

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Boston, Massachusetts  
Wednesday, March 22, 2017

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 **Members:**

3 TED AMES  
Senior Advisor  
Penobscot East Resource Center

4  
5 TERRI LEE BEIDEMAN  
Chief Executive Officer  
Vast Array Corporation

6  
7 JULIE BONNEY  
Executive Director  
Alaska Groundfish Data Bank, Inc.

8  
9 DICK BRAME  
Atlantic States Fisheries Director  
Coastal Conservation Association

10  
11 HEATHER BRANDON  
Consultant  
Ocean Policy and Protected Species

12  
13 COLUMBUS BROWN  
Retired, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

14  
15 DAVID DONALDSON  
Executive Director  
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission

16  
17 PHIL DYSKOW  
Retired, President of Yamaha Motors

18  
19 RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA  
Environmental Consultant, Puerto Rico

20  
21 ERIKA FELLER  
Program Director, North American Fisheries  
The Nature Conservancy

22  
23 RANDY FISHER  
Executive Director  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 LIZ HAMILTON  
Founding Executive Director  
3 Northwest Sportsfishing Industry Association

4 JULIE MORRIS, Chair  
Associate VP for Academic Affairs  
New College of Florida

5 MIKE OKKONIEWSKI  
6 Pacific Coast Seafood

7 JIM PARSONS  
Fish Biologist  
8 Owner, Troutlodge

9 HARLON PEARCE  
Owner and Operator  
10 Harlon's LA Fish LLC

11 BOB RHEAULT  
Executive Director  
12 East Coast Shellfish Growers Association

13 PETER SHELLEY  
Senior Counsel  
Conservation Law Foundation

14 PAM YOCHER  
15 Senior Research Scientist and Ex. Vice President  
Hubbs Sea World Research Institute

16 NOAA FISHERIES STAFF:

17 PAUL DOREMUS  
18 Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations

19 JOHN HENDERSCHIEDT  
Director, International Affairs and Seafood Inspection

20 ADELE IRWIN  
NOAA Fisheries, Policy Analysis

21 HEIDI LOVETT  
NOAA Fisheries, Policy Analyst

22

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):  
2 JENNIFER LUKENS  
Director, Office of Policy  
3 KATE NAUGHTEN  
Director, Office of Communications  
4 SAM RAUCH  
Deputy Assistant Administrator  
5 Regulatory Affairs  
6 ALESIA READ  
Office of the Assistant Administrator  
7  
8 MICHAEL RUBINO  
Director, Aquaculture Office  
9 SUSAN-MARIE STEDMAN  
Office of Habitat Conservation  
10  
11 BRIANNE SZCZEPANEK  
Chief of Staff  
Office of the Assistant Administrator  
12  
13 FRANCISCO WERNER  
Chief Scientist and  
Director, Scientific Programs

14

15

16

\* \* \* \* \*

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ITEM	PAGE
3	Update on First Meeting and Activities of the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force	7
4	Ecosystems Approach Subcommittee	24
5	Commerce Subcommittee	51
6	Resilience Working Group	82
7	Letter to Secretary Ross	122
8	Close Out: Review of Decisions, Action Items, Next Steps, Next Meeting	141
9		
10	Adjourn	

11

12

13

\* \* \* \* \*

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

2 (8:56 a.m.)

3 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Good morning  
4 everyone. So, today we're having the subcommittee  
5 reports. We were going to begin with a  
6 update from Peter on a recent meeting of the  
7 Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force.

8 Paul is on a conference call from 9:00  
9 to 9:30. He'll be joining us then. Then, we'll  
10 have our Ecosystems Approach subcommittee report and  
11 the Commerce subcommittee report. And then, Terri  
12 and Ted will lead us through some sort of status  
13 report on the Resilience Working Group.

14 We're going to add to the agenda after  
15 that, a discussion and potential approval of I  
16 guess a letter to Secretary Ross about the  
17 President's budget and hiring freeze, and our  
18 concerns about that. And then we'll have the  
19 close out, next steps, action items.

20 So, the things that were actually  
21 scheduled to sort of vote, consider voting  
22 approval this morning, are on the Framework and

1       Emergency Actions report and also, this letter to  
2       Secretary Ross. I'm not sure if there's any action  
3       items coming out of the Commerce and the Systems  
4       committee, that require a vote.

5                 So, let's begin. Peter.

6                 MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Julie. And so,  
7       I'm just going to repeat for those of you who were  
8       in the committee meeting about the same material.  
9       But I do want report on the first meeting of the  
10      Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force.

11                I'm serving as the liaison between them  
12      and MAFAC and the ecosystem committee on the task  
13      force. Liz is a member of the task force in her  
14      private capacity. And for us recognizing her work  
15      there.

16                And just so people recall, this task  
17      force is being formed to allow this really  
18      important activity to go forward in the Pacific  
19      North West under the umbrella of the federal  
20      advisory committee structure.

21                There has been some discussion, that I  
22      think was reported when we undertook this task,

1 that they might have formed their own federal  
2 advisory committee. But the sense was that there  
3 was enough interest in this group, particularly,  
4 from the ecosystem-based management approach of  
5 what they were doing, that we would be willing to  
6 have them operate as a task force for this group.

7 And what they will be doing, will be  
8 making recommendations to us at the end of this  
9 process if all goes well, on common goals and  
10 helping to define a shared path to a long-term  
11 salmon and steelhead recovery in the basin.

12 I think as many of us observed when this  
13 task force was being set up, this is a very  
14 ambitious project. A number of the parties have  
15 been in significant adversarial positions for a  
16 long period of time on many of these topics. And  
17 some of that adversarial posture continues. So,  
18 this set of conversations is going to be laying  
19 over the dynamic of that adversarial process. And  
20 I think a number of us were concerned about how  
21 they would work together or whether they could  
22 work together.



1                   And just in summary, I would report that  
2                   the first meeting went very well. And it looks  
3                   like a very promising effort.

4                   I'd particularly like to call out Barry  
5                   Thom and the regional fisheries office out there,  
6                   both for their willingness to do this, number one.  
7                   And it is to sort of open your programs up to a  
8                   scrutiny like this and be willing to be influenced  
9                   by a group decision, is something new, at least in  
10                  my experience with NOAA fisheries. And so, Barry,  
11                  I think, this is probably a lot of Barry's  
12                  brainchild, I think. And he and his team deserve  
13                  a lot of risks their taking in this process.

14                  We reviewed, I think at the last MAFAC  
15                  meeting, the representatives to the task force and  
16                  their where they came from, their interests, the  
17                  stakes that they were bringing into the process.  
18                  It seems like we did a really good job. I mean  
19                  that sort of the group tested itself for like who  
20                  was missing, who was absent. And there were some  
21                  peripheral conversations about people who might be  
22                  useful there. But the overwhelming consensus was

1       that the task force had the right group of people  
2       to work on developing this shared vision.

3                There was, as I mentioned in the  
4       committee meeting, a lot of these folks are fairly  
5       process weary. They've been through a lot of  
6       different procedures. And one of the task force  
7       objectives, actually, is to come up with one  
8       common set of metrics that can be used to think  
9       about what the long-term objective is for salmon  
10      and steelhead recovery. For the community, so  
11      that there's agreement around that. And then some  
12      metrics to measure progress.

13               And so, instead of having eight  
14      different notions of what success is going to look  
15      like, hopefully, this group will come up with one  
16      set of metrics that the other subsidiary  
17      activities could nest within, so that everyone is  
18      sort of working in the same direction. And so,  
19      it's a very ambitious and promising objective.

20               They were, I think, I don't know what  
21      the right word -- cautious, about what MAFAC's  
22      role was. They didn't really understand. We're

1 definitely the new kid on the block. And so,  
2 Heidi did a really good job of providing material  
3 and an overview of what a federal advisory  
4 committee is. We were very explicit in telling  
5 the task force that they were reporting to this  
6 group. That they were not reporting directly to  
7 senior management in Commerce.

8           And so, there's a pretty healthy  
9 discussion about the degree to which MAFAC would  
10 feel at liberty to modify or adjust or add  
11 recommendations to their report of the task force.

12           And Heidi and I, I think, reported back  
13 about other task forces we've had and said, you  
14 know, we intend to honor your work. And, you  
15 know, we'll stay liaised with the group and make  
16 sure we're all happy with it and that we're  
17 staying within the bounds of the federal advisory  
18 committee requirements. And that we might likely,  
19 given that some of the people here have comments  
20 back or questions back to the task force or  
21 thoughts about maybe preliminary work products  
22 that might come out of the task force.

1                   But they were in the spirit of making  
2                   sure that the task force came to us with the most  
3                   comprehensive and representative set of  
4                   recommendations they could, and that we would  
5                   respect their work and would, you know, one of the  
6                   important roles that we would play would be to  
7                   make sure that the recommendations got before  
8                   senior agency leadership under the umbrella of  
9                   MAFAC. Which I think they all understood added  
10                  enough weight to the process that they seemed  
11                  enthusiastic to join it and once again, sort of  
12                  roll up their sleeves and go back to the task of  
13                  doing this.

14                  The first meeting, was an organizational  
15                  meeting. A facilitating group who seemed very  
16                  good was hired and ran the meeting. There was  
17                  material presented on sort of where we are in  
18                  terms of the science around recovery. And I  
19                  should mention that although some of the species,  
20                  or maybe a lot of the species, that are within the  
21                  scope of this task force, are ESA listed species.  
22                  The task force actually is broader than that and

1 is looking at all steelhead and salmon  
2 populations, whether they're listed or not in the  
3 basin.

4 So, there was a very interesting science  
5 presentation on the basin. And it is an  
6 impressive piece of geography, going all the way  
7 up into Canada, which I didn't realize, Canada and  
8 then back down to Idaho.

9 And, you know, when you actually have  
10 representatives from all the stakeholders who have  
11 powerful interests in the outcome of this, sitting  
12 around the table, it was very impressive. There  
13 were representatives of tribes. There were  
14 representatives of the power utilities, which of  
15 course, you know, have their own mission to  
16 accomplish. There were states, state  
17 representatives and state governments who have a  
18 different prospective than the Federal Government  
19 does sometimes or they have. And then there were  
20 conservation interests. I mean it was really a  
21 very impressive group. And they, you know, I  
22 think made a commitment to each other to try to

1 make this happen.

2           They set up, I think they're going to be  
3 three groups to move work along between meetings,  
4 including a sovereign group, of tribes who  
5 respect, you know, coming from New England, I  
6 don't have a lot of experience with sovereignty  
7 issues. But they're very important in the Pacific  
8 Northwest. And the treaties and other legal  
9 arrangements under which some of these recovery  
10 plans operate. The treaties with some of these  
11 tribes are very important, both to the U.S. and  
12 the tribes. And so, I think there's a sense that  
13 having a separate sovereigns group be recognized  
14 within that task force was valuable. And then  
15 there were a couple of working groups. One that  
16 would be working on the agenda for the next  
17 meeting, and one that would be working on stuff,  
18 you know, the substance of the task force so that  
19 all the meetings would be productive.

20           I think they're four meetings schedule  
21 through the end of 2017 at this point. And, you  
22 know, it's kind of fasten your seatbelts, and

1 let's see where this goes because it could be  
2 very, very exciting.

3 So, I guess I'll stop there. I didn't  
4 go into a lot of the specific goals and  
5 objectives. There are materials available, both  
6 the minutes from the task force meeting, as well  
7 as materials that Barry and his team prepared,  
8 that are available. There's a website on the  
9 Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force, I guess it  
10 is. I don't know what the exact title of the  
11 webpage is, but if you look up Columbia Basin  
12 Partnership, if you search that, you'll come up  
13 with the materials.

14 And Heidi and her team are, you know,  
15 and Barry's group, are making sure that everything  
16 gets posted. That that is again, that's a fact of  
17 requirement, that the public is included.

18 There were opportunities for members of  
19 the public to attend. It was actually very well  
20 attended. The sort of seats in the back of the  
21 room were filled with other folks who participated  
22 at different times during the meeting. And I was

1 really impressed by the sort of effort that was  
2 being brought forward. And I don't know, Liz, who  
3 was also at the same meeting, maybe she saw a  
4 different meeting. But I'd love to have you add  
5 any of your thoughts as a participant.

6 MS. HAMILTON: I think you covered it  
7 pretty well. I think a lot of us sitting at the  
8 table, we don't know whether we're there to get  
9 something done or make sure something isn't done.  
10 You know how bad it is with interest that are so  
11 varied at the table. But we got to give it a try.  
12 I mean those who finish are optimists, right?  
13 Today's our day. So, I'm sort of a little neutral  
14 about it but committed. And I've got other staff  
15 that will be attending the meetings with me as  
16 well from the science centers.

17 MS. LUKENS: Okay, Peter, I wanted to  
18 add that if you go to the MAFAC main page, there's  
19 a link to the task force and all the materials in  
20 the website there.

21 MR. SHELLEY: Great.

22 MS. LUKENS: So, if you all are



1 interested in that, you don't have to go  
2 searching, just go to the MAFAC website.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Thank you.

4 MS. MORRIS: Are there questions and  
5 comments?

6 MS. LUKENS: Yes.

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Were there any  
8 congressional staff there?

9 MR. SHELLEY: I believe there were. I  
10 was going to mention that, but I couldn't recall  
11 off hand. I think there were a couple offices.

12 MS. HAMILTON: It might have been  
13 Blumenauer or Schrader, but I could be wrong.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Schrader.

15 MS. HAMILTON: It could have been.  
16 Maybe Blumenauer. I'm trying to think now. As  
17 you mentioned, there were a lot of interested  
18 parties in the room that weren't --

19 MR. SHELLEY: But that's an important  
20 comment. And I'm sure Barry, who was incredibly  
21 thorough in setting this up, recognized the  
22 importance of having those offices stay involved

1 or at least informed about the process. But I'll  
2 double check and make sure that he is inviting all  
3 those offices.

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: (inaudible) is on  
5 Schrader. But I'm just curious to if -- I mean  
6 it's a pretty thorny issue at times. There's just  
7 so many diversities there that go away in the  
8 different routes of --

9 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- ensuring business  
11 and culture and everything.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Right. Yeah, this was  
13 definitely the honeymoon meeting. And it'll  
14 quickly into the, you know, the real nuts and  
15 bolts of marriage soon enough.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Should be out looking  
17 for divorce lawyers.

18 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, we're not looking  
19 for any divorce lawyers at this point.

20 MS. LUKENS: Liz.

21 MS. HAMILTON: I'm just going to add one  
22 thing. and I don't know whether MAFAC has the

1 money to do this or not. But every year, there is  
2 an annual update of juvenile passage data in the  
3 basin, which is, for most of us, you follow it  
4 closely, we know that's the limiting factor. You  
5 know, it's not an adult issue, it's the babies  
6 getting downstream through eight federal dams.  
7 And so, every year, the scientists in the region;  
8 if they're state, federal, tribal, scientists,  
9 monitor the small-passage data. Think of an  
10 annual report.

11           And it's fascinating. And it's done in  
12 something that even I can understand as far as how  
13 they translate the science. And it's what makes  
14 us fight for river conditions that are good for  
15 small (inaudible) downriver. And so, it's very,  
16 very informative for people who are trying to get  
17 their arms around what the underlying science  
18 issues are.

19           And I know you talked about (inaudible)  
20 factors. This is really the biggest one in the  
21 whole basin, is downstream passages.

22           So, I'll look up the data and find the

1 date for it, but it's in April. It's a half-a-day  
2 meeting. And I don't think there's a phone-in  
3 because it's a public water resources building.  
4 But I leave inspired every year that I've been  
5 able to work with (inaudible) because it's pretty  
6 simple.

7 MR. SHELLEY: I just wanted to ask Heidi  
8 if she wanted to add anything.

9 MS. LOVETT: No, I think you covered  
10 (inaudible) except for what Jennifer added, that  
11 they will always be -- the West Coast region is  
12 sort of maintaining their website because there's  
13 so much information. And it's great to have your  
14 staff helping with that. But there's a link from  
15 our webpage right to it.

16 MS. MORRIS: Okay, I just wanted to say  
17 that, you know, we wondered whether this would be  
18 a good thing to add to the MAFAC scope of  
19 activities. I think it actually strengthens MAFAC  
20 to have this work in the Columbia Basin be under  
21 our umbrella. That I hope we'll learn things from  
22 this model of a facilitated process, to set goals

1 in a very intractable and complicated, challenging  
2 management area. And hopefully, we can learn from  
3 the model and use it in other parts of our nation  
4 that face difficult problems.

5 So, I'm very glad that it's off to a  
6 good start, and I am grateful to those of you that  
7 (inaudible) participated.

8 Yes, Julie.

9 MS. HAMILTON: So, based on that, I mean  
10 people tend to be focused on materials and  
11 interaction of the participants. But it sounds  
12 like for us, we need more of a documentational  
13 process.

14 MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

15 MS. HAMILTON: And so, that it can be  
16 applied somewhere else. And so, I don't know if  
17 that's something that's being kind of reported in  
18 terms of how the process is functioning and  
19 molding.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Heidi is in charge of  
21 that.

22 (Laughter) As far as I'm

1                   concerned. I'm not a process guy.

2                   MS. LOVETT: I can add that there was a  
3 lot of process since the kernel of thought started  
4 here, and the first meeting happened there. And  
5 it involved a lot of players. And there's some  
6 really key staff up in the Westcoast region that  
7 fought it through, including, starting with Barry.  
8 Actually, because he came to us and met with  
9 lawyers from general counsel, that understand the  
10 various options.

11                   But as you said, I think he (inaudible)  
12 and brainchild. So, I think he tried to figure  
13 out what is the

14                   (inaudible) and make it happen and  
15 make it happen as soon as he could.

16                   MR. SHELLEY: I think it's good, Julie,  
17 that Heidi participates because she really has a  
18 tremendous amount of expertise around the FACA  
19 process and what's acceptable under what the  
20 requirements are for it and has already identified  
21 herself to the group as helping to play that  
22 function, to make sure to ask for states within

1 bounds.

2 MS. MORRIS: So. that is mentioned.

3 MS. HAMILTON: Yeah, I'm thinking you  
4 were asking about how the process may lead to  
5 something or were you asking how this relates to  
6 other task forces we had in MAFAC?

7 MS. MORRIS: That's basically, how we  
8 had functioned

9 (inaudible) task force, yeah.

10 Especially, when it's as  
11 complicated as this one sounds.

12 MS. LUKENS: I just wanted to clarify,  
13 that I'm glad that it actually is a requirement  
14 under FACA, that the DFO or alternate DFO, be at  
15 those task force meetings and be a part of that.  
16 So, I just want to make sure for fact purposes you  
17 understand that we have to be there, so.

18 MR. SHELLEY: Good. Julie, I couldn't  
19 hear your conversation with Liz.

20 MS. MORRIS: Oh, I was saying that I'm  
21 thinking it's not so much about how this  
22 particular process is going to unfold in terms of

1 decision making, it's more about how the process  
2 could be applied in other task force agreements.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Right. Okay.

4 MS. LUKENS: Mike.

5 MR OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry, you said DFO.

6 MS. LUKENS: Yes. Oh, not in Canada.

7 (Laughter) Designated federal official, sorry.

8 (inaudible) has something under FACA, for each  
9 committee, there's a designated federal official.  
10 Okay, sorry, I began to table, but we said so.  
11 But Canada is not (inaudible).

12 MS. HAMILTON: You're awake, right?

13 MS. LUKENS: You are.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: We call that a DFO win  
15 on Alaska.

16 MS. MORRIS: Okay, any other comments or  
17 questions? Thank you. Thank you. We'll move  
18 into the Ecosystems Approach subcommittee report  
19 panel.

20 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Thank you. we had a  
21 similar briefing that you folks just did, from  
22 Peter Shelley. Thank you very much, on the



1 Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force. We also,  
2 Susan Marie Stedman, stayed around to meet with us  
3 and talk a little bit more about the mitigation  
4 policy that NOAA's, and we appreciated that very  
5 much. And I thought what I would do is give you  
6 an idea of a general comment that we made to her  
7 and then some of the other issues that she brought  
8 to us, that you may remember she mentioned. There  
9 were 19, and she only talked about eight of them  
10 in her presentation. So, we asked her what those  
11 other ones were. And then a little bit of  
12 discussion we had at the end about process and  
13 what the next steps would be with regard to MAFAC.

14 So, one of the first comments that we  
15 made was that you may remember that she mentioned  
16 that the mitigation policy is envisioned as an  
17 overarching policy, a very general policy, and  
18 that they would follow with some more general  
19 guidance as needed. And one of the things that we  
20 mentioned was that a lot of the questions that  
21 MAFAC members had, fall into the category of the  
22 devil's in the details, sort of things.

1                   And so, we hoped that the document, even  
2                   if it is general, would have enough examples,  
3                   maybe some case studies, something like that. So,  
4                   that people will get a feel for how it would, not  
5                   only how the policy is stated, but maybe some  
6                   examples of how it would be implemented.

7                   Of the other issues that have already  
8                   been considered and that she didn't mention in her  
9                   presentation, she talked about six of them that  
10                  will be in the final summary document. And then  
11                  she mentioned three that they talked about but are  
12                  not going to include in the summary document. So,  
13                  I'll just sort of run through those quickly.

14                  The first one, was assessment tools,  
15                  whether NOAA has the right tools in place to be  
16                  able to evaluate mitigation and projects.

17                  The second one, was climate change, how  
18                  that should be factored in. And she gave the  
19                  example of a person or developer who was looking  
20                  to fill in a wetlands and then said that there was  
21                  really no need to mitigate this because the whole  
22                  area would be under water in 20 years anyway. So,

1       how this whole issue of climate change.

2                   Monitoring came up, in that sites need  
3       to be monitored long enough to actually  
4       demonstrate that they are providing the ecosystem  
5       services that they are supposed to be. And there  
6       was a fair amount of discussion about this for  
7       projects big and small. Really big projects, for  
8       example, use performance bonds.

9                   Another issue they talked about was this  
10       concept about research project or a study as a  
11       mitigation or as compensation. And in the case of  
12       some endangered species, for example, data-poor  
13       situations, actually, the best thing for  
14       mitigation might be for the developer or other  
15       entity to provide funding for a research project.

16                   Mitigation for restoration projects was  
17       also something that they talked about. And that's  
18       a complicated issue. So, for example, if you  
19       remove a dam, you may restore a stream, but then  
20       you may drain a wetlands. And so, then how do you  
21       mitigate for your mitigation project? Very  
22       complicated.

1           Another issue that they discussed that  
2           will be included in the document is the concept of  
3           combination banks or combination mitigation banks  
4           or stacked credits. And the idea there is that  
5           you can't be allowed to sell the same credit  
6           twice. So, the same project can't be used to  
7           mitigate for more than one issue. And how do you  
8           make sure that that doesn't happen.

9           They also talked about at least three  
10          things that they decided were issues but were  
11          either beyond the scope of the document or for  
12          other reasons, they wouldn't include them.

13          One of them was the what possible  
14          mechanisms for elevating NOAA's recommendations,  
15          because their role is advisory. How can they do a  
16          better job of getting peoples' attention about  
17          their recommendations that they're making.

18          The other issue or another issue was  
19          that activities with minimal impact, for example,  
20          something that is affecting less than half an  
21          acre. Those sorts of projects or activities are  
22          handled differently in different regions. So, is

1 that okay or do we need to have a more standard  
2 approach? But it was felt that that wasn't  
3 necessary to be included in the mitigation policy.

4 And then, another issue they talked  
5 about was this concept of fines in lieu of. The  
6 concern was that these monies may sit in a fund at  
7 the Army Corps for years. And the question was  
8 whether somehow these could be used, if NOAA  
9 fisheries could get access to these funds for  
10 beneficial uses. And it was thought that, as you  
11 can imagine, there's a lot of legal issues and  
12 financial issues that was too complex and really  
13 not appropriate for the mitigation policy.

14 So, moving forward, you may remember the  
15 timeline that she talked about when she gave the  
16 presentation to all of us. Within the next couple  
17 of months, NOAA expects to have a revised or  
18 condensed version of the issues document. It's  
19 going to include some of the feedback that we  
20 provided. And then it's going to go back to, my  
21 understanding is that it'll go back to the  
22 stakeholders that have been a part of the process

1       so far, which would include MAFAC. And we'd be  
2       given another opportunity to comment.

3                   And I took notes on what we said during  
4       the meeting, and then I also took notes about the  
5       subcommittee member comments on some of these  
6       other issues. So, I can either share those with  
7       everyone now, or we can just wait until the issues  
8       document comes out and make any comments then.  
9       So, hold that thought, we'll think about that in a  
10      moment.

11                   And then, the full-draft mitigation plan  
12      is expected by December. And so, then we would  
13      have an opportunity to comment, our comments would  
14      be valued on that plan as well.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Randy?

16                   MR. FISHER: You know, this thing  
17      worries me because the more I think about it, and  
18      the more I listen to it, the more worried I seem  
19      to get. Because I don't know how we're going to  
20      do all this stuff. My recommendation to Paul was,  
21      you know, probably what you should do is instead  
22      of calling it a policy, you should call it

1 principles. So, you'd have some general  
2 principle. Because I think what they're trying to  
3 do is tell other agencies, which have the rule of  
4 permitting authority, what they think is  
5 important.

6 It seems to me, that I would be more  
7 interested in the higher-level principles first,  
8 and then start drilling down. Because it just  
9 seems to me that there's a lot of workload here,  
10 and they don't have anybody to do it.

11 MS. YOCHER: I would just say, in your  
12 mind, what is the distinction between principle  
13 and policy?

14 MR. FISHER: I think principles give you  
15 more latitude, policy may not. Because policy is  
16 usually, you know, when you have a policy, then  
17 you've got to have some sort way of dealing with  
18 that policy.

19 It seems to me that there is a lot of  
20 opportunity here for people with the regional to  
21 interpret a lot of the stuff the way they want to.  
22 And it seems to me that they maybe have already

1 done this is to go around to the different regions  
2 and say, okay, what's the biggest problem we have  
3 here. What now am I supposed to do? They  
4 probably don't have enough people to do such and  
5 such and consultations, you know, to resolve that.  
6 There's a lot of other agencies that are getting  
7 very upset. So, I just think it gives you more  
8 latitude.

9 MS. MORRIS: Jennifer?

10 MS. LUKENS: So, I think that's a good  
11 point when you say policy. There's a lot of  
12 different -- it means a lot of different things to  
13 a lot of different people. And the way the policy  
14 directives system is set up within NOAA fisheries,  
15 policy is a more overall high level over our  
16 (inaudible) statement of what our beliefs are or  
17 what our goals are.

18 Then, we have a next step down, which is  
19 our procedural documents, which gets more into how  
20 we do something with the directions on how you do  
21 things or how you apply that to get to reach those  
22 principles and with those goals that are outlined



1 in a policy itself.

2 When Susan Marie put out that schematic  
3 there that had the policy with the stepdown  
4 guidance, you're right, it's a lot if you include  
5 all of that stepdown guidance there. And that's a  
6 conversation that they are having, and they  
7 realize that it is a huge undertaking. It could  
8 be a huge undertaking.

9 So, they have involved folks from every  
10 single one of the regional offices, the habitat  
11 offices. And it is a very inclusive conversation.  
12 And I'm not sure how big it's going to be or how  
13 small it's going to be. But I think it is a  
14 worthwhile undertaking to look at from that high  
15 level and then make those decisions as to how far  
16 down and how much effort is being put into that  
17 and what it looks like.

18 So, I don't think the level of  
19 complexity that you're thinking about right now is  
20 the ultimate goal of the discussion. It's good,  
21 they're just starting to have the discussion.

22 So, I as the policy office director, is

1 going to be trying to help navigate them through  
2 and advise them through that process.

3 MS. MORRIS: Liz?

4 MS. HAMILTON: I'm troubled from a  
5 completely different prospective. Because I've  
6 heard and I've seen that there are authorities  
7 under which this needs to be done. And if it's  
8 not done, that latitude could cause -- I'm just  
9 making this up now, you know, someone in the  
10 Southwest, to ask for different (inaudible) of  
11 different litigation for damage than someone in  
12 the Northeast. And so, the word programmatic was  
13 popping into my head when she was talking.

14 But I'm sort of troubled with not  
15 getting something on paper before we start having  
16 banks, and I mean real banks, money; big, real  
17 money as this grows as an industry, and it is on  
18 the West Coast. I think some good guidance, so  
19 people know how NOAA's going to approach this and  
20 the consultations that are ESA or EFH or even from  
21 permitting where they're

22 (inaudible). Anyway, I'm more

1                   troubled on where how the money  
2                   plays into all this. And I mean  
3 workload's always an issue, but still, this is  
4 your authorities that have to do it.

5                   MS. LUKENS: I've got Bob (inaudible).

6                   MR. RHEAULT: Yes, I'm sort of  
7 wondering, so who is this for? Who's the target  
8 audience? Is this internal guidance? Is this  
9 external guidance (inaudible) agencies and NGOs?  
10 Are we telling the Army Corps how to do this, and  
11 do we have the authority to do that? (inaudible).  
12 Are we writing a BFD or are we writing rules? And  
13 I'm just, you know, who's the target audience and  
14 under what authority I guess, if we are telling  
15 other people other than NOAA how to do this,  
16 where?

17                   MS. LUKENS: I would say, it is a NOAA  
18 fisheries policy. It is for NOAA fisheries  
19 employees and direction to them on how to  
20 implement under a legal (inaudible) system  
21 authorities. And is a publicly available document  
22 that will be listed on your external website, so

1 people can understand what our position is and how  
2 we're going to implement that. We cannot tell  
3 other people.

4 MR. RHEAULT: That's what I thought.

5 MS. LUKENS: But there's advisement on  
6 how we're going to do things and letting others  
7 know what our guidance is, and we're trying to get  
8 to the objective of predictability and consistency  
9 to a certain (inaudible), certain, you know,  
10 there's always going to need to be built-in  
11 regional flexibility based on geography and  
12 (inaudible) and whatnot. The purpose of our  
13 policy, we've been trying to tell other people to  
14 do.

15 MR. RHEAULT: And what goals and  
16 guidance and rules and regulations?

17 MS. LUKENS: Yeah, policy is not a  
18 regulation in my definition. In my policy  
19 directives world that we limit in fisheries,  
20 policy is not a rule or regulation or statute, it  
21 is kind of the next layer down of interpreting of  
22 what that means internally to our folks for

1 consistency, efficiency and help me execute our  
2 programs and our mandates.

3 MS. MORRIS: In my sense to Pam's  
4 concerns, that having policy guidance will help  
5 the limited staff to feel like they can't deal  
6 with the workload and consultations, this should  
7 help them be more efficient and more productive in  
8 terms of getting consultations. Pam?

9 MS. YOCHER: I think this discussion  
10 here is one of the reasons that we, I mean that  
11 was the sense I got when people were asking  
12 questions when she was getting her original  
13 presentation, is that people are nervous about --  
14 give us some examples about exactly how you intend  
15 to use this or how you plan to, you know, so that  
16 we do have some predictability and some  
17 understanding of what this policy is going to mean  
18 for, you know, for us or for others. Ray?

19 MR. ESPINOZA: Thank you. So, I found a  
20 couple things really interesting. And one of the  
21 things you mentioned was when using mitigation in  
22 the face of climate change and habitat migrations,

1 I think we need to be really careful because  
2 depending on what the policy or principles go with  
3 that, you're implying that when you're modeling  
4 those changes, certain data is going to be  
5 accepted as the norm.

6 So, for example, if you're saying why am  
7 I going to mitigate this area because it's going  
8 to disappear anyway and seeing how you worked it  
9 out. depending on the language you use to put  
10 that in to the policy, it could set precedence  
11 onto, again, the science part. Onto what data is  
12 used for -- not specifically for the mitigation,  
13 but what modeling is used to see where errors are  
14 going to shift and not shift.

15 And so, that just makes me a bit nervous  
16 because what data are you going to use? Are you  
17 going to use the lower side or the higher side?  
18 And I know that it's risky as well as interesting.  
19 I mean that conversation really interests me as  
20 part of the science as well just because of what  
21 implications it could have on other things.

22 And, you know, to begin with, I think

1       it's not really mentioning about, we were talking  
2       about the ERP and that conversation with the rural  
3       versus urban if mitigation goes here and where it  
4       goes. I think it could play a role to identifying  
5       the best areas. And that's, I think where  
6       modeling as well could have a role seeing  
7       (inaudible) that doesn't mean you just don't have  
8       to mitigate it because you have to mitigate where  
9       it does migrate to.

10                I think, again, I think it's really  
11       interesting. It's a really big task, not just on  
12       the policy side but then on the implications that  
13       it has on what science is implicitly accepted as  
14       the norm. And so, that's what I just wanted.

15                MS. YOCHER: Thank you. And again, I  
16       think that's what she was trying to convey a  
17       little bit is the dilemma. Is that we want to  
18       acknowledge that climate is an issue. We want to  
19       acknowledge that this off-site compensation is an  
20       issue, without getting down too much in the weeds  
21       about exactly how we're going to solve that  
22       problem or we would address an individual project.

1                   But as you saw, with all the questions  
2                   that came out, people want at least a sense of:  
3                   Can you give us a case study? Can you give us an  
4                   example of how that might be approached?

5                   MS. LUKENS: So, I think this discussion  
6                   that you all are having here and your comments  
7                   here is exactly what Susan Marie is looking to  
8                   hear from and what NOAA is looking to hear from  
9                   MAFAC. And looking at the issues paper coming  
10                  out, what your concerns may be. And when they get  
11                  to that actual draft, hearing from you all, it's  
12                  too big, it's too small, it forgot something, it  
13                  included something it didn't need to include.

14                  So, the idea of what it's going to look  
15                  like on the end, isn't there right now, it's in  
16                  the scoping phase. And I think that will be very  
17                  valuable, and I'm glad she had the opportunity to  
18                  come up here and tee up the issue for you all.  
19                  And as it moves along, you all have those concerns  
20                  from a variety of different perspectives across  
21                  the spectrum, for you all to weigh in on that.  
22                  that's what we're looking for.



1 MS. MORRIS: Mike.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think Randy kind of  
3 nailed it once (inaudible). It seems to me, the  
4 principles and objectives and goals that are  
5 foundational to your policy. And I go on the  
6 website, and I see reference under ADFM, two  
7 principles, but I can't find them, of course.  
8 There's a roadmap, and there's kind of an outline  
9 of what it is all about. Maybe some of those  
10 could be principles, but it doesn't explicitly say  
11 they are principles. And I would think that that  
12 was somewhat elementary to developing policy.

13 MS. LUKENS: There's a policy and then  
14 the roadmap is the procedural directives. So,  
15 there's two documents --

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

17 MS. LUKENS: -- on it.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, that's what a  
19 roadmap would be, but --

20 MS. LUKENS: No, sorry. The terminology  
21 in our policy directive system. We have a policy.  
22 We have an EBFM policy. Our procedural directive

1 is called a roadmap. So, it fits underneath that  
2 in how our system is set up, so.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think it would be a  
4 way to get policy implemented.

5 MS. LUKENS: It is.

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But the step before  
7 that, it seems to be, is the lay and the  
8 principles of what it is you're trying to achieve  
9 and why you -- those are the basis for why you're  
10 doing -- in my --

11 MS. LUKENS: And that's what's in the  
12 policy. I can follow up if you need help with  
13 that.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Again, missing  
15 something.

16 MS. LUKENS: Pam.

17 MS. YOCHER: So, as Jennifer says, what  
18 I'm hearing is it's going to be up to use to  
19 feedback. This is too specific. It's not  
20 specific enough. It includes something it  
21 shouldn't include, that general comment as well as  
22 commenting on some of the specific topics.

1                   So, yours about, you know, we should be  
2                   talking about principles not policy, that could be  
3                   something that when we see the issues document  
4                   come back. Because I did hear, you know, from  
5                   Susan Marie that she heard us and heard others who  
6                   have commented on it so far. And so, we don't  
7                   know how much our input is going to be incorporated  
8                   in the document that's going to come out in a  
9                   couple of months. And if we don't feel like we  
10                  got our point across, then we're going to have  
11                  another opportunity to try to get that point  
12                  across.

13                  MS. BONNEY: So, then in the timeline,  
14                  wouldn't you suggest that we be doing a  
15                  teleconference review?

16                  MS. MORRIS: Heidi, do you want to  
17                  comment on that? You had talked about that there  
18                  might be several subcommittees that would be doing  
19                  things or needing to talk in late summer or early  
20                  summer.

21                  MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I'm not sure of Susan  
22                  Marie's timeline exactly, but there's opportunity

1 to do webinars and bring information back here.

2 I'm forgetting specifically when she  
3 said that issues paper was due, but when it came  
4 out, we thought we would do a webinar. It would  
5 be for the whole committee but targeting,  
6 obviously, the subcommittees, so that they can  
7 help monitor the progress of the work. Does that  
8 answer it?

9 MS. YOCHEM: Yes.

10 MS. BONNEY: So, it's a two-step  
11 process. So, the summer review and then probably  
12 another final review at

13 (inaudible). (inaudible) maybe?

14 MS. MORRIS: Well, it won't be final  
15 because the actual policy is not expected out  
16 until December.

17 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So, it might go to  
18 (inaudible) in the next few (inaudible).

19 MS. MORRIS: So, what seems still a  
20 little bit unclear is whether the review of the  
21 draft issues paper in the summer is a subcommittee  
22 review or a MAFAC review.

1 MS. YOICHEM: Yes, and that's what I  
2 would like guidance from the committee, on whether  
3 you want the webinar to be just to the  
4 subcommittee, and we will, as I said, I've taken  
5 some notes, or if you think that this is something  
6 that the full committee would want to hear and  
7 have a chance to weigh in on.

8 MS. BONNEY: What do you think? The  
9 subcommittee has fluid boundaries, right?

10 MS. YOICHEM: Yes.

11 MS. BONNEY: Sort of it's not, there's a  
12 lay of a defined group of people empowered to  
13 participate in the subcommittee activity. Is that  
14 what you were going to say for your (inaudible)  
15 Peter?

16 MR. SHELLEY: No, I was just going to  
17 say

18 (inaudible). But boundaries. I'm  
19 interested in hearing, but I  
20 realize I'm on this subcommittee,  
21 so I'm coming either way.

22 MS. MORRIS: That kind of fixes that.

1 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

2 MS. MORRIS: Do you have a strong  
3 feeling about whether there should be a full MAFAC  
4 review of the kinds of comments that the  
5 subcommittee will be developing in response to the  
6 draft issues paper? Am I using the right language  
7 here, Peter?

8 MR. SHELLEY: Well, maybe there could be  
9 a quick report out from the committee  
10 electronically to the full MAFAC with a reply, you  
11 know, it's a rather quick turnaround reply date  
12 for any concerns.

13 MS. MORRIS: Ray?

14 MR. ESPINOZA: Yeah. So, I'm not on the  
15 subcommittee, and so, I would either appreciate to  
16 be on the subcommittee or be part of -- allow  
17 MAFAC so that I could comment on that as well.

18 MS. MORRIS: Liz?

19 MS. HAMILTON: When she was describing  
20 the schedules, it seemed to me like they weren't  
21 date. That it is a work in progress. And I was  
22 thinking while she was talking that it is really

1 likely that our fall meeting will be close to the  
2 point of when they have a policy. And if they  
3 want advice, if, you know, if NOAA wants advice  
4 from us, we could mesh that with our next meeting.  
5 And so, that didn't seem that far off, but it  
6 could (inaudible).

7 MS. MORRIS: Heidi.

8 MS. LOVETT: So, I think the question  
9 that you're trying to figure out is whether you  
10 all feel we need to have some kind of consensus  
11 advice or if you're comfortable with your  
12 individual advice coming through MAFAC to Susan  
13 Marie. Does that make sense?

14 If you want to be able to air and share  
15 all your concerns regardless of, you know, your  
16 stakeholder view that you work in and who you  
17 represent so to speak and you're experience, all  
18 of that advice is helpful to Susan Marie. But if  
19 you feel it important for you to have some  
20 consensus advice, then, you know, we can monitor  
21 the process and organize the meetings as necessary  
22 of the full committee. Does that make sense?

1                   MS. YOICHEM: Yes, so could either -- in  
2 other words, given all this timing, we could ask  
3 Susan to come back to the fall meeting and give  
4 another presentation of the revised document. And  
5 then we could comment individually there. Is that  
6 what you're saying, rather than having something  
7 interim?

8                   MS. LOVETT: No, no, we could do  
9 something interim and provide comments. It's that  
10 individual comments versus a consensus advice.  
11 It's up to you all what you think you might need  
12 to do. Does that make sense?

13                   When the draft policy comes out and it's  
14 out for public review, that might be a time where  
15 you might want to make some adjustments. Because  
16 she's getting input from a variety of people ahead  
17 of that. And otherwise, your individual input is  
18 very helpful to her at this point, I think.

19                   MS. MORRIS: It seems like because  
20 MAFAC's engaged through this meeting, through a  
21 presentation to the whole committee, we kind of  
22 have a path to, as a group, make comments.



1                   And so, we definitely want to comment  
2                   once there's a draft policy at the end of the  
3                   year. But it also seems like we have an  
4                   opportunity, as MAFAC, to comment as the draft  
5                   policy is being -- and I think that's what we  
6                   should do, not just depend on this as the  
7                   information and we respond individually until the  
8                   official comment period. So, I'm moving in a  
9                   different direction.

10                   MS. LOVETT: Okay, that's fine. I just  
11                   wanted to explain the difference.

12                   MS. MORRIS: I think I'm new leader.  
13                   (Laughter) I don't want to do something else.

14                   MS. BONNEY: I agree with you.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

16                   MS. BONNEY: And I think that doing it  
17                   through the subcommittee makes sense.

18                   MS. MORRIS: Okay.

19                   MS. BONNEY: And then it's just  
20                   everybody's noticed, so you're welcomed to join if  
21                   you're a MAFAC member.

22                   MR. ESPINOZA: Right. Julie, I agree

1 with that just because I was, for example, I  
2 wasn't approached as an individual or as  
3 (inaudible) NGO to comment on that. I was  
4 approached as a MAFAC member. So, that's my  
5 access to it. Because there's a lot of things I'm  
6 commenting to NOAA on my own, and I don't do it as  
7 a MAFAC member. And so, since it was done here, I  
8 think that's the appropriate avenue to do so.

9 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, yes, Peter.

10 MR. SHELLEY: I just have a procedure  
11 question. Under the (inaudible) such a good  
12 federal advisory committee member --

13 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, in the notes.

14 MR. SHELLEY: -- decisions, if this  
15 group is making decisions, does that have to  
16 happen publicly?

17 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

18 MR. SHELLEY: Or it's with some public  
19 capacity to chime in.

20 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

21 MR. SHELLEY: Good. I mean, so we've  
22 got to take that in to account, whatever approach

1 we agree on.

2 MS. MORRIS: So, if we have a summer  
3 webinar or comments called, to develop some  
4 comments on the draft, that would be a publicly  
5 noticed, available for public comment.

6 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

7 MS. MORRIS: Thanks, Peter. Okay, so  
8 whatever happens in the summer, is going to  
9 be based at the subcommittee.

10 MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

11 MS. MORRIS: It will be publicly  
12 noticed. We may invite Susan to come back to the  
13 fall MAFAC meeting in order to brief all of MAFAC  
14 on how our (inaudible) evolving. And then, after  
15 the draft policy is posted for official public  
16 comment, that'll be the third time we swing at it.

17 Okay, great. Thank you for that. Ready  
18 for the Commerce subcommittee report?

19 MS. BONNEY: I don't feel that I can do  
20 as good a job as Pam did. And I didn't have a  
21 full cup of a coffee when you asked me if there  
22 was an action to vote on.

1                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, it is an action  
2 to vote on.

3                   MR. SHELLEY: Yes. (Laughter)

4                   MS. BONNEY: So, I think the background  
5 for the recommendation is, we had quite a bit of  
6 discussion at the beginning of the meeting before  
7 we actually figured out what direction we were  
8 going to go, about the excitement in terms of  
9 making progress on the aquaculture under the  
10 current Administration. And so, there's a lot of  
11 things happening on a policy level and also on the  
12 industry level, where people think that they're  
13 finally going to be able to break through the  
14 ceiling and make some progress. So, it was really  
15 felt that MAFAC should be a partner in that, in  
16 terms of continuing to make progress.

17                   And if you look at the National Aqua-  
18 Culture Association letter, they basically are  
19 saying that they want us to be engaged with the  
20 implementation of the strategic plan. And also,  
21 are looking at certain elements in the letter to  
22 continue to make progress in aquaculture.



1 Culture of additional, and I guess it would be us,  
2 of additional actions and allocation of resources.  
3 These become apparent as a result of the review in  
4 progress with me. So, that's right of the letter.

5 Creation of a standardized permit  
6 process for short- term aquaculture research to  
7 allow the testing.

8 Demonstration of technologies in the EEZ  
9 and other recommendations that they deem important  
10 or recommend to MAFAC to help move aquaculture  
11 policy forward.

12 MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, it's really hard  
13 to

14 (inaudible).

15 MS. LOVETT: So, ladies, we'll hang it  
16 on the screen for us all to see.

17 MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

18 MS. BONNEY: So, the only point I would  
19 raise, Heidi, is we need to take recommendations  
20 to MAFAC for the Office of Aquaculture. Because  
21 their making recommendations to us is not directly  
22 to the Office of Aquaculture.

1 MS. MORRIS: Is there any more  
2 explanation you want to provide while we're --

3 MS. BONNEY: So, I think the best thing  
4 to do would be to look directly at the letter.  
5 So, we're pulling a lot of tasks directly out of  
6 the letter that they submitted to us.

7 MS. MORRIS: Okay, and this was posted  
8 on the rating --

9 MS. BONNEY: Right.

10 MS. MORRIS: -- website where the  
11 presentations were posted, right?

12 MS. BONNEY: Exactly. And we did kind  
13 of put that one catchall in there. I don't know  
14 if people are nervous about that. But knowing  
15 that that group is really the expert, they may  
16 have better ideas than we do.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, is this a  
18 proposed motion from the Commerce subcommittee to  
19 the full committee? I guess it is.

20 Okay, so we're discussing the motion  
21 then.

22 MS. BONNEY: So, the only comment that I

1 would make is recommendations to MAFAC for the  
2 Office of Aquaculture because of the (inaudible).  
3 So, the second bullet, I think, needs to be  
4 modified.

5 MS. LOVETT: Is that what you're asking?

6 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

7 MS. MORRIS: Peter?

8 MR. SHELLEY: I recommend we take out on  
9 the points that the NAAA raised in their letter  
10 from the first bullet.

11 MS. MORRIS: Do you have a rational?

12 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I mean I think we  
13 either do this or we don't do this. NOAA has  
14 alerted us to some concerns they have, but we're  
15 not doing this, you know, because they asked us  
16 to, I guess is the simplest way to put it. I mean  
17 I think it's, you know, if we reviewed the  
18 strategy annually and NOAA will certainly continue  
19 to keep giving those inputs, I think the same  
20 objective is made without sort of highlighting one  
21 group.

22 MS. MORRIS: Pam?



1                   MS. YOICHEM: I would agree with that,  
2                   because I think the, well the NOAA letter raised a  
3                   number of issues, there might be others that the  
4                   task force would want to -- other aspects of the  
5                   strategic plan that they would want to review.  
6                   So, we don't want to just --

7                   MR. SHELLEY: Limit.

8                   MS. YOICHEM: -- indicate that we're  
9                   limiting to those points.

10                  MS. MORRIS: And is annually the right  
11                  time period for that review by the task force?

12                  MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

13                  MS. YOICHEM: Yes, it is.

14                  MS. MORRIS: And the mover and seconder  
15                  are okay with that adjustment?

16                  MR. RHEAULT: Do we need to clarify that  
17                  it's the

18                                 (inaudible) agriculture strategic  
19                                 plan --

20                  MS. MORRIS: Sure.

21                  MR. RHEAULT: -- with what we're doing?

22                  MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Any other suggestions

1 about the dots, the four bullets?

2 MS. BONNEY: So, I guess my only  
3 question on that is the strategic plan  
4 implementation in progress? Are we implementing  
5 the plan versus just --?

6 MS. MORRIS: Sure. That makes sense.  
7 Does that make sense? The implementation of  
8 NOAA's --

9 MS. BONNEY: Progress on the  
10 implementation of. There you go, right there.  
11 Get rid of the word progress.

12 MS. MORRIS: That's good.

13 MR. RHEAULT: And I guess I just have a  
14 process question. How is the makeup of the task  
15 force created and updated and indicating who's on  
16 it and who gets on it and who stays on it and who  
17 decides?

18 MS. LUKENS: So, when the task force was  
19 set up, we had a charter established for it. And  
20 I think we need to go back to that maybe and look  
21 at if we need to just reup with the new tasks that  
22 we're asking it undertake or if we need to create

1 that. So, I'll defer to Heidi now.

2 MS. LOVETT: So, there was a terms of  
3 reference assigned to the task force. And it  
4 seems to me that what you're doing here is  
5 creating a new terms of reference, and you've made  
6 the request that the task force be maintained for  
7 two additional years.

8 So, I would propose that we would send  
9 letters of invite to the current members, asking  
10 if they wish to continue for the next two years  
11 with this terms of reference. And then if there  
12 are gaps, meaning people are stepping down or for  
13 whatever reason, if there's vacancies, then we can  
14 put a call out to solicit additional members for  
15 it.

16 MS. MORRIS: Yes, Julie?

17 MS. BONNEY: So, in the past, I think,  
18 John Corbin was kind of the liaison between MAFAC  
19 and the task force. And so, I don't know if  
20 there's that bridge that exists between the  
21 current members and MAFAC right now.

22 MS. LOVETT: Bob's been doing both.

1                   MR. RHEAULT: I mean I can do it until  
2                   like I'm termed out in February.

3                   MR. PARSONS: I'm fine with doing it  
4                   too, so.

5                   MS. MORRIS: So, Jim and Bob will help  
6                   with that. Julie, can you help us get the right  
7                   words for the first part, which is just kind of  
8                   suggested here that MAFAC is recommending  
9                   reconstituting or breathing new life -- I don't  
10                  know what the (inaudible), bringing new life into  
11                  -- giving a second life to the Aquaculture Task  
12                  Force for a two-year period with terms of  
13                  reference as follows.

14                  MR. PARSONS: We approved their  
15                  continuation last year for one year.

16                  MS. MORRIS: Okay.

17                  MR. PARSONS: But we haven't had any  
18                  tasks for it.

19                  MS. MORRIS: Oh, so it's still -- when  
20                  does that one year up?

21                  MR. PARSONS: A year from Portland. So,  
22                  whenever that is.

1 MS. BONNEY: Coming up. Yeah.

2 MS. LOVETT: And there was a task force  
3 for it because they provided input on the  
4 strategic plan. So, that was their work --

5 MR. PARSONS: Right.

6 MS. LOVETT: -- over last year.

7 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Julie, can you  
8 help us give the words so that this is an actual  
9 motion about --

10 MS. BONNEY: So, you need -- basically,  
11 you're talking about up above.

12 MS. MORRIS: Right, just kind of says  
13 may wish to, could be. So, what are the words  
14 that represent what we're doing there?

15 MS. BONNEY: Well, she's typing right  
16 now. I think it's reconstitute, would be the  
17 right word, don't you think?

18 MS. YOCHAM: Or continue. Maintain.

19 MS. MORRIS: Maintain or continue  
20 (inaudible).

21 MS. BONNEY: Okay, it's continue.

22 MS. YOCHAM: Maintain.

1                   MS. BONNEY: Maintain for an additional  
2 two years. That works.

3                   MS. LOVETT: Does that work for you?  
4 MAFAC request that the Aquaculture Task Force be  
5 maintained for two years to conduct this work.

6                   MS. BONNEY: I would say to conduct the  
7 following, versus.

8                   MS. LOVETT: Okay.

9                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, is this acceptable to  
10 the mover and the second? Mike.

11                   MR. RUBINO: Just a question that I've  
12 been asked to

13                               (inaudible). I guess number one  
14 for a bullet point, highest bullet  
15 point. Has there been an attempt  
16 to like capture how many permits or  
17 how many applications have been  
18 submitted, you know, for how long  
19 they're going and when their  
20 progress is -- individual projects  
21 is or how many of them are  
22 prototypes or what? I mean what

1                   stage of development or how much  
2                   progress are they actually making  
3                   in this implementation?

4                   MR. PARSONS: Zero.

5                   MR. RUBINO: So, that's a pretty easy  
6 measurement. It's also an F grade in school. So,  
7 I guess maybe it's nothing to do with language,  
8 but going forward, I think that's something we  
9 want to get measured (inaudible) or at least  
10 comment on.

11                  MR. PARSONS: Well, there's a lawsuit  
12 that has to disappear first for Gulf anyway, so.

13                  MR. RUBINO: I always mention that too.

14                  MS. MORRIS: So, I take your comments to  
15 be supportive. Anybody else? Heidi?

16                  MS. LOVETT: I just want to point out.  
17 I think as we were capturing this during  
18 yesterday's meeting, the third bullet was  
19 something which you all were requesting of the  
20 Agency. I guess I'm not reading it right. So,  
21 you might want to pull that bullet out and have it  
22 separate from what you have, you know, proposed to

1 the task force.

2 MS. MORRIS: Pam.

3 MS. YOCHER: Oh, Paul had something to  
4 say.

5 MR. DOREMUS: My question was about that  
6 bullet too.

7 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, it's because this was  
8 notes on the generation of the subcommittee work,  
9 so.

10 MR. DOREMUS: Yeah, it's probably where  
11 that gets directed. But also, it implies the  
12 limitation in a sense on technology development  
13 for using EEZ and (inaudible) economic zone was  
14 (inaudible) on, and (inaudible) and see where the  
15 value changes (inaudible) attributes (inaudible).  
16 I think intent is to try to develop technology  
17 that can be used to forebode production, that  
18 could evolve a complex system to have land-based  
19 components (inaudible).

20 MR. PARSONS: I think the intent of the  
21 association and the directors that pushed this  
22 forward was to make the process standardized for



1 those that wanted to try to get a research project  
2 going. Because they're not yet at this point --

3 MR. DOREMUS: I wasn't getting that  
4 meeting from that bullet. I was just testing for  
5 --

6 MR. PARSONS: But it's not yet.

7 MR. DOREMUS: You can't get a  
8 streamlined permit for research projects.

9 MR. PARSONS: Yeah.

10 MR. DOREMUS: So, you wouldn't  
11 necessarily have the same rigorous and --

12 MR. PARSONS: That's production.

13 MR. DOREMUS: -- time-consuming nature  
14 as a full commercial permit.

15 SPEAKER: How are we getting that from  
16 them

17 (inaudible)?

18 MR. DOREMUS: Clarification helps a lot.

19 MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, Pam had her hand  
20 up.

21 MS. YOCHER: Actually, I remember this  
22 discussion too, and I thought one of the things

1 that came out of that discussion was that maybe  
2 this was too specific for a charge - - that this  
3 was a specific recommendation that the task force  
4 might make after reviewing progress on the  
5 strategic plan and finding that it wasn't moving  
6 forward fast enough, that a suggestion might be a  
7 standardized, you know, process for doing  
8 demonstration projections. That recommendation  
9 seems at a different level than the other ones.

10 MR. MORRIS: Julie's next then Bob.

11 MS. BONNEY: Let Bob go first.

12 MR. RHEAULT: Well, I'm just suggesting  
13 that that would be something that would be more  
14 appropriate for the full MAFAC to recommend to the  
15 intergovernmental working group on agriculture.  
16 That that's really where, you know, this is  
17 something that should eventually come from MAFAC  
18 as a recommendation to the intergovernmental  
19 working group, provided we can all agree that  
20 that's something we want to do.

21 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so are you saying it  
22 doesn't belong in the motion or --

1 MR. RHEAULT: Correct.

2 MS. MORRIS: -- it doesn't belong in the  
3 motion? You would recommend removing it from the  
4 motion.

5 MR. RHEAULT: Yes, that would be  
6 something that MAFAC should decide to do, not  
7 necessarily a task for the --

8 MS. MORRIS: So, is that --

9 MR. RHEAULT: -- task force.

10 MS. MORRIS: -- is that a second motion  
11 that we'll take up after this motion or something  
12 that will be

13 (inaudible)? I don't understand.

14 MR. RHEAULT: The question is whether it  
15 belongs here as a direction to the task force.

16 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

17 MR. RHEAULT: I do believe that as a  
18 recommendation from NOAA from other bodies and  
19 various formats, it's already been recommended in  
20 a letter to the intergovernmental working group,  
21 that I just received this morning. So, I mean  
22 other people are advocating for this. We could

1 emphasize that and carry that message forward from  
2 MAFAC or choose not to. That's something that's  
3 sort of different from what we're discussing right  
4 now, it's just the judgement of the task force.

5 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Harlon?

6 MR. PEARCE: I just don't want us to get  
7 confused because really, my vote today, was to get  
8 something done and

9 (inaudible), so you could get some  
10 sort of prototype or whatever, so  
11 that we can process this policy  
12 (inaudible)). It just not as  
13 simple with the (inaudible) as  
14 opposed to when you intend to make  
15 it work.

16 And so, whatever it takes to get that to  
17 work, is what I'm in favor of. If you've got to  
18 move it to another spot or whatever. All I want  
19 to do is get 'er done. Get it over with.

20 (inaudible). I understand what Bob's saying. I  
21 just don't want to lose it or however you put it.  
22 So, get it out of this (inaudible) and put it in

1 something maybe let's say we're stronger than this  
2 spot here.

3 MS. MORRIS: Jennifer?

4 MS. LUKENS: I thought I raised my hand.  
5 But in looking at this, I think the top three  
6 bullets are what the motion should be, and that  
7 the bottom one that is no longer a bullet, is  
8 something that our MAFAC or representatives, Jim  
9 and Bob, could bring to include as part of the  
10 discussion of the task force, as part of  
11 reflection of their conversation here and bring it  
12 back there, so it doesn't have to part of the  
13 motion itself.

14 MS. MORRIS: Julie?

15 MS. BONNEY: Well, I guess my only  
16 question is, is that something you need the aqua  
17 culture experts to have input in? So, in other  
18 words, is it something that you could just direct  
19 NOAA up to begin the process of developing these  
20 kinds of permits or do you need a stakeholder  
21 group to help advise how to make that function?

22 MR. PARSONS: I don't think we need to

1 micro- manipulate the intergovernmental workings  
2 with agriculture. If we tell them that we think  
3 this is imperative, that this is helpful, please  
4 do this. And there's a lot of agencies that are  
5 still going to have to work on it. It's not just  
6 NOAA. They all need to get their finger in the  
7 pot.

8 MS. MORRIS: Harlon.

9 MR. PEARCE: Keep it simple, stupid.  
10 What you did is risky is done (inaudible). So,  
11 the less bureaucracy you add to this process, I  
12 think the better. (inaudible).

13 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so on I need sort of  
14 a clear direction from the mover and the seconder  
15 about -- I think you're clear that you want us to  
16 go ahead on the motion with the three bullets.

17 SPEAKER: Correct.

18 SPEAKER: Yes.

19 MS. MORRIS: So, at this point, is there  
20 any more discussion on motion with the three  
21 bullets? Hearing done. All those in favor, say  
22 aye.

1 COLLECTIVE: Aye.

2 MS. MORRIS: All those opposed,  
3 (inaudible). Any abstentions? Okay, that motion  
4 passes. Is there another motion that the Commerce  
5 subcommittee wants to take at this point?  
6 Question at the (inaudible)?

7 Harlon's walking out of the meeting.  
8 (inaudible) but not because he's upset  
9 (inaudible). (Laughter)

10 MR. PARSONS: I think that, you know,  
11 this would almost be like when one of those  
12 circular references in Excel. Because that  
13 recommendation initially came from the aqua  
14 culture task force.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

16 MR. PARSONS: So, we can't really send  
17 it back to them.

18 MS. MORRIS: Well, we could (inaudible).

19 SPEAKER: Or we could embrace it and  
20 move it to NOAA.

21 MR. PARSONS: Yeah.

22 SPEAKER: With the motion that it's a

1 recommendation.

2 MS. MORRIS: Mike.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just had a  
4 clarification question, maybe for Bob or Jim.  
5 When they use this intergovernmental working  
6 group, do they kind of keep the same people and  
7 the same agencies involved at every point or does  
8 it change every time you go (inaudible)?

9 MR. PARSONS: You know, it's sort of  
10 (inaudible) a recent development is that they all  
11 (inaudible) the meetings. We don't even get the  
12 minutes. We don't get to attend. And we don't  
13 know who is attending or not.

14 So, (inaudible) we're not happy about  
15 that. We've registered our (inaudible) with  
16 (inaudible) now secret meetings without minutes.  
17 And the lack of transparency is something that we  
18 regret. And we'll registered our displeasure.  
19 And that's where it stands.

20 Now, with whether the intergovernmental  
21 working group, you know, actually does anything, I  
22 hope they do and continue to do work. And we have



1 to some faith in that. But I don't know who  
2 attends. And we don't really talk about it, so.

3 SPEAKER: (inaudible).

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, they meet twice a  
5 year I believe. And there's a representative from  
6 each of the major agencies that usually attends,  
7 but there's spotty attendance of certain agencies  
8 according to my sources.

9 MS. MORRIS: Listening devices. We've  
10 got listening devices.

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: They have done some  
12 good work.

13 MS. MORRIS: What did (inaudible what  
14 did Shawn?) say?

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I was going to say  
16 there's a meeting report out and there's --

17 MR. RHEAULT: There are some good work  
18 products, but the last couple, I guess it was two  
19 meetings or so,

20 (inaudible).

21 MR. DOREMUS: I'm just kidding.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just a quick follow up.

1 This is pretty important to many people. There's  
2 billions of dollars that are invested (inaudible).  
3 And it looks like to me like this task force  
4 (inaudible), it's going to be a long haul, more  
5 than two years. And if you've gone this far  
6 (inaudible), not the task force but just in  
7 general, it speaks volumes about how much  
8 (inaudible) you're going to have to start building  
9 momentum. Because unless you get something done  
10 somewhere, (inaudible) so to speak, I believe it's  
11 going to keep (inaudible) aquaculture.

12 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, any other  
13 business for the Commerce committee. Terri wants  
14 to say something.

15 MS. LEI: I have a question. SO, what  
16 would be the vehicle to provide comments to the  
17 interagency such as that particular recommendation  
18 or others, that what is our vehicle to provide  
19 input them or how does MAFAC?

20 MS. MORRIS: It seems like we provide  
21 input to the assistant administration (inaudible)  
22 for fisheries.

1 MS. LEI: Okay.

2 MS. MORRIS: And through that, to the  
3 development people in the Department of Commerce.

4 MS. LEI: So, if MAFAC wanted to compose  
5 a letter emphasizing this issue and its importance  
6 to have it, you know, that the permitting is, you  
7 know, we all know permitting is the big problem,  
8 but how do we go about having, you know, small  
9 pilot projects be able to begin by having  
10 something streamlined liked that? So, would the  
11 Commerce committee want to think about pulling  
12 together a letter that we could send from MAFAC,  
13 transmitted, that would go through the Agency to  
14 the right people --

15 MS. MORRIS: Bob?

16 MS. LEI: -- to promote that?

17 MR. RHEAULT: Yeah, so (inaudible) at  
18 the National Agriculture Association held a town  
19 hall with all federal agencies, (inaudible) and  
20 agriculture (inaudible) about a month ago. And it  
21 was a big cry fest for all the industry. And they  
22 came out with two pages of (inaudible)

1 recommendations. And it was just moments ago sent  
2 to the intergovernmental working group on  
3 agriculture, with two pages of recommendations.

4 MS. LEI: Including that?

5 MR. RHEAULT: Including that.

6 MS. LEI: Okay. All right.

7 MR. RHEAULT: Now, we can choose to  
8 reinforce these if we think it's important that it  
9 comes from here as well as the NAAA. I don't know  
10 how much more impact that would have.

11 MS. LEI: Just inquiring (inaudible).

12 MS. MORRIS: Ted.

13 MR. AMES: Yeah, I wonder if defining a  
14 specific length of time that this task force  
15 should function, is more detrimental than it would  
16 be simply to say that we are going to continue it  
17 or push to continue.

18 MS. MORRIS: So, Ted, what I would say  
19 for that, is if you're trying to recruit people to  
20 serve on the task force, and I mean a defined  
21 period of time for their next global commitment,  
22 is probably a good thing. And we could come back

1 and extend it to future MAFAC members and extend  
2 it for

3 (inaudible) periods of time. Let's  
4 see, Rai.

5 MR. ESPINOZA: So, on Bob's. I'm not  
6 part of the NAAA. I have no idea of that meeting.

7 MR. RHEAULT: We can change that.

8 MR. ESPINOZA: But I do understand that  
9 MAFAC is something entirely separate. And so, if  
10 that intergovernmental panel for agriculture is  
11 deciding something that it's just receiving  
12 information from the sector that wants to do  
13 agriculture, I think it would have a different  
14 type of weight if it came from a different type of  
15 organization, such like MAFAC. And I think,  
16 again, here, I for example, support us sending a  
17 letter if that's something that's appropriate,  
18 from this committee to that.

19 MS. MORRIS: Jennifer? You had your  
20 hand up. No?

21 MS. LUKENS: No.

22 MS. MORRIS: Bob?

1                   MR. RHEAULT: So, I'm just going to  
2 suggest that we pass this motion and ask the task  
3 force to look at the issue; they are away of this  
4 list of issues, decide a priority ranking of  
5 things, and bring it back to the MAFAC. If the  
6 task force thinks it's important enough to have  
7 MAFAC make this recommendation to reinforce what  
8 the NAAA has said, we will ask that MAFAC pile on.

9                   And so, once we reformulate the task  
10 force and ask them to do this, I expect the task  
11 force will come back rather quickly with the  
12 request to reinforce some of our recommendations  
13 because it's all (inaudible) been done. And now  
14 we just need to decide what to do with MAFAC. And  
15 rather than try and do it in a hurry today, let's  
16 get the task force to prioritize, rethink it, and  
17 (inaudible) to make a recommendation and we can do  
18 it on an interim basis electronically in the next  
19 couple months perhaps.

20                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, when you said pass  
21 this motion, we have already passed the motion.

22                   MR. RHEAULT: Oh, good. (Laughter) But

1 we operate under Congress, correct?

2 MS. MORRIS: Right.

3 MR. RHEAULT: So, we have friends in the  
4 Congress Department, which preferably I mean the  
5 whole Congress Department. That would be our one  
6 champion agency that we would love to get some  
7 support from. We can't even break through that,  
8 we're, you know, nowhere.

9 But if they could kind of  
10 agency-to-agency, become the champion I guess. I  
11 don't even know if it (inaudible). But having a  
12 champion that believes in this stuff would be, I  
13 think, at that level, would be important.

14 So, I mean for putting the  
15 recommendation out there, I think we somewhat want  
16 to line up the department before we do anything  
17 and see if they can maybe (inaudible) the other  
18 agencies I guess. Maybe that's just naïve of me,  
19 but I don't know.

20 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so we continue to  
21 have this like push and pull. So, people push and  
22 let's pass a motion.

1 (inaudible) we went to is kind of  
2 the subject of a (inaudible) expert  
3 on this and say let's wait. Let's  
4 let it come to us through the aqua  
5 culture task force. There's enough  
6 time.

7 MR. RHEAULT: Well, I don't want to just  
8 pass that one piece because I don't think that's  
9 the best recommendation

10 (inaudible)

11 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Do you want to --

12 MR. RHEAULT: I think that (inaudible)

13 --

14 TERRI LEI: More inclusive.

15 MR. RHEAULT: -- about the field of  
16 recommendations, that I think the task force is  
17 ready to bring forward.

18 MS. MORRIS: Julie?

19 MS. BONNEY: So, I agree with that. I  
20 think it makes more sense to do a more holistic  
21 ask at the end of the day once we get feedback  
22 from the task force.



1                   The only other thing I would note under  
2                   this item, is we need to send a loop back to the  
3                   National Aquaculture Association and tell them  
4                   what we did as a group in terms of reacting for  
5                   their letter. So, I'm assuming that there would  
6                   be a letter. So, in terms of function: We're  
7                   reconstituting the task force. We need to reach  
8                   out to the members, send them a letter, ask them  
9                   if they're willing to serve for two more years.  
10                  Figure out whether we have all the box filled.  
11                  Have Bob and Jim serve as the MAFAC  
12                  representatives to the task force. And then loop  
13                  back to the Aquaculture Association and tell them  
14                  what our action was based on the letter. And then  
15                  I think we're done with this issue. That's my  
16                  recommendation.

17                  MS. MORRIS: Thank you, Julie. Any  
18                  other discussion?

19                  Okay, we've arrived at our morning break  
20                  time a little early. So, it's 10:20. Please be  
21                  back here -- you can leave the check out at this  
22                  moment, you know, for the longer break. Please be

1 back at 10:40.

2 (Recess)

3 MS. MORRIS: Okay. We are going to jump  
4 back in.

5 SPEAKER: Yes.

6 MS. MORRIS: Terri is going to lead the  
7 discussion about the status of the reports on the  
8 Resilience Working Groups.

9 MS. BEIDMAN: Right. And I'm going to  
10 say that I want to thank all the people that  
11 participated on all these working groups, and  
12 that, you know, I've learned a lot in trying to  
13 coordinate them. And it's not always as easy as  
14 it looks sometimes, it's very, very much different  
15 than that.

16 So, anyway, thanks again, for everyone's  
17 work. So far it's great, and I was working on  
18 trying to figure out how to framework these into  
19 an executive summary, and being kind of new at  
20 these charges I took a look at our initial  
21 discussions, and I went: oh, well, we didn't  
22 address that, and we didn't address that. But we

1 did address a lot of it, and our conversation  
2 included into these tasks.

3           So, many of the tasks -- some of the  
4 tasks got completed rather quickly. I've asked  
5 task leads to, please, provide me with some --  
6 like a one-pager type of summary. What's in their  
7 document which will be attached in full but they  
8 are lengthy, and so it precludes kind of inserting  
9 them into one document. I think it would be  
10 better used as, perhaps, standalones that could be  
11 useful in lots of ways.

12           So I've asked the leads to come up with  
13 sort of a summary and, you know, three to five  
14 more pressing recommendations that they would like  
15 to highlight that could assist in making it, you  
16 know, perhaps more easily digested. So, we had  
17 our Resilience Group, Task 3 was completed and  
18 approved November, and I always thought to do  
19 that, and am happily going to do it.

20           Tasks 4, 5 and 6 are still in process,  
21 but we have made some great progress here at this  
22 meeting on all of them, and the groups are

1 working. So, I'm going to ask, first of all,  
2 because our initial timeline, we have exceeded, in  
3 some cases, for good reason, you know, we are  
4 trying to be thorough, but I'm going to ask the  
5 indulgence of the Committee that we have a little  
6 bit of an extended timeframe, and try to get this  
7 work wrapped up completely during the summer the  
8 groups are working to finalize reports.

9 In some cases they have some tasks to  
10 do. So, I'm going to first, turn it over to Task  
11 4, update from Julie Bonney concerning the Social  
12 and Economic Community Impacts.

13 MS. BONNEY: Okay. Second cup of  
14 coffee? (Laughter) So, we finally kind of settled  
15 on a direction, and moving down the path, so what  
16 we've been involved with it, and as we are in it,  
17 and we went through and found six different case  
18 studies, where there's been adaptive planning for  
19 climate change, in terms of fisheries, and through  
20 six different communities. It was interesting  
21 that there really was not that many cases where  
22 it's dealt with fisheries, it's usually community

1 infrastructure, sea-level rise.

2           So, the next step was, okay, so how did  
3 the process work? We developed and interview, the  
4 questionnaire, and I've been contacting the  
5 practitioners of these six different case studies,  
6 to understand how the processes work. We  
7 completed four out of the six interviews, and it's  
8 interesting that when you go -- even though they  
9 are all over from Alaska, the West Coast, Rhode  
10 Island, (inaudible), and more Sea Grant oriented  
11 with the common threads, the class before that  
12 we've already done.

13           And so we have two more interviews to  
14 complete, and then we are going to start drafting  
15 kind of our reports, and some of the  
16 recommendations. And also planning to do  
17 additional interviews with two different  
18 universities that are talking about climate  
19 change, and how to talk about climate change; one  
20 is Yale, and then there's also a gentleman, and I  
21 forget the name of the book, that there's been a  
22 lot of community planning in terms of climate

1 change, and so that was coming.

2           So, process-wise, the way I see this, is  
3 we will complete the interviews, it has been --  
4 and I want to thank Heidi and Kate quickly, that's  
5 not here, on the phone, but they've been a huge  
6 help in terms of staffing this task force. So, we  
7 hope to complete the interviews sometime the first  
8 part of April, and then we'll start drafting our  
9 report, and then have some kind of an interim  
10 teleconference to review what we found so far,  
11 figure out if we are going to interview website  
12 folks, and then (inaudible) with the book, and  
13 then I think we'll be in a good place to be  
14 completed.

15           So, I think that Terri's timeline of the  
16 first part of August to, you know, make that our  
17 final recommendation to our task should work,  
18 barring no disasters.

19           MS. MORRIS: Julie, you said the final  
20 recommendation or the final report?

21           MS. BONNEY: Final report.

22           MS. MORRIS: Okay. And can you give us

1 a little flavor of what the common threads are?

2 MS. BONNEY: So, the one that I think is  
3 interesting is that the conversation starts with,  
4 what are your problems. So, in other words, it's  
5 a bottom-up approach versus a top- down approach.  
6 So, there's a conversation with the stakeholders  
7 to understand what they are seeing in their  
8 Fisheries. Versus talking to them and saying that  
9 climate change is affecting your livelihood, and  
10 this is how to, so it's more organic, and so once  
11 they kind of identified what the issues that they  
12 are seeing within their fisheries then you bring  
13 in the experts to kind of say, what is causing  
14 those effects. So that was one of the key ones.

15 Help me out, Ted. There was another one  
16 too; there was a big one and Heidi -- Oh. The  
17 other one was then that the best way to entice  
18 people to come, is to have a fun place to go. So  
19 in one case it was -- they had coffee and bagels  
20 and stuff in the morning, at a set time, like on  
21 Sunday mornings. And in the other one they were  
22 meeting in a bar in the (Inaudible) area, happy

1 hour; so, trying to get people engaged too.

2 Shoot! I'm drawing a blank. There was another --

3 MS. LOVETT: That one was to sort of  
4 meet them where they are, in fact that Sunday  
5 morning, we planned to meet at 7:30 in the  
6 morning, which was a surprise, you know, for most  
7 of us. The other thing was, Julie, I think to  
8 talk about using local experts, people that we  
9 trusted, and I just want to (crosstalk) that one.

10 MS. MORRIS: Any other comments or  
11 questions about the task force? Any other  
12 comments or questions about -- Did you want to  
13 comment, Ted, about the work?

14 MR. AMES: It's really fascinating,  
15 those groups that started, as Julie suggested,  
16 came up with a set pattern, where they developed a  
17 concept of how to address the local problems,  
18 gather the group of experts, or individuals, or  
19 organizations that could support -- answer the  
20 questions that they were raising. And it really  
21 became a bottoms-up effort in the interviews that  
22 I did. It was incredibly successful. I think it



1 was true for all of them I think that we've  
2 scheduled so far. Good job.

3 MS. BONNEY: It's just fascinating, I  
4 would just think it was the Agency would go to the  
5 community and say that's a problem, let's figure  
6 out what we are going to do, but the reality of  
7 just having a conversation, identifying the  
8 problem, and then figuring it out, so far.

9 MS. BEIDEMAN: So, the next task, you've  
10 heard the report from Erika yesterday, and she is  
11 in the process of pulling together also her  
12 report, so she appreciates having a little extra  
13 time to try to make sense of the issue. But you  
14 did get her report out yesterday, so I don't have  
15 a lot more to add, other than she is estimating  
16 that she'll be able to have the report ready,  
17 hopefully, in June, to come back to the Task  
18 Group.

19 And then be able to have that ready,  
20 whether or not we would do a separate call, I  
21 think maybe it depends. But it would all be  
22 circulated out for MAFAC to review, and suggest

1        comments, so then we could hopefully finalize that  
2        in there, rather than have to have three separate  
3        calls for this

4                        (inaudible). So, that's my hope,  
5                        and everyone here seems to be  
6                        buzzing along, so I'm happy to say  
7                        that I'm sure that she'll pull it  
8                        together. So, you'll all be  
9                        alerted once

10                      (inaudible). So, the next issue is  
11                      task 6, which turned out to be  
12                      a lot more complicated than we thought  
13        it would be, however, I think the product is -- it  
14        was worth the effort of going through the exercise  
15        to try to get to where we needed to be. But it's  
16        easy when you talk about data, particularly to get  
17        very wide, and then try to hone it back into what  
18        we actually need.

19                      So, I think we made huge progress  
20        especially in our call yesterday with Gail on the  
21        phone who, you know, I appreciate the little data  
22        task group has put a lot on her back to do. So,

1 huge kudos to Gail Beck for offering to do  
2 drafting on this, because you know I was trying to  
3 do some of it, and Peter Moore was also in the  
4 group. So, he's not here, so it kind of fell on  
5 her, a lot of it. And we did make great progress  
6 yesterday. I believe -- I don't know where --

7 SPEAKER: Where is Harlon?

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: Harlon is, so we'll take  
9 -- Oh, Harlon is not here, but the data issue  
10 turned to be a bigger deal, or more difficult to  
11 get refined. So, that paper, the next draft of  
12 that is scheduled to be prepared by April 11th, is  
13 what she hopes, and then that will be distributed  
14 out to the Task Group. We'll be doing some, you  
15 know, whatever revisions within the group, and  
16 then we'll be circulating that out, and hopefully  
17 we can get to a final before this August point.  
18 And I'm hoping that we can get by the end of July,  
19 or beginning of August. So, that is that, in  
20 terms of the data issues, paper for task 6. And  
21 I'm going to see if Harlon has anything to add,  
22 because --

1 SPEAKER: We are at home.

2 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. Thank you.

3 MR. PEARCE: I'm sorry, that I was  
4 walking around with something that --

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: No problem. I just went  
6 over the data issue, and that we are having a  
7 draft paper ready by April, and the goal of course  
8 is to have it all completed, by the end of the  
9 summer we should have a teleconference with MAFAC  
10 to approve the entire document, and that deletes  
11 --

12 MR. PEARCE: If you are going to bet it  
13 down, I can go to (crosstalk) --

14 MS. BEIDEMAN: I doubt it. However, so  
15 I wanted you to add whatever you might want to,  
16 concerning Task 6, and the progress that we made.

17 MR. PEARCE: On what would you have it  
18 here?

19 MS. BEIDEMAN: On Task 6 on your task.

20 MR. PEARCE: Okay. Have you gone over  
21 the framework, and have we done that yet?

22 MS. BEIDEMAN: No. We haven't done that

1       yet, I kind of thought we'd save that till last,  
2       just to get through the other two little  
3       sub-reports.

4                   MR. PEARCE:   Okay.   Got you.

5                   MS. BEIDEMAN:   So, here we are, it seems  
6       --

7                   MR. PEARCE:   Sorry.   I'm sorry I was  
8       outside.   I will try to catch that quick -- Well,  
9       I think one of the problems that we had with Task  
10      6, was we kind of got far afield without thinking  
11      that it's easy to get way out there when we start  
12      talking about data, because we all love data.   And  
13      so we kind of got a little away from our charge,  
14      and I think we did a great job yes bringing it  
15      back down to earth.

16                   So, we really approached our charge, and  
17      pay for the charge to make sure we have the data  
18      that the councils need to develop framework  
19      actions within plan amendments that have triggers  
20      and then drove to the future.   So, I think we get  
21      a lot of work there, I think.   Like Terri said, we  
22      are going to be finishing this up soon, and I

1 think we are ready to go. I mean, we won't be  
2 long now to get it done. Gail will have a final  
3 draft in June, is what I think she told us.

4 Right, Terri?

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: April 11, for the next  
6 little run out for our Subcommittee for the Task  
7 Working Group.

8 MR. PEARCE: Okay. So, all right, that  
9 will be fine. So, we'll get that done. And by  
10 our next meeting in Silver Spring, we'll be able  
11 to wrap this thing up.

12 MS. BEIDEMAN: We'll hopefully be able  
13 to wrap it all up before then, and that's my goal.

14 MR. PEARCE: Right, yeah. But to become  
15 final, I mean.

16 MS. BEIDEMAN: It could be final, by  
17 teleconference likely during the summer, late  
18 summer, I think, by the way it looks.

19 MR. PEARCE: That's good. And then --

20 MS. BEIDEMAN: And then we'll send it to  
21 the --

22 MR. PEARCE: So, that's pretty much it.

1 You know, we'll get into the details more when we  
2 get finished with the paper, we'll do another  
3 draft with them. And so we did a good job  
4 yesterday and we all focused a little bit better.  
5 I feel very good about it. And so then I'm fine  
6 with that, I mean, at the end, I don't know what  
7 she'll want to do with that particular segment I  
8 think we are good. We can go into the framework,  
9 if you are ready.

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm ready.

11 MR. PEARCE: Okay. We, thanks to Julie  
12 and Columbus, we have an excellent framework  
13 paperwork that we discussed yesterday. There were  
14 some moderate changes made. I understand, Peter,  
15 you made some changes this morning.

16 MR. SHELLEY: Some suggestions.

17 MR. PEARCE: Suggestions, is that in  
18 this documentation that we are looking at? I  
19 can't see that.

20 MR. SHELLEY: I think so.

21 MR. PEARCE: Pete, do you want to tell  
22 us what the changes -- suggestions are?

1                   MR. SHELLEY: Well, a couple. And I  
2 apologize to Columbus and Julie for the  
3 (inaudible) -- yeah, the goal lines, stand here.  
4 Let me just start that over. Some of the changes  
5 are just clarifying, from my perspective, of how  
6 frameworks are actually are used in the fishery  
7 and management process, and why they are a good  
8 tool for managing with dynamic information without  
9 sacrificing public participation, or all the other  
10 more extended processes that are associated with  
11 the underlying fishery and management plan.

12                   So, I had some language that sort of  
13 nested the framework a little bit more than these  
14 other public processes, so it didn't seem quite so  
15 free-standing. There was one section that I just  
16 didn't understand exactly having to do with policy  
17 directive that NOAA Fisheries develop for  
18 framework actions and with the focus on NIPA  
19 compliance.

20                   And it seemed like the first -- I don't  
21 know which paragraph it is, but it seems like the  
22 first couple of sentences of the policy directive



1 was, you know, fully cooked. And then there are a  
2 couple of sentences, I would say, were highly  
3 controversial and people were concerned about all  
4 sorts of things. And I don't know if those were  
5 comments that came in during the development of  
6 the policy directive, or whether the policy  
7 directive was being challenged by people with  
8 those sorts of concerns.

9           So, it just didn't -- it just didn't  
10 make sense to me, in terms of how it's stated.  
11 You know, I don't know -- So, it's very simple, I  
12 just flagged it because, reading it through, I  
13 didn't see a --

14           SPEAKER: Peter is referring to the sort  
15 of dark teal color shading on the screen.

16           MR. SHELLEY: So, maybe that was what,  
17 maybe that's saying that the tiering, beneath the  
18 tiering was considered by NOAA in the policy  
19 directive, but was not adoptive, but I don't think  
20 that's true. So, I figure you would understand.

21           MS. MORRIS: Columbus?

22           MR. COLUMBUS: Okay. I believe you are

1 talking to the reference, if that will help you.

2 MR. SHELLEY: Okay. Yeah.

3 MR. COLUMBUS: And if anybody who knows  
4 this, and would like help me out, please do.

5 (Crosstalk)

6 MR. SHELLEY: I have no question that  
7 those issues were raised during the development of  
8 the directive. I just thing they were --

9 MR. COLUMBUS: After the Magnuson Act is  
10 (inaudible), NOAA's requires to --  
11 take a look at it, and at the  
12 procedures that had all kinds of  
13 meetings across the country, within  
14 the councils sorting through, and  
15 so forth, and it was a very --  
16 there was a lot of hostility in the  
17 room, at a level that the Council  
18 meetings of -- Where are we going  
19 to go? How we are going to get  
20 there?

21 And I added that part in there just to  
22 sort of add - - lend some credibility to the

1 process because, you know, NOAA did go through a  
2 very rigorous process, and I didn't bother -- you  
3 know, and I went back into it, and had a look into  
4 their documents so I could understand the  
5 complexity of what they were dealing with. You  
6 know, perhaps we could (crosstalk) --

7 MR. SHELLEY: Well, then I think it's  
8 just editorial, I think it should be --

9 MR. COLUMBUS: Okay. Perhaps we could  
10 -- You know, perhaps we could smooth that out  
11 somehow, and I would say maybe with help from NOAA  
12 to make sure that --

13 MS. LUKENS: I think I need to look at  
14 this a little bit more, and read the actual  
15 directive itself to understand that. That the  
16 folks are in my office who wrote the policy  
17 directives so I can -- they can --

18 MR. COLUMBUS: Right, right. But from  
19 the documents that go online that --

20 MS. LUKENS: That's actually  
21 (crosstalk).

22 MR. SHELLEY: This makes it seem like

1       it's still an open fight, and I don't think it is.  
2       I think it was resolved, and those concerns were  
3       heard, and dealt with.

4                   MR. COLUMBUS: Well, what happened was,  
5       there were some areas where, well NOAA had a --  
6       they wanted to move in this direction, and those  
7       were some confusion, and some people felt like,  
8       you know, this is a good idea and go ahead. Some  
9       people felt like, I'm not feeling it, so I think  
10      if we go in this direction, public input might be  
11      lessened, and --

12                   MR. SHELLEY: I think that was  
13      absolutely the

14                               (inaudible). So, I mean I think --  
15                   I do know that it was all --

16                   MR. COLUMBUS: But process-wise under  
17      NIPA, they would not be knocked out of being able  
18      to provide input.

19                   MS. MORRIS: So, Columbus, is it okay to  
20      delete from the document that will we be doing  
21      that today, the language that's highlighted in  
22      teal here?

1                   MR. SHELLEY: Julie, this is mine. I  
2                   wouldn't delete it because it does add color to  
3                   the development of the policy directive. I just  
4                   think it needs to be reworded slightly so that it  
5                   doesn't seem like there's pieces still floating  
6                   around there on the directive.

7                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. Well, some we are --

8                   MR. SHELLEY: So, it's kind of  
9                   editorial, I believe.

10                  MS. MORRIS: Where we are today, is  
11                  either going to approval of this, or delaying. Or  
12                  going approval with direction for somebody to be  
13                  empowered to edit this particular section in a way  
14                  that we trust to be done, so I'm trying to get an  
15                  indication about where people would want to go on  
16                  this.

17                  SPEAKER: Jen, do you understand what  
18                  needs to be done?

19                  MS. LUKENS: Yeah. I'm trying to get a  
20                  hold of the -- if that's necessary to have the  
21                  context for the document that you all are going to  
22                  put together here. I think it's citing the policy

1 directive, in your policy, I'm looking at it right  
2 now, it goes through the process stage and went  
3 through to develop this, a couple of comments that  
4 they put on it, and how they are addressing it.  
5 So, I think that can be found in the policy  
6 directive.

7 SPEAKER: Right.

8 MS. LUKENS: And I don't know if it  
9 needs to be stated here additionally, but that's  
10 for the Committee to consider and act on that.

11 MS. MORRIS: Could we just say something  
12 like, see - - And is this the link that's already  
13 embedded there?

14 MS. LUKENS: Yes.

15 MS. MORRIS: The comments in the  
16 process?

17 SPEAKER: Yeah.

18 MS. MORRIS: So, maybe just a note  
19 saying: see the Final Policy Directive document  
20 for insight into the questions that were raised  
21 and how they were addressed by the Agency?

22 MR. SHELLEY: I think that's fine. I

1 would just add, that maybe just in the place with  
2 the public process.

3 MS. MORRIS: But the public process was  
4 enough --

5 MR. SHELLEY: As addressed through a  
6 public process framework with the actions in  
7 policy directive. That would be fine too.

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Heidi is ready to  
9 type the words if you could get them through.

10 MR. SHELLEY: No. If there's a reason I  
11 suggest then the actions through a public process  
12 resulting in policy directive where you need -- to  
13 follow. And then get rid of the last two  
14 sentences, I think.

15 SPEAKER: The tiering?

16 MR. SHELLEY: Under the tiering  
17 mechanism. That would be my recommendation. Yes.

18 MS. MORRIS: Are there any comments on  
19 that change; any objection to that change?

20 SPEAKER: I'm okay with that.

21 MR. COLUMBUS: I'm good.

22 MS. MORRIS: Columbus is good. Any

1 other objections? Okay, so we'll take that  
2 (inaudible), even though we haven't placed this in  
3 a motion yet. And then, Peter, it seems like the  
4 --

5 MR. SHELLEY: The only other sort of  
6 thing I'd put in here, dealing with the policies,  
7 is that I think it's really important to stress,  
8 since we are not going to be doing the data piece,  
9 contemporary mostly with this, but the successful  
10 use of frameworks is premised on good, near real-  
11 time data to avoid false positives, false  
12 negatives, you know, sort of reacting quickly, and  
13 mistakenly so, I added a sentence that eventually  
14 we can link a reference back between the two  
15 papers, saying that these framework is only as  
16 good as the data that supports this, that's said  
17 in many more words, but that's the thought.

18 SPEAKER: Yeah, for setting the process.

19 MS. MORRIS: Yes. That's highlighted in  
20 yellow that's on the screen there. Any objection  
21 to that?

22 SPEAKER: Columbus, are you okay?



1           MR. COLUMBUS: I would say: management  
2 actions that result in unintended consequences.

3           MR. SHELLEY: Yeah. Sure. That's  
4 better.

5           SPEAKER: Heidi, did you catch that?

6           SPEAKER: Say, that last piece.

7           MS. MORRIS: Terri?

8           MS. BEIDEMAN: I would say in the second  
9 line down there "the ability of councils" I would  
10 rephrase that to remove councils and say: fishery  
11 managers, in general. We don't have to say "in  
12 general" just "fishery managers".

13          SPEAKER: So that we can capture the  
14 HMS.

15          MS. BEIDEMAN: And others -- state,  
16 commission, and we will try whatever.

17          SPEAKER: And we could have the last  
18 part deleted as I did.

19          SPEAKER: I think everything else, and  
20 just kind of editorial comments that would deal  
21 with that.

22          MS. MORRIS: Yes. That's right.

1                   SPEAKER:  And we reject it or accept it,  
2  whatever.

3                   MS. MORRIS:  So, Harlon, can you move  
4  this as -- can you make a motion to -- to make  
5  that to approved this?

6                   MR. PEARCE:  So moved.

7                   MS. MORRIS:  Likely for trademark  
8  actions?

9                   MR. PEARCE:  So moved.

10                  MS. MORRIS:  Is there a second?

11                  SPEAKER:  Second.

12                  MS. MORRIS:  It's, clear; is there any  
13  additional discussions?

14                  MS. BONNEY:  I have a question?

15                  MS. MORRIS:  Yes, Julie.

16                  MS. BONNEY:  So how did you end up  
17  picking these particular cases?

18                  MS. MORRIS:  She asked how we ended up  
19  picking the particular case studies.  We asked  
20  MAFAC Members to suggest things.  We asked Wendy  
21  Morrison, NOAA Staff, to suggest things, and then  
22  we tried to find excerpt and plans that followed

1 up on our suggestions. And some of those were  
2 inappropriate, and some of them got included in  
3 the document. And just recently, over the  
4 weekend, Sylvia from the Western Pacific, Fishery  
5 Management Council staff, suggested some  
6 adjustments based on their direct experience.

7 But Peter and I have concerns that, you  
8 know, if we sent this document out to all of the  
9 regions they would find errors and updates. So  
10 that is a concern, because Wendy Morrison, and all  
11 of you, to review it, I'm not sure that you have.  
12 So, there's a little bit of risk that this should  
13 go through greater review, so we are not  
14 embarrassing ourselves. But we have a motion  
15 right now. So, what do you want to do?

16 MS. BONNEY: I guess for this event, I  
17 didn't think in this report, and then some of the  
18 ones that's in there

19 (inaudible), and the North Pacific  
20 had questions that -- Okay, well I  
21 made that as (inaudible) --

22 SPEAKER: I can't hear Julie.

1 MS. MORRIS: You can't hear Julie.

2 MS. BONNEY: I said some of the ones on  
3 the North Pacific I question.

4 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, maybe this is a  
5 cautionary note, and we should table this until  
6 they've had more opportunity to have Council's  
7 review whether the examples are

8 (inaudible). And if you feel that  
9 way, somebody should move to table.

10 And I will not take it -- We will  
11 not personally -- will not take it  
12 personally.

13 MS. BONNEY: I hate to be the  
14 (inaudible) on, and so if people are -- it's  
15 conceptual, and if people don't get all that,  
16 without the details, and I'm fine with letting it  
17 move ahead, just as far in advisory than it tells  
18 the specific in my mind. If you feel that it  
19 erodes the credibility of the document, and it  
20 should be moved back and in terms of the case  
21 studies, then I would suggest that you table it.  
22 So I could go either way with that. Those are my

1       comments

2                   MS. MORRIS:   Peter?

3                   MR. SHELLEY:  My concern is that there's  
4       a lot of detail, these plans are all very  
5       complicated.  I don't know anything about them,  
6       and I don't know if they are successful, and they  
7       are being promoted as successful examples, I  
8       think.  So, I think it is important to document  
9       the case studies and ground rules, at some level.  
10      And I'm just not capable of doing that.  I don't  
11      know if maybe some of the members here can let you  
12      -- or in some of the fisheries that are involved,  
13      but I'm not sure if it's to involve them.

14                  MS. BONNEY:  I mean, I can't think.  
15      Increasing the VSC limits may be appropriate of  
16      such -- for mortality and it's going to -- In  
17      other words, I don't know of any case in the North  
18      Pacific where you had a hard cap on a VSC that  
19      they decided to make it higher to prevent a  
20      Fishery from being, economically and basically  
21      impact.  So, with that example, I don't know if  
22      that's ever happened.

1                   MS. MORRIS: So, it's something that's  
2                   in the document but it hasn't been employed, it  
3                   hasn't been --

4                   MS. BONNEY: Well, I don't know if it's  
5                   even possible. I mean you could do an emergency  
6                   rule to change if it's a new amendment packet, but  
7                   I've never known of them -- I guess I should try  
8                   it. (Laughter)

9                   MS. BEIDEMAN: I recall our conversation  
10                  was to try to find things that would help -- that  
11                  we could point to that were potential examples.  
12                  Perhaps they weren't employed yet, or perhaps they  
13                  were not completely even thought about, but that  
14                  raise for management to be more nimble. And the  
15                  use of framework actions is a way to speed up the  
16                  amendment process which is lengthy, and be more  
17                  responsive to conditions.

18                  And of course the (inaudible) on having  
19                  good data to base it on, but the purpose, I  
20                  thought, in trying to find these examples, not all  
21                  of which have been actually utilized, but some of  
22                  them are in place, or could be in place. Instead

1 of using an amendment process it would be  
2 potentially, something that Councils could think  
3 about.

4 SPEAKER: Correct.

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Or managers could think  
6 about to make management more responsive and  
7 flexible and nimble. And that I thought was the  
8 purpose of the final --

9 MS. BONNEY: And just a follow up, I  
10 agree that that is the purpose of the whitepaper,  
11 and there are several examples in here for the  
12 North Pacific that gets us exactly to that point.  
13 I guess my question is: Of all of the examples,  
14 are they true or not? If they are true, should  
15 the fish be included? Or maybe the better example  
16 would be to make us do just a few examples, versus  
17 the large (inaudible) ones that are in here. I  
18 don't know.

19 But the one for yellow fin in here, is a  
20 great example which basically involve the ability,  
21 this is a North Pacific example, but it's pollock  
22 -- FA (phonetics) pollock allocations are, you

1 know, very complicated, and so it's really a trade  
2 off, whether you get a lot of pollock you've been  
3 to the Pollock Fishery.

4           This is the trigger that basically says,  
5 when pollock is low we are going to make flatfish  
6 -- yellow fin available to a larger group of  
7 stakeholders so they are not economically damaged.  
8 And the science suggests that yellow fin -- or  
9 flatfishes will be higher, and with climate change  
10 that pollock will be lower. So that's a great  
11 case study of the framework to action that really  
12 addresses climate change.

13           Other ones in here, I think they are  
14 maybe on the books that they've all been  
15 discarded, so I guess I don't, like I said, yeah,  
16 the purpose of the backing if it's great, it's  
17 just whether if it's perfect. If you don't care  
18 if it's perfect, let's pass it on because I think  
19 it meets the objective of what you are planning to  
20 do.

21           If you are worried about perfection, and  
22 people coming back on that saying, you could vote



1       this back, and this isn't right based on my  
2       Council, then you know it's -- table it and maybe  
3       have the different councils to review it, and  
4       maybe they even have better examples of framework  
5       to actions that might come out the other end.

6               MS. MORRIS: Right. And you have reason  
7       to do it, now it's to be done with something,  
8       right? And maybe that's not the overriding goal,  
9       it would be better to really investigate whether  
10      these examples are [inaudible] -- are positive  
11      examples, rather than, you know -- So, again, I'm  
12      waiting for further discussion on a decision about  
13      whether to table for further ground-truthing or  
14      crew. Go ahead Mike.

15              MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I've learned a  
16      lot from Julie over the years, and she has yet  
17      agility; so it sounds like you kind of had two  
18      directions you might choose from, perfection, or  
19      close to, or somewhere in the vicinity, which one  
20      would you recommend?

21              MS. BONNEY: I guess it depends on how  
22      well, you know, you put the qualifier at the

1 beginning that says that these are examples that  
2 have been pulled from the regulations, that hasn't  
3 been (inaudible) of the region. If we did that  
4 then I think it would be less likely to have  
5 people say something negative about the document.  
6 So, if you did that, then I think you could just  
7 go ahead and then approve it as is.

8           Otherwise, if you don't put the  
9 qualifier in there, I think that you need to  
10 re-task what's in here and make sure that it's  
11 factual, and is actually on the books for a true  
12 framework that's in use within the Council.

13           MS. MORRIS: Are the mover and seconders  
14 for the qualifier of the type that Julie is  
15 suggesting?

16           SPEAKER: I'll put it in the discussion,  
17 yes.

18           MS. MORRIS: Tegan?

19           SPEAKER: I'm okay with that.

20           MS. MORRIS: Peter, you were the  
21 seconder?

22           MR. SHELLEY: From my agreement, you can

1 table it or to do the qualifier?

2 SPEAKER: I'll table the qualifier.

3 MR. SHELLEY: I don't think there's any  
4 time for the department driving this, and so I was  
5 rather pretty comfortable that it's good enough.  
6 I don't need it to be perfect, but I do think it  
7 would affect, you know, our readers' confidence in  
8 recommendations if they looked at a particular  
9 example and they note that, that doesn't exist, or  
10 that's not how it works, or that slows things  
11 down. I mean, it's -- I think it's important to  
12 be good enough, and I can't tell right now whether  
13 these are good enough. I like that Mike  
14 (inaudible), and we have wonderful examples  
15 outside Fisheries, but it's the particular  
16 Fisheries ones that are going to great detail in  
17 the document.

18 MR. COLUMBUS: Yeah. I think the key  
19 point that was made in the last discussion was, we  
20 need to move towards a blueprint of what it should  
21 really look like, with involvement from the  
22 councils, and so forth.

1                   MR. SHELLEY:  And if it's the will --  
2                   You know, if the consensus I'll go along with the  
3                   ballpark, but I just think a little bit more work  
4                   on it would make it potentially that it's a better  
5                   product.

6                   MS. MORRIS:  Good.  Jennifer?

7                   MS. LUKENS:  Just something to think  
8                   about.  If you don't have a time constraint on  
9                   this, and I've heard the comment earlier when we  
10                  were talking about the data, why people, or  
11                  whatever were calling it, the next (inaudible)  
12                  date it would be nice to have that come out  
13                  complementary with this.  It's up to the Full  
14                  Committee, but it sounds like if you put them all  
15                  out together at the same time as one complete  
16                  package, as Terri was talking about delivering it  
17                  as one complete executive summary, and all the  
18                  tasks that following the resiliency tasks that we  
19                  developed last fall.

20                  If there isn't any time constraint then  
21                  that will give you some time to make it more of  
22                  everybody seeing it at the same time as a complete

1 package instead of step-wise. So, I offer that  
2 out just for (inaudible).

3 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Ted?

4 MR. AMES: Well, I agree with Julie. I  
5 think putting in that -- or announcing that this  
6 may not be directly on point for all of the groups  
7 -- or all of the studies. I looked at yours and  
8 Mike's question and your response, and I think  
9 that a simple way to address what the (inaudible)  
10 needs, what are these, it's going to take  
11 incredible amount of time. Regardless, it seems  
12 like putting in note saying -- qualifying the  
13 management approaches listed there is a good idea.

14 MS. MORRIS: Harlon, I think I'm -- I'm  
15 coming across the suggestion. Go ahead?

16 MR. PEARCE: I have a question, and I  
17 guess a suggestion, too. If we put this off until  
18 we bring the whole paper together with the data,  
19 is that enough time, to get what you want done,  
20 done? I mean, are you going to be able to get all  
21 these councils to come back and tell us what they  
22 (crosstalk) which I doubt that you

1                   can. So, with that goal in mind, I  
2                   think we go with the qualifier, and  
3                   get this thing moving now. Other  
4                   than that, you know -- and  
5                   Jennifer, I understand what you  
6                   said, but I'm just concerned about  
7                   --

8                   MS. LUKENS: I don't have a position,  
9                   I'm just

10                   (crosstalk) --

11                   MR. PEARCE: No, no. I know you don't,  
12                   but I'm -- but I almost agreed with you, but then  
13                   I say, like Ted said, are we really going to be  
14                   able to get the answer we need in our timeframe  
15                   from the Council system? If that would go to  
16                   looking and ask for comments, and I doubt we do.  
17                   So, I would say let's put the qualifier in and  
18                   move it out.

19                   MS. MORRIS: Peter?

20                   MR. SHELLEY: So, an alternative right  
21                   here. You know, looking at the table, the table  
22                   looks about right, you know, it feels right to me,

1 all the sort the bullets seem like good  
2 descriptions of the purpose of the framework  
3 actions that are referred to. So I think that I'm  
4 certainly comfortable at that level saying this is  
5 good to go. I think it will be good to flip, and  
6 the details, kind of an appendix on those, so it's  
7 like a --

8 And that's where I think the qualifier  
9 would be useful. Saying, you know, we are putting  
10 these out here with the qualification, and that  
11 whatever it is, we haven't been able to  
12 exhaustively research each framework and determine  
13 how successful those have been in an operation, or  
14 something like that.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, we have a very  
16 specific suggestion that we might be able to get  
17 majority to agree to, which would be to move the  
18 details from an appendix with a qualifier  
19 introducing them for the framework part. Harlon,  
20 is that supportive?

21 MR. PEARCE: (Crosstalk).

22 MS. MORRIS: Would you view that as

1 friendly, to reorganize the report with the table,  
2 the details going in the appendix with the  
3 qualifier saying, these haven't been ground-  
4 truthed yet?

5 MR. PEARCE: Do you want a yes or -- I  
6 believe, yeah.

7 MS. MORRIS: I'm asking as the mover,  
8 whether you would be supportive of the use of that  
9 --

10 MR. PEARCE: Yes.

11 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, we are viewing  
12 that as friendly. And is there any more  
13 discussion on the main motion then with those  
14 changes that we have just (inaudible). If not,  
15 are you ready to vote? All those in favor say,  
16 aye.

17 GROUP: Aye.

18 MS. MORRIS: Those opposed, like sign?  
19 Any abstentions?

20 SPEAKER: Me.

21 MS. MORRIS: One abstention. The motion  
22 passes. Terri?



1                   MS. BEIDEMAN: So, I would assume that  
2                   the writers would have the ability to reorganize  
3                   that. I think that that's a good idea to, you  
4                   know, put some sort of a disclaimer, and that we  
5                   haven't, because rules -- framework actions even  
6                   change in the process of writing it so, you know,  
7                   there may be examples that are obsolete, or what  
8                   they are provided for example. So I think that's  
9                   a good way, and I do, you know, prefer that we  
10                  have -- you know, it be as accurate as we can make  
11                  it, but I don't really know that we would have  
12                  time, and I believe people on all sides of the  
13                  issue might have some debate as to whether or not  
14                  framework actions worked well or not, depending on  
15                  what your viewpoint is.

16                  So, I think that's a good way to try to  
17                  compromise and get the document rolling. I also  
18                  believe that that will provide time to have the  
19                  data section pulled closer to it; and given the  
20                  fact that it's all going to task that that will be  
21                  helpful.

22                  MS. MORRIS: Great. Thank you. And

1 thanks for leading us into a difficult discussion,  
2 and rescuing us from this (inaudible) (laughter).

3 MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. MORRIS: So, next is the added  
5 agenda item today which is the review of the brief  
6 letter that we would like to convey to Secretary  
7 Ross. And that was emailed to everybody this  
8 morning. And so, please look through your email.  
9 And I think, Heidi, you can get it projected up on  
10 the screen. Right?

11 SPEAKER: So, are we working from  
12 Peter's revision, or an original one?

13 MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Let's work from  
14 Peter's revision, which was also emailed to  
15 everybody subsequent to the initial (inaudible),  
16 right.

17 SPEAKER: Heidi, could you pull it up  
18 just a little bit, please? Thank you.

19 MS. BONNEY: So, I have to ask the  
20 question. When you bold it in yellow, versus  
21 underlying in red; what's the difference in terms  
22 of the context that you are trying to make?

1                   MR. SHELLEY: Sloppy, me editing. I  
2                   mean they are all -- At least I know the blue  
3                   underline is mine, (inaudible) in yellow.

4                   SPEAKER: I think it means that  
5                   (inaudible)?

6                   MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

7                   SPEAKER: So the yellow means you are  
8                   questioning whether that's --

9                   MR. SHELLEY: No. That's, I'm adding  
10                  that. Those yellows are all adds, and I think the  
11                  blue underlines are probably full edits from  
12                  (inaudible).

13                  MS. MORRIS: So the evolution of this  
14                  document was, we talked about it, Jennifer and  
15                  Bob.

16                  SPEAKER: Bob wrote it.

17                  MS. MORRIS: Bob wrote it -- Sent it to  
18                  Erika as the Chair of the Subcommittee on  
19                  Strategic Planning, and Budget, and me to review.  
20                  Erika made it better prose and (inaudible)

21                  (laughter) and --

22                  SPEAKER: That's a short (inaudible).

1                   MS. MORRIS: And then she sent it to me  
2 before she left for the airport, at 4:30 a.m. And  
3 then I edited her better prose to get it more  
4 concise, and then Peter has made some suggestions  
5 too. So, I think we are pretty close to the work  
6 of those people who have edited it, generated it  
7 and edited it to some things for us to consider  
8 adopting, and so now is the point in time in which  
9 we would discuss it. Yes, Heather?

10                   [HEATHER]: XXXNo surname noticed in  
11 notesXXX Well, when I vetted it -- to me it read  
12 like a cover letter to the editor, and comments to  
13 the transition team? Which I think was the point  
14 of this, and I wonder, there were three points  
15 that the group wanted to emphasize yesterday, and  
16 I just think they should be called out in a more  
17 visually, striking manner, so maybe three bullet  
18 points. Like, these are the three things we  
19 really want to highlight in this one-pager.

20                   MS. MORRIS: And what were those three  
21 things? [HEATHER]: The staffing issue, other  
22 people were --

1                   they were -- they were the three things.

2                   SPEAKER: Budget; impact of the budget?

3                   [HEATHER]: Well, the impact of the budget and the  
4                   staffing issue were --

5                   SPEAKER: Were they met? [HEATHER]: --  
6                   were one, weren't they?

7                   MS. YOCHER: It says: elimination of key  
8                   programs, hiring freeze, and then permanent  
9                   reduction of Federal workforce. Were those the  
10                  three?

11                  SPEAKER: I suppose.

12                  MS. YOCHER: Or is the hiring freeze and  
13                  permanent reduction, one?

14                  [HEATHER]: And I guess reducing the  
15                  trade deficit was -- I thought like that was one  
16                  of the points, too. But maybe that was something  
17                  that couldn't be done without if the budget and  
18                  the workforce weren't in place.

19                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. So all of those  
20                  things are addressed here, but they are not  
21                  influenced -- they are not put out as (crosstalk)  
22                  --

1                   [HEATHER]: Right. So what I'm saying,  
2                   that something visual will strike this. If this  
3                   person doesn't really have to read this document,  
4                   right, so, if the person can just glance at the  
5                   page, and take away these are our three top  
6                   problems, the three things we want you to know  
7                   about, and how that reads less like a cover  
8                   letter, but of course you can refer them to the  
9                   longer document, so that was written for the  
10                  Transition Team, that's just fine, you have that.  
11                  But yeah, so have the point be more visually,  
12                  visually (inaudible) is my suggestion.

13                  MR. RHEAULT: And just so everyone, as  
14                  we are cautioned to keep it brief, that's what  
15                  we've been told the person -- with limited  
16                  appetite for lots of words. And we wanted to  
17                  reemphasize his own priorities, state the  
18                  priorities of trade, jobs, fish, deficit, and say  
19                  we recommend those, and we fear that these -- you  
20                  know, reductions and so forth, and our ability to  
21                  get there, and it's all, how you get there, and we  
22                  tried to make it.

1                   We realize that we weren't going to be  
2                   able to get everything we wanted in there, and  
3                   then we had this nice transition document, and if  
4                   we can get, you know, draw his attention to that,  
5                   then that's great; or, someone on his staff, more  
6                   likely. But, you know, I made a lot of effort to  
7                   keep it as brief as possible without making it  
8                   just three big bullet points, and I think it so  
9                   matters, striking a balance between that in the  
10                  English language and the bullets.

11                  MS. MORRIS: Great. So, I think that  
12                  Heather's main point is not that the -- she wants  
13                  some bullets so that it jumps out, where  
14                  (inaudible). It's not of content -- she's kind of  
15                  reorganizing and reformatting the points that are  
16                  there. Right?

17                  [HEATHER]: Yeah. I mean the way it  
18                  reads to me, the first paragraph, it's like, well,  
19                  we are patting you on the back. Like, we agree,  
20                  even, you know, and then the second paragraph was:  
21                  however, you know, we have these problems, and  
22                  then finally, referred to a longer document, where

1       you could go for information. It just doesn't --  
2       it doesn't, to me, seem like really striking, so I  
3       just feel, like, maybe the points could be more --  
4       Well, just think of yourself, if you are reading  
5       document and you don't have very much time, you  
6       skip to what's bolded -- or what's bolded or,  
7       well, I just need what are the main points.

8                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. Liz?

9                   MS. HAMILTON: I'm not a writer I'm  
10       quite sure by a long shot, but I'm a little bit  
11       concerned that there's nothing in here about  
12       NOAA's responsibilities, and their consultation,  
13       and various issues that -- things that I care  
14       deeply about, and I know that, you know, they are  
15       not of the aquaculture and trade deficit  
16       reduction, but if we could get just a tiny, little  
17       --

18                   SPEAKER: Mention?

19                   MS. HAMILTON: -- mention of things that  
20       I think

21                               (crosstalk), because I feel cutting  
22       would get NOAA's ability to do



1                   that, is it's actually going to  
2                   stop all sorts of projects from  
3                   moving forward.

4                   MR. RHEAULT: I'll accept that --

5                   MS. HAMILTON: That's a disaster --

6                   MR. RHEAULT: -- as absolutely true, but  
7                   my personal opinion writing it was that he  
8                   probably doesn't care about that, and it hasn't  
9                   been more at this stage, cause or objectives. And  
10                  I was just trying to pat him on the back of the  
11                  things that he has come out and said, that we can  
12                  agree with, and said, you know, hopefully that  
13                  would spark his attention. And then point out  
14                  now, some of these cuts will damage, not only  
15                  those priorities, but certainly other priorities  
16                  as well. And, you know, mentions of NOAA, we  
17                  could bring those (inaudible) in and the whole  
18                  panoply of NOAA's kind of facilities, but it's  
19                  going to become a longer document. I was trying  
20                  to trim all of that ancillary stuff out and keep  
21                  this as brief as possible.

22                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Bob, you don't

1       feel like you -- you don't need to feel you need  
2       to defend in response to every comment.

3               MR. RHEAULT:  Okay.  You are absolutely  
4       correct.

5               MS. MORRIS:  Liz, you wanted to follow  
6       up?  But not when it's going to cause another --

7               MS. HAMILTON:  You know, I guess that  
8       I'm hopeful, that our emphasis on what he what  
9       said, doesn't mean we want you to prioritize  
10      everything else that would be funding

11              (inaudible), so as long as -- Oh,  
12              yes, we can't control it -- just to  
13              advise, so.

14              MS. MORRIS:  Julie?

15              MS. BONNEY:  It seems to me the examples  
16      are a little -- I'm fine with the way that the  
17      letter -- I'll say that, in terms of, (inaudible),  
18      what our concern is, and we are willing to work  
19      with you, and by the way, there's an attachment.  
20      So, really, I think, what you are saying is, is  
21      that we need to call out what our main point is,  
22      so can't we just underline and bold, really the

1 points --

2 SPEAKER: Certainly (crosstalk) --

3 MS. BONNEY: Oh, actually, I think when  
4 the President proposed fiscal year 2018, that line  
5 and the following line, and leave it at that.

6 SPEAKER: That was my suggestion too.  
7 Pull those two sentences, or underline those two  
8 sentences.

9 MS. MORRIS: Did you want to say  
10 anything else, Pam? No?

11 MS. YOCHEM: No. Besides the entry  
12 (crosstalk) that pitch seems to be --

13 SPEAKER: The whole difference.

14 MS. MORRIS: Mike?

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I have a sense that the  
16 only way of saying that it does reference the --  
17 (crosstalk) reference the group, the idea, you  
18 know, which I think Bob captured very well, is  
19 that the (inaudible) over us, stating certain  
20 goals of the idea about trading deficit, if we  
21 weren't, as Bob said, we were all about climate  
22 change, I don't think we are addressing

1 everything.

2 But, you know, if you hit on the scene  
3 when it's already developed, then at least you get  
4 his attention, maybe we can (inaudible) that away  
5 from him, and I think Bob did exactly that, or  
6 with that, well, with some additional if getting  
7 to that process from his part and other people's.  
8 I am sensitive to what you are saying but, I mean,  
9 I can identify with probably with (inaudible) the  
10 target, and I don't want to get it, you know,  
11 right in front of it. Probably thinking industry  
12 in general; and stakeholders in particular would  
13 probably all come up with something. We do  
14 reference a transition document in there. The  
15 bullet points I think it's probably a good idea,  
16 but the content, as is, I think needs to be  
17 (inaudible).

18 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Pam, you are  
19 following up?

20 MS. YOCHER: I'm trying to read his  
21 mind. I also think that it could be that  
22 recommendations that are in the President's

1 budget, he doesn't think will impact the ability  
2 to address the trade deficit, things like that.  
3 And so if nothing else, we are saying, we think  
4 that your attempt to streamline the department and  
5 eliminate things you don't think are important or  
6 whatever, we do think that it's going to affect  
7 the Secretary's stated objective to focus on these  
8 things.

9 MS. MORRIS: Ray?

10 MR. ESPINOZA: I just have with just the  
11 word at the beginning "however" where, you know,  
12 the patting on the back can get that. And then  
13 just diversity is the, however, we are trying to  
14 -- we are not presenting something different, we  
15 are presenting this letter in support of his  
16 concerns and our concerns. So I think it's not an  
17 however, it's a --

18 SPEAKER: Just strike "however" --

19 MR. ESPINOZA: Yeah. I just would -- I  
20 think we can we say: we are bringing this to your  
21 concern. But I think it's just -- it's less  
22 tension and the less, I think more support.

1 MS. MORRIS: Good idea.

2 SPEAKER: Yes.

3 MS. MORRIS: Back to Heather.

4 [HEATHER]: And then just right after that, can we  
5 just say: our concern; instead of having  
6 all that other language? Just to make that  
7 concise? However, we are -- no however -- we are  
8 concerned.

9 SPEAKER: Mm-hmm. Just a simple fact?

10 MR. AMES: Since we are in the process  
11 of edits, I've been looking at it and saying, the  
12 sentence we had prepared a set of concise -- a  
13 concise set of recommendations, I would be tempted  
14 to switch the sequence with the last paragraph  
15 that says: As your stakeholders and advisors, et  
16 cetera. And then follow it with a set of -- a  
17 concise set of recommendations. That way the  
18 person is recognizing, we are advising, you know,  
19 helping with what we can, and here is our first  
20 offer.

21 (Discussion off the record)

22 SPEAKER: And this is affected by --



1                   -- in the (inaudible) down there  
2                   and looking at (crosstalk).

3                   SPEAKER: Yes, yes, yes.

4                   MS. HAMILTON: And then maybe the set of  
5                   recommendations. So there are two things: we  
6                   address our concerns and then we refer to our  
7                   document, and those two would jump out.

8                   SPEAKER: So bold the reference to the  
9                   recommendation?

10                  SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

11                  SPEAKER: I don't know if that's too  
12                  much in bold, because that's three bold sentences  
13                  that we'll engage, but --

14                  MS. LOVETT: So, I'll just cross this  
15                  out, because there are two more lines that  
16                  (inaudible).

17                  SPEAKER: Right. Thank you.

18                  SPEAKER: Okay. So, it's all the bold  
19                  sort of the - - is that sort of like, sending an  
20                  email message in all caps?

21                                 (Laughter)

22                  MS. HAMILTON: Well, it's either that or



1 we bold it, I think that's (crosstalk).

2 SPEAKER: It's likely to do two tweets.

3 SPEAKER: I think so. I think that  
4 (crosstalk) my reaction to writing the letter.

5 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Any other suggested  
6 changes to the draft letter to Secretary Ross?  
7 Yes, Columbus?

8 MR. COLUMBUS: Go back to the first  
9 paragraph. Are we suggesting adding conservation  
10 interests to marine resources professionals?

11 GROUP: Yes.

12 MR. COLUMBUS: You know, I think we need  
13 to be consistent in our dialogue and make sure  
14 that we don't throw out the baby with the wash,  
15 because, you know, we spend a lot of time on the  
16 charter and what it says in a previous document.  
17 So, if you recreate this language over time, you  
18 sort of lose the breadth of the organization in  
19 the process, and I would recommend that we go back  
20 to the same language that we used in the second  
21 paragraph of the letter, about where the people  
22 are coming from who are members of MAFAC.

1 MS. LOVETT: Where is it different?

2 MR. COLUMBUS: Is that what we are  
3 talking about. But we said MAFAC used -- members  
4 are supposed to possess a wide range of expertise  
5 on commercial records of fishing, aquaculture,  
6 seafood processing, seafood marketing sales.  
7 Consumer interest is not mentioned here. That's  
8 another component --

9 MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry. We don't know  
10 where you are, Columbus.

11 SPEAKER: Where are you reading from?

12 MR. COLUMBUS: I'm reading from the  
13 Abundance Seas, making the (crosstalk).

14 SPEAKER: Transition?

15 MR. COLUMBUS: Marine Resources  
16 Transition document.

17 SPEAKER: The transition document.

18 MR. RHEAULT: My intent was to try and  
19 be brief.

20 SPEAKER: Yes.

21 MR. RHEAULT: So, I cut lot of language  
22 out there, I'd love to put there, in the goals,

1 but we were told to keep this brief.

2 SPEAKER: Well, I mean, I think you can  
3 -- If he is going to need us for different things,  
4 then I think we need to make sure it's clear to  
5 him other areas where our expertise comes into  
6 play.

7 SPEAKER: And all of that language is  
8 going to be in the attached document.

9 SPEAKER: Right. The transition  
10 document, yeah.

11 SPEAKER: Yeah. But he's not going to  
12 read that.

13 SPEAKER: (Crosstalk) for certain.

14 [PHIL]: XXXLast name not in notesXXX Excuse me?

15 MS. MORRIS: Yes, Phil. [PHIL]: It's  
16 perfectly acceptable for the Chairman

17 or the Incoming Chairman, when they've  
18 got the gavel in front of you, to eliminate this  
19 endless wordsmithing, and simply say: we will do  
20 it for X-amount of time, only will allow staff to  
21 do the final wordsmith thing, so you don't end up  
22 wasting endless time on something that doesn't

1 matter.

2 MS. MORRIS: So, Phil at last moments,  
3 his last meeting is expressing frustration about  
4 (crosstalk) (Laughter)

5 [PHIL]: Other government, you know,  
6 advisory committees I sit on do that, but they  
7 won't allow this to happen because it takes away  
8 from the purpose of what you are here for.

9 MS. MORRIS: So, based on that, would  
10 somebody like to put the current language into a  
11 motion?

12 SPEAKER: So moved.

13 MS. MORRIS: Would somebody like to  
14 second that motion.

15 SPEAKER: Second.

16 MS. MORRIS: Do you want the motion to  
17 include final editorial delegation to the --

18 SPEAKER: Heidi, to Heidi Lovett.

19 SPEAKER: For her editorial?

20 MS. MORRIS: -- Heidi Lovett. So,  
21 that's included in the motion; any further  
22 discussion on the motion? All those in favor say,

1 aye?

2 GROUP: Aye.

3 MS. MORRIS: All those opposed, like  
4 sign?

5 (No response.) XXXnot sure I should  
6 type?XXX

7 MS. MORRIS: Any abstentions?

8 (No response.)

9 MS. MORRIS: The motion carries.

10 SPEAKER: Can we have (inaudible)?

11 MS. MORRIS: Oh, yeah. Okay. So, for  
12 the first time in our agenda we are all  
13 (inaudible). What we are supposed to do now is  
14 close out. We have decisions, action items, next  
15 steps and next meeting. What do we know about the  
16 next meeting? Heidi?

17 MS. LOVETT: We have been looking at a  
18 few different things, trying to avoid the kind of  
19 CB partnership -- that the Columbia Basin  
20 Partnership is needed when we have our Leadership  
21 Council Meeting we always tell which Council and  
22 Commission meetings. I think last night, Dave

1 Carlson mentioned that one of the proposed dates  
2 might be his meeting, his Fall Meeting. So right  
3 now, some dates are: October 24 to 26; or November  
4 7 to 9.

5 The location is -- the group is looking  
6 at the general Silver Spring, Washington, D.C.,  
7 area. It seems like at this point that you would  
8 have finished a lot of your work coming to the  
9 summer on the Resilience task. So, there is the  
10 one topic that I heard for sure that you would  
11 like to come back is the Litigation Policy.

12 MS. MORRIS: Okay. We are moving into  
13 what the next steps are.

14 MS. LOVETT: Oh, sorry. I can leave it.

15 MS. MORRIS: So, I just wanted to talk  
16 about the planning of the meeting. So, it will be  
17 testing those two possible dates with the MAFAC  
18 Members, via a Doodle Poll, or something like  
19 that?

20 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

21 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Terri, you wanted to  
22 say something about the dates?

1 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. I'm on other  
2 government panels that meet in the fall as well,  
3 so if you could try to coordinate with the AP  
4 folks, or HMS, and the other -- the Advisory  
5 Committee that overlap this one, and I know Rachel  
6 is going to try to avoid that in John's office.  
7 But, so expect a call, or call her.

8 MS. LOVETT: I will work with the New  
9 Chair on the date.

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you. (Laughter)

11 MS. MORRIS: Okay. (Crosstalk) chairs  
12 here.

13 SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Could you remind  
14 me?

15 MS. MORRIS: The 9th -- I'm going to go  
16 over the notes that I have about the next steps,  
17 and where we are on things, and as we go please  
18 verify, and all that. So, the Columbia Basin Task  
19 Force has four meetings scheduled for 2017, and I  
20 don't think there's -- MAFAC has done a reporting  
21 and filing rules on that.

22 The Litigation Policy, there's going to

1 be an effort for the Subcommittee to do summer  
2 comments during summer on the next Issue Paper  
3 Draft.

4 And then possibly invite Susan to come  
5 join the Subcommittee again in the Fall Meeting,  
6 with official comments from the full MAFAC after  
7 the total comment period begins after the summer.  
8 Is that correct? Okay.

9 We are going to ask that the Aquaculture  
10 Task Force be reconstituted for a two-year period,  
11 and we have certain -- a new list of tasks for  
12 them, and we probably hope to hear back from them  
13 in some regard (inaudible). And we also need to  
14 draft a letter replying to their letter that came  
15 to us on January that describes this action --  
16 this motion of the

17 (crosstalk). We need to, for the  
18 Fall Agenda, talk about

19 transition of Subcommittee Chairs,  
20 because several of the current subcommittee Chairs  
21 will be rotating off in February of 2018. So, it  
22 might be, you might want be, you might want to



1 think about putting your Subcommittee Chairs would  
2 be for the Fall Meeting, and so there's some kind  
3 of overlap, and we'll end up there.

4 On Resilience, Terri has asked each of  
5 the Resilience to identify some areas of focus.  
6 Is that right?

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yes.

8 MS. MORRIS: And all of the Resilience  
9 tasks are supposed to wrap up with some kind of  
10 product, by the end of summer. And I think it's a  
11 little unclear about what we do about that for the  
12 Fall Meeting, and if everything is all wrapped up,  
13 what's the main factor next? So, I feel a little  
14 muddy about that. Go ahead.

15 MS. LUCENS: Well, so I think we will be  
16 joining a call -- a follow-up meeting in the  
17 summer, and it's not going to be a teleconference  
18 call, and that's one of the topics we could add to  
19 that. And I think other things will certainly pop  
20 up, and we can refer back that to the transition  
21 document that you all put together, and see if  
22 there's anything to refine there, and working with

1 the other (inaudible) leadership, the few topics  
2 that they may be interested. So, I think we could  
3 have done (inaudible) at the conference.

4 MS. MORRIS: Okay. And then, it's set  
5 -- Yes, Liz?

6 MS. HAMILTON: Are you going over  
7 agendas for the next meetings, still, because I'm  
8 (crosstalk)?

9 MS. MORRIS: Yes. And then according to  
10 Paul, there will be more detailed Presidential  
11 Budget out in May.

12 MR. DOREMUS: Yes. That's what we are  
13 expecting. Yes.

14 MS. MORRIS: And Paul was thinking MAFAC  
15 might want to put out additional comments once we  
16 have more detailed budget direction.

17 MR. DOREMUS: That would be the time to  
18 understand what the specific implications of the  
19 budget might be.

20 MS. BONNEY: I have a clarification?

21 MS. MORRIS: Yes?

22 MS. BONNEY: So you'd like that in

1       October, and the

2                               (inaudible) teleconference?

3               MS. MORRIS: I'm putting this out to the  
4       Committee and the new leadership about whether  
5       they think there will be a need for MAFAC to  
6       communicate over the summer, to respond to the  
7       more detailed budget direction coming sometime in  
8       May.

9               MS. BEIDEMAN: So that would be out in  
10       May.

11              MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

12              MS. BEIDEMAN: And timing of course I  
13       know the sooner the better, et cetera. If we have  
14       a teleconference in August is that too late for a  
15       response?

16              MR. DOREMUS: It all depends on --  
17       frankly with FY '18, the administration has, well,  
18       I think it's always helpful for the Committee to  
19       be on record with their views with the Secretary.  
20       But the President Budget, we can submit it --  
21       congressional considerations will be taking place  
22       pretty much immediately. I don't know what their

1 calendar is going to be for FY '18  
2 decision-making. That is, of course, your  
3 individual opportunities to -- especially if you  
4 are using your individual capacities, so that's  
5 where the more urgent timing would be, I think.

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

7 MR. DOREMUS: As far as the Committee  
8 action, it's up to the Chair at the time but, you  
9 know, at any time is always -- any time that the  
10 Committee can actually, you know, reasonably pull  
11 together a statement of views, it would always be  
12 welcome.

13 MS. MORRIS: So, Paul, do you imagine  
14 having an analysis similar to what you shared with  
15 us today, after you'll be redoing that kind of an  
16 analysis, so definitely making that available to  
17 maybe some -- maybe a webinar, or something like  
18 that?

19 MR. DOREMUS: Yes. We could probably  
20 figure out something virtually, I don't see why we  
21 couldn't do that.

22 MS. MORRIS: Yes. I think that would be

1 very helpful as the next step. Mike?

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. Two things  
3 actually: the letter, the one-pager we are doing,  
4 once finalized it will go out immediately, or  
5 soon, or --

6 MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And then from that  
8 point, it's a public document, or not?

9 MS. MORRIS: Correct.

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, if we wanted to use  
11 it --

12 MS. MORRIS: We will share it in the  
13 field.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- to some (crosstalk)?

15 MS. MORRIS: Yes.

16 MS. BEIDEMAN: And we'll post it on our  
17 Web page, so that --

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. And it's all  
19 different if it comes from a constituent and a  
20 district, too.

21 MS. LUKENS: Yeah. But you can use it  
22 as you probably wish.

1                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. Okay. So, that  
2 was my question.

3                   MS. LUKENS: As an individual.

4                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry?

5                   MS. LUKENS: As an individual you can  
6 use it.

7                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yes; or representing an  
8 entity.

9                   MS. LUKENS: Yes.

10                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: But the second one is  
11 -- it would seem that this -- When does Congress  
12 adjourn for the summer?

13                  MR. DOREUS: I don't have the schedule  
14 for May, but that's probably available.

15                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: In May?

16                  MR. DOREUS: I don't know when they --  
17 it's always

18                                   (inaudible).

19                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: I guess in some sense  
20 if they

21                                   (inaudible) it anyway, maybe it  
22 doesn't matter if it's submitted --

1                   of the comments that we might make  
2                   from MAFAC about the (inaudible), I  
3                   think that would be something that  
4                   might be available till maybe  
5                   August, I would think is too late.  
6                   And of course, I don't know this  
7                   process at all, but it would seem  
8                   like you'd want to get in front of  
9                   it as soon as possible.

10                   MS. MORRIS: It seems like the first  
11                   thing would be get sort of an analysis that  
12                   probably will lead to broader audiences. And  
13                   provided to MAFAC, and then you can figure out  
14                   what to do next. Peter?

15                   MR. SHELLEY: I'm would be interested in  
16                   knowing whether a charter, whether it was  
17                   appropriate for this Committee to actually -- as a  
18                   Committee put comments to Congress.

19                   SPEAKER: (Crosstalk) --

20                   MR. DOREMUS: Well, it is not possible  
21                   for you to do that with Congress, that's why I  
22                   made the distinction.

1                   SPEAKER: That would be the individual  
2 letter.

3                   MR. DOREUS: The Secretary is formerly  
4 your charter, but then each of you in your  
5 individual capacity, are at liberty at any time to  
6 engage the members.

7                   SPEAKER: And then you could attach the  
8 comments.

9                   MR. DOREUS: Yeah -- Well, you can't  
10 represent the Committee, you can only represent  
11 yourself.

12                   SPEAKER: Sure. Right, right.

13                   SPEAKER: I think that's the key.

14                   SPEAKER: But you can reference the  
15 document.

16                   SPEAKER: And to be clear. That's what  
17 I was suggesting, it's not as a MAFAC  
18 representative.

19                   MS. MORRIS: Then, moving on it seems  
20 like for the Recreation Subcommittee we talked  
21 about maybe some briefing on this issue paper that  
22 came up regarding --



1 SPEAKER: (Crosstalk)?

2 MS. MORRIS: Say again?

3 SPEAKER: Can the (inaudible) issue  
4 paper, and Dick shared with me, so I don't know if  
5 that's a next step for Recreation Sub or not.

6 SPEAKER: Yes.

7 MS. MORRIS: It would be a next step  
8 then. Okay, other next steps that we might have  
9 missed? That I would have missed in my list?

10 SPEAKER: Were you speaking of  
11 something?

12 SPEAKER: No. That was it.

13 SPEAKER: Okay then.

14 MS. MORRIS: Oh. Okay. All right, so  
15 we've covered review of decisions, not really.  
16 Have we covered review of decisions? They are  
17 recent that I'm not going to remember --

18 SPEAKER: Yes. You just did them this  
19 morning.

20 MS. MORRIS: Action is next meeting.  
21 Final comments? We'll go to the order, before we  
22 recess our successful meeting. Everybody just

1 wants to leave. Columbus?

2 MR. COLUMBUS: I think we just need to  
3 give our Chair a round of applause.

4 SPEAKER: Yeah. (Applause)

5 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. It's been a  
6 privilege and a pleasure to work with such great  
7 team of people, with such impressive leadership  
8 skills, such deep knowledge, and such broad  
9 experience and major (inaudible) of perspectives,  
10 and at the same time when everybody is really open  
11 and wants the best outcomes for the Agency, and  
12 for Fisheries, and for

13 (inaudible) marine service. So,  
14 it's been quite a ride. I've grown  
15 a lot, and grateful for the  
16 experience, and hope to  
17 (inaudible). Okay. The meeting is  
18 adjourned.

19 MS. LUKENS: Can I say one last thing?

20 MS. MORRIS: Certainly.

21 MS. LUKENS: Thank you to Heidi for  
22 arranging this wonderful place and hanging it

1 together so quickly. She does so much work, that  
2 she does behind the scenes. I think a lot of you  
3 know that, but I just wanted to publicly  
4 acknowledge that. And to Adele for helping us  
5 with the (inaudible) and support for this meeting  
6 also. So, thank you, guys.

7 SPEAKER: Thank you. (Applause)  
8 (Discussion off the record)  
9 (Whereupon, at 12:00 p.m., the  
10 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

11 \* \* \* \* \*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

## 2 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

3 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary  
4 public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia, do  
5 hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was  
6 duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under  
7 my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell  
8 the truth under penalty of perjury; that said  
9 transcript is a true record of the testimony given  
10 by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for,  
11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to  
12 the action in which this proceeding was called;  
13 and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or  
14 employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the  
15 parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise  
16 interested in the outcome of this action.

17

18 (Signature and Seal on File)

19 Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of  
20 Virginia

21 My Commission Expires: November 30, 2016

22 Notary Public Number 351998