

**NWX-DOC CONFERENCING**

**Moderator: Heidi Lovett**  
**July 1, 2019**  
**2:00 pm CT**

*(List of all participants on the call is after the transcript)*

Coordinator: Hello, and thank you for standing by. At this time I'd like to let all participants know that today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you and you may begin with your host, Miss Heidi Lovett.

Heidi Lovett: Hi, this is Heidi Lovett. I'm acting as the DFO, the designated federal officer for this meeting of the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee, today, July 1, beginning at 3 o'clock eastern time. I'm going to start with a roll call and then I'm going to pass the meeting over to (Erika Feller), chair of MAFAC. So roll call, (Robert Beal), (Sebastian Belle).

(Sebastian Bell): Here.

Heidi Lovett: Thank you. (Roger Berkowitz).

(Roger Berkowitz): Present.

Heidi Lovett: (Megan Davis).

(Megan Davis): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Ramundo Espinoza). (Erika Feller).

(Erika Feller): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Randy Fisher). (Tom Fote).

(Tom Fote): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Bob Gill).

(Bob Gill): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Robert Jones).

(Robert Jones): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Donna Kalez). (Sara McDonald).

(Sarah McDonald): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Don McMahon).

(Don McMahon): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Peter Moore). (Stephanie Moreland). (Michael Okoniewski).

(Michael Okoniewski): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Jim Parsons). (Harlon Pearce). (Kellie Ralston).

(Kellie Ralston): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Joe Schumacker).

(Joe Schumacker):Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Patrick Sullivan).

(Patrick Sullivan): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Richard Yamada ).

(Richard Yamada): Here.

Heidi Lovett: (Erika), just for your knowledge, (Matthew Upton) and (Jim Parsons) had said they could not attend. In the meeting room here is myself, Heidi Lovett, and...

(Jeanette Davis): (Jeanette Davis).

Heidi Lovett: And I know (Mike Rust) is on the line. Are there any other staff or individuals on the line right now?

(Mark Rath): Hi, Heidi, this is (Mark Rath) from Sea Grant.

Heidi Lovett: Thank you, hi, (Mark). Great. So (Erika), I'm going to pass the meeting over to you.

(Erika Feller): Okay, great, thanks. So the purpose of today's call is to review and approve the comments of the Aqua Culture cap court, NOAA strategic aqua-culture science plan. You guys should have received the red line of the plan with the cap court comments and a list of general comments from Heidi on June 29th, and I believe she resent those around this morning. And there's a link included in the agenda also.

So we're going to get started. Our first step will be, (Mike Rust), we're going to get him to go through the plan but before we do this, many of us on here know each other, but we have three new MAFAC members who have joined this call and hopefully we'll get to see them all in the fall. But I thought this might be a good chance to invite the three of them just to introduce themselves. So I think we'll go in order that Heidi gave me their names. (Tom Fote).

(Tom Fote): Yes, my name is (Tom Fote).

((Crosstalk))

(Tom Fote): Go ahead, my name is (Tom Fote). I've been involved with fisheries management for about 45 years, since I came back from Vietnam. I retired at a young age, so I've been a volunteer at all the jobs I do, set up many environmental and fisheries organizations, recreational mostly. I've also been the commissioner to Atlantic states marine fisheries commission off and on since 1990 to represent the governor of New Jersey.

So basically I think MAFAC was the last one of my things I wanted to fill, because I'm 72 now so I figure I've got one more job to do, volunteer job that doesn't get paid for.

(Erika Feller): Welcome, (Tom). (Don McMahan).

(Don McMahan): Hey, this is (Donnie McMann). I'm from Pensacola, Florida. I own the Pensacola Bay Oyster Company, and also the Pensacola Bay Oyster Hatchery. I've been involved in aquaculture about four, five years now. I've served in the financial services business, I own and operate an independent agency in Pensacola and - insurance agency in Pensacola and Destin, Florida. And I have a keen interest in aquaculture and happy to be on this board. Thank you.

(Erika Feller): Welcome, and we have (Patrick Sullivan).

(Patrick Sullivan): Hi, there. This is (Pat Sullivan). I'm a professor at Cornell University in the department of natural resources. I serve on the New England Fisheries Management Council as SSC, and I've been at Cornell for about 20 years, I'm a fish population dynamicist there, and prior to that I was 10 years on the International Halibut Commission.

(Erika Feller): Great, welcome. Thanks for that. I think we're a little ahead of schedule, but I see no reason not to turn this over to (Mike Rust) to get us started with a review of the development of the aquaculture science lab. (Mike), you ready?

(Mike Rust): Yes, sure. Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity to come back and talk to MAFAC again. First, I want to thank the Aquaculture Task Force for not once but twice now entertaining our questions and our hopes for information on how we can do business a little bit better. I'm going to be very quick, just kind of bring us back up to speed and remind everybody of what this is, and then I'll turn it over for your discussion.

First, from a motivation standpoint and background, aquaculture is a cross-line office activity at NOAA, which means that there is activity in national marine fishery service, national ocean service, and sea grant particularly. And because of that, we are a little bit different in that the aquaculture program has grants that it gives out through Sea Grant, through - there's also some going out through (unintelligible), SBIR grants, and others.

We have bricks and mortar laboratories around the country, I think both in NMFS and NOS, and we also have contact through a number of bilateral agreements with other countries. So we can think of these different things,

we've called them assets, scientific assets, and we can think of these assets as being what makes up the research side of aquaculture program.

In the past, it has never been brought together, and thought of strategically as one tool for advancing science and research around aquaculture. The motivation from this came from actually the first time we did a review of NMFS' aquaculture science and realized that laboratories were only part of the picture and the grants were being kind of reviewed separately.

And so it was decided, well, each of those kind of assets bring the different strengths, they have different weaknesses. What would happen if we thought of them as one and tried to play off the strengths of one to get more, really, more bang for our buck, better science, better research? This was also motivated by a realization that we'd already known that we were not a highly resourced group within the agency and not within the government at all at large.

So how could we make a small budget work harder? The other thing that came out of our science review is that we don't have geographic coverage everywhere from the science center standpoint, and we are lacking in key scientific disciplines, particularly economics and a few others. So how can we pull from other areas, other agencies, use our grant programs to make up for those areas that were highlighted?

So this strategic plan really has two parts, and its one part is to just do that, look at the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches, different kinds of assets, and the other part of it was to identify the topics. So that's more I think traditional, when you think of a strategic plan, is that you identify what you're going to work on. You don't necessarily talk so much about how you're going to work on it.

But in this case we really wanted to move forward with both at the same time. So we started this by asking our customers at NOAA for aquaculture for science, we have two we have identified. One is the industry being represented by MAFAC, and you all remember our first ask was basically for the Aquaculture Task Force, and MAFAC took them up with a list of topics, the things that we should be working on.

The other customer we have is largely internal. But also other agencies, and these consist of postal managers, people that are making decisions on permitting or management of an industry. And in NOAA, that's for example people working on ESA consultations, working on habitat consultations for projects, as well as seafood inspection and international, how you sell your product once you've produced it, and then a few others, internal for NOAA dealing with statistics and so on.

So we also asked them at the same time, the request went out to MAFAC for topics, we also asked internally, people that do meat analysis, people that do vetting of consultations for their topics. When we developed the topics, we asked each group to come up with a vision, and in that case for each topic the vision would be, in an ideal world, what would we - what would it look like? So as you can imagine for diseases it might be, well, we have no diseases. So maybe that's a bit too aspirational.

But we did want the visions to be a little bit aspirational, something to work on. That came back to our office. We worked to meld the two visions, one from the regulatory customers and one from the industry customers, into a single or sometimes a couple visions per topic, which really highlighted how moving forward we would adjust not only the economic performance shoes that the industry would like to see us advance on, but also compliance with environmental regulation, which should ease in law, being able to permit and being able to fund the industry according to our legal system.

So that is where we are now. That has come back. This is the second document you're looking at, it is a integration from both customers. Added to that is a section on tactics, so getting back to these different assets, that was done basically by having a small team just do some background literature research, talk to other agencies to see how they did things, and then just draw experience.

So those two documents are roughed out and we are now looking forward to hearing what your comments are. I will add that at the same time this went back to MAFAC for input, it went out to the larger scientific community. This was the first time we've asked the science community to comment on this strategic plan, because we really wanted to do a good job of articulating our customers' needs before we sent it out to them.

The scientific community in this case includes the Science Centers, both NMFS and NOS, as well as the Sea Grant network, both - largely through the Sea Grant Extension network. So that's where we are. I will now shut up and let people ask questions, and or if you want to go into discussion, that's up to you.

(Erika Feller): Can I ask one quick question before - it's less of a question and more of a request before we open it up to MAFAC members for questions. If you're not talking, if you could keep your phone on mute. There's a little bit of background noise that makes it hard to hear the speakers. Just remember when you have a question, if you feel like nobody's responding to you, it's probably because you're still on mute.

So it's now - we've now got a little bit of time for questions if anybody has any, and Heidi, presumably, they just say it out if they have a question, or is there something else they should do?



Heidi Lovett: Yes, this is Heidi. That would be helpful, and we are going to get a transcript of this presentation, this meeting, so if you could say your name before you ask your question then it's helpful both for the other listeners and for the transcript. Thank you. Are there any questions of (Mike Rust)?

(Don McMahon): (Mike), this is (Don McMahon). I had a question on your diagram talking about conceptual development of science and technology to enhance industry.

(Mike Rust): Okay.

(Don McMahon): And I'm very new to the group as I just introduced myself. But looking at this diagram and what I'm - what the end goal is to increase domestic aquaculture production in all these areas and not focus on a region but just the whole United States. But it seems to me like the industry is the one that in the competitiveness of the industry and the needs of the industry, would be the first piece, and then go into the research piece to help address those ideas.

In other words, that industry given research and it's specific to I guess every different kind of aquaculture there is, but instead of what I'm looking at here, just a big macro picture of this thing. And I was just wondering am I reading this right, or how do you address the production goals and by the time you - in other words, without going to the industry first and saying where do you have it, where are the roadblocks?

Where are the issues? For instance in a hatchery, you know, there's no - for oyster hatcheries there's no - not much if any research that I know of, of good stock collection and conditioning to produce oyster seed all year round.

Therefore, we're stuck in the summer months and down south, hurricanes, etcetera, etcetera, interrupting that. But that would be, you know, if you had to go to the Florida Shellfish Association and say what are your industry needs?

What do you need help with here in the research arm and all the resource?  
And we have such a tremendous amount of resources, I've been reading this, about NOAA and sea grant and all the different things, and it seems like it might be a bit backwards. I'm going to be quiet and let you comment on that.

(Mike Rust): Okay, no, thanks for that. That's - I think you're exactly right. I think probably the diagrams were maybe a little bit complex for you know, what they were trying to convey, but certainly the idea that we start with the customer's needs and go from that I think is incumbent on us. I don't think this is exactly the diagram. I think it was up a couple.

But the point of the diagrams were to illustrate that before we get to that point, so before we get to the really understanding that there's a need, there's a great body of science out there, just basic understanding of oysters for example, or how they function, their physiological characteristics, which is far away from understanding hatchery needs.

But then that information which is fairly diverse, everything from physics to biology to chemistry comes into some sort of a use area where we develop a paradigm for how an oyster works, for example. And then that information can further become operationalized and used, and I think that at all of those points it's important, especially for NOAA which is an applied research organization, to focus on those applications for those uses for that information.

This was just to try to extend that chain back. There are things that they found for example on the base lights that had nothing to do with space that we're using now for energy generation or for keeping our food safe. So that was the whole point of this diagram, is just to put it in context of a larger body of knowledge. Does that help?

(Don McMahon): Yes, it does. But it kind of - I guess we're talking about what would be the source that you would use for the industry information would be the next key question, so would you use regulatory people, or would you - do you have something set up to use the industry as an example of collecting that data? In other words, how does that data get back to NOAA? And then how did they - then what is the mechanism for ranking the importance of what the industry is saying and what we can afford to address, and which universities, which Sea Grant institution or other institutions may be able to work on that problem in a more efficient way?

(Mike Rust): Right, and I mean, I think that's kind of the whole gist is how do we do that in the best way we can? Right now, for example, we have - NMFS has a Milford Lab that's (unintelligible) and shellfish culture, and they work with the industry. They have a hatchery, they train hatchery technicians to do the algae culture, and so on and so forth. So there's a direct link between industry and that laboratory.

At the same time, sea grant funds for example, extension people in Alabama and elsewhere and South Carolina I believe also that go out and work with farmers to get that information back into the universities, also some of those folks have hatcheries associated with those universities that work on hatchery issues. So you know, I think building in those connections with industry, we have some of those.

You know, it's not and things that are done with NOAA dollars are not done in a vacuum. I think there are those things, but if there's areas we can improve, there's other things that we can do better, we want to hear that.

(Don McMahon): I think, and I agree with you, they do a lot geographically for I guess some of the south coast, and we're kind of in one group, which includes Auburn, LSU,

Texas, Mississippi, and Florida. And recently I saw a NOAA grant staffer come down and ask me to participate as an industry person at a - for shellfish genetics, and I don't want to get off in the weeds. We've got a lot of stuff here, but it's a \$4 ½ million grant to collect genetic breed stock and try to create a superior oyster to breed in the Gulf of Mexico.

And my comment back to them was that Florida will not allow any deployed root stock from any other state on the Gulf Coast, or from the East Coast of Florida. So this type of research is really not going to do - we have to do our own in a geographical setting. Does that make sense? So spending all that money in Florida, it's a huge aquaculture shellfish state, much bigger than Alabama and probably all the rest of them combined.

I don't think Texas is open yet, but they're getting ready to. So from the geographical, how do you address that? We do not have any federal labs down in the south here, and you mentioned the one up doing shellfish research, but it's a game plan to make recommendations to expand that network in this document, or just address it?

(Erika Feller): Hey, (Don), this is (Erika). Can I - I think these are really good and important questions, but I want to make sure other people have a chance to ask clarifying questions about the report before we have to move on at 3:30 to the next topic. I think what you're bringing up are the subject of a lot of the MAFAC comments in the next section. So we'll definitely come back to that.

(Don McMahon): Okay, I'll be quiet then.

(Erika Feller): It's - not at all. Thank you.

(Mike Rust): If I can just quickly comment on that, though. I mean, it very nicely illustrates why we're doing this, because we don't have enough resources in the

southeast (unintelligible) area which is lacking a science center devoted to aquaculture, and this whole interplay between regulatory and business, I mean, the fact that you can't bring in oysters into the state of Florida is why we really have to address those twin customers at the same time - because maybe that regulation is not founded on sound science.

But we really do want to get into projects which are exactly that, so truly identify the risks and opportunities of being able to do something like that that would move the industry forward in a sustainable way. Thanks.

(Don McMahon): Okay, I appreciate that. Thanks. I'm going to be quiet, and where I was trying to get to the point was maybe you can use a lot of the private infrastructure that's there and develop a vision plan that works more closely with those folks that are already out there doing that instead of having to spend lots of dollars building (unintelligible) and having universities continue to build their own. So thank you.

(Erika Feller): Do other folks have clarifying questions on the trade plan? Sure.

(Robert Jones): I do. Yes, this is (Robert Jones) with EDF. Thanks for putting this together and taking our questions. In context of looking at the marine spatial analysis, I'm curious if there should be consideration to a program specifically on species selection aimed at improving production and reducing impacts from climate change, in other words looking at species selection as part of a resilience program as we are looking at changing climate.

(Mike Rust): Is that something I should respond to? I think that's a great idea. Yes. We should.

(Robert Jones): I don't know how far we are down on the road here, but it might be good to at least include a section that speaks to that and kind of sets up a framework to

have that conversation and consider that as part of the broader strategy. Would you say beyond species selection, just kind of a whole general resilience to climate change issue?

(Mike Rust): Yes, I mean site selection, species selection, coastal communities that are impacted. I mean, we - as we all know from modeling, we have wild stocks that are moving around because of changing water temperature and habitat. It seems that that needs to be accounted for when we're talking about aquaculture as well.

(Robert Jones): Great. My second comment/question, in the social science section, it doesn't seem to include objectives or activities related to understanding the negative impacts on other stakeholders like fishermen or on food security, and I'm wondering if there can be some depth added there or if there's been thought to that?

(Mike Rust): Is this already in the comments coming back to me, or I mean, I'll certainly put it in there.

(Robert Jones): I'm not on the Aquaculture Task Force in MAFAC so I'm just now getting a chance to really look at this, so if they addressed it. They may have, I just hadn't seen that yet.

(Mike Rust): Okay.

(Erika Feller): Yes, so why don't we, just given where we are, I apologize, guys. This is (Erika). I did not do my chairmanly duty. So here's kind of what our plan is. (Mike)'s gone through his presentation. We're going to turn the conversation over to (Jeanette), who's going to walk us through the draft comments that the aquaculture task force put together that we're going to approve. We'll have the opportunity for questions and discussion.

Then we'll throw the floor open to public comment if we've got any, and then we'll move onto motions and approval of those comments. And after we get through all that I also wanted to see if (Bob Gill) and (Megan) had some updates they wanted to share with us on the commerce and rec subcommittees, and we'll do some other administrative stuff at the end. But that's kind of what our plan is here going forward.

So if as you've been listening to (Mike) talk about this, you have things that you think are important to consider in this plan, your opportunity to bring up something is coming up in probably about 20 minutes. So you might want to start quickly going through documents and scribbling and thinking about your questions for (Jeanette). Are there any more clarifying questions on the underlying strategy before we turn it over to (Jeanette)? Going once, going twice. Okay, (Jeanette), I think you're up.

(Jeanette Davis): Okay, hello, everyone. Yes, I'm just going to quickly go over process or some of the means and things that happened prior to you guys getting the document that the ATF (Aquaculture Task Force) put together, so (Mike) went over the larger vision, the purpose of the document. You guys have already seen the vision statements and approved that, and so right after our last MAFAC meeting, we received the draft plan.

And the ATF had about two weeks or so to go over that document, add comments, add in all of those things and then we got together again. Well, they submitted their comments individually, just want to emphasize that first, so everyone kind of had their own comments that they wanted to put forward with the plan. And then I compiled all of those comments into one document, so I added that in track changes as well as just some general comments from the ATF.

We then had a teleconference meeting and met for about an hour and a half to go back over those comments. The ATF then had another week or so to scrub and incorporate their edits. And so at that point we decided instead of just saying hey, think about adding this, everyone just went through and added the things that they wanted to add to the plan, and if there was no time to add to it, then it was just left on the general comments sheet.

So what you have before you is the latest version of the plan with the ATF comments, edits, concerns, either incorporated into the document or on a general comments sheet. And I would just like to add for the comment sheet that some of these things that are mentioned such as how we used the term industry, those were all discussions. That was all a part of the discussion, and for some of these things (Mike) has already agreed to incorporate into the plan, so it's not necessarily in track changes.

But these are comments that he's already considering, and some of them were already ready, such as a specific species list and all of those things. So again if it's on the list, although it's not in track changes on the current version, it's already something that the ATF raised, and it's something that (Mike) has already agreed to or is thinking about incorporating into the plan. And Heidi, remind me if there was something else you wanted to add to that.

(Mike Rust): Sounds good.

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi. So the - what would be - since we have the document on the screen and I'm in the control seat for that, if as questions come up you can direct us to approximately what page and you want us to look at something or people would like to make edits or have other things be considered. We can go sort of point by point, or we could go section by section, first, whichever your preference is.



(Erika Feller): Can I ask a - this is (Erika), I just have a couple quick clarifying questions for (Jeanette) and (Mike). The first one is, (Mike), can you talk a little bit about when you expect this plan to be finalized and what your plans are for release and kind of socializing this within the agency?

(Mike Rust): Yes, so within the agency, I hope to have a draft by the end of the fiscal year, so the end of September. At that point, leadership will have it to decide what they want to do. If I was guessing I would say that it will go out for public comment at that point in time, and be finalized currently early next spring, probably?

(Erika Feller): And have you thought about what you plan to do as far as getting it out there? I'm thinking of (Don)'s comment before about sort of where there are some disconnects, and you responded, this plan is something that should help to address those types of things, and that's (unintelligible) somebody has heard of it.

(Mike Rust): Yes, so it's being - yes, I should have probably mentioned this a little bit clearer. So it's being developed, my leadership is the head of the National Marine Fisheries Service, head of the parent organization for Sea Grant, and (Cisco Warner), who's the science director at NMFS. So at that level I'm sure that would be a rollout of some sort, but it's being socialized within Sea Grant. It will go out to the network within the regional aquaculture coordinators.

So our regulatory side of the house, it'll get - they're all involved with it, so it'll be widely socialized within the agency, and then also there'll be some sort of a public rollout I'm sure. I mean, that hasn't really been talked about yet, but let's see what happens with these sort of things.

(Erika Feller): Okay, and (Jeanette), just one quick question about the Task Force review of this. The comments that are in the document and that are on sort of the general comments, are these - would you characterize these as like consensus recommendations from the task force, like there were no objections to any of these, this was kind of what that group thought was the right thing going forward?

(Jeanette): Yes, it was a consensus, and I was just saying to Heidi, it may be worth going over the general comments first because the last three bullets at least are some of the things that some of the MAFAC members have already kind of raised or asked a question about, but yes, these were general consensus amongst the ATF.

(Erika Feller): Okay, well, why don't you go through those and we'll just stay flexible and let people kind of sing out if they have like a question or a thought about a particular one? And then we can turn to the bigger documents. Does that sound okay?

(Jeanette Davis): Yes, that sounds good. So you guys can see the comments on your screen, correct?

(Erika Feller): I can.

(Jeanette Davis): Okay. Just trying to talk, so yes, we can just start at the top. I will just want to point out first that the ATF thought that the draft was well written and reflects considerable and constructive effort. They weren't really too extensive. Some just added some phrases here and there. There was a major comment about integrating IOOS data. (Mike) agreed with that and is going to add that, and there is a section highlighting where it can be added.

There was quite a big discussion on the term industry, and back and forth on if that term is perceived as good or bad or how that could possibly be misinterpreted or seen as a negative term. And so there was some suggestions about adopting different types of terminology to avoid, where possible, miscommunications, so some of those terms could include aquaculture producer or aquaculture farm.

And again the ATF did trust that (Mike) will work in any way possible or where need be. The next one - let's see, okay, so this one was essentially about adding some background information. So there was a discussion on how much information is enough in terms of background information. And so the consensus was to provide a little more background information in the beginning of the document, but to add specific links to all the other reports that have come out in the U.S. about aquaculture, and that this was going to be more of a NOAA specific aquaculture plan.

But as some background, but linking to other documents that highlight aquaculture in the U.S. The next one, where government support is needed is in research areas or topics that are difficult for industry to capitalize themselves. It's generally those that required more long term timeline or are overly costly to work out, so that was also just a general comment.

So the last three are some of the topics that some of you guys talked about. And this goes back to being selective with fish and aquaculture species, so this - some of this language is already added to the plan and specifically looking at species that grow quickly to meet market size, (unintelligible) for fish density etcetera, and so these are things to be taken into account when you're thinking about improving efficiency in aquaculture.

Like, what are the exact species, and then related to that is selection potential for species, and the ATF suggested that there are some discussions somewhere

on what NOAA is specifically looking for in an aquaculture species, is that they thought that that would add value to the overall plan. And then lastly recognizing that there's a research need or that there are research needs that will exceed availability of funding.

They talked about developing a process for how to identify or how to prioritize species in research. So yes, considering that there is limited research, how would you prioritize what you will do in the future?

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi and to add to that, the conversation definitely stressed the importance of engaging industry in that particular process as well. And then, this is Heidi continuing, (Sebastian) and (Megan) who are on the call were part of the conversation and the back and forth email with the ATF, as ATF members, so I don't know if they would like to add anything additional to these general comments.

(Sebastian Bell): This is (Sebastian). I have nothing to add.

(Megan Davis): This is (Megan), I don't have anything to add either.

(Roger Berkowitz): (Roger), I have nothing to add.

Heidi Lovett: Anybody want to ask any questions or have any thoughts about this one before we ask - before we maybe turn over to the other doc? No? Okay. (Jeanette), are there any kind of major things you want to walk through in the red line of the larger document?

(Jeanette Davis): No, I don't - I mean, we have the larger document to make edits if you guys would like to make edits somewhere. But also in the bullets that we just described on the general comments, if there are also maybe - if you guys also agree with these or if there's any feedback that you can provide on potentially

how to incorporate some of these things or I don't know. I wanted to highlight these because I know that some of the previous questions are kind of centered around some of these things. So I don't know if there was more to add, but the general document is here for us to scrub if you feel the need to.

Heidi Lovett: And this is Heidi, regarding the overall general comments, if there's anything that people consider gaps, if there's anything that should be stated that isn't stated, then now's the time maybe to discuss that or raise that.

(Erika Feller): And this is (Erika). The floor is open for discussion.

(Sebastian Bell): This is (Sebastian), I just - I don't think I said this on our last call, but I did want to say that (Michael), I think this is one of the more thoughtful pieces that I've seen come out of NOAA in quite some time. And I know that you've put a lot of time and effort into this. And you deserve credit for both it being a thoughtful piece, but also it being quite a broad reaching piece, and I do hope that it will be used as a management guidance document for the internal decisions that the agency makes in terms of where it puts its resources and prioritizes its work.

(Mike Rust): Thank you, (Sebastian). I appreciate that.

(Erika Feller): This is (Erika). Heidi, do you think this would be a good moment to see if there's any good - any public comment?

Heidi Lovett: Sure, that is, I didn't note - yes. So we're about that time on the agenda also. Operator, this is Heidi. Is - are there any other individuals on the call that are listening in?

Coordinator: Yes, ma'am, there is.

Heidi Lovett: Okay, we welcome you providing your instruction for how people can provide public comment.

Coordinator: Yes, ma'am. If you would wish to add a comment or a question, please press star one on your phone. Please make sure you phone's unmuted and record your name when prompted. Thank you. If you wish to withdraw your question you can hit star two. Thank you.

Heidi Lovett: Is anyone queuing up to ask a question?

Coordinator: At this time, no there is not, ma'am.

Heidi Lovett: Okay, thank you, Operator. (Erika), back to you.

(Erika Feller): We're moving on then. Okay, I think we are at the motions and actions portion of the agenda, so does anybody have a motion? Like say a motion to approve the Aquaculture Task Force's comments, for instance.

(Bob Gill): This is (Bob), second it.

(Erika Feller): Oh, I wasn't moving that. I'm waiting for somebody else to. I can't do that, I'm the chair.

(Sebastian Bell): This is (Sebastian), I'll make the motion.

(Erika Feller): Good job. So (Sebastian) has moved the motion and (Bob Gill) has seconded. A little out of order, but yes.

Heidi Lovett: So (Sebastian), this is Heidi. Just for clarification, you're moving both documents as they currently stand?

(Sebastian Bell): I thought we were voting to approve the general comments for the ATF members as being MAFAC, are you asking us to move the science plan itself as...?

Heidi Lovett: I'm asking you. Sorry, I was - this is Heidi. I was asking for clarification of you, because I'm taking notes. We are recording this meeting, but I'm trying to take notes as well.

(Sebastian Bell): Yes, I got you. Okay, so my motion was to move to approve the comments, not the document itself.

Heidi Lovett: Okay, the general comment document.

(Sebastian Bell): Yes.

Heidi Lovett: Fine. I put it back up on the screen in case there's any other discussion.

(Bob Gill): And this is (Bob), and my second was to that point for the general comments only.

Heidi Lovett: Okay.

(Erika Feller): Okay. Any discussion on the motion?

(Man): Yes, this is (unintelligible). I had a question on this. So does this motion mean that we approve that the comments are going into the general document, or do the comments stay as comments to the document?

(Erika Feller): This is (Erika), the way I understand it, what we're currently considering is these general comments that are up on the screen, not the comments - not the other document.

(Man): Right, but these comments are comments that are going to be incorporated into the document?

(Erika Feller): Yes. They're comments MAFAC is recommending be incorporated into the document.

(Man): Great. Okay, that's what I was looking. So we can't really approve the document at this point unless the comments are in there already.

(Erika Feller): Yes, we're not being asked to approve the document. We're being asked to approve the Aquaculture Task Force's comments on the document.

(Man): Very good. Okay, thank you.

(Erika Feller): Any other discussion on the motion? Heidi, you've got the roll call, so I guess we'll put it to a vote. All in favor? Say aye when Heidi calls your name.

Heidi Lovett: (Erika), I think it'd be easier to say - ask for ayes and then if there's any no's we can ask for names.

(Erika Feller): Okay, we can do it that way. All in favor say aye.

((Crosstalk))

(Erika Feller): Are there any nos? Okay, then the motion is approved. So Heidi, do we need to separately consider the red line edits on the bigger document, or are we good?

Heidi Lovett: That would be the interest of the Aquaculture Task Force for MAFAC to consider all the comments as red lined in the document.



(Erika Feller): Okay, so what we just approved was this general comments document. So now the question is, do we approve the red line edits that are recommended to the science plan? No, we're not being asked to approve the science plan. We're just being asked to approve the red line edits that the task force has suggested. So is there a motion to approve those edits? These are the specific edits to the plan?

Man: Are these the red and blue edits? I'm sorry.

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi. Just for clarification, it's all of the edits in color. It's because of edits being added and compiled from various documents, so it doesn't show up as one color, but everything in color and underlined are additions, or anything that is struck out was recommended to be replaced with another term or taken out.

Donald McMahon: Okay, I have a question about the yellow not written yet areas. Several places says not written yet, be included by scientists or something. How is that going to be incorporated?

Heidi Lovett: (Mike), can you answer that?

(Mike Rust): Yes, it helps if I take myself off mute. Yes, so this is step two in a three-step process. As I was going through it, I mentioned that this was the first time that the science community has seen the document and so there's a lot of responses to that. In addition there is input coming from NOAA's Science Advisory Board, more the tactics side, I mean, how we use our grants and how we use our different programs.

And as long as the other customers doing the regulatory community is also looking at this, so there's a lot of different input coming from multiple places,

and that all has to be incorporated. In addition in this, because we were asking for some fairly specific recommendations, those all need to be collated. Things that are similar need to be put into common language, numbers attached and so on and so forth.

So there's plenty of work that's left to do on this, and the third section will be much more specific in terms of recommendations by industry and by how far offshore you are, for example. That's what those areas are.

(Patrick Sullivan): This is (Pat), so maybe it would be useful to approve the ones that are not in yellow.

(Don McMahon): This is (Don). Would it be prudent just to wait until we get the whole document, or is this critical to move forward?

((Crosstalk))

(Erika Feller): To be clear, this is - oh, go ahead, (Mike).

(Mike Rust): Yes, let me try to clarify that. So this document is NOAA's document. When it's done, this is us saying this is what our strategic plan is. We're asking the customer upfront for their input and we're asking for help on identifying things, but we reserve the right to totally ignore everything we say. What you're approving right now is what advice you want to give us to see that it's in the plan, and then for us to consider to put in the plan. You're not really approving the plan per se. does that help?

(Patrick Sullivan): We're just - what are we doing, then?

(Erika Feller): We're - this is (Erika). We are being asked...

(Patrick Sullivan): I don't follow this.

(Erika Feller): ... only the red line edits that are in the document. None of the red line edits, the underlined or struck out text is in yellow highlight, so we're only being asked to make a decision on the recommended changes from the Task Force. We could say we like all of these changes and still say we hate the plan. I'm sorry, what?

(Patrick Sullivan): I was understanding what you're saying. I'm sorry, but I understood what you were saying. I'm asking for the procedure point here. do we have to approve these red line documents for this document to move forward, or should we better off wait until these other people input? I think a lot of the questions I had weren't really related to this committee. It may have been one of these other committees that would be included.

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi, maybe I can add a little bit more clarification. Because our agency has (unintelligible) advisory committee and you have had standing for the last several years an Aquaculture Task Force, (Mike) reached out at the front end of developing this document to get input from industry via MAFAC. And so, as he noted that once input is received from the various channels that he is getting input from, it's our expectation that the final draft, a final complete version of this document, will go out for public comment.

And at that time, MAFAC is certainly - it's another opportunity for MAFAC to comment on the public draft. MAFAC sort of has gotten a preview if you will and has been providing a lot of input at the front end to make sure it was included into the draft that's going to go out for public comment. (Mike), is that a suffice - does that succinctly describe what you're trying to do?

(Mike Rust): Yes, and you know, it's certainly within MAFAC's right to ask for a review of the final document when it's ready, the final draft document, even before it

goes out for public comment, I mean that's probably something that can be accommodated if that's something that the committee wishes.

(Sebastian Bell): Yes, so this is (Sebastian), and I think, (Mike), that actually would be a great idea, just because it will be in particular I think very interesting to see what the scientific community and the regulatory community add into the document, and I'm not saying that to try and slow the process down. I just think from a MAFAC perspective that would be both educational and helpful.

(Erika Feller): And hey, (Don)? Don McMahon): Yes?

(Erika Feller): I just meant that the general - this is (Erika), sorry - the general comments document that we just approved, the last item on there talks about how the task force noted that the document should include a roadmap for how to prioritize. And they stressed the importance of engaging industry and not just the research community as part of the process. I think this is an idea that gets at what you were asking about at the beginning of the call. Did I understand that correctly?

(Don McMahon): Yes.

(Erika Feller): So maybe what (Sebastian) is suggesting is a good idea, that we take another look at this when it's closer to final and these - we can sort of see how these kind of general comments end up getting incorporated into the document.

(Don McMahon): Yes, I think that's a good idea. I'm new to this and I've looked at these, and I feel like I'm drinking through a fire hose trying to figure out all the different strategic plans and really what we're supposed to do here. It would be very helpful. I think, I just - I think going back to the original goal is to increase aquaculture, we've got to have a big part in this towards the industry, whatever it is, fisheries, shellfish, and the resources that we do have need to

be used wisely. So any comments from these other groups would be helpful to me. I didn't realize it's strictly science group only, but it all ties together.

(Erika Feller): Absolutely.

(Don McMahon): So my question again, in the way, the process, do you need us to approve this, or are you saying we just go ahead and wait, like with the other comments and then readdress it?

(Erika Feller): We could. Again, this is (Erika). I would - I think that it would probably be most helpful to (Mike) in his work if MAFAC approved a set of comments so that he can go forward and think about how to incorporate that into his document, and then we plan for - to have him back to tell us about how this thing has evolved.

So yes, I think from the process standpoint, we need to have a motion today on approving the redline edits so that (Mike) can move forward and we can kind of take the next step. Because otherwise, if we don't approve these, then these edits and comments don't - I mean, the general comments we already approved, but then these red line edits don't go forward if we don't approve them today.

(Don McMahon): So that's the procedure, if you don't approve them today, they don't go forward?

(Erika Feller): That's correct. Heidi, am I right, now that I've said that?

Heidi Lovett: Yes, so this is Heidi. Yes, so just to clarify a little bit, when the agency is seeking consensus comments from any type of group or - they must do so through a federal advisory committee process. That's per the Federal Advisory Committee Act, so the whole purpose of having federal advisory

committees is to help generate consensus comments. The agency is always able to go out to individuals or individual groups and get individual comments.

And then, they may accept or figure out how they want to reconcile things that might not be yet consensus comments. The agency figures that out on its own. So the purpose of having MAFAC is to provide that sort of general consensus, we're in agreement, we represent a variety of diverse individuals from the stakeholder community that engage with your agency and these are our comments - because MAFAC, because it's such a - the membership is such a varied group. And because there have been a lot of aquaculture related activities, MAFAC determined that it was helpful to it in making its decision to establish a separate task force which allows them to reach out further into a particular stakeholder group, in this case the aquaculture stakeholder group, and get more concrete comments from again a broader group of people.

But that task force in and of itself is not a FACA committee. Everything that it develops and generates must be considered and does not go forward to the agency unless it goes officially through a federal advisory committee. That's just the process for any federal advisory committee related to any federal agency as authorized under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. So for everybody's - most other people who have been on MAFAC for a little while are familiar with the second Task Force, the Columbia Basin Partnership, which is organized in the same fashion.

Their comments and deliberations on very specific Columbia River topics are developed - but they must come to MAFAC for review and consideration before they can be delivered to the AA, the assistant administrator, the head of NOAA Fisheries.

(Sebastian Bell): So this is (Sebastian). I would make a motion to approve the red line version edits as we have received them today, with the proviso that we get to see the document after the other groups have had their input as well. So we - my motion is to approve what we've got in front of us with the understanding that the draft will come back to MAFAC after the other groups have had some input so that we can see what the final draft - not the final draft, but the draft draft is going to look like. And then after I make that motion, I have one specific question for (Mike) with respect to one of the redline edits, and it's just a clarification piece.

(Erika Feller): Hold that question until we get a second.

(Sebastian Bell): Yes.

(Don McMahon): This is (Don), I'll second this motion.

(Erika Feller): Thank you, (Don). Okay, discussion on the motion.

(Tom Fote): Yes, I've got a question. This is (Tom Fote). I looked through all the documents that I received by email, and they don't match the one that's on the Web page. I can't find any document out here that has the - what you have on the Web page were the ones in red and one's in blue. I don't have that. I see it on the Webinar, but I don't see it in the documents - on both of these documents three or four times. What I do see is a red line going through the side of a whole paragraph, but that's all I see.

Heidi Lovett: Hold on. This is Heidi. (Tom), if you click on that red line, there's two views that some computers allow one where you see the comments and one where they're sort of already incorporated, and then you don't see the individual red notice line. So click on that line to the left side.

(Tom Fote): That's a whole new ballgame. I just clicked on the line, and a whole bunch of stuff that came up, and actually in orange and red.

Heidi Lovett: Sometimes different screens choose to use - to show different colors, if that wasn't clear.

(Tom Fote): So I - yes, and I haven't gone through these changes because I didn't know that was where I was supposed to be clicking on, and so I don't feel comfortable voting yes on this. I - you know, I got the documents the first time a couple of days ago, so I'm really - I was going to ask you last time, you said yes, no, and as we have in a lot of votes is an abstention. Usually it's NOAA that abstains because they can't make a decision on something (Unintelligible) further down the line they want to make commission level. So I'm having a problem because I had not seen all these changes, I've gone through at least 49 pages to see them.

((Crosstalk))

(Erika Feller): That's fine, (Tom), if you want to abstain.

(Tom Fote): Yes.

Man: So this is...

((Crosstalk))

(Erika Feller): You had a question?

Man: Yes, so (Mike), I'm looking at table four, which is the United States mandates regulating the environmental impacts of aquaculture, and in that table the last box looks at escapes brood stock management, monitoring, and reporting.



And it cites Magnuson Stevens as the federal act, and you know, my question is obviously given the court ruling, how does this actually reflect the reality of stuff as of today? And there's a couple of other boxes that have Magnuson Stevens in it.

And I guess in my mind, things to do with escapes in particular, at least in my world, are regulated through the NPDS permit, the EPA permit. And so I don't know if you need to put a footnote in there around Magnuson Stevens and the current state of flux, if you will, from the legal world. And if you maybe need to reference the fact that in certain instances the clean water act, the NPDS permits have been used to regulate those potential environmental impacts.

(Mike Rust): Yes, thanks, you're right, then, and I should put NPDS in under that section. I think the reason that section is there is because of provisions on impacts to managed species. It's not the Gulf ruling, just Magnuson.

Man: Okay, well just some clarifying language in there I think would be helpful, because it just - given what's going on legally, it would be a shame to confuse people.

(Mike Rust): Okay.

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi. Just for clarification, are you recommending adding that bullet?

(Erika Feller): I just did on the screen. And I'll spell it out.

(Tom Fote): Yes, so it's fine to add NPDS under that bullet, and then maybe a clarifier under the Magnuson Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act that it's to do with federally regulated species.

(Erika Feller): (Unintelligible).

(Tom Fote): And I'm sure I don't know the right language for that, (Mike), so I mean, you guys can figure that out, but you get what I'm driving at.

(Mike Rust): Yes, yes.

(Erika Feller): This is (Erika). Can I offer a friendly amendment?

(Mike Rust): Absolutely.

(Erika Feller): Hey, Heidi, at the top of that screen in the nutrient discharges box where it says clean water act, (unintelligible) discharge permit, EPA.

Heidi Lovett: Yes.

(Erika Feller): I would select that, copy it, and paste it.

Heidi Lovett: Thank you.

(Erika Feller): Sure.

Heidi Lovett: I was just trying to remember the "S" and NPDS.

(Erika Feller): There's no point in that. Any other discussion on the motion? Then I'm going to ask, all in favor of the motion to accept all these edits, with the clarification that we get another look at this thing once it's more fleshed out and other groups have had input. All in favor, say aye.

((Crosstalk))

(Erika Feller): Are there any no's? Are there any abstentions.

(Tom Fote): Yes.

Man: Yes.

(Erika Feller): Right on. Two, okay, thank you.

Heidi Lovett: The second - thank you, I've got two abstentions.

(Erika Feller): Heidi, does that complete our work on the aquaculture task force comments?

Heidi Lovett: Yes, it does.

(Erika Feller): Yay, okay. We've got a little bit of time left here on our agenda, and (Megan) and (Bob), I think I warned you a little bit earlier, and hopefully Heidi did. We thought this might be a good chance to give you guys the floor to update the group on what's going on with the Commerce and Recreational Fisheries subcommittees. We're expecting that these are probably going to be topics for the fall agenda. So we just thought this might be a good chance to check in on what you guys are working on. Who wants to go first?

((Crosstalk))

(Megan Davis): (Bob), are you okay with me going? I love it.

Heidi Lovett: Please proceed.

(Megan Davis): Okay, this is (Megan Davis), and I'm helping to chair the Seafood Promotion Task Group, which is a subsection under the Commerce Subcommittee, and for those that were at the last MAFAC meeting, we had a very dynamic round

table discussion panel talking about seafood promotion in terms of a national seafood promotion council.

And so on June 11th the task group got together with a conference call and (Roger), (Sebastian), (Harlon), (Mike), (Bob), and (Joe) were on the call along with NOAA National Marine Fishery Service, Heidi, (Jennifer), (Tom), (Laura), and (Laura), and during that call we talked about where do we go next. We had a very much a resounding yes that a national seafood promotion council sounded like a very good direction.

So now what we're looking at is, there's three main questions that we're looking to continue to work on, and so we want to look to see how deep that support is for national council, and we want to get more input from the broad seafood community. We're also looking at is there a top branding level for the national seafood promotion council, and right now we're settling on a top level seafood as actually seafood promotion and education.

And then we're also in discussion about how would a national seafood council be established and implemented, and so that those are the three main areas that the task group is working on. We have details underneath of those areas, but I want to let you know what our action items are right now. We're working on a concept on paper, probably not much more than two pages, somewhere in that vicinity.

And this would be a summary of working document for a national seafood promotion and education council, and this would be something that the industry or the seafood community as a whole can react to this. And so what we're looking at is building this concept paper that talks about the overarching goal, the mission, how to operate and metrics of success and what sort of funding would be needed for the national council.

And so what we are aiming to do is to work towards a timeline where we come back to the full Commerce Subcommittee with a concept paper, and full MAFAC like we're having this call now prior to the October meeting. And then having some listening sessions that we help to facilitate with working with NOAA, administration leadership, and getting the right voices and the right influencers to come and talk more about the concept of the national council.

And we're hoping that we'll have another panel in October. We're also hoping that we'll have some more virtual listening sessions by Webinar, and then possibly having a session at the next seafood expo in March. And then we'd like to round out all of this with recommendations back to NOAA sometime in - well, we haven't quite got the exact date on that, but certainly sometime within the next I would say 8 to 10 months. And so that's my summary, (Erika).

(Erika Feller): Thank you. Okay, (Bob), you want to fill us in on what the Recreational Fishery Subcommittee has been working on?

(Bob Gill): Sure, happy to, (Erika). So the Recreational Subcommittee for those that were at the MAFAC meeting recall that we're working on two tasks. Task one is led by (Richard Yamada), and that deals with looking into participation and retention on volunteer and citizen science applications and projects and trying to see if there's commonality on what works and what does not that would bring to bear on recommendations to the secretary.

Task two, which is led by (Robert Jones), deals with looking at the universe of recreational anglers. We're utilizing the Gulf of Mexico as a template and focusing our efforts there to look at the reporting programs of the various states, and how they are viewed not only by the state directors and the program managers. but the goods and the bads and utilize those as sources for

recommendations on how they might be improved to incorporate a better knowledge of the universe of recreational anglers.

So since the last MAFAC meeting we've gone to monthly conference calls. We meet for those that would like to join us the last Friday of each month at 2:00, no more than an hour or typically 45 minutes. And to continue progress on both these tasks, and I would characterize both tasks as in some facet in the homework phase. In case of the participation and retention in citizen science type projects, we have assembled a number of projects and articles that talk about and have done research on this problem of retention and participation.

And we are on the next call going to utilize a synthesis of that to utilize that as a basis for going out to the programs themselves to see how each program has dealt with the common structures. Similarly, in task two, the universe of recreational anglers, we have assembled a tentative list of questions to provide a common platform for discussion with state directors and program directors for each of the five states in the Gulf.

We hope to finalize that in the next month, and a team has been assembled for each state. We will have two MAFAC members and one MAFAC staffer, or maybe I should say NMFS staffer. Jointly make the call with the state director and program director of the registry and to talk about what - how they view their program and what it would take in their mind to make it better.

So the progress we should see by the fall meeting will have some of this completed, but completion of both efforts is anticipated in 2020, and that completes my summary.

(Erika Feller): Thanks, (Bob). Great. I hope that catches everybody up. Heidi, you wanted to share some meeting logistics and some other administrative stuff?

Heidi Lovett: Yes, so I believe everybody has received word that we've scheduled the fall meeting to be October 15, 16, and 17. It falls right after Columbus Day, Monday of Columbus Day. And it will be here in the general DC area. I don't have an exact hotel yet. If there are any new topics that people are interested in, they should reach out to me or (Jennifer) but as you've heard we will be scheduling time to for subcommittees to meet.

We do anticipate continuing and having a third panel conversation related to seafood promotion and education. There has been a request from the protected resources subcommittee at the last meeting related to inquiring about coral reef related grants and activities, so I've reached out and we will likely have a presentation on the current priorities of the NOAA coral reef program, which is a joint program managed by NMFS and the national ocean service. And we usually have - we'll have an update from Cisco as we usually do, as well as I think (Jeanette)...

(Jeanette Davis): No, I won't be able to attend.

Heidi Lovett: Oh.

(Jeanette Davis): Because of the PICES meeting.

Heidi Lovett: Oh, I thought you were there the first day.

(Jeanette Davis): Oh, okay.

Heidi Lovett: Well, sorry about that. Cisco was going to report on some of the research activities of the summer, in particular something he mentioned at the last meeting with some genomics related research cruises and some new work, so he's kind of already excited about reporting out on the status of that work. I

think that's all I have at the moment. Usually it's about two months in advance that we put out the call for you to start making your reservations.

The one thing that I would, as far as from the administrative side, when we do put that call out, if anybody has questions about how to secure their airfare or air flights through the contractor that we are required to use, the state federal contractor, please do reach out to me. I know there's often - there's questions, but just suffice to say that everyone must secure their air flight travel, for those that are traveling by air, it has to be done through the CWTSato contractor.

And you may not get your own airline ticket and expect reimbursement. We've had a few questions about that of late. I think that's all I have at the moment.

(Crosstalk)

(Bob Gill): Hey, this is (Bob). I have a question.

Heidi Lovett: Sure.

(Bob Gill): So in your planning for the October meeting, do you think it would be possible that we could schedule the subcommittee meetings not concurrently so that we have the options of attending more than just one?

Heidi Lovett: I will try to do that.

(Bob Gill): Thank you.

Heidi Lovett: Yes, yes. So essentially not the Recreational and Commerce at the same time. I didn't think that they overlapped last time, but I apologize if they did. I think



the Protected Resources Subcommittee did overlap with one other committee, as I recall.

(Robert): Heidi, this is (Robert). I understand that might be difficult. My request would be either way, whether they're concurrent or not, maybe we could get like maybe an extra 30 minutes added to the time slot for the subcommittees, that would be great.

Heidi Lovett: Okay, great, yes. Add 30 minutes. I will add, I totally forgot to mention, last week there was another meeting of the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force, there will be a progress report. They're going to have another meeting in September prior to our October meeting, so we'll be able to update on sort of how their - the processes that they're using in their phase two development.

I will say that their final report which we hoped to have already sent to you all, is getting printed in a formal fashion. And it's going to be also - it will be posted to the Web site, and because there's a lot of tables and graphs and things in that document, it's going through some extensive review to make sure it's 508 compliant, which means that it can be read by anybody that has any kind of disability.

And we hoped that that was going to be finished a few weeks ago and there was just a little hiccup with the printing, but at this point we expect it to be finally released in sort of a nice, colorful format, the week of - I think next week, late next week, the week of July 8. So look for email from us on that. It'll be officially rolled out.

(Erika Feller): And Heidi, I'm sure you've covered this, but just because sometimes I don't retain information like I should, for our new members, we - if you guys decide you want to join any subcommittees, what do they need to do?

Heidi Lovett: So they just need to reach out to me. I think we talked about this when I did a - I don't even know what we called it - a briefing that I gave to everybody. I know (Tom) has already been engaged I think on the Recreational Fisheries Subcommittee, and (Don) I assumed you'd want to be on the Commerce Subcommittee which is where most of the aquaculture conversation occurs. (Patrick), I'm not sure if we finalized that, but anyway you all can reach out to me.

On the MAFAC Web site there is a description of the five standing subcommittees, the three that - those two that I just mentioned. There's a public - I'm sorry the Protected Resources Subcommittee, an Ecosystems Subcommittee, which is the parent to the Columbia Basin Partnership, and a overarching Strategic Planning/Budget Subcommittee.

I actually did anticipate probably before the October meeting I will be sending something out to all members that - so just a table of where we have identified or where you all have identified, just to double check that everybody is on the committee that they wish to be on, subcommittee.

(Erika Feller): That sounds like a great idea.

Heidi Lovett: Yes. Well, we're at time.

(Don): One more quick question before we...

Heidi Lovett: Sure.

(Don): Did you receive my bio? I noticed that (Pat Sullivan) and I still have nothing on there. Did you receive the bio I sent you with the picture, or is it just taking a...

Heidi Lovett: I did, and that was on my to-do list this week. I've been on travel a little bit.

(Don): Okay. I understand that.

Heidi Lovett: But yes, I wanted to be sure to at least get your names up there quickly. I need another person to help me with the photo, but I do have the information you all sent and it will be going up very shortly.

(Don): Thank you.

Heidi Lovett: Yes. Okay, if that's it, we're adjourned.

(Don): Okay, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thanks, everybody, bye-bye.

END

**PARTICIPANTS ON THIS CALL**

MAFAC Members

Erika Feller, Chair

Sebastian Belle

Roger Berkowitz

Megan Davis

Tom Fote

Robert Gill

Robert Jones

Sara McDonald

Donald McMahon

Mike Okoniewski

Kellie Ralston

Joe Schumacker

Patrick Sullivan

Richard Yamada

NOAA Fisheries Staff

Jeanette Davis

Heidi Lovett

Mike Rust

NOAA Sea Grant Staff

Mark Rath

Public attendees

Naudelis Fernandez, Friends of the Earth (FOE)

Andrea Folds, Earthjustice

Molly Masterton, Natural Resources Defense Council, Staff Attorney

Jenni Stucker, Loyola

Richard Zarella, U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), Analyst