46:2 55:30
tied 44:34	transmitting 58:47	U.S 1:7 5:40 6:1 7:21	57:36,46 73:24 74:9
tiering 28:39	transparency 69:44	10:6,7 23:25 29:28,29	useful 31:44 80:22
tightly 44:34	70:24,30	30:6,12,26,48 31:12	uses 11:4 47:25 58:6
timeline 14:33 17:23,27	transpires 25:15	31:16 40:19 41:7,21	USTR 13:30
17:39	travel 81:43,45	42:22 50:44 51:17	USVI 21:10
timelines 13:3 17:7,8	trawl 66:21	74:44 75:6,9,19	utilize 77:32
17:11,13 58:37	treat 50:43	UA 12:44,47 15:15	utilizing 51:32 58:43
timely 59:9	treated 64:45	37:41	
times 12:7 19:16 20:15	tremendous 23:19	ultimately 29:42 30:41	V
48:29 50:39	trend 34:7	61:8	valuable 20:17 46:29
	I	I	l

Watamura 1:45 40:24 whales 21:15 46:32 48:27,45 49:11 wrap-up 73:20,35 78:31 49:14 40:25 42:18 **whatnot** 37:29 78:38 **value** 31:1,9,22,24 watch 6:10 30:46 31:2 **whiffed** 78:24 write-in 19:41 46:36 47:44,45 31:11 39:33,36,46 White 15:24 written 4:40 7:24 70:19 valued 46:24 40:3,11 45:39 56:9 wide 20:14 42:15,34,47 wrong 46:46 varies 38:34 62:7 wild 31:21 33:10,20 Χ watching 55:33,34 62:5 various 7:48 8:9 11:45 49:33 Wildlife 13:38 14:23,24 21:6 25:23,28,34 water 13:40 20:15 21:2 Υ 61:46.47 wind 21:14 44:39 75:21 Vera 6:12 verify 55:40 water's 74:44 75:30,36 year 5:16,43 6:7,28 wish 4:10,13 versus 23:27 25:28 waterfront 44:18,34 11:40 17:15,16,28 Witherell 1:46 4:36,38 58:15 66:42 47:29 79:13 39:31 41:27 42:13 vessel 47:24 54:41 57:7 waterfronts 10:29 Witherell's 7:41 52:15 53:29,46 54:31 57:7,9,14,18,29 61:35 35:34,40,47 36:3,17 witnessed 57:31 59:14 64:39,42 68:26 36:39 37:1,48 44:43 62:17,25,28,31,36 wonderful 78:18 69:26 74:44 75:38 63:10 49:28 76:46 wondering 26:19,21,30 77:34 year's 79:11,14 vessel's 55:41 waters 20:47 21:2,4,7 37:45 72:1 wording 15:11 28:3 vessels 56:1 66:21 21:11 years 15:27,27 17:22 words 39:45 52:8 54:21 video 11:27 55:30,33 way 4:13 15:30 16:43 20:5 36:1 37:39 39:12 55:34,37,47 56:10,25 work 6:45 7:17 13:30 17:16,41 19:6 20:2 39:31,39 46:43 50:41 56:34 57:24 60:38 27:2,5,26 28:12,18 13:39 19:24 21:44 52:4 53:28 61:29 23:20,34,43 24:26,26 61:21,36 62:29,42 41:20 45:42 46:45 67:39 63:16,18 66:25,30 61:41 62:29 63:6,7 24:48 28:29,35 29:26 yesterday 4:8 7:19 9:14 67:9,11,15 74:27 70:33,38 78:47 79:26 30:20 32:9 33:5,23 15:43 16:1 35:20 43:2 video-teleconference 34:18 35:11 36:20,32 81:41 43:7 81:21 wavs 24:20 27:23 30:34 36:43 38:10 39:9 young 34:42 76:48 1:27 videos 31:32,37 33:1,14,34,46 34:26 45:14,31 46:10 48:20 YouTube 55:32 81:25 view 49:37 55:2 60:46 37:6 43:23 55:44 49:37 51:6 52:24 Ζ viewpoints 7:14 62:22 68:23,32 69:3 74:37 views 35:5 49:42 54:48 weaknesses 10:40 75:29,46 79:41 81:37 zealous 60:15 74:31 weave 61:41 81:38,41 82:21 zone 73:13 violations 57:41 web 31:31,39 55:30,35 worked 37:39,40,40 0 Virginia 33:22 56:8 62:30 63:19 workforce 10:28 34:11 virtual 5:2 79:32 Webex 4:15 44:2 63:45 34:27,33,34 35:28 1 virtually 4:48 website 6:14 32:1 39:46 36:16,38 37:2 38:31 **VMS** 57:10 70:18 39:8,11 44:20,45,47 1:15 1:27 **voice** 22:1 48:6,10,10 week 36:18 38:33 51:12 49:29 76:46 1:30 4:4 72:38 48:19 49:26 72:12 67:17 76:12 79:28 working 7:19 10:29 **1:31** 4:2 voices 21:13 22:43 weigh 19:10 22:27 13:10 18:16 21:5,27 10 3:20 9:42 43:45 voicing 19:43 27:18,45 21:42 31:39 32:42 **10:30** 4:4 voluminous 7:26 weighed 19:39 49:18 33:32 34:30 35:34,40 **100** 60:47 62:4 vote 9:27 68:46 69:8 weight 49:24 35:46 36:1,2,16,38,48 **11** 3:22 50:22 67:26 vulnerabilities 36:7 weird 68:6 37:47 38:13,19 39:26 **12** 12:40 67:27 71:15 welcome 11:22 16:28 41:30 44:18,34,42 **12:20** 50:14 W 32:11,40 34:12 42:5 46:36 49:28 51:35 **12:35** 50:14 49:7 50:20,30 71:26 61:48 63:33 73:3 waiting 16:10 64:37 **13** 17:17 73:35 walk 48:25 55:28 73:34 74:37 76:46 **13921** 3:19 10:3 11:32 walked 55:13,15 58:3 welfare 49:1 works 51:1,2 56:8 **14008** 11:7 43:20 74:40 well-done 31:6 wanted 4:9 16:12,36 65:10 **15** 50:13 well-known 41:37 20:48 26:9 40:25 41:5 workshop 6:6,17 7:23 **15th** 59:2 65:9 77:24 42:40 44:11,11 49:36 went 45:21 46:43 50:18 8:21 9:4 76:11,27,39 **16** 3:25 17th 79:12,28 51:4 71:29,33,41 79:1 73:16,31 82:24 workshops 52:28 weren't 14:41,43 world 6:8 16:39 46:28 81:6 **18** 12:5,23,36,45 Werner 74:3 worried 49:5 wanting 62:7 **1986** 30:17 wants 23:26 64:7 west 4:5 5:41,42 26:12 worth 23:48 26:48 19th 79:3.12 Washington 21:23 41:28,38 51:30 54:30 **wouldn't** 81:14 1st 79:7 wasn't 14:38,45 45:21 **WP** 6:14 66:33,43 66:29 Western 4:5 21:9 77:8 wrap 3:39 72:35 2

2 70:13 2:00 72:42 73:13,18 2:04 73:29 20 1:22	9 4:23,33 8:9 9:39		
2:04 73:29		Ī	
2011 25:40 27:36			
2013 51:45			
2019 5:10 51:47 2020 4:42 5:29 17:44			
74:8			
2021 1:22 3:41 4:48 5:13 59:2 74:4 75:33 77:28			
2022 3:42 5:7,16,29 6:28 76:34,38 79:28			
2030 74:45			
21st 79:3 235 67:37			
3			
3 4:7 18:39 3:20 50:18			
3:35 50:15 3:36 50:19			
30 3:28 6:7 74:42,42,43			
30th 68:15			
4 4 3 :11,22 10:10 11:12			
43.11,22 10.10 11.12 11:32 13:17 37:9 41:44			
4:30 72:39			
4:32 73:16			
5 5 3:12			
5:00 72:43 73:13,19			
5:01 73:17 5:02 73:31			
5:05 73:32 5:28 82:24			
50 3:33 42:22			
51 12:25 5th 68:16			
6			
60 30:4			
60,000 5:11 31:35 67 3:37			
7			
7 17:3 59:37 73 3:39 19:35			
8			
8 3:17 59:37,37 80 40:31			
9			

${\color{red} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{R} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{F} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{A} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E}}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: NOAA Fisheries Coordination Comm.

Before: US NOAA

Date: 05-20-21

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &