### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + +

### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

### MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

### PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

# THURSDAY NOVEMBER 30, 2017

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Sheraton Silver Spring Hotel, Magnolia Room, 8777 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland, at 9:00 a.m., Terri Lei Beideman, Chair, presiding.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

- TERRI LEI BEIDEMAN, Chair; CEO, Vast Array Corporation
- ERIKA FELLER, MAFAC Vice Chair; Director, Marine and Coastal Conservation, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- SEBASTIAN BELLE, Executive Director, Maine Aquaculture Association
- ROGER BERKOWITZ, President and CEO, Legal Sea Foods, LLC
- JULIE BONNEY, Executive Director, Alaska Groundfish Data Bank, Inc.
- RICHEN (DICK) M. BRAME, Atlantic States Fisheries Director, Coastal Conservation Association
- COLUMBUS HALL BROWN, SR., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (ret.)
- RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA, Environmental Consultant

- RASELA FELICIANO, Vice President, Feli Fisheries, Inc.\*
- RANDY FISHER, Executive Director, Pacific States
  Fisheries Commission (ex officio)
- ROBERT GILL, Co-owner, Shrimp Landing
- ELIZABETH (LIZ) HAMILTON, Executive Director,
  Northwest Sportfishing Industry
  Association
- PETER MOORE, Fisheries and Community Development Consultant
- MIKE OKONIEWSKI, Pacific Seafood Group
- HARLON PEARCE, Owner/Operator, Harlon's LA Fish LLC
- ROBERT RHEAULT, Executive Director, East Coast Shellfish Growers Association
- PAMELA YOCHEM, Senior Research Scientist and Executive Vice President, Hubbs Sea World Research Institute
- \*Participating by telephone
- NOAA STAFF PRESENT
- JENNIFER LUKENS, Designated Federal Official; Director, Office of Policy
- CHRIS OLIVER, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries
- PAUL DOREMUS, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations
- HEIDI LOVETT, Assistant Designated Federal
  Official; Policy Analyst, Office of Policy
- MICHAEL RUBINO, PhD, Director, Office of Aquaculture
- FRANCISCO (CISCO) WERNER, PhD, Director, Scientific Programs and Chief Scientific

Advisor

ALSO PRESENT
JAZZMIN AWA-WILLIAMS
DAVE BOND

RICH CODY, ECS Federal LLC; MRIP Program

Management Team Member, Office of Science

and Technology

CLIFF COSGROVE, Office of Management and
Budget

LAURA DIEDERICK

TOPHER HOLMES, Office of Legislative Affairs

STEPHANIE HUNT, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

BECKY LIZAMA, Office of Legislative Affairs

JENNIE LYONS, Office of Public Affairs

JIM MCCALLUM

DAN NAMUR, Director, External Funding Division,
Office of Management and Budget
KATE NAUGHTEN, Director, Office of Public

Affairs

LAURA OREMLAND, Acting NOAA Citizen Science and Technology

### CONTENTS

NOAA Fisheries grant-making processes
Dan Namur 5
Citizen Science - Review of NOAA & NMFS
projects that involve citizen science
Laura Oremland
Rich Cody
Subcommittee & Working Group Reports
Recreational Fisheries Subcommittee
Dick Brame
Resilience Working Group Task 6
Harlon Pearce
Ecosystem Subcommittee - Comments on
Draft Climate Assessment
Pamela Yochem
Ecosystem Approaches - Comments on NCA4
Pam Yochem
Commerce
Commerce
Julie Bonnie
Close Out: Review of Decisions, Action Items,
Next Steps, Next Meeting
Jennifer Lukens 288
Adjourn
114104111111111111111111111111111111111

## 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 9:01 a.m. CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Good morning, 3 4 everybody. And welcome back to our third meeting 5 day, anyway, of the meeting. And we got a little 6 extra time this morning, but we have some good 7 presentations. And we're going to get a lot of 8 things wrapped up, it looks like. So that's a 9 good deal. Everyone's worked hard. Are you 10 ready? 11 (Off the record comments) 12 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. So you're 13 ready then? All rightie. And with that ---14 (Off the record comments) 15 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I'd like to introduce 16 Dan Namur who is the director of External Funding 17 Division in the Office of Management and Budget. 18 And he's here to speak to us about NOAA fisheries 19 grant making processes. And thank you very much, 20 Dan.

And thanks for having me, guys. I understand

MR. NAMUR: No, thank you very much.

21

from some of your calls and some of your meetings there's been some conversations that have come up and some questions that have come up regarding grants in general. So today we'll go over just kind of some of the grants enterprise that Fisheries oversees, some of the bigger programs and how they work.

And then for the most part, I really want to hear from you guys. So I really am trying to keep this fairly general, fairly quick, and then open it up to you guys to address the issues and concerns that you have. And we'll get into the weeds at that point.

(Off the record comments)

MR. NAMUR: So while she's working to go forward, I know the next slide's going to talk to you guys about kind of the size of the grants enterprise within the National Marine Fisheries Service.

And people don't realize that a third or more of the funds from the National Marine Fisheries Service every year actually go out

though financial assistance. And that's grants and cooperative agreements. And that's up to about 700 grants which is almost \$400 million-worth of funds that go out, as you can see here, that go out in the forms of grants, research grants, cooperative agreements where we're working very closely with our constituents.

And this actually doesn't even count our work with the majority of our cooperative institutes, for those of you that work with them, that we work through OAR and NESDS for that. So that's another several hundred grants each year.

So you can see that we're working towards, when you include those CIs, cooperative institutes, about \$500 million-worth of external funds that go out for research in the form of ogrants each year.

So this is kind of a small slide and hard to see, but you can just kind of see the numbers across, again, about 700 grants for almost \$400 million. And we track it very closely throughout the year, at the beginning of

every year, around the country.

As you guys well know, Fisheries is very regionalized. It's not centralized like a lot of the other NOAA offices. So we have folks all over the country, and they work up their plans, what they anticipate doing, working with folks like you, coming up with plans. And then we track that throughout the year knowing that we're going to reach somewhere near \$400 million.

You guys probably know as well as I do kind of the areas that we work in around the country. So you can see here, again, I use this slide to make the point that, despite the fact that I sit in headquarters at Silver Spring, the majority of the work, the majority of the dollars, and more importantly the majority of the external work is happening around the country in these blue areas.

We have regional offices, five of them around the country. We have six major labs, and then we have many smaller labs where much of this work is. And I'm sure you guys work very closely

with some of our NMFS folks that sit in those regions.

On the financial assistance side, you can get an idea here of kind of how it's spread around, that we've got about the \$400 million.

You can see that as they move around from up in Alaska, the West Coast region, out in the Pacific Islands.

I was just talking to Raimundo about that, you know, that that's quite diverse and quite spread out from Hawaii, American Samoa, CNMI, our northeast, which is covered by the Greater Atlantic Region, and that includes the Great Lakes, and then down in the southeast which includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

And then, of course, we have headquarters offices which operate kind of like a region. Our habitat office, our protected resource office, those offices really function kind of like their own region. They have their own director.

So Fisheries grants, so a lot of

things that people ask about is: you know, how does the money get out the door? And because of both our intentions and our desires, as well as what's been expressed to us from Congress, from the White House, is we want as many of our grant opportunities to go out in a transparent way, in an open and fair way, and most importantly in a competitive way.

We still do have some non-competitive awards. We have some that are called formula awards which are Congressional awards that are aligned with a Congressional formula to go to certain entities, whether that be states, to make sure that they get the amount of money they need for the work that they're doing.

We have institutional awards. Those are awards for organizations that have been working with us for such a long time it really doesn't make sense to continue to force them to go through a competitive process for work that we've been doing for long, long periods of time. And we're talking 20-30 years in those cases.

And then we also have unsolicited proposals.

About five years ago we came to the realization that, you know, despite the fact that we have some very smart folks, we have brilliant minds in our science centers, we have not thought of every type of application that we want to receive.

And if someone has an idea that is better than sliced bread, and we don't have a solicitation out for them, there's no way for it to get in to us.

And so we've created a portal called the Broad Agency Announcement, which allows these innovative ideas that we haven't really asked for yet to come into us, and we can review them, determine whether or not we want to fund them.

And you can see we did 37 of those last fiscal year.

And as we're moving through, please interrupt, raise your hand, ask the questions.

As I said, this is a pretty general presentation.

What I really want to address today are the needs

and concerns that you guys have. So feel free to interrupt as we go through.

With anything that we do, we have our legislative drivers. Every financial assistance award that goes out has to have some kind of authority associated with it. We can't just spend money for the sake of spending money. We have to spend it as is directed by Congress, as it's directed by the President.

So these are the major drivers that allow us --- that we cite and say we're putting money out due to the fact that we're addressing the needs of the Endangered Species Act, that we're addressing the needs of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act. Those are the legislative drivers that let us put this money out and address the needs of the nation.

And you can see that we've got a decent number. You guys know as well as I do that Magnuson-Stevens is our overarching legislation that kind of drives the majority of what we're doing.

So major program areas, I talked about the way that they went out, whether they're competitive or formula. In our Office of Sustainable Fisheries, we have our IJ grants, that's inter-jurisdictional fisheries. There's 26 states around the country that work through that. We work with our commissions and councils on that. We actually have a specific appropriation line for councils and commissions.

We have the Saltonstall-Kennedy

Program which, despite the fact that it's not

located in the Sustainable Fisheries office,

that's kind of the driving force, is promotion,

development, and ultimately sustainable fisheries

around our country.

And particularly resources, we have a lot of salmon work. We have ESA work and, of course, our marine mammals, and then, in our habitat conservation, coral resiliency grants.

And then if we have any disasters, a lot of that comes out of Habitat Office. And then our major data collection efforts come out of our Science

and Technology Office.

You can see, I've got a couple of extra bullets down here. They're kind of standalone offices. We do a fair amount of work for aquaculture, law enforcement, of course, and then we do work some with our international affairs and international work around the globe. And we have an office for that as well.

So quickly, those major grant areas, we'll go through these fairly quickly. The Regional Fisheries Management Councils, I'm sure you guys know them fairly well and work with them very closely.

But we work with them every single day. They help us out. They're helping us with our fisheries management plans. They're helping us with advice. And we spend a fair amount of time working collaboratively to make sure we know exactly how we want to move forward to further U.S. fishing around the country.

And you can see on this slide kind of how the funding breaks out. This is for eight

fisheries management councils around the country that adds up to almost \$30 million a year that we put out.

There is the major PPA which is just the administrative portion that goes out. And then we have these other lines to do the National Environmental Policy Act, to do stock assessments, to do peer reviews. Those kind of things are funded through this as well.

And these are funded through five-year multi-year awards. So we give one big award every five years. And then they can come in each year and say, yes, we're continuing to do the same great work that we have been doing. It matches our scope of work. We'd like our next installment. And we release the funds.

The Saltonstall-Kennedy Act which, when I change hats from being the guy who oversees all the grants, I also oversee as the national manager for the S-K Program.

And the S-K Program was signed into law in 1954. And the driving factor here, and

it's kind of unique compared to some of our other grant programs, is that the S-K Program is not appropriated dollars. And it's collected through duties and tariffs through the Department of Agriculture.

The money gets transfered over to the Department of Commerce. And a portion of that is left for the S-K Program. And we'll get into those transfers a little bit later if you guys have questions about that.

But really, the driving force here is that as Americans import fish, buy fish that are taxed, we take that money and put it back into developing and supporting our own US fishing.

And hopefully, it's a positive feedback system that, as we develop our own fishing, we import less, we buy more U.S. fish, we promote our own fisheries.

And so you can see here we put out competitively, ballpark, \$10 million to \$11 million each year and then non-competitively, which we call our national program, about \$4

million a year. And that's for additional data collection, a little bit more aquaculture work, things like that.

The way the act is written is that we are allowed to obligate funds to address the needs that were not adequately addressed through the competitive process. And so that's what that national program does.

And again, I know that from some of the things I've heard, you guys have more specific questions about S-K. I've got some backup slides later if people have some questions about the S-K program, the process, those kind of things, as we move forward.

So you can see, this is what I was talking about. We're really working towards rebuilding and maintaining sustainable fisheries and making sure any of our conservation management measures that are impacting the fisheries, how do we address that. How do we make sure that our communities, our fisheries are still thriving?

Moving around and over to the West Coast, the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund, this is about \$65 million a year. And it's a line item in the budget each year. This is appropriated funds. And really what it's doing is supporting the conservation in the western states for salmon around the western states and Alaska.

And you see here, there's 28 listed salmon as well as steelhead. And we're working towards making sure that those are stabilized.

And I'm sure you guys know that that's a huge effort. We put a lot of money, but we also put a lot of time and manpower into that. We work very closely with our partners on the West Coast, the Pacific States Commission, the states, and the tribes as well.

The Fisheries Information Networks, or as we like to call them, the FINS, those are really working towards collecting the data. This is stock assessments, how many fish are out there, where are they? How sustainable are these

particular fisheries?

And we spend a lot of time and money working on these, because this is the information that really drives our management decisions. You know, as we know more and more about where the fish are, how many there are, whether or not the fishing businesses are healthy, we can make good decisions that are both environmentally conscious, of course, but helping our fisheries thrive and the communities around them thrive.

So you can see here where those

Fisheries Information Networks are. They're all

over the country. In the northeast, we call it

the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics

Program. It's a mouthful. Everywhere else it's

a FIN, down in the Gulf, the Pacific, Alaska,

Western Pacific, and then we have RecFIN, which

is recreational fisheries.

And we're funded out of S&T at about \$7 million to \$8 million. Through the S-K

Program, I've put about another \$1.6 millionworth of data collection effort funds out to our

program.

So Interjurisdictional Fisheries, this is a formula allotment program which means that there's a set formula when the appropriation comes in and says we get X-number of dollars for this particular fishery. It gets pumped into a formula, and the states get their funds based on that particular formula.

And you can see here some of the objectives for the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Program or IFA. So it's about \$3.2 million.

It's formula allotment. There's 35 states and territories if you count the territories at 2.4.

And then our three commissions, we work very, very closely with. They work very closely with our constituents.

By its very name, Interjurisdictional Fisheries is that fish don't know where the borders are. They're going to come and go, they're going to be in state waters, they're going to be federal waters. And so about \$800,000 gets divvied up to the three

commissions.

A lot of words on this slide, I'm not going to go over it. But aquaculture in general is becoming more and more of a priority as we have more and more concerns with our wild caught stocks.

We're looking into different types of work through aquaculture, making sure that's environmentally stable. And so this is one of the areas that's getting more attention which, of course, means more funding.

One of the programs I saw from you guys' notes that you had some questions about was the Bycatch Reduction Program, or BREP. This is run out of our Office of Sustainable Fisheries here in headquarters.

And the BREP program historically was actually an internal program within the National Marine Fishery Service where there was an amount of money. Our scientists around the country actually did an internal competition to see whose ideas were the best. We split the money to those

particular science centers, and they were able to do that research.

Back in 2012, Congress said no, we think this money really could be better served going out externally. We want this to be a competitive process. We want all \$2.5 million to be going out externally. And so it became an open, fair, robust, competitive process where folks can apply the priorities and evaluation criteria set each year.

The FFO will be out very soon for the FY '18 competition. And really, what we're looking for here is innovative ways to stop catching the stuff we don't want to catch, really. That's what it boils down to. Or if we are catching it, can we utilize it? Can we market it? Can we put it towards something that's maybe editable? Can we use it for bait? Can we use it for aquaculture feed? And so this program's really looking towards making sure we don't catch things that we just toss back over with no use.

And then we have our law enforcement programs. And here we've got vessel monitoring. Where are the boats, what are they doing, where are they going? Are they in closed areas?

And then a big push starting maybe five, six years ago is EM/ER, electronic monitoring, electronic reporting. And this really is just making sure that we've got the best technologies in place to make sure that we're tracking what's being caught. This helps feed into our stock assessments, which ultimately helps feed into our management decisions. And the better our data, of course, the better our decisions, which is less impact on our fisheries.

You can see here protected resources.

There's some overlap in a lot of these programs.

S-K deals with protected resources, bycatch

reductions, try not to catch the protected

resources.

We have specific set aside programs as well. We have a pinniped program up in Alaska.

We have the species recoveries grants. One of

the new big things, and you see it on our website right now, it's front and center, is our Species in the Spotlight. And then we have the Mitchell Act which is more salmon work, salmon hatcheries.

So that's the big picture for 700 grants, \$400 million-plus, kind of very quickly going through it. I went through it fairly quickly, because it looks like most of you guys already know.

I've got some slides on S-K, because I saw that you guys had specific questions. I know you guys also had questions about some of the other programs. At this point, do people have some specific questions before we get into more slides? I saw a lot of hands. Go ahead, Bob.

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Dan. If you could go back to your -- I think it was the third slide where you had the regional financial breakout.

MR. NAMUR: Yes. We need to flip it quickly back, here.

MEMBER GILL: There. One of the anomalies I see there is that all the science centers are represented with the exception of the Southeast. Is that omission intentional?

MR. NAMUR: So that's an excellent question. And I should point that out as I give this presentation. So the research and the funding that goes out through the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is represented in those numbers.

This is me wearing my grant geek hat where, in the process, the folks that process those grants all sit in our region. So even if the work's being conducted to support our Fisheries Science Center or some of the initiatives out of there, if the collaborative effort comes from our scientists from there, the actual grant process happens in the region. And that's why it's displayed this way.

So there is a lot of those numbers, the 106. At least half of those are supporting the work that's happening out at the science

And that's why they're not listed 1 centers. 2 specifically, because they don't specifically process the grant. But that's just a function of 3 the administration. 4 5 Forgive me, this is MEMBER BERKOWITZ: my first meeting. 6 So I may not completely 7 understand ---8 That's all right. MR. NAMUR: 9 MEMBER BERKOWITZ: But could you elaborate a little bit more on the status of 10 11 bycatch in terms of where we are with that? 12 Yes. So I won't get too MR. NAMUR: 13 deep into the weeds on that. So that program's 14 run out of Sustainable Fisheries, and it's run by 15 a gentleman named Derrick Warner who does an 16 excellent job. 17 In terms of your question of status, 18 I'm not 100 percent sure if you mean whether or 19 not we're doing a better job of not catching them 20 or whether we're doing a better job of

I can tell you right now we've got an

innovating.

21

initiative to address that very question, to have a better idea for every dollar we put out, the bang for the buck. We do a very good job of reading the progress reports and making sure that what was said was going to be done is being done.

But we don't have a great repository to say, in one location, where we are with all of our reports in general. So right now, we've got a big initiative to do that, to have one collective spot.

And we're also working, and
Sustainable Fisheries is working towards working
with the constituents to actually ask for each of
your projects, you know, was there a change to
the way that the fishers are fishing. Was there
a management decision? Was there a regulatory
decision based off of the results? But we don't
have a really good quantified answer for you
right this second.

MEMBER BERKOWITZ: So I think maybe specifically, are there fish being thrown back in right now that come up on bycatch?

MR. NAMUR: So in different fisheries, most certainly there are, yes, absolutely. If folks are out, and I'll use Western Pacific, if the Western Pacific is out, and they're doing bigeye fishing, there are certain species that are bycatch that they keep, opa, ono, any of those kinds of things.

Because they know they can bring them back and sell them. They sell for a pretty decent price -- not as good as the tuna, but you can still sell them. And they taste very good. But if they get a blue shark, you can't sell it. They don't really want it. They try their best to make sure they're cutting in a sustainable way and release it alive. But those are being returned. So that's just a single example.

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Dan. And just to add to that, Roger, there's regulatory discards, you know, that quota's filled, you can't bring them back or --- but your bycatch, it's a bycatch for something else. So, yes,

Yes, go ahead, Bob.

there's a lot of that. And that's a big issue.

MR. NAMUR: Yes, excellent point.

Thank you.

MEMBER BELLE: Sebastian Belle. I have to say, I looked at this slide initially, and what jumped out for me was how little money is going to the northeast. And it's obviously very self-serving for my geographic base.

(Laughter)

MEMBER BELLE: But the question I have for you is: I'm assuming these numbers are not -- there's no kind of proportionality or policy about assignment to regions. It's being driven by the issues that the specific regions are dealing with.

But do you, from a policy point of view, at some point look at the value of the fisheries in the region and how money is being assigned to those regions? Because I would assume, just for bang for buck kind of calculations, at some point you've got to ask that question.

MR. NAMUR: So we absolutely do. And every program runs. And the first step of every program is to set the priorities, look at the evaluation criteria, look at the need.

So I'll address this in a couple of points. One, this is slightly skewed, because some of the money is hidden in other places. So Saltonstall-Kennedy is listed as headquarters. The northeast gets the majority of the S-K money most years. They get about 40 percent.

Bycatch reduction is run out of headquarters. That's another chunk that's spread nationally. So those numbers, again, are going to get skewed a little bit there.

So numbers, again, it's tricky to do a great job of really showing exactly where the money is being spent. Because we move money around in fisheries for the needs as we need.

As far as how the money is allocated, absolutely the biggest driving force is the issues on the table. And so we do consider the size of fisheries and things along those lines.

But certainly that's not the only driving factor.

If that were the case, the billion dollar industry in Alaska would get pretty much everything.

But if they have less issues, less bycatch, less problems, then we don't need to do quite as much research to figure out how to fix it. And so that's why you see some disparity there.

MEMBER BELLE: Just a follow-up question, Madam Chair. So, I guess, in terms of understanding where the money actually ends up, that would be helpful for me as a MAFAC committee member. Because this slide, I think -- and you said it yourself -- is a little oblique, I guess I would say.

MR. NAMUR: That's right. Yes.

MEMBER BELLE: Because it's, as you had to say, there's money being funneled through the headquarters that ends up in some of the regions. So it would be helpful to actually know, on a regional basis, what the actual

expenditures in the regions are. And just kind of for interest sake, I think that would be helpful.

MR. NAMUR: Yes, no problem. No problem. That's certainly --- it's all public information, so that's certainly easily disseminated.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: Thank you, Madam

Chair, and I was going to wait a little longer to

see where we --- I know you have more slides.

But Sebastian kind of opened the door for me

asking that last question right there on where

the regions and how we're spent. And, of course,

being self-serving, this is very important.

But, you know, first I'd like to say that the reason why we've become, in the U.S. Caribbean, very interested in the S-K program and those funds is because we see the really important and great work they're doing with fisheries across the U.S.

So it's really great to see the collaboration, you know, besides the cooperative

resource program that requires that. This
doesn't require it, but you see the integration
of fishermen into it without it being required.
So it's something that we really like that. We
really appreciate it. We recognize it, and we'd
like to have a bit more of it in the U.S.
Caribbean.

But one of the things that we've seen is that -- one of the priorities that has been with S-K for a while has been territorial science. And, of course, being territories we assume that this should include the U.S.

Caribbean, Puerto Rico and USVI.

But we have seen that. And since 2014 through 2017 there's been 219 grants awarded. Of those, 29 have been in the southeast. And of those, seven have been for projects in the U.S. Caribbean. So that's three percent of the total grants in that time period.

So that three percent doesn't sound to me like we should be a priority. Because if anything, if you've spent three percent of

anything, it doesn't sound like a priority, or it's territorial science.

So it seems that, you know, the priority between Pacific and U.S. Caribbean, it doesn't seem to be balanced. And so my only concern with that is: how do we define priority, and how do we kind of have that balance? And what's priority and what's not? And how do you grade it? How do you quantify it?

And then from that, there's been projects, those projects in the U.S. Caribbean, only two have actually been based in the U.S. Caribbean. And, you know, University of Puerto Rico, the University of the Virgin Islands have amazing programs. Of course, we have amazing scientists down there. And so this is actually under 1 percent in the past years that actually have been based in the U.S. Caribbean.

So one of the concerns that I had, when this was brought first to my attention was actually from the Chair of the SAC from the council when he told me that I shouldn't even

bother applying to S-K. Because he has actually never gotten them.

So said, look, I'm going to get one.

I'm going to do it. And again, we haven't gotten
one yet. And the last one we --- the only one
that we've gotten that was actually based in
Puerto Rico was a really great job, reefscaping.

Dr. Torres is doing a great job.

But that's one of those things that we want to see, how do we --- and I know you guys have invested a bit more and, you know, before the hurricanes were planning on trying to see how you can promote that and get more folks to apply. You know, one of the issues has been: not enough folks have applied.

But at the same time, I also see that an issue has been not necessarily the program, the S-K program, but the network or the reviewers that S-K really brings into it.

And for example, we did this inadvertently. We've gotten funded for projects from NOAA grants, for projects that were rejected

by S-K, kind of verbatim -- and different reviewers.

So it's interesting that projects that were from one set of reviewers, the technical aspects of the reviews seemed to have received really high marks and seemed to be one of the high priorities for certain folks. But then within S-K --- so it seems that there seems to be, at least for the U.S. Caribbean, from the experience that we've kind of gone into a little bit of analysis to see what's going on.

And so we want to make sure that we are able to continue to promote this program. Because it's really an amazing program. So we want to make sure, one, that we can promote it to get more folks to apply so we can up that success rate of funding.

And, of course, we want to know what it means actually to be a priority, what does the priority entail and how that's based into the, you know, the grant awarding.

Because I think, you know, if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

something's going to be a priority, it's 1 2 something that you need to really evaluate and consider when you're conducting your reviews and 3 4 awards. 5 Yes, I think ---MR. NAMUR: 6 MEMBER ESPINOZA: Your program is 7 amazing. It has done some great work. And 8 that's why we're really interested to get into 9 working further with you guys. So that was a lot. 10 MR. NAMUR: 11 (Laughter) 12 MR. NAMUR: So I'll do my very best to 13 address as many of those points. If I miss a 14 few, hit me up, okay? All right. So first points, you know, 15 16 how we address the priorities, we actually go 17 through a fairly rigorous process. And we do 18 this each year. I've got some slides on this as 19 we move forward. 20 But all the programs are a little 21 different. So I'm going to address the point of

why one program might have thought it's better

than sliced bread, and it might not have scored quite as well in another, is that evaluation criteria are different for every program.

The priority, even though it may say that the title may be the same, exactly what we're looking for is a little bit different.

And, of course, some programs are specifically regionalized so it's much more in the weeds, as opposed to the S-K program which is a national program which is quite general.

So that's one of the reasons why you may see, you know, when we still had a bycatch reduction priority in S-K that, if you applied to my program and to Derrick Warner's program, you may have been selected in one and not the other.

It's because our priorities -- though they have the same title word -- are trying to address different needs. And so, therefore, how well it addressed that priority, the evaluation criteria would be a little different. So that's kind of point one.

Two is if we write it as a priority,

why isn't it getting -- you know, it's one of four priorities. Why isn't it getting 25 percent of the funds?

And one of the things that we have, and if you read the full funding opportunity, is it's very robust what the review process is.

There's a four-step process during the review.

So you've got things come in, and we do a bare minimum, minimum requirements. Did you meet the page elements, are you addressing one of our priorities? You know, are you not using it to do infrastructure? Are you a U.S. citizen, essentially, including the territories?

So it goes through Phase 1. If it passes those bare minimums, it gets to Phase 2 which is the pre-proposals. And here we're looking at, you know, the relevance, the need.

One of the evaluation criteria in there right now is how well you're tied into the community, the fishing community. Are you working with them, or are you directly impacting them? That is 25 percent of the score in the

pre-proposal process.

From there, people can decide whether to apply or not. We encourage or discourage, but either way, they're still allowed to apply.

That's not a hard cut off point.

You go into our merit and technical review process, where every application undergoes a minimum of three reviews by subject matter experts. And we utilize our experts in each of the regions. We don't focus all that work in headquarters, because we do about 1,500 reviews during that part.

We lean on them to knowing their region, who those subject matter experts are.

And the question comes up a lot of: how do the reviewers get selected? And the answer is every single application is looked at individually.

And we go out and try to find the best people for each.

So we don't start out with a list of people that we're going to use, no matter what applications come in. We'll look at an

application that comes in, we'll look at the scope of work, look at where it's being done, and try to find the people that have the best knowledge base to evaluate that application openly and fairly based on the evaluation criteria that are listed in the FFO.

And as much as the federal government grant programs hold our constituents and applicants to the rules of an application process, once we put it in print it also holds us to those rules. We cannot look at anything except for the evaluation criteria that we wrote in the full funding opportunity.

So whether someone thinks it's better than sliced bread or not, they have to rank it exactly the way we said. Look at this factor.

Did it meet it? And that's how the scores come down.

From that, the top ones move on. And what I normally tell the folks --- and the last step is our panel process -- and what I tell the folks that sit on the panel, and this is a

completely external panel, there are no feds on the panel, and there are no academics on the panel. We only want constituents that are on the ground.

And the reason is every application
that goes through to the panel process we've
deemed meritorious. It's technically sound.
That was the main point of Phase 3, if you will,
is to make sure that the applications, you know,
are they scientifically sound. Do they have the
right people working on it? Is the cost
reasonable? Do they have a good data sharing and
outreach program? Those things are looked at.

Once we get past that point, the panel's really looking at --- and we sit three people from every region on every panel. So it's evenly distributed. And those folks are really looking at the relevance and need again.

So example, you could have an application that is absolutely better than sliced bread as far as technically sound. The science is great, the data collection's great, the

analysis is great. The best scientists in the world are working on it. And they're looking to see whether or not J hooks versus circle hooks work with turtles.

And the panel says we already know that answer. That's not a need right now. Yes, it's technically sound, and it scored very well. But we don't need that application right now. And so that's that last phase. And so that answers a couple of the little questions in the middle of how we get to where we get to.

One of the other questions or concerns that you brought up was kind of the distribution.

And as you read further into the FFO, past those points of what are the evaluation criteria, what are the priorities, we describe how we're going to select.

And then there's a little section that says that one of the things that we do as a program -- and I'm talking specifically about S-K right now, but this is pretty much a case across all of NMFS grants programs -- is we have a

section that we, in our evaluation, based primarily on the scores, the merit scores and the panel scores, but we also have the ability to look to make sure that there's a good distribution across regions, across priorities, across entity types.

So we're looking at that, and we're doing a lot of statistical analysis on the back end to look at that. Now, does that mean that we're looking to see that it is equally shared? No, we're not. What we're looking at is: is it proportionally equivalent to the applications that came in?

applications, 125 or 100 out of the northeast, logically, if everybody's scoring fairly evenly, not one region scoring higher than the other, which we do a lot of data analysis on, and that doesn't happen, we do a lot of standard deviations and statistical analysis to make sure that we're getting a really good review process.

expect that same percentage of applications would be good enough to make it to the panel. That same percentage of applications would make it to selection.

Does it have to be exact? No, of course not. But what we're looking for is we don't want any huge outliers, that we're looking at one region having been scored harder than another, that there was, you know, inherently aquaculture people score harder than data collection people.

And we look at that. And historically, we have not found that. You know, we do a lot of data analysis that shows that the scores are very even, that there's not a lot of separation between regions, and by priority.

And so then you're looking at, when you start getting into your 3 percent, 1 percent of applications that come in, what percentage are you representing? And it's about 3 percent and about 1 percent.

And that's why you're -- specifically

for the Caribbean I'm talking about, but this is true of all the regions, the percentage that's being submitted, within a couple of percent, is what's being funded. And so we start out this year almost 600 pre-proposals. It's a lot of pre-proposals. And it's a lot of reviews.

And we look at that, and then we encouraged 150. And we looked at it and made sure, of the applications that came, we're recommending full applications from approximately the same percentage across the regions.

I look at the priorities as well, so territorial science being one of them. Of the applications that came in, a certain percentage came in as territorial science. There's not very many. Make sure that's the same percentage or close to it is moving forward or being encouraged.

And then we look at entity type as well. Because one of the concerns that we hear from our constituents is: all of NOAA's grants programs are designed for the big universities.

And that, if you read the S-K program's objectives, is certainly not the case. We want the best science to address our communities, our fishing industry.

And so we make sure that we, again, have a good percentage by priority, region, but also entity type, to make sure that for-profit, non-profit, industry, rec, all of those are well represented. So hopefully that addresses that a little bit.

So the biggest concern for me for areas that are getting low percentages -- whether it's the Caribbean or anywhere else -- is to increase the awareness that the program's there, to increase the applications that come in.

You know, typically we start out -- by the time we get full applications, I think last year we had six from territorial science, total, out of 600 pre-proposals and almost 300 full proposals. That's not a good percentage.

And so coming out of the gates, you're looking at that you're probably --- you're not

going to score all six. And so that's one of the reasons. And I'm using that example, because I'm talking directly to your question. But that's true of every region, every priority, every entity type.

So hopefully that addresses it a little bit. So my big concern --- and we've talked on a sidebar, was to do a better job communicating with the constituents, encouraging them to apply, helping them apply, those kind of things.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes. I think that
--- I really appreciate your response. And I
think it's a great direction that you guys are
working for. And I understand, but when you
mentioned that the panel and content expert
reviews, for example, when you cite, and it's
happened, when you cite --- you say this is how
many pounds of certain species that are being
caught.

And then in the reviews you get comments saying those are not real. But that's

what NOAA cites. That's what's reviewed. So the person that at NOAA, and this is what you're supposed to say.

Or when there's political comments included in the comments that are submitted and show political bias, it's very concerning. And why is that included in some of these comments?

So it's one of those things that I do think there is room for improvement. But also, and again, so this is again with a very small amount for the U.S. Caribbean, right. And again, so that's what's very concerning. But again, I think you've addressed a lot of the issues that we have. And I think that there's a good path forward.

MR. NAMUR: Yes. And one of the things, you know, I want to point out is, despite the fact that I'm explaining the process to you, that does not mean defending any one thing.

We're always working, too, and S-K's not unique. We're constantly tweaking our programs. We're constantly trying to make sure

that we're being open, we're being fair. That's always our objective.

Every single year you'll see a couple of sentences changed on all the programs as we learn. I mean, the fact that we didn't put in a caveat for, you know, acts of God and hurricanes. Well, that won't happen again, okay. So we're constantly learning, because maybe it wasn't an issue last year. And then it comes up, and we've learned. And when you see the FY '19, that sentence is going to be in there.

Our review process is the same. You know, we've only been doing pre-proposals for two years now. This is our third year. This is, you know, we're learning. And we're doing the best and, really, our objective on all of our programs is to be extremely transparent.

You know, I do two national webinars.

I do webinars for each of the regions so that
those regions get --- you know, the can ask me
more specific questions. I travel to the
different regions, you know, to have one-on-one.

We have our website which is loaded with a bunch of S-K information, both background and where we are in the process. It's in Fish News; it's in press releases. I did, I think, eight different radio spots this year where I got interviewed and talked about the process. So we're trying to scream from the mountaintop and get the word out there.

Anybody who feels that their area is not getting enough information from me, call me, absolutely. It's one of the things I've got, and I've been remiss not to introduce him, Chris Cosgrove works with me and is slowly taking over the S-K program. He'll be the new national manager here as we transition.

But our objective is to reach out to everybody. This is not something we look at as a negative thing if we get bombarded with, instead of 600 we get 800 pre-proposals. To me that's a win. Because ultimately, I want the best applications for the best science moving forward.

All right, so we've got one over here,

and then I think Mike's got one as well.

MEMBER HAMILTON: I'll try to keep this brief. Maybe during a break would could talk further. First of all, on the regions and how much money is distributed, I think most of you would not like the peer-to-peer management that we do for 23 listed stocks plus the Magnuson weak stock management. So it's pretty tough in the northwest to run fisheries.

We had an experience with S-K that we got high scores from two reviewers and a low score from one who made criticisms that were inaccurate. It showed they didn't understand what was happening. So we went back the next year and more thoroughly described. But we didn't make it past the pre, even though we got really high scores the year before, which is fine.

But my question is, we're also an organization that has not applied for grants. So we're not skilled in that area. And so you're going to find, I think, and I used to be on ---

I've been on panels reviewing grants before. And we were trying to be really careful about not having a bias towards large organizations with really skilled grant writing staff.

And so I'm wondering about assistance to get a good grant written, you know, to help organizations meet the benchmarks to be able to at least get past --- we didn't get past preproposal the next year, even though we addressed that one low scorer's critique.

MR. NAMUR: Okay. So I'll address that in a couple of points. And, Madam Chair, let me know if we're getting to far into the weeds and going too long.

As it pertains to training, we're doing more and more. Obviously, there's only so many warm bodies to go around the country --MEMBER HAMILTON: Right.

MR. NAMUR: -- and do this. But each year NOAA Grants Management Division does workshops, one on the West Coast, one on the East Coast. It's typically in Seattle, the West Coast

one.

I strongly recommend any potential applicants go to that. That's a pretty high level grants world, and that's a NOAA level, so it's not specific to fisheries. But that is helpful, just kind of what's needed, what the process is, who's looking at it.

The other thing is, you know, we're working more and more to do specific grant writing workshops. We've started doing them in the Pacific. I was up in Alaska this year. I've talked to the folks on the West Coast, and we want to do a couple of them. So again, we'll broadcast that.

People can come in, I'll talk about it more specifically and say, hey, we've got a lot of grants. You know, what's it take to get into a competition and fare well?

As far as S-K is concerned, I will let you know that every year when we write our evaluation criteria, which is what the reviewers have to follow, is that we write it to gear

towards to try to get as much of that bias away
from the grant writing professionals. That's not
our intent. So that's why we score heavily
what's your involvement with the community.
What's your outreach? What's the impact on
management decisions, those kind of things? So
we are working to try to help get there.

The other thing that we're working towards -- and as Raimundo pointed out, it is not mandatory in our program, but we do say that we take it into consideration -- is collaboration. So even sometimes the numbers show that a big university is winning, but they're subbing with a smaller entity, or fishermen, or using their boats. So there you might not see it in the data, but they are being involved, okay.

But absolutely, you know, any time anybody needs more help, more direction, let my staff know. We've got staff all over the country. Either Cliff or I will fly out as the headquarters person, utilize the warm bodies in the regions, and more than happy to help out and

help folks. Absolutely.

The only other point I'll make there, and no matter whether you're a big organization or a small one, and it's the same advice that you probably get --- that you give younger folks that are about to apply for a job, is answer the questions that are being asked. And when you look at the priority in the evaluation criteria, write to it. Write on that.

So that's the best I can answer that right now. But I'm more than happy to always work with folks.

Oh, Mike.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Yes, I hate to be critical, but I'm going to make a few points here. We, me, myself, applied for a first S-K grant. And it was for a research project that actually Cisco is connected back to originally as far as just conceptually, nothing involved in the workings of it.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Last year, we had

a proof of concept kind of thing we ran with the NOAA Southwest Center survey ship, paid for it out of our own pocket, realized that wasn't going to work. And we wanted to embellish that, and enhance it, and had the full support of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center to do so.

We realized we were at the deadline to get everything in. So we did contact the guy that's done quite a few of these before. I'll leave his name unmentioned, but we were given --- and he did a good job, I thought, really walked us through the steps. But he's had a number of these that were successful. So he set us all up.

And we --- he was given an option of putting in our sampling protocol when we did the pre-proposal. The system choked on that with the information. And we were just dismissed, out of hand. And it was not as ---

MR. NAMUR: Did you put it in? I want to be clear on that.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry?

MR. NAMUR: Because it didn't get

through the system, is that the --
MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: It was too much

information.

MR. NAMUR: Okay.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: But we were give

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: But we were given no warning about that or anything, or even any feedback. And the guys that I work with were royally pissed off. And I'll just say it.

MR. NAMUR: That's okay.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: At my age, I can say pretty much what I damn well please. But the problem is, you know, I understand these things have to run a course.

But the guy that helped us was really angry himself. And the guys that I work with in this non-profit group, West Coast Pelagic Conservation Group, just were beside themselves. And they don't have the highest regard for government stuff anyway. They don't deal with it. And one's a fisherman, the other runs a major processing --- the largest processing plant on the West Coast.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And, you know, I mean, if there's going to be some kind of something that kicks you out automatically, and somebody that's fairly skilled in the process doesn't even realize it, there should be more than just you're dismissed kind of thing.

Because the people that are involved in this -- and we put a lot of time, and effort, and some money into this ---

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: -- it leaves a really sour taste in your mouth.

MR. NAMUR: No, I've been on the other side. I've been on the side writing the proposal. I know how much work it is, trust me. So first, obviously, I'm very sorry that that was the experience. Secondly, I'll probably talk with you a little more offline about more of the specifics, exactly what happened.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'd be very happy to do that.

1	MR. NAMUR: Because I want to
2	understand exactly what happened. On a maximum
3	20-page application, size shouldn't be an issue.
4	And so that's why I want to get into the
5	specifics, probably not with the whole group, but
6	
7	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Right, right. I
8	wouldn't want the whole group
9	MR. NAMUR: because I want to make
10	sure this doesn't happen to people.
11	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And that's why I'm
12	bringing it up.
13	MR. NAMUR: Yes.
14	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: It's not to center
15	on my own personal experience.
16	MR. NAMUR: No.
17	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Because I go
18	through ups and downs every day. But when I see
19	this happen, and I think, well, how widespread is
20	this?
21	MR. NAMUR: Yes.
22	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And that's the

first thing that comes to mind. 1 2 MR. NAMUR: And again, we will get into the details offline. But if it's, you know, 3 4 that they couldn't get through the system, that 5 is grants.gov, the portal, to apply, we've got some issues that I'll need to work with. 6 7 Because that's not my --- that's an 8 ETHS system that we utilize. Because that's 9 grants, you know, enterprise-wide across all of the federal government. So if that issue is 10 11 happening, I certainly do want to hear about it. And I'm going to talk with you about it. 12 13 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And that's all I 14 ask. 15 Yes. I'11 ---MR. NAMUR: 16 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Thank you. 17 MEMBER ESPINOZA: So thanks. So this 18 is really quick. And it's actually a suggestion 19 or a comment on something that I'm hearing. 20 Because this is something that, you know, my 21 perspective had been just US Caribbean. But what

I'm hearing is that it's a lot of smaller

organizations that really see the opportunity in S-K and are not able to be successful with it.

And being one of the few NOAA grants that doesn't require a match, it seems to me that S-K could --- and these small organizations have really deep connections with the fisheries communities, be it recreational, be it commercial.

opportunity for helping develop these small community-based organizations that really have these connections and these relationships, deep relationships, more than just hiring them as a boat, but have long term relationships.

So I think, I mean, this could be an opportunity for S-K to look at these smaller organizations to help them continue to develop, to become better at grant writing, while actually meeting the goals, the core goals of S-K.

So, I mean, I really think you have a really good opportunity to continue doing the science but also develop fisheries, focused

organizations that do a lot of work, you know, continuing them and helping them out as kind of an externality of the funding, you know, if that's something that you guys would be interested in considering --

MR. NAMUR: I appreciate the comment.

And it's poignant. I think that through the conversations that we've had already, you know, of additional training, additional outreach, we absolutely want to make sure that we're helping organizations be more successful, have a chance at being more successful.

One of the things I do want to point out, and this is unique to S-K, is the fact that it is unallowed to have anything to do with infrastructure. So we can't help build an organization but supporting and making sure, absolutely, and I hear you.

And again, I've got a slide for it, if we're going to have time for it, that kind of shows the process for setting priorities. And we really do branch out. This is not me sitting in

my office kind of by myself. You know, this is across the country, NMFS leadership, this is all of our councils, this is all of our commissions that are working with our states and our constituents. We're looking at five-year research plans for each of the councils. I mean, this is a pretty big enterprise that comes back to what drives those priorities.

So again, the question comes up a lot. How do you come up with the priorities? It's because we're listening to our constituents say what's important. And that's how we end up driving that. And that's true of the majority of the programs where they know. And now they may be more focused. I mean, S-K is pretty broad, you know.

Your other point, I think, is really good, and I'm glad you brought it up, and it's important for people to know, is that S-K used to have a match requirement about eight years ago, 25 percent. And we got rid of it for that very reason. We didn't want it to be that only people

big enough to bring that big match to the table could be successful. So we got rid of it to help the smaller organizations be able to apply.

even if it's a voluntary match, that can't be used in the evaluation criteria. Because human nature is, hey, more money, more bang for the buck, that's great. We're not allowed to actually look at that. Because again, that helps sway it towards people that can just drown people with money. And so those are things that we do to try to keep the playing field level.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Thank you. I have a couple of more general comments I'd like to make. But first, I really want to thank you for coming today and giving this presentation. You're being very gracious about all this, you know, feedback.

But a couple of points I wanted to make, when the Admiral talked to us two days ago, he mentioned some megatrends, two of which were exponential advances in technology and also this concept that we're returning to the great power

competitions.

And he specifically mentioned China. He mentioned that this is not just a national defense issue but also an economic issue. At one point, he showed a side that talked about how we're sustainably saving over \$100 million a year through improved science.

But what we're very concerned about in the science community is the decreasing investment in R&D in the United States. We're really losing our place in the world. The National Science Board's 2016 report, for example, gave a couple of statistics. Although the US is still first in total dollars, at about 25 percent, China is gaining and is now second with about 20 percent.

investments in research and development have not even matched inflation. It's been about 0.8 percent per year. China, during the same time period, has been investing --- has been increasing their investment 19.5 percent per

year. We went from first in the world to 11th in terms of our R&D investment as a percentage of GDP. So anyway, some very alarming statistics.

And so, again, we're very concerned about that. And so I like, you know, the numbers that you're showing. It looks like a lot of money. But, in fact, we're concerned about the fact that we're losing ground.

And then the last point I'd like to make is the fact that all of the slides in the discussion are about financial assistance. I wish it would say something like financial investment.

When you do a paycheck to your inhouse talent, you don't hand over the paycheck
and say here's your assistance for this month.

It's actually, you know, fee for service. So
you've talked about all of this funding goes to
advance things that no one needs to get done --

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER YOCHEM: -- and things that could be better done perhaps by tapping, you

know, the talent. When I, again, if I hire an architect to design something for me, when the bill comes due, I don't say here's your assistance.

MR. NAMUR: Right.

MEMBER YOCHEM: And so that's just a perception thing about the nature of these dollars. We really feel, you know, in the outside of government community, that we are doing a service to the nation by the work that we're providing as opposed to the nation doing a service to us by assisting us with these dollars. So thank you.

MR. NAMUR: No, not a problem at all.

Those are excellent points. I'll start by saying that. It sounds like -- I'm sorry I missed the presentation. So that's one.

As far as, you know, whether or not we can do other things, you know, obviously I have no control about how much funding we give for research. So I wouldn't disagree that I'd love to have more to put out. That's always my goal,

more to go out for great research.

As far as the terminology, that's actually directly out of the Grants and Cooperative Agreements Act of 1977. That's financial assistance.

And the reasoning in there --- and I understand, and personally I can do a better job messaging it to make sure it doesn't come off as assistance so much as, you know, we're collaboratively working.

But the reason for that is that --and as my current position I oversee contracts
some as well. And you've referenced, you know,
if you had an architect or if you had an
employee, and the difference there is that's for
the direct benefit of you.

So the difference in my world,

contracts are for the direct benefit of the

federal government. And there, that's a payment.

You know, thank you very much for doing the work

that we needed. We needed five tables built,

they were built, here's your payment. Thank you

very much.

In the grants and cooperative agreements world, we're assisting the work that the constituents and the nation wants. It's not our work. It meets our mission, of course, and it meets our statutory authorities. But the difference is that we're trying to help people meet the needs that they want to accomplish that align with our mission. So that's why that term is used. But I'll take to heart the perception.

MEMBER BELLE: So I want to broaden the conversation a little bit here and just ask a question about the reviewers pools. And I've been a reviewer, and I've been on the receiving end of reviews. So I've served in both functions. But --

MR. NAMUR: Thank you in advance.

MEMBER BELLE: No way. So I think one of the challenges we have in aquaculture in this country is that, both within the academic community and within the resource management community, the level of expertise, technical,

scientific expertise in the scientific and management community is behind the state of the art internationally.

And so my question to you is do you ever use international reviewers? If you do, great, if you don't, why don't you.

And the second part of the question is while I recognize that obviously the purpose of all of these grants, whether it's Saltonstall-Kennedy or any of the other grants, is to answer a scientific question or address a need that the agency has in terms of a resource management question or what have you --

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER BELLE: -- one of, I think, the frustrations from the private sector's point of view in aquaculture has been there have been many, many grants given for projects which, from a commercial point of view are completely irrelevant and, in fact, may actually distort the market.

Because you're basically subsidizing

a line of inquiry or a project which has no commercial possibility of ever being successful. And so the other part of the question is, is there any part of the review process that tries to ground truth for the kind of private sector commercial reality of the exercise as well.

MR. NAMUR: Yes. Those are great points. And aquaculture is, you know, as you know probably better than I do, an ever-changing environment that's growing extremely quickly.

And so the reviewer pool is hard.

Typically for S-K, the answer is no, we don't use international reviewers. And that's because the intent of the program is based on the need and relevance for US fishing. So therefore, we use our internal folks and our external constituents that would understand the need of US fishing better. So that's why that would be the case for not using international reviewers.

And then the -- and I know there's a follow-up. So the second part of your question was ---

MEMBER BELLE: Relevance to commercial.

MR. NAMUR: Thank you. So relevance to commercial, so we do try to balance our reviewers, absolutely, so that we have people that are looking at it.

Again, I don't want to repeat myself, but it goes back to each individual application we're looking at is to try to ensure we're getting the best reviewers for that particular application. So if there is some impact on that facet, commercial fishing, commercial selling, whether it's the communities, yes, we certainly do try to do that.

One of the things that is a challenge for me as the manager is if you look at, like, the pre-proposal process. That 600 pre-proposals, multiply that by three reviews each time, you just said it. The number of people that are subject matter experts, it's tough.

And there's a phrase called, and I'm sure you've experienced this, reviewer burnout.

Everybody and their uncle's calling you, because you're the guy that knows. And so it is a challenge for us.

We certainly do feel that we get a very good pool of subject matter experts that do a great job for us. But it's always a challenge, absolutely. And so cheating, self-interest here is, you know, that's a request from me to you guys is, you know, wherever possible assist or recommend other people. Because we're always looking for a larger pool of people that we can reach out to for great reviews.

(Off the record comments)

MR. NAMUR: Yes. And so for a lot of programs, absolutely, we do utilize that. For S-K, historically we haven't. But that's because of the intent of the program.

MEMBER BROWN: I just wanted to add to the comment that Pam made. One of the things that's problematic about financial assistance, it is a budgetary term ingrained throughout all grant programs across agencies. And if there's a

need to change that culture, then that's 1 2 something that's going to have to work its way probably through OMB and the Congress. 3 4 MR. NAMUR: Yes. And then it goes 5 back to my original answer, you know, why we use But I think Pam's point that we can 6 that term. do a better job messaging is a good one. 7 8 thank you for this. 9 MEMBER FISHER: So I love to follow 10 the money, so I think that --- didn't you mention that some of this money goes to commerce first? 11 12 MR. NAMUR: Okay. 13 MEMBER FISHER: So how much do they 14 rip off? MR. NAMUR: All right. So I figured 15 16 this question was coming. I know that Stuart 17 Merrill was here yesterday and did a great job of 18 giving you guys an initial answer. But this is -19 -- sometimes it's easier if you visually see it. 20 So as I mentioned, and we're only 21 talking S-K here, this is specific to Saltonstall-Kennedy, is that these are not 22

appropriated dollars. So we're not waiting ---1 2 although we are held hostage by the appropriation process, these are not appropriated dollars. 3 4 And so a certain amount of imports 5 come in. There's tax, duties, tariffs on those. 6 And from that there is -- 30 percent of that is 7 moved over to the Department of Commerce. So you 8 can see the duty is collected. It is close to 9 \$500 million. About \$145 million, that's exactly 30 percent, gets transferred to NOAA, to the 10 11 Secretary. And so you can see that at that point 12 the Promote and Develop account is sitting at \$145 million. 13 14 MEMBER FISHER: So could I ask you a question? 15 16 MR. NAMUR: Yes, sir. 17 MEMBER FISHER: Real quickly, who 18 decides the 30 percent? So if I go meet with 19 appropriators, which I do, in the lobby to be 20 held, so, I mean ---21 MR. NAMUR: All grant money? 22 MEMBER FISHER: Yes.

1	(Laughter)
2	MEMBER FISHER: So the 30 percent is
3	just some number that somebody dreamed up or
4	something?
5	MR. NAMUR: Senator Kennedy and
6	Senator Saltonstall. It's in the Organic Act of
7	1954.
8	MEMBER FISHER: Got it.
9	MR. NAMUR: Yes. So that is not a
10	choice by anybody unless the legislative act is
11	actually amended.
12	MEMBER FISHER: Okay.
13	MR. NAMUR: That's how that happens.
14	Question, how much is and I won't use your
15	term, but transferred?
16	MEMBER FISHER: Ha, ha-ha.
17	MR. NAMUR: We have \$145 million
18	coming over to the Secretary of Commerce that is
19	for NAA's use.
20	During the appropriation process, and
21	I think Stuart did decent job of kind of talking

is going to say X-number of dollars is going to go to NAA.

What they do, and if you read the appropriation language each year, it says X-number of dollars goes to NAA. Of that, \$130 million will be funded from the Promote and Develop account.

That means they don't need to appropriate as much to us to get to that same number. Because they're taking \$130 million of our \$145 million, putting it over to OF, and that's how they plus-up the NAA budget. Now, until 10, 15 years ago, that was a NAA/OF offset, not Fisheries ---

MEMBER FISHER: Right, right.

MR. NAMUR: -- NAA. Which meant that money went across. That's Operations, Research, and Facilities, for those --- sorry about using acronyms. And so we have a hard time sometimes at that point knowing is that going OAR, is that going to NESDS, is that going to the National Ocean Service?

So starting, I think it was in 2012,
Congress started doing their appropriation
process saying \$130 million will be transferred
or offset, but it will be used for these
purposes. And they're specifically for fisheries
research which aligns somewhat with the S-K
program.

So you've got expanded annual stock assessments, fisheries information networks, your cooperative research programs are 100 percent funded out of this transfer, and surveying, monitoring, as well as the interjurisdictional fisheries grants. Those are all funded out of what started in the Promote and Develop account.

(Off the record comments)

MR. NAMUR: So before we get to the next one, I think Mr. Cosgrove has an addition to my explanation.

MR. COSGROVE: Just a quick one. I just wanted to say that ten percent of NAA's overall budget goes to fisheries grants.

MR. NAMUR: Actually, was it?

MR. COSGROVE: Well, yes.

MR. NAMUR: So, yes. So I think his point here is that despite the fact that it's transferred over to our OF, is that it's still going towards our research granting opportunities. So all of these are external grant functions. So it is a transfer, which means that we get less appropriated to us, but it's still going out externally for our research needs.

MS. LOVETT: What part of the whole NMFS budget goes out as grants?

MR. NAMUR: As grants, is a third or more. Yes, actually it's a huge portion. So if you look at the NMFS budget, and actually the same is true for NAA, it's about a billion dollars each year that goes out from NAA. But if you look at the NMFS budget, about a third goes out as grants, about a third goes out as contracts, and about a third is used for our own research and, of course, administration.

And you can see this is just basically

that small, little box that was there, you can see what the \$130 million is used for that gets scraped off from the Promote and Develop account. The money changes colors. It now becomes just regular old ORF money. And it's used for these purposes.

The remaining funds, that's why we talk about it with two different terms, because it gets confusing if you always say S-K. The S-K money that went here versus the S-K that went somewhere else, we call that Promote and Develop money that got transferred.

The S-K program gets what's leftover, essentially. Whatever is left is what we use. We put the majority of that out as competitive grants. We put the rest out as supplemental grants. So upwards of 90 percent of the funds that are still colored S-K go out externally in the form of grants.

MEMBER FISHER: Could I ask you another question then?

MR. NAMUR: Absolutely, sir.

MEMBER FISHER: It seems to me like

Paul gave us a certain amount of money to add

into the FINS, because we've been flat funded for

at least 15 years, that I know of.

MR. NAMUR: Yes, sir.

MEMBER FISHER: So it looks like to me that there must be some ability to move some of that money around every year. But we never know what it's going to be. And Paul will come and say, well, this year we don't have any or blah, blah, blah. So how does that work?

MR. NAMUR: So again, we are, like everything, subject to the will of Congress. And we all serve at the pleasure. So with that, we don't know the numbers up front. Because right now, even for '18, I don't know what's going to happen. I don't know what transfer's going to be.

And we're always playing the game of how many fish are getting purchased from outside. So how much tariffs are coming in? So we're always constantly trying to estimate as we go.

And we use the prior years to do that. But we're constantly kind of massaging the data, if you will. So that's one of the reasons Paul can't tell you for FY '18 this is what's going to happen.

The other part of it is, the way the Organic Act is written is that other money, that's being supporting the FINS, is in what we call our national program. That's after we're done with the competitive process.

And at that point, the way the Act reads is that funds can be used to address those needs not adequately addressed through the competitive process. So we don't know what needs haven't been addressed until we hold the competitive process.

So there's two points there. One, we don't know how much money we're going to get.

Two, we're going through the competitive process to see whether or not some of those needs are addressed through the competitive applications that get funded.

1	Example for why we don't say anything
2	other than what we anticipate is that, in 2010
3	and 2011, Congress transferred more money from
4	the OF during the OF offset than we actually
5	had. So therefore, the S-K program became zero.
6	We had nothing left. We ran no programs.
7	We hope that doesn't happen every
8	year. We cross our fingers. But, you know,
9	we're at the whim despite the fact these are
10	not appropriated dollars, the appropriation
11	process dictates how much money is left for our
12	program.
13	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So question here as
14	we're slipping a little bit on our timberline.
15	MR. NAMUR: Sorry.
16	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Do you have a lot of
17	slides left?
18	MR. NAMUR: These are actually
19	supplemental slides for the
20	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay.
21	MR. NAMUR: Because I knew that
22	question was going to come up.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: All right.

MR. NAMUR: So instead of just talking, because sometimes it's very hard to conceptualize the transfer without some pictures.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I appreciate it very much. I'm visual.

MR. NAMUR: The only other point that I would point out is kind of --- it's talked about a lot, you know, how the priority is set.

And this, again, I've already said it, but this kind of visually outlines it.

When we're doing the priorities, we're working with the councils, we're working with the commissions. We're working with all the NMFS leadership at headquarters. We're working with our science centers, our regions.

So there's a lot of people working into this and tapping into our constituents as well to make sure that we're doing the best we can to know that we're addressing the needs of the nation but also that those are in line with the intent of the S-K Act.

1	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So we have a few
2	people in the queue. And like I said, we are
3	slipping. So I'm going to ask folks if they
4	could be succinct, and if a question's been
5	asked, maybe no repeats. And you'll be around
6	for any amount of time?
7	MR. NAMUR: I know I can stay as long
8	as people would like.
9	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Excellent.
10	MR. NAMUR: You can pull me off into
11	the hallway and
12	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Our next break will
13	be after the next presentation. So maybe folks
14	could grab you during that break. That's
15	MR. NAMUR: Absolutely.
16	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: scheduled for
17	11:00. So I'm going to go to Peter. He's been
18	waiting.
19	MR. NAMUR: Okay.
20	MEMBER MOORE: Yes. Hi, Dan, thanks.
21	MR. NAMUR: Okay, not a problem.
22	MEMBER MOORE: This is a perfect slide

for my question. My experience with S-K, I worked in the industry in Alaska in the '80s, '70s and '80s. And then I did winter work for the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation. At the time, it was a pretty robust foundation. We got all the S-K money for Alaska.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER MOORE: The Board was, I think it was, like, three harvesters, three processors, you know, maybe it was more than that. And I think we had the NMFS --- I don't know if he was the original administrator, Carl Roger. He was our godfather. He was very involved.

The point is that the priorities for Alaska were set by the industry. And at that time, it was let's get surimi making on shore, let's get flatfish development going, let's get, you know, byproduct utilization going.

These were not academic ideas, they were not my ideas. These were ideas that the industry said, hey, we can make money at this.

Or we need to develop this, or we need to reduce

bycatch, or whatever it was.

And when I look at this slide, you know, okay, I can see maybe where industry input comes in. But in a way, sort of reflecting on Mike's comments that, you know, I helped a crowd out of Rhode Island, Sea freeze, put a proposal in, I think, a year or two ago. And it was a lot of work.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER MOORE: And just to get those guys to agree that they're going to put somebody on it, even though other people were doing the lifting, it was a priority for them, what we were trying to do. And we didn't -- I think we made it through the first round, or maybe not.

But, you know, and it's not a criticism of you, but I think that somewhere in this --- and we're not even talking about aquaculture right now, because they don't sit on the Council, for instance. So the industry input into this industry research and development, and product development, and whatever program, I

encourage the Agency to really think about that one hard.

And, you know, honestly when we see much of the money going to the academic institutions who have the capacity to put these grants together and sort of, like, well, Joe Blow got half of all the grants in the Northeast.

Like, how did that happen?

And I'm not intending to be critical, but I think that the industry participation piece of this is what has made it unique. And that would be something I would encourage, you know, the group to really think about, you know, how do you want to try and encourage that.

MR. NAMUR: Yes. So I'll address it, and I'll try to be as brief as possible. So there's a couple of points. One, in specific because you mentioned Alaska, is that back in the '80s and even the early '90s the actual S-K competitive program was tiny. It was, like, \$2 million.

And there was a lot of money going to

certain areas. But that's because that was back in the day of earmarks. And so that was the major driver. There was \$10 million to \$17 million being pumped through earmarks to certain locations and certain entities. That has gone away, okay. With that, there was a huge culture shift.

What I have seen personally in the last three or four years, as people have recovered from being used to that being the process to, wow, there's a lot of competition, is that the number of applications --- and I'll be specific to Alaska here --- the number of applications has gone up significantly. The number of folks that are not from the University of Fairbanks have gone up significantly.

And what I've seen in the last two years is the percentage of applications that are not university are going up significantly as well.

Second part of my answer though will be kind of the same as that I gave to Raimundo

which is --- and it's gotten better, and we've done a huge media blitz for Alaska asking them, hey, look, if you're interested, get it in there --- but for years we've had a really hard time getting the applications in.

There's a concern that the money's not being funded there. But then when we look, no one's actually applying. And that's now getting fixed. And I like that. I'm very encouraged over the last years that every year there's more applications, there's more being funded, and there's more variety of entity type.

So I hear you. We can certainly work to include industry more when we're setting our priorities. And we certainly lean in that area on the North Pacific Council. But we can certainly work even harder.

That said, as far as the funding portion, there's a lot of history of why it went from \$17 million for exactly what industry wanted to do to -- now it's being addressed in a little different way.

1	MEMBER MOORE: Thanks.
2	MR. NAMUR: Yes, not a problem at all.
3	MEMBER BONNEY: One is I would
4	hopefully we get the slides, the appendices
5	slides, because they're not on the
6	MR. NAMUR: Yes, I've given them to
7	Heidi.
8	MEMBER BONNEY: Okay. And then the
9	other thing, and this is if you go back to
10	the split.
11	MR. NAMUR: So you want, okay. Yes,
12	ma'am.
13	MEMBER BONNEY: So where you see that,
14	right there.
15	MR. NAMUR: Yes.
16	MEMBER BONNEY: I mean, I don't really
17	know that I think of the offset, the \$130
18	million. That really isn't grant funding in my
19	mind. It's basically base funding to support
20	particular programs within NMFS. But yet it
21	seems like when you're looking at the what
22	was it, half a billion dollars up front, what was

1	the total number?
2	MR. NAMUR: Yes, it's about \$400
3	million.
4	MEMBER BONNEY: It's really not grant
5	funding. It's maintaining a lot of programs that
6	are essential to do the work of the Agency, isn't
7	it? I mean
8	MR. NAMUR: And I understand exactly
9	why you're saying it that way. Because it does
10	change color and become part of our base funding.
11	You know, it's kind of slid across the board, if
12	you will.
13	Once it's there, these are I mean,
14	out of our appropriated dollars and our base
15	funding, even if it's not ORF, the way we decide
16	to address the needs of our mission sometimes is
17	through grant programs. And in these cases, that
18	\$400 million, those are actual grant research
19	programs, all of them.
20	MEMBER BONNEY: Like PacFIN in the
21	data
22	MR. NAMUR: Yes. Fisheries

information networks, those are grants. They go out the door for not us, for our constituents to go and collect fisheries' information, data collection. Now, does it benefit our stock assessments? Absolutely. But it's also used by the constituents.

MEMBER BONNEY: But I guess it's not really competitive. It's basically they're a line item in the budget. And that just gets programmed as grants.

MR. NAMUR: For certain programs that is true. Certain programs are what we call formula allotment. And we have an actual budget line that says how much is going to go into jurisdictional fisheries. Again, it's not technically competitive, it's formula. It goes to our states, because the states have a certain need.

Going back, there was a question earlier. Do we ever take into account the size of the fishery when we do a grant program? S-K, no. Interjurisdictional fisheries is based

primarily off of landings. So it changes every 1 2 That formula fluctuates based off of how much came into each state. And that dictates the 3 That formula is decided by Congress. 4 5 We have to follow it. MEMBER BONNEY: I know in Alaska, 6 7 first, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 8 interjurisdictional grant funding is base funding 9 for them as well. And then I hear the conversation of people concerned about being 10 11 competitive for grants for different 12 constituencies in the industry. 13 And I think the way this is messaged 14 it makes it --- you feel as if you've got all that money out there available when the reality 15 16 is, when you break it all down, it might be \$40 17 million total, across all the ---18 MR. NAMUR: Oh, no, much, much, much, 19 much more than that. 20 MEMBER BONNEY: Okay. 21 MR. NAMUR: So on one of my first

three or four slides I had a breakdown.

22

And it

showed the types of applications that we funded.

And the number one is competitive. It is by far
the majority.

Now, there still are, of course, our formula allotments. Those are Congressionally mandated. We don't have a choice. We certainly have other line items. That, again, comes from Congress, therefore we have to follow the intent of Congress. I wouldn't look good in orange. So I'm going to follow the intent of Congress.

So I hear where you're coming from.

But no, the majority of our funds still go out in an open and fair competition, absolutely.

MEMBER BONNEY: Okay.

MEMBER RHEAULT: Great presentation. So I sit on two groups which spend a huge amount of time devising surveys to survey our industry members on research priorities. And then, you know, we winnow down dozens and dozens, and prioritize these lists, and send them off to the various funding agencies, and wonder if anybody ever reads them.

Just curious if those are ever 1 2 weighed? 3 MR. NAMUR: Yes. 4 MEMBER RHEAULT: And maybe I'm sending 5 them to the wrong address or ---6 MR. NAMUR: No, no. I'm not sure what 7 address you're sending them to. No, we certainly 8 And in my case, that window is on the slide do. 9 where you saw, you know, to set the priorities, that you've got NMFS leadership involved, is that 10 11 that's where that's going. 12 And so one of the points, again, and 13 I'm not sitting twisting my mustache in my office 14 by myself, is I'm really leaning on a lot of 15 folks when the priorities are being set. 16 of those places is we go up and we're talking with our head leadership. And that's the AA and 17 18 the DAYS, Cisco, of course. 19 You know, they can weigh in and say 20 look, you know, based on what's come in this is

the way we're going, this is the needs for the

Agency at this point. So those certainly are

21

1	taken into account. But if you're feeling
2	they're not being heard sufficiently, you can
3	always send them directly to me. That's fine.
4	(Off the record comments)
5	MR. NAMUR: Ha, ha, ha.
6	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay, Mike.
7	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Forgive me, I'm
8	going to give a little speech here.
9	MR. NAMUR: Absolutely. Go for it.
10	As long as it's okay with Madam Chair.
11	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think it will
12	be.
13	(Laughter)
14	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I promise not to
15	use any more profanity.
16	MR. NAMUR: Okay.
17	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: But, you know, 91
18	percent of our seafood is imported. We
19	represent, in part here, producers that would
20	like to see the trade deficit for seafood go the
21	other way.
22	But we are on a cost basis. And what

I -- I'm responsible for five bottom lines, five divisional bottom lines in our company. So I wasn't skilled in business when I took on the job. But I've learned how it works.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: So we're competing against cost models which don't have all of our regulatory burden and foreign imports.

In my mind, some of these funds were set up as somewhat of an offset from tariffs on imports, right?

MR. NAMUR: Okay.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Thirty percent.

MR. NAMUR: Correct.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: But when I start seeing or hearing of competition, and who's got the best writing skills gets the money, and I see a lot of universities -- and I'm all for research, believe me, but we've talked more and more about collaborative and cooperative research, how beneficial that could be on many different levels, not just, you know, the data

that comes out of it. But it's a trust-building thing. We're talking about citizen science, I think, next.

I think that a certain amount of this stuff should be non-competitive that probably is competitive now, and be dedicated towards industry-type projects that are in line either with research or marketing.

Marketing is a big deal to us. And we don't have, you know, the largest seafood companies in America, and I represent one of those, are very small in comparison to, you know, some of the big other food giants out there.

MR. NAMUR: Absolutely.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And I guess it would --- and hearing Peter's comments and Randy's, I think there's a lot more that could be done. I'm not saying that the research at the academic level is not necessary. But we're kind of a tip of the spear, and we're doing stuff that's going to be lot more fundamental to just keeping our industry alive and vibrant.

And I think that has to be a consideration on how these funds are handed out. We're not -- you know, stuff that's climate change, 20 years down the road or whatever, that's great. We need to be doing it. But you shouldn't be picking our pocket, in a sense, to do it. Because this money to us is how do we keep fishing on the water and keep our industry going. And it's helpful what PacFIN does, and these guys, it's amazing.

MR. NAMUR: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: So it's
beneficial, right, to industry itself. I think
some of these collaborative projects, one which I
just talked about that got kicked out before it
even started, would also be beneficial, I think,
from a data collection point too.

Because we can, with fishing vessels, and other techniques, and our knowledge, we can fill in a few gaps at a much cheaper basis than what the NOAA ships and some of the other research items they have can do. So I'm just

putting it out there for consideration.

MR. NAMUR: No, no. And that's one of the reasons I'm here today. I appreciate the comment. And I certainly take it to heart. And so on Point 1, considering whether or not we want to allocate the funds differently, I'll certainly take that. And that is a decision and, again, not made with me sitting by myself. That's a conversation.

But no, it's hearing things like that that bring it to the table, and that we can talk about it, and decide what's best for the program.

The other thing I would say is the fact that, you know, we're continually evolving. I said, you know, we're constantly changing our FFO. And over the years, and I hope it's becoming apparent and that we're doing an okay job messaging it, is that we're working more and more to ensure that the way we write our evaluation criteria and our priorities is geared towards communities and industry that we have.

If you look at the scoring, even

during the pre-proposal process, 40 percent of it is are you working -- either have a direct impact on the community or working directly with the community. So again, it may be a university that's working with them. But if they're not, they're actually going to score lower.

The last point, and we're working very hard to try -- and I use the term level the playing field, but I don't really like that.

Because it makes it sound like one is actually better than the other --- but to make sure that all entity types, regardless of whether or not they're professional grant writers or not, are coming in on a level playing field, that we're really looking at the technical merit of the science not the technical merit of their sentence structure.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And lastly, I'd like to thank you for taking some abuse here and listening.

(Laughter)

MR. NAMUR: It's all right. It's the

1	story of my life, Mike. Ha, ha, ha.
2	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So the last word will
3	be going to Liz.
4	MEMBER HAMILTON: I think that's my
5	nickname, right, Last Word Liz?
6	(Laughter)
7	MEMBER HAMILTON: Just a quick
8	question. How much it's to help the fishing
9	industry, and I echo a lot of what Mike said.
LO	How much of it goes to help the recreational
L1	industry?
L2	And I'll admit that, in our industry,
L3	our feeling is with NOAA that we're very much a
L <b>4</b>	small, tiny, little after-thought versus being an
_	
L <b>5</b>	industry that deserves the attention and customer
	industry that deserves the attention and customer service that the aquaculture and commercial
L5 L6	
L5	service that the aquaculture and commercial
L5 L6 L7	service that the aquaculture and commercial fishing industry currently receives.
L5 L6 L7 L8	service that the aquaculture and commercial fishing industry currently receives.  MR. NAMUR: Well, that's an excellent
L5 L6 L7 L8	service that the aquaculture and commercial fishing industry currently receives.  MR. NAMUR: Well, that's an excellent point.

of times, kind of like whether or not there's collaboration, whether or not it is rec fishing, sometimes it's hidden in a project that doesn't say in the title "Rec fishing for the Southeast."

It will be that there's impacts on the recreational fishing as well as commercial fishing or the management needs.

We did do an analysis of this recently. Actually, Mr. Cosgrove was the one that headed it up. And I'm sure he'd be happy to talk with you on the side. Because we were concerned for the exact same reason, making sure that despite the fact that this most certainly is not a recreational fishing program, that the objective of the program includes them, absolutely. They are part of the objective of this program and of the mission.

And so we did go through and make sure that we're looking at a number of applications that are really submitted. And it becomes hard and a little bit soft data, if you will. Because again, you can't just query it in Sigmacell and

say, yes, there were 27 that were the word, "Rec fishing." Because sometimes it's only a portion of it. And it gets put into the aquaculture panel or put into the data collection panel. But it's affecting the recreational community.

From that we were pleasantly surprised, to be honest with you. We were pretty pleasantly surprised. But I don't have the numbers right off the top of my head. I apologize.

MEMBER HAMILTON: I just would encourage you to think about the word industry and rec, rather than rec fishing, rec industry. Because they are different. You know, one is about customers, and the other's about business.

MR. NAMUR: Yes. Thank you. And you can see Mr. Cosgrove here is quickly writing it down so that we actually have right now our FY '19 FFO is a draft document. And every time somebody says something like that to us, we put it as a little comment on it. So that when we go through looking at what we want to write for '19

we take all of those points into consideration. 1 2 So this whole, despite the fact, you know, as Mike says, I take a little abuse 3 4 sometimes, it's very useful for us. Because when 5 we go back and work towards writing the next solicitation, we're hearing what you guys say and 6 can include it where it's appropriate. 7 8 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9 10:31 a.m. CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Well, and I thank you 10 11 Dan for coming and helping us get through this. 12 You can see there's lots of interest and 13 questions, and it's very helpful to have you in 14 person. Absolutely, and the last 15 MR. NAMUR: 16 thing I'd say is, first, thank you so much for 17 the opportunity. Really appreciate being able to 18 And both Cliff and I are really always come. 19 available. 20 Please reach out, whether it's about 21 SK, I know we got kind of in the weeds there

towards the end but, you know, that's ultimately

40 of our 700 grants. There's a lot of other 1 2 programs out there. If you guys have concerns or 3 questions, please let me know. 4 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Thank you again, and 5 And I'll stick around. 6 MR. NAMUR: 7 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Oh, okay. 8 MEMBER FISHER: This is a question to 9 you, Madam Chair, and that is is it possible that MAFAC could make some suggestions based on what 10 11 you've heard here today? I mean, what was the 12 plan for MAFAC as a result of this presentation? 13 MS. LUKENS: Well in going back to it, 14 I think it was raised request to have more information on this and have a better 15 16 understanding and get a thorough explanation from 17 Dan about all of the different programs and 18 become more informed on it and to have some and 19 to have some Q&A and answers. 20 So I don't think there was a specific 21 plan, what MAFAC was going to do with it. just a topic that they expressed interest in. 22

1	After this, MAFAC may have a conversation or
2	something to that extent. But nothing was
3	articulated that I'm aware of.
4	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So we are a little
5	behind, so I think we're going to have to work
6	through our break, unless they're very quick.
7	Citizen science, very interesting. So the next
8	topic and I don't know, is it Laura?
9	MS. LUKENS: Laura's over there.
LO	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Laura?
L1	MS. LUKENS: Ormeland.
L <b>2</b>	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Ormeland. She can
L3	come up here if she wants. I'll give up my seat.
L <b>4</b>	(Off microphone conversation.)
L5	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. And Rich.
L6	Okay.
L7	MS. OREMLAND: Oh, I'm sorry. Would
L8	you like us to go a little bit shorter and try to
L9	take an abbreviated version? Or just go with
20	what we had planned?
21	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I think what I'd like
22	to do is to hold any questions until you've been

able to present it, and then there could be some 1 2 questions and potentially we might get a little bit closer to our schedule. But I'd really like 3 4 to have you be able to go through your whole 5 presentation. So if folks can just, you know, catch my eye, I'll put you in a queue. 6 7 MS. OREMLAND: Okay. 8 But that might work CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 9 out better. 10 MS. OREMLAND: Okay, thank you. 11 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, thanks. 12 MS. LUKENS: Okay. Well thank you for 13 having us here today. I'm Laura Oremland and 14 this is --15 MR. CODY: Richard Cody. 16 MS. OREMLAND: -- from the NOAA 17 Fisheries Office of Science and Technology. 18 really excited to talk to you today about citizen 19 science in the fisheries sector. 20 So with that, let's see, okay. Here 21 we go. So just to give you a sense of the 22 outline, what, you know, really have to start

with some definitions and also to give you a sense of where does citizens science fit within NOAA. Where does it fit within the federal community and where does it fit within fisheries?

Then I think the part that folks will be most interested in is some examples. Where is it being used? How is it being used? What are the challenges encountered? And we wanted to do a special spotlight on how it's used or what the potential is in the recreational fishing sector where I'm going to turn it over to Rich to cover that topic. And then we'll review the challenges, possibilities, and then leave it open for questions that you may have.

So the slide I would like to start with is this one, to really show where citizen science has potential in this area. I've always, you know, just in classes, known that space is way more to explore than the ocean. And I would say in a similar sense, citizen science really hasn't been explored as much in the fishery sector.

So looking at it from a broad scale, we're the second largest EEZ in the world, and nearly 500 stocks in stock complexes, a hundred are protected species, barely 3,000 federal employees to manage all of that, shows what having extra eyes on the water, the potential can be.

So just to give you a quick sense of where does citizen science fit in the broader NOAA community. NOAA started its own community of practice in 2013. There's almost 200 members from across the agency, many of whom are from fisheries.

And one interesting statistic in there, we had to inventory our projects to submit to a federal catalog per a request of the previous administration. And we noted that they receive over a half a million volunteer hours per year for these projects, which was pretty substantial.

And then just a quick snapshot of what does it look like at the federal level. There is

a very large and active federal community of practice, over 350 members from over 60 agencies. And one of the things that is interesting is that of the steering committee, there's about eight from across the federal agencies including NFS, Fish and Wildlife. NOAA has been one of the core seats at the table to help direct their actions.

And one thing that was recognized this year was the Federal Community of Practice was one of four finalists in Harvard's Ash Center Innovation in American Government award. So they are a very, very active community.

So where I'm going to skip to at this point, actually, I'm going to mention they do have an active catalog of projects that you can search. You just go to citizenscience.gov, and over 40 of the projects there are from NOAA. And I just want to also mention, because what I understood to be they asked here, they do have a very detailed reference desk.

I mean, some of the key questions that come up in citizen science are how do you design

a project? How do you maintain volunteers? How do you find volunteers? They've got very nice how-to guides, reference papers, you know, sort of case studies that kind of walk people through some of the hurdles that are encountered. So I just want to point that out as a reference.

So now getting to the core thing.

What is citizen science? There are many

definitions out there and the one thing I

encourage people is not to get bogged down in the

details. It's referred to as NSF is public

participation and scientific research. Some

people don't even like the word citizen in there.

But I think, don't get too bogged down in the

details.

The where I point to is the Crowdsourcing & Citizen Science Act that was enacted in January of 2017. And I'm going to go over how they defined it. But I'm also going to mention, because what sometimes comes up in the same discussion of citizen science are prize competitions, crowdsourcing. So I'm going to get

into those, just very peripherally, but if you have questions, I'll be happy to address those.

So how does the Act define citizen science? They take a very broad approach to it, which is any form of open collaboration which individuals or groups voluntarily participate in the scientific process. They give a bunch of examples from collecting data to analyzing data. But it doesn't, it's not restricted to this list.

So, it's a very broad definition. If you're voluntarily contributing in some way or other to the scientific process, they consider that to be citizen science.

And then just again from the language, because again I think these get talked about in the same discussion to citizen science, how they define crowdsourcing is simply a method to obtain services from a community. Largely, it's an online community. I don't know if anyone used your Waze app to get here this morning. There's a perfect example of crowdsourcing.

And also, prize competitions. There

used to be, State Department used to run a fish hack-a-thon to design projects that would help, you know, address sustainability and fisheries issues. And there are active competitions right now that NOAA fisheries has taken advantage of in the prize sector. They often involve a large incentive to do that.

So citizen science, again, there's a spectrum of projects. It can be simply contributory, scientists design the project and volunteers are collecting the data. All the way over to co-created where volunteers are actually helping design the project in some way and are full-fledged partners in it.

I would say most examples in the fishery sector fall into the contributory element, but we do have an example that I'm going to highlight today that it gets a little more into the collaborative scale.

And the other thing in the definition thing that I thought would be important to bring up, because this has been a question that we've

sort of been struggling with and finally tackled this is, how does citizen science differ from cooperative research?

We worked with our NOAA fisheries cooperative research working group, we worked with some legal folks to say what are the true differences here, if any?

So I am going to go through this in the sense that you know quite straight forward, the authorities are different. The Crowdsourcing and Citizen Science Act provides broad authority for federal agencies to conduct citizen science. And the Magnuson is the primary authority for cooperative research in terms of subject matter.

For citizen science, it just needs to be scientific. It's not restricted to fisheries, whereas cooperative research would be fisheries research determined with the councils to address critical needs. So there's a little more of a guidelines to what can be cooperative research.

Terms of the voluntary nature, you know, for according to the Crowdsourcing &

Citizen Science Act, they're not financially compensated for their time, if you are going to accept voluntary services under that act whereas in Magnuson, for cooperative research, fisheries research, that NMFS is authorized to provide funding for. So there is a funding element there.

Participation citizen science, it could be a wide range of volunteers where it's a little more, you have a more structured pool of stakeholder participants in cooperative research. And the timeframe can also be variable. But again, it can be variable for citizen science. In some cases, you might be able to get off the ground quickly. If not, for cooperative research, it may depend on the vehicle you're using.

But what does this all boil down to?

Both are tools to help address science and

management priority needs for the agency. So one

isn't going to replace the other. They can both

add value. They can address similar questions.

They can help improve our understanding of fisheries in the environment.

But I think it's the last bullet that kind of gets to the heart of the matter, which is some cooperative research can fall under the citizen science umbrella. If you have volunteers who aren't compensated, that too could be citizen science. And a perfect example would be these tagging programs. So there I think that would be a clear-cut example.

So before I go any further, the one thing that shows up is, you know, when people often ask well how much citizen science are you doing? It's not always easy to identify this.

And I think this example shows it.

at a publication that was tracking, a synthesis publication tracking of phenological changes and bird migration. Found out over 170 research papers were cited in the subject and none of them used the word citizen science, even though on further exploration, over 80 of them had used

citizen science data.

So publications are often not using the key words citizen science. They are not referencing citizen science in there. So it really takes a lot of digging to figure out when citizen science is actually used.

So stepping over to, again you know, when the question was asked, and last spring we asked ourselves at the NOAA fisheries level, you know, how many citizen science projects and crowdsourcing projects do we have going on across the agency? And I would say this is very much a living exercise.

I don't think this is a completed one by any means because there's always new ones you're discovering as the word isn't always present. But what we discovered so far is that there were over 40 activities across the nation.

Some of these are activities where

NOAA was an actual partner in, some where we were

actually the beneficiary or the end user of the

data. They were going on in all regions, science

centers. Right now it looks like, you know, there's a higher number in the northwest than the northeast. Some were supporting management efforts and some had an education component to them.

This slide here probably could take an own presentation of itself. But why I put this one up here is to say, they're really helping provide information in several of our key areas and priority goals, whether it's providing information for fishery resources, we're going to cover one in particular that has been used for some assessments on west coast rockfishes.

Sound toxins is an example that has volunteers monitoring harmful algal blooms, and managers actually use that in their decision process whether to close or to do further sampling in the northwest. Many, many examples relate to protective species conservation recovery. We'll go a little deeper into one of those.

And we also have examples that are

with Puget Sound rockfishes, where divers are collecting information on their locations. Are reporting them have been used for habitat suitability models. And also ocean temperatures and currents.

Again, this slide alone could be an hour long presentation, but with lobster traps, I think the number I had on that one this morning was, you know, basically millions of hourly temperatures from over a hundred locations in the gulf of Maine. And again, many examples that cover the range from environmental to actual organisms.

I would point out that citizen science is definitely not new. Just because we had the act in 2007, some of these programs, many in fact, the one program, Cooperative Shark Tagging Program proceeds NOAA becoming NOAA. Some of this is sort of their data, and some of this is fairly recent.

I mean, just to give you a sense of the magnitude of the voluntary contributions for

this program, between 1962 and 2016, over 285,000 sharks of 52 species were tagged, and more than 17,000 sharks of 33 species have been recaptured.

It's been used to report assessments and a variety of other stock identity, EFH designations. The American Littoral Society has a very active and meaningful tagging program that has also been used to support the MRIP B2 discards estimate.

And again, even the southern and resident killer whale sightings, one of our species in the spotlight, data that report takes the public sightings of these southern resident killer whales have been used in Section 7 consultations.

Quickly here, just most of these projects involve partnerships. NOAA is just one of many in I'd say probably all of them. Some of them are, you know, delving into the apps.

I think apps are an area that are an active exploration, how they can be used. I think the lesson learned so far is that it's more

to maintain it. The costs are higher to maintain an app than to develop it. I don't know if you wanted to mention the app in angler, but they're --

MR. CODY: Yes, I mean, there are various initiatives around. I mean, I'm more familiar with most of the ones in the gulf, but there around the coast that deal with angler app development and maintaining the application.

And, you know, in most cases the impetuous is there to get the app started, but what the difficulty is being that they're finding is that keeping the app up is a huge challenge.

MS. OREMLAND: And finally, I'm not sure, I think it may be in the interest of time, I'll breeze through this, but just to show that there are some crowdsourcing projects that NOAA, one platform of folks are familiar was universe which maybe is just more familiar in the citizen science world.

But it's a online site, it's a website that basically allows any online participant to

contribute information on multimedia files, whether it's images, sound recording, video recordings.

In this case, I think the latest date on the stellar sea lion, stellar watch which reaches out to the online community do try to identify which images actually have a tag stellar sea lion in them. I believe there were over 300,000 images classified by about 7,000 volunteers to date.

And again, NOAA is making use of these prize competition, which I'm going to skip over here. But if there are questions, just let me know on that one.

So finally, again, kind of divvying a little deeper into some of these examples. I think many of you are already familiar with this, but just in case not, that South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is attempting to become of the first council with a full-fledged citizen science program.

They kicked things off in January,

2016 with a program design workshop for all partners. And they actually formed a council level committee in July of 2016. And by December, they had designated a full-time council staff position.

So where they are now is in June they had an advisory panel selected to advise on, and five action teams and five key topical areas.

Communications, data management, finance, projects, and volunteers.

And I think the areas to watch for right now are in January, they are going to have an all hands meeting of all these action teams to share their recommendations. And in March, that's when the council is going to review modify or adopt any program recommendations.

And the project that's being proposed right now is the likely first project, is to develop an app for fisherman from all sectors to provide scamp discard information.

Interestingly enough, the Western Pacific Council, on a much smaller scale, was

exploring on a recommendation citizen science to both support outreach and some smaller scale data needs. Right now, they are holding off on that. There was some concern on whether that data could be used to meet national standards for best available scientific information.

So I think we can probably tag team -MR. CODY: Sure, sure.

MS. OREMLAND: -- this slide here.

But I think this is one of the most interesting and effective examples of citizen science in fisheries.

The California Collaborative Fisheries Research Program, basically it started off in 2007, California had designated several MPAs covering about 20 percent of California's central coast, and to help monitor them and provided data for fisheries management. This program got off the ground.

What it effectively is is a fishery independent survey program for west coast ground fish. Scientists designed the study, although

volunteers help select the sampling sites. And there's a large number of active volunteers to collect fish. Did you want to add anything to that?

MR. CODY: Yes, I can add a little.

The program itself had very specific long term

and short term research questions that they

wanted addressed. So they really get that across

to their volunteers that these are the things we

wanted to achieve and this is how you can help.

And Laura mentioned about the 850 plus volunteers that are part of this program.

There's a lot of effort that goes into maintaining that panel, no I wouldn't call it a panel, but that list or that group of anglers.

And they keep them participating in the project.

As Laura mentioned, it's been going for more than ten years now. But one thing I will add is that they took to heart the concerns that the scientific community had about opt in designs, or opt in or volunteer data being used to provide population parameters and population

related estimates.

And what they did was, they came up with a very, very structured, rigorous scientific design, sampling design. And then the volunteers really are the vehicle through which that's enacted.

MS. OREMLAND: So, and also in terms of the importance to NMFS, it has been used. They're catching upward data for indices of abundances and length compositions. The size compositions were used in recent rockfish assessments. And I think perhaps most significantly, it's filling a key data need. There's really no other near shore fishery independence survey that exist for these.

And one last example, going back to that example where citizen science isn't often used as a key word, or even if you read the paper you're not going to see the term citizen science anywhere. But several recent publications here I think demonstrate that it's being actively used to support some of our models.

So I don't know if anyone is familiar with this program called REEF, which is the Reef Environmental Education Foundation. It's basically an opportunity for divers to report their sightings and sort of a categorical estimate as opposed to saying I saw 33 types of this fish that were reported in groups of 1, or 2 to 10, or 11 to 100, or over 100.

But that data, REEF data has been used and you can see some of the publication dates, just come out in the last few weeks in some of them. But in some cases they were used with demographic modeling to help inform the habitat preferences and population dynamics of goliath grouper and mutton snapper.

And again, if anybody needs the publications on these, I'm happily willing to share that. They help provide growth rate estimates for protective rockfishes in Puget Sound, that was using a MARS model. And again, at one thing I was saying, in some cases it's just one data source of many. In some cases it's

the only data source available.

So it's an interesting opportunity to see where this type of data fits. It was used to help evaluate the population status of some rockfish species and Puget Sound. And the last few examples, I think, are some really interesting recent publications.

One, in some cases it was used to improve the quality of ecosystem models and produce distribution maps for grouper species.

For goliath grouper, the REEF data was the only data available. And it was also used to estimate some natural mortality rate for multiple species and life stages in the Gulf of Mexico.

And I'm going to wrap up in just a minute, but to just to also say there are several monitoring programs to wrap up, or to address here. There's a program in Kachemak Bay, research reserve trying to identify if the European green crab is, hopefully, not invading there yet.

Australia's Red Map is a really

interesting program that helps track the distribution of species of, whether it's a fisherman or diver. If you see a species that you think, I've never seen this before. You snap a picture of it, it's sent to a team of experts. And they'll actually get a response back as to what it is. And that data is actually logged to try to track if species distributions are changing. So it's a really interesting model.

And then there are Phytoplankton

Monitoring Networks to try to track for harmful

algal blooms. On the start, it was a regional

effort, it's now a national one. And with that,

I'm going to turn it over to Rich to really focus

on the recreational fishing side.

MR. CODY: Yes, usually when you think of citizen science, MRIP is probably not the first thing that comes to mind. Of course, MRIP has had quite an involvement with the angler app development and also in electronic reporting and supports efforts to do so.

So coming at it from the formal

probability perspective, we have, you know, within MRIP we have a catch and effort components to contribute to a complimentary survey that produces catch based on an effort portion and also a catch portion. And it's, as I said, it's based on formal probability sampling design.

And the reason for this, or I should say that it's basically, it follows the mandates put forth by Magnuson and national sign or two and for nation quality act requirements. So from the formal probability perspective, research ism on non-probability sampling is very limited.

But the American Association of Public Opinion Research in 2013 produced an opinion that basically said that non-probability based sampling is not appropriate for estimating population characteristics.

So those are the volunteer type surveys that you would expect that use angler apps and that are the ones that we hear about quite a bit in our field collecting research, or collecting recreational data. So the MRIP

perspective, I should say, really represents the formal probability sampling perspective. Not so much MRIP.

And we think that, you know, it's not appropriate to estimate catch and effort based on volunteer data from self-selected groups of anglers. So you need some kind of a way to represent population in a representative manner.

So as far as citizen science direction is concerned, we have a NMFS procedural directive on electronic technologies and fishery dependent data collection.

And that provides some guidance for us in terms of what types of things we should be involved in and support. And what it does is it supports identifying and addressing the limitations of non-probability sampling designs.

So that is, basically, it supports finding appropriate uses for these types of data, and support for electronic reporting for census and probability sampling methods. So essentially the California example, the California Fisheries

Research Collaborative that we just talked about is an example of using formal probability designs to harness the willingness of anglers to provide data, to volunteer.

So in 2012, MRIP conducted a workshop on opt-in angler panels. It was chaired by Jason Didden of the mid-Atlantic council. And what was the workshop acknowledged was that, you know, a large potential for bias existed in this type of framework.

One of the other things that I think is very important that the workshop acknowledged was the fact that angler trust could be harmed if volunteer data is not used. There is an expectation that if you volunteer your data, that it's going to be used.

So coming up with methods that would identify bias and perhaps cultural data that define the representative sample, may leave some anglers feeling like their data is not as important as some other anglers. So that's something that has been a consideration for us.

And then again, it's difficult to assess the appropriate uses for data. We just recently did a discard workshop in New Orleans and we had several service statisticians there.

And their basic take home message was that right now the status of research into volunteer angler types of data collection programs is at its infancy and there's just not that much research out there that tells us how effective they are. And then the ones that are out there may not be applicable to the situation that we're interested in.

So MRIP over the year has though has funded or supported electronic reporting research studies. And those have included Snapper Check, which is the Alabama State angler app that's used by the State of Alabama to monitor red snapper.

And then you have iSnapper in Texas.

And then the iAngler app, which may be familiar
to some people here. It was developed by the

Snook and Gamefish Foundation in Florida. And we
funded a study that evaluated the appropriateness

of the data or uses of the data, and did some comparisons with MRIP data.

So what do we know as far as that's concerned? We know that opt-in angler data and volunteer data is being used and it can provide data that's useful under certain conditions. For instance, in the fishery dependent data realm, distributional information has been used on catch locations, things like that. Tag return reporting and biological information on effort as well.

So there are some uses, very important uses to stock assessments that could be of benefit by developing these programs. And the fishery independent realm, we mention again the California example, biological information and also relative abundance information has been used in stock assessments.

And then from a fisheries management perspective, angler notifications, a lot of fish and wildlife agencies are taking advantage of the fact that anglers voluntarily sign up for apps

where they can get notified on regulatory changes or area closures, that kind of thing.

So, I'm going to talk a little bit about the angler app data. A lot of reference has been made to, while the states are using angler apps regularly, why isn't MRIP doing it?

And we have some data that we can look at to kind of give you our perspective on things.

The angler app that we hear a lot of reference to is iAngler. And that has been used effectively to provide discard information on snooks, spotted seatrout, red drum for Florida State stock assessments.

Now this app itself has the ability to harness anglers' willingness to provide those kinds of data, whereas with MRIP, APAIS, the dockside survey that's conducted by MRIP, we don't get that information because the angler has returned from his trip and discards are not available to be measured or seen. So we have to take their word for what they report.

So this does provide some information

that MRIP can't. Information is very limited on other species. And one of the things about this app is that it's being used, as I said, by stock assessment biologists in the State of Florida, but it's not quite as rosy a picture as has been painted.

It has been rejected for use in certain stock assessments and mainly the sheepshead assessment. And that's a relatively commonly encountered species, even in APAIS.

So it's something that they are looking at, you know, the possible ways that they can expand the use, but there are some assumptions they have to make for stock assessments where it is included. And then there others where they are not willing to make those assumptions.

And I will say that for snook, for instance, the iAngler app was developed by the Snook and Gamefish Foundation. So it had a very motivated group of anglers that were users of the app. And they do mirror the snook distribution

pretty well in terms of where the fish occurs and where it's being caught. So, you know, there's less of an assumption associated with discard data that may be provided from that app for that assessment.

An MRIP pilot study that looked at the iAngler data found under certain conditions, unweighted CPUEs could be comparable. But those conditions were really set up to favor the app data. So it really is not an apples to apples comparison. It picks the best scenarios for a comparison.

And then also acknowledged in the study is that there is an angler avidity bias, which is what you would expect when you have an act that was specifically developed for one purpose and now is being used, or the use is being extended to other realms.

So I think that's basically where I am, or where we are with it. But going forward, we see managing expectations as being key to, you know, successful use of these types of apps and

that involve volunteer data.

Have to set expectations based on identifying and addressing data use imitations. And then finding the appropriate uses and making sure that that message has gotten back to the anglers.

Defining data standards is also an important consideration. With the examples of the iAngler app, it was developed for one purpose and then has kind of evolved into something that is a little bit different.

So it may be that the intention is there to provide data, but the minimum data elements may not be even available with that app.

So that takes some consideration.

And as Laura had mentioned earlier on, it's easy to develop the app, but keeping it up and keeping it current with evolving data needs takes quite a bit of resources.

Then, you know, accounting for bias.

There are some studies out there right now that

are investigating the use of metadata and

administrative data as supplemental data sources. But there are some issues with access to those data. They may not be widely available, and may be confidential in some respects. So there are considerations there as well.

And then appropriate waiting for the data. That's something that comes with some negatives and positives. If you wait data that's applied by volunteers, then that means that it could be perceived that one angler's data means more than another angler's data.

And then quality assurance and validation metrics are important in terms of transparency and how the data are used. So I think that's all I have.

MS. OREMLAND: Yeah, I think I just have about two or three slides that I, just to wrap up here. You know, I think data collection and data quality are some of the big concerns and questions that come up. There are a number of publications on this that do provide some guidance in what you can to do improve the data

quality.

But one study I'll point to here,
which was a very interesting one that came out
recently in Biological Conservation that
compared, and again, this is not as complex as
doing a catch rate or some sort of catcher
effort, but nonetheless, they compared
researchers to citizen science and how on the
numbers -- they collected marine debris from
around the entire coastline of Australia.

And they compared what the data results were for both the citizen science and the trained scientists. And they found that there was no significant difference.

They did find some minor differences between the volunteer sets, but between the overall volunteers and the scientists, there was no significant difference.

And so just to wrap up, again what are the possibilities which, going back to the title, again, it could be a lighter, faster, cheaper way of doing things. It can be cost effective. It

can be a timely mechanism. It can help build relationships with stakeholders.

I think somebody mentioned in the previous discussion, you know, the trust in the relationships in the outreach. So I think that that is a definite benefit of using citizen science.

You can also serve multiple goals and can be used as a tool for outreach in education.

And there is a stat that, a 2015 paper that looking at bio-diversity citizen science. And their figure was that over, you know, between one to two million volunteers contribute anywhere between a several hundred million to billions in time annually through their contributions.

And again, what are the challenges?

Not to be pointed here, I think Rich said it

best, you know, managing expectations, being

clear up front, here is what the intent of the

data is. If it's not going to be used for

management or it's a pilot study. I think being

as clear as possible up front is an effective

strategy, you know, how to address the bias issues.

But I think it's also important to be clear that the citizen science isn't going to replace existing programs, it's there to supplement, a supplemental data source. The data quality is always going to be a question.

Will the zero values be recorded? If you don't catch anything, will somebody take the time to fill out an app and say, you know, it was zero that day?

And the ability to survive peer review. I think that's sort of the big question that, you know, watching what the South Atlantic Council Effort does will be interesting and revealing.

You know, and the costs. I mean, the California Collaborative Fisheries Research

Program has been probably one of the best success stories, and still it's not trivial for them to seek out and maintain funding for it. And again, outreach to recruit and maintain volunteers is

sort of an art and a science in and of itself. 1 2 Anything you want to add? MR. CODY: No I think you covered it. 3 4 MS. OREMLAND: And just, our last 5 slide here. Again, I think citizen science is on the rise. Whether that's because of the Act or 6 7 just people are interested, I'm not really sure. 8 But it does seem to be on the rise. It's, you 9 know, people are exploring better ways to use it. It's highly diverse, its diverse use is across 10 region and species. 11 12 There are ways that it is being used 13 in fisheries management, but there are challenges 14 ahead at the peer review phase, but it can be 15 done. 16 And I think we'll just wrap with this 17 quote from the Thiel paper that, "The 18 contribution of citizen science has greatly 19 enhanced research capacity, providing an 20 increased workforce over extensive spatial and 21 temporal scales at relatively moderate costs." 22 So, with that, do you have any

questions?

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Thank you very much for that presentation. It's very interesting and a lot more thorough and lots of action working.

I have Harlon first.

MEMBER PEARCE: Thanks for your presentation. One of our tasks here, Task Force 6 is really involved in more, better data collection, for sure. I think everyone in this room understands that that's the key to the success to any of the fish that we have. It's also involving different things at the council level, make it move quicker based on better data and more real time type science.

And it's not as easy to do as it sounds. Now citizen based science is part of our thought process, and our recommendations are going to be to be able to use more and more of that to get it done. But you described a lot of the problems and the pluses and minus of that.

In the Gulf of Mexico we've got the harvesting component is under mandated VMS-type

programs. The charter fishing program is now mandated to do real time data with some sort of a method to give them real time data. The challenge has always been in that the growing recreational fisherman, which is great to have that happening, to be able to let them be able to help us understand our fishery in a better way through some sort of a citizen science situation.

To me it's awful difficult to try to mandate something to that segment of our fishery, but I think that they all realize that we need more and more of that data that they're getting.

And it's very difficult. The iSnapper app, these types of things like that.

You mentioned many things, bias, the inability to ground through, sometimes these things. And then the lack of training sometimes, as to what, to me that's a big part.

You know, for instance, there are some tagging programs that are going on in the Gulf, and it's great to do it. But the guy that's doing the tagging doesn't know he needs to

measure that fish, or do this or get other data out of it, of what use is this tool unless somebody catches it and we know where it was tagged and so on and so forth.

So I think there are many things we have to consider. Avidity, all these things are problems that we have to overcome in order for to better understand how our great recreational fishery is working right now in the Gulf. And I think all I see is it growing.

So if it grows, it really needs to grow in the right way when it comes to data. And I'm sort of at a loss sometimes as to how to solve that problem, how to help them solve that problem to get it done.

And anything you can do to help that through education components, or through different things in the Gulf, through the council level, or whatever, I think it's much needed.

Very much needed.

And I think the ability to utilize that data, coming from our great recreational

fishermen is very, very important for all the battles that are being fought right now in all of our fisheries everywhere.

So I applaud your efforts, but I think you've got a lot of work to do. And I think that the Gulf is a great place to start because there's a lot of situation damage you mentioned with the iSnapper, the other things that are down there to get done or other ideas that may come out of it. But it's got to be good data. It's got to be unbiased.

It's got to be some sort of a ground truth and take avidity into consideration. All those things are important. I think that it will go a long way to solving our problems.

## CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Bob?

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for the presentation. Two comments that you didn't mention that I'm sure you're aware of. And this comes mainly from the Cornell Liebert program.

And one is, what they found is that

feedback to the individual at the individual level in, I don't want to say real time, near time, you know rapidly, so that they can see their contribution, they find absolutely vital to the success to their program.

And the other one, I'm sure you're aware, and this relates in part to your comment about the apps is that as the scale of the citizen science project grows, the cost grows dramatically. So, you know, thinking about scale relative to what you're trying to accomplish is important in terms of your ability to actually do it.

But I think citizen science, much as Harlon said, is going to be important in the future. Managing those expectations, I don't know how you're going to do it because I think the average stakeholder thinks that oh, I'm going to input into the stock assessment directly and I'm going to have that impact. And he's thinking catch and effort, right? So that's a huge challenge.

Exactly how you work around that beats the heck out of me. But if you don't, you know, you may start off well, but you'll hit a big ditch. So, well done, thank you.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Peter?

MEMBER MOORE: Yeah, that was great, thank you. I'm thinking about getting back I think to some of Mike's comments about SK and industry involvement.

I'm thinking about the electronic monitoring that's coming along and the reviewing of that information, those films. And how could that effort be sort of implanted within the citizen science community.

And in particular, I know this is going to sound like, you know, fox guarding the hen house potentially, but how could this be something that is a talent that's imbedded in the industry so that they can actually do their own review with some kind of checks and balances like Randy was talking about yesterday.

Where, you know, every so often, you

know, enforcement looks at the reviews and decides okay, this is working or it's not in terms of species ID and the quantitative aspect of that.

What made me think of it was that I'm familiar with a guy at the University of Delaware, Art Trembanis, or Trembanis who has an ROV that has a camera on it. He does a lot of scallop surveys for, I think it's for the industry. And he has a crowd of people that go online and they just review all his films and they identify, they're counting scallops. And it's actually incredibly effective.

And I don't know how he does the QC part of that, but you know, to Mike's point about sort of industry participation in its own welfare, if you will, it's just something that we could think about going forward. How can that not be externalized out to an agency or some other entity when, you know, it's part and parcel of the operations of the company?

There's a company in Seattle called

Sea State that I'm familiar with that does quota management cooperatively with NMFS on a lot of the pollock fisheries. And I don't know how, I think they get their information from federal observers on the vessels. But it's just sort of thinking creatively about how we can sort of move to the sort of next level of industry taking responsibility for its own business.

## CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Mike?

MS. OREMLAND: Is it okay? No, I
think the mechanism used I think is on SciStarter
and there's a Seafloor Explorer on SciStarter.
And that's an interesting, because -- I think, if
I understood your point was how can industry
explore ways to kind of take this on their own.
And one thing that is interesting is, it's a new
feature and again, maybe a small start. But I
just wanted to at least share this information.

Zooniverse, which is the same thing that's another mechanism. You can use SciStarter or you can use Zooniverse as a tool to do exactly that scallop, the sea floor bottom images,

counting scallops or identifying other organisms in them. It's just sort of like a competing platform.

But one of the things that they just did, it used to be that that platform used to have to have a required number, used to have to have, I don't know, 10,000 images. You had to pay some money to do it. They've opened it up so it's entirely free now.

If you want to put a project on there and do it, and they actually have these data quality control mechanisms so that a certain number of people -- in other words before the data point is accepted, either, like, five people have to agree that no scallops were in the image.

Or if you were saying there were three, there have to be like, I think, seven that agree that there were seven scallops counted before that data point is registered on. Anyway, it's just another resource that they've kind of opened up a little more broadly.

MEMBER MOORE: Can you provide the

1	link to that?
2	MS. OREMLAND: Oh, absolutely.
3	MEMBER MOORE: It was on one of your
4	slides, right?
5	MS. OREMLAND: Yes, actually it's just
6	Zooniverse.
7	MEMBER MOORE: Zooniverse.
8	MS. OREMLAND: Yeah, but I'll be happy
9	to email that to Heidi or to whoever
10	MEMBER MOORE: Okay, great.
11	MS. OREMLAND: you guys, to email
12	that to.
13	MEMBER MOORE: Thank you.
14	MS. OREMLAND: And I also just want to
15	second the comment about the real time
16	notification. I thank you for bringing that
17	point up. The California Collaborative Fisheries
18	Research Program just invested in a new dynamic
19	site to share the results in a more timely
20	manner. So that really was an important point to
21	raise.
22	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: You know, thank

you for your presentation. I think one of the benefits I'm seeing, or think I will see more of is when I first entered into the, I guess, the science realm of, was totally uninitiated outside or I was overwhelmed and almost felt like there was a fence, or they were insulated in this kind of tower.

But you didn't, like the whole, the high priesthood that you didn't approach. Or if you did you did it very carefully and at your own risk. And to the point where one star panel, I remember, where they gave us 30 seconds to make our public comment on a very sensitive issue. And didn't go over well.

But I think I've seen a lot of changes, at least on the west coast. And I have to thank Cisco for part of that, just with his leadership. But it was underway, I think, before he got on board too. Just because there's a lot of acrimony going around and which I think is just, you know when the taxpayer is funding this stuff, it's some level of transparency of process

is good to have.

But more to the point, I think you're, the approach of citizen science is going to have a lot of benefits just from, if nothing else, just from an object standpoint. And I'm really happy just to kind of see this process evolving.

So let that be -- stop there I guess on that piece. But I do have one small question I guess. What is a non-probability sample? I mean, I don't quite, I can imagine --

MR. CODY: Yes.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: -- what it might be.

MR. CODY: It's a term that's coming to use lately, but it really just refers to volunteer samples that don't follow, you know, strict sampling protocols. So for instance, a probability based sample would be you have a population and each sample or each individual population has a certain probability of being selected.

And you can either have unequal

probabilities where you weight one part of the population higher than you do the other. Or you can have equal probabilities where everybody has the same chance of being selected.

Or you have volunteer surveys or selfselected surveys where you have, it depends on
the angler actually just signing up for something
and then submitting data.

You don't really have any control over your sample. You basically get what you get. So you have to rely on other kind of sources of data to kind of characterize what you're getting or who you're getting it from.

So that's a concern that a lot of the survey scientists have right now is how do you categorize, or how do you characterize the suppliers of the data, so to speak, so that you can account for some of the biases that might be inherent in that kind of a process? So I hope that makes sense.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Thank you for that explanation. I would think then that there's

some measures being undertaken that there are some minimal protocols that maybe the data, maybe some of that data can be a little more utilized, because it sounds like basically you couldn't really utilize it much at all.

MR. CODY: It's difficult to say.

With that earlier paper, that paper rose out of,
partially out of a study that we had funded with
the University, or we being MRIP, with University
of Florida through Rob Ahrens there.

And basically what the way, the approach he took was he looked at ways to evaluate those kinds of data so that you could make comparisons. And he said, you know, this isn't the answer to everything, but it's a start.

So what they did was they, you know, they tried to get the best comparisons they could get by going down to different regional or substate levels where you had good comparisons.

And for a species like snook, for instance, that occurs in southeast and southwest Florida and the fact that you have a bunch of

very motivated anglers to provide data, you can match up the samples pretty well with MRIP in terms of their comparability.

So as I said, he didn't prescribe that as the way to go forward, but just a start, really. So there are investigators are looking at ways to maximize the potential of those kinds of data.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Well, thank you again very much for your presentation. It sounds like there's some interest in, you know, perhaps having some further conversation with MAFAC in the future as this is rolling forward. So, you know, we'll probably be back in touch to see how the progress is going. And thanks again.

I wanted to tell Members that we're going to work through our break because we have -- Dick has a report that he has to give then he has to leave. And we have to call in Rasela who wants to be on the plenary portion of our working group.

So I am going to say if you need to

use facilities, get up and go, but not all at once, if you could. And so we're going to move ahead. And I assume we're going to go to the subcommittee reports and we're going to bump Dick forward so he can present his recreational fisheries subcommittee report.

MEMBER BRANE: We ready?

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Yes.

MEMBER BRANE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

We had a meeting yesterday of the recreational subcommittee and got an update from Russ Dunn on recreational fisheries. And the first thing he said is he thought there were positive things happening in recreational fisheries both within the administration and the agency. He thought things were looking up.

Tim Sartwell gave us an update on regional roundtables. The meeting in each region, have a meeting in each of the eight regions to see what the issues were, and we got a good update from Tim Sartwell.

He also gave us a brief update on the

8th World Recreational Fishing Conference. And there were at least a dozen, give or take, NOAA presenters or poster people there who were well represented.

He also showed us that they've developed these regional recreational fishing snapshots, these papers about what's going on in each region. And that was very well received.

And he talked about the national implementation plan status update, completed or stat substantial progress over 80 percent of them are done.

Next he talked about the upcoming

Recreational Fishing Summit which will be March

28th and 29th here in the Crystal City Westin in

Arlington. And the theme is opportunity and

stability in recreational fisheries.

They put together a ten member
advisory panel that has been selected and is
working to develop objectives for the conference.
One objective, or the main objective, is to
identify discrete suite of challenges where
tangible partners can be made through

collaboration.

And the number of us, I'm sure, will attend that meeting in March. It's the third Recreational Fishing Conference? Yes, the third one. And this one wants to have some discrete outcomes, which I think is good.

And then lastly we got a very good
MRIP update from Richard Cody. Basically NOAA
fisheries has addressed the National Academy of
Sciences recommendation, the survey is more
precise and accurate. That's the general outcome
of it.

estimates of effort and probably catch. The new estimates will be available starting in 2018.

And then there was a lot of discussion on how to communicate the changes in MRIP to the public.

There was a lot of people that felt there needs to be better communication about what's going on with MRIP. And that concludes my report.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Well, thank you Dick for a very thorough report. I was kind of hoping

I could pop in there, but you worked through your whole meeting pretty much. So, thank you very much for telling me what we missed. Does anyone have any questions for Dick?

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Not a question but a comment, and it relates to

Jennifer's email last night. And two stalwarts

out in the subcommittee are gone, so the remnants

that are left are few and far between. So that

subcommittee needs some populating.

MS. LUKENS: You are correct. And that's one of the things I was going to bring up. So we'll talk about the email that I sent out last night and subcommittee chairmanship and representation members at a point later on today before we adjourn. Thank you for raising that, though.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And have safe travels, but you're still officially here until February, right? I'm just reminding all you folks. You have plaques and you have coins, but you're not completely sprung yet.

1	MS. LUKENS: Let's take just a moment
2	and do this.
3	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. We're going to
4	take a really brief break while we try to do the
5	technical phone thing.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7	went off the record at 11:30 a.m. and resumed at
8	11:31 a.m.)
9	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. So a little
10	change.
11	MS. LUKENS: I'm sorry, did you
12	announce?
13	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: No, I wanted to make
14	sure that we got Dick in.
15	Ms. LUKENS: Okay.
16	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: It's no problem for
17	the rest of the subcommittees to wait until after
18	we work on the resilience document, or are you in
19	a big hurry to do your reports?
20	MEMBER BONNEY: If you're asking if I
21	care about the order, I don't think our
22	subcommittee cares. So it's at you discretion,

1	Madam Chairman.
2	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Thank you for the
3	clarity.
4	MEMBER BONNEY: Ditto on the commerce
5	side.
6	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Thank you both. So
7	in keeping, I guess, with the way that we have
8	done this before, we've been approving these, or
9	reviewing and approving these tasks first and
10	then now we're going to wrap it up with an
11	executive summary that would be in front with all
12	of these attached as an Appendix.
13	And I recognize that there are some
14	new individuals that are coming in on the tail
15	end of projects, and that's the nature of MAFAC,
16	I guess. I had the experience as well.
17	But those of us who have been around
18	through this process are, you know, we've done a
19	lot of work. And I'm really appreciative of all
20	of the leads and the tasks and all of the task
21	force and individuals that stepped up.

It was a little bit like eating an

elephant, and I think we did a pretty good job 1 2 finding our way through it. So, it's a big topic. And I view the points that we brought up 3 4 as being very relevant and important for any 5 administration to hear. We're at, finally, Task 6. 6 7 approved the other ones. And the very last ones 8 we did were by teleconference in August. So this 9 task report is the final one. I'm going to turn it over to Harlon to steer his hopefully last 10 task group chair activity. 11 12 (Off microphone comments.) 13 MEMBER PEARCE: Speak for yourself, 14 All right. How would you like me to Bob. proceed, Madam Chair? I think everyone's had a 15 16 chance to see it, I would hope. I know we're 17 going to have some additions to it based on the 18 citizen science we just looked at, and we talked 19 about that. 20 (Off microphone comments.)

know we talked about, yesterday we said we would

MEMBER PEARCE:

21

22

Ι

Well, I don't know.

look at the presentation and see where it fit in, or if we had to change anything in the report, we would. That's the only thing I think that was left sort of in limbo.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. Well I'm going to let you steer that though. My understanding is everyone has received this. If there is something you believe should be in there, we are going to vote on this verbatim. And, you know, if we have amendments, we need to get them up there, on there, and approve it as it's written as a task to complete this out.

So, anyway, if you have information you need think needs to be in there, there were opportunities yesterday and the day before to be a part of this.

And the only question is, based on any of the presentations that we received today, do you believe that there is something that is critically needed to be added in here that we missed. So I'm going to throw it back, oh, to Heidi.

1 MS. LOVETT: So, what you all 2 discussed was, it's up on the screen, just whether or not you wanted to make any changes to 3 the existing bullet on citizen science based on 4 5 what you heard today. That's how you left it. So it's not that it was vacant from 6 7 the report. It's in the report. It was just 8 whether or not you wanted to add anything to it. 9 MEMBER PEARCE: That's correct, because we didn't have the benefit of the full 10 11 presentation that we just got. Does everyone 12 have the recommendation? It's all the way at the 13 And is there anything additional you want 14 to do to recommendations which would be involving citizen science? If not, that's fine. 15 16 (No audible response.) 17 MEMBER PEARCE: Hearing anything from 18 Robert? I see you thinking over there. anyone? 19 It's just the heat. PARTICIPANT: 20 MEMBER PEARCE: I'm fine like it is, 21 but it's up to the rest of us, rest of the group. I voted up, ma'am. 22

1 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Do you want her to 2 read it out loud? 3 MEMBER PEARCE: Yes, please. MEMBER BONNEY: So this particular 4 recommendation is, I should say, so all of these 5 say in support of our recommendations. 6 7 recommendations were actually are included and 8 referenced in some of the other work that MAFAC 9 has completed. But in addition to those, there 10 were certain principles of good data collection 11 programs that you wanted to ensure was in your 12 report. And related to citizen science it 13 14 says, "Increasing the use of community based monitoring, citizen science, and crowdsourcing 15 16 can improve efficiencies, especially during 17 periods of reduced resources, but also increases 18 stakeholder and fisherman awareness, builds 19 trust, and fosters improved relations between 20 them, scientists, and managers." 21 MEMBER PEARCE: Yes, Pam? MEMBER YOCHEM: I think that sums it 22

up pretty well. And if you look down to bullets, there's a mention again of citizen scientists, or citizen science that another principle of good data collection is to be aware of repositories of information that are not held by NOAA. And citizen science is one of those. So I think between those two, it pretty much covers it.

MEMBER PEARCE: Sounds good to me.

Robert, any problems before we keep going?

Sounds like we're all on board.

Madam Chair, I think we beat this up pretty good. Does anybody in the room have any changes to this document? We've read it numbers of times. I mean, do you have it, Liz? Last minute Liz.

MS. BURMAN: I wasn't able to be in the room for some of the final editing. But when we first talked about this and I asked if we could add some climate risk reduction information and folks said yes, go ahead and write it up and send it over. But it went into the executive summary, Heidi is saying.

1	MS. LOVETT: That's where I thought
2	you wanted it, but if it's I can pull it up
3	and show it.
4	MEMBER BONNEY: What did we talk
5	about?
6	MS. LOVETT: It's up to you.
7	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Julie?
8	MEMBER BONNEY: So I think the process
9	would be to make a motion to approve the document
10	for Task 6. So I would make that motion.
11	MEMBER BROWN: Second.
12	MEMBER PEARCE: Is it both Bobs over
13	there yelling? I heard just one.
14	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Is there any more
15	discussion?
16	MEMBER PEARCE: All right, we have a
17	motion, seconded.
18	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Then I, we have a
19	motion, and we have it seconded. Could I have
20	please all those in favor signify by saying aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And those opposed.

1 (No audible response.) 2 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Then the motion has 3 passed. 4 PARTICIPANT: Well, we got the 5 executive summary still. Yes, we are not quite 6 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 7 over the bridge, but we're getting there. 8 this is a big deal. I'm very happy. That was a 9 very difficult report to write. So here we come with our executive summary which has kind of two 10 11 It has the top kind of intro section, and also has a very brief summary of the tasks down 12 below that are listed. 13 14 But this is the first part that we hoped would be read pretty widely. And my hope 15 16 was to try to make it interesting, relevant, more 17 current, bring up some of the real issues that 18 this resilience needs are things that are affecting people now and later. 19 So this has also been circulated to 20 all the members. And it's been revised to 21 include some examples from the Pacific, from the 22

Atlantic, and also from the Puerto Rico, you 1 2 know, the hurricane issues of Harvey, Irma, and Maria. 3 4 And a specific mention of the fact 5 that there's things that we think are kind of unique about the situation in Puerto Rico where 6 7 they can really put in a resilience starting from 8 zero. 9 But the report is there. It stands 10 for itself, and those are recommendation that will be coming from MAFAC. So if you have --11 12 yes, Bob? 13 MEMBER GILL: Well, Madam Chair, I was 14 going to move we accept the final summary report. I just wanted to 15 MEMBER YOCHEM: 16 comment that Heidi's put up the information that 17 Liz was asking about. So if you want to take a 18 quick look at that. 19 This is an additional MS. LOVETT: 20 bullet added to what was finalized yesterday. 21 Sorry. MEMBER BONNEY: So, Madam Chair, I 22

guess I'm looking at the new addition. How do we feel that this is different than the other bullets that are recommendations, I guess was my question. And so Heidi is the master in terms of controlling all the opinions and putting it on paper so it all flows and fits together.

And I just want to make sure that
we're kind of staying within the corral of what
we've been talking about over this whole two year
process, and whether that one's kind of captured
in the ones above or if it is a standalone new
and different addition. So, that's my question.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Well my reading of that is certainly some of the tasks that we were doing are specifically related to what risks might be being faced by fishing communities, the tasks particularly that you did where people were planning.

So I think reducing the risk would also be people planning. That would reduce risk. So I don't believe that it's a wide departure from our overall theme. That's my thought.

MS. BURMAN: It's all blurred. Two days ago when we first discussed this, I suggested or asked that we put in something about what's necessary societally to reduce climate impacts. I mean, we can prepare for risks, but I didn't want to miss the point that, you know, until we reduce our carbon output we're not -- we're leaving ourselves at risk.

And I specifically mentioned a paragraph out of a report that we got on the webinar a couple weeks ago and was asked to write a paragraph to put in. So I did that a couple days ago, but I think it fell through the cracks in terms of getting submitted to the discussion yesterday. And I wish I could have been involved in the discussion. I missed it.

So I feel like this concept was introduced and supported a couple days ago. And to me, the most salient part of it is the last sort of half a sentence. But many of these ongoing ecosystem changes can only be avoided with substantial reduction and atmospheric carbon

dioxin emissions. And I'm hoping that MAFAC continues to make that point when possible, in light of how often this particular issue is denied.

MEMBER BONNEY: So I guess I'm looking at this and trying to tie it all together. So I don't know that we need the second sentence in here, because it's all throughout the document and all the recommendations.

So the point of this recommendation is conservation measures that deal with the carbon footprint. And I think it's lost in the way this is structured because you're trying to do point recommendations in the top. So I would think you would want to kind of rearrange it to get to that point.

MS. BURMAN: Yes, because this was written a couple of nights ago, it probably is lost in what the work you've done since. And I'm supportive of anything that makes it fit better into the document.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Mike?

Washington DC

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think I had to step out yesterday at the end of this. But I think Julie's points, well they made an impression on my mind anyway that in taking out the second sentence, I think, and I would recommend that we follow that, Julie's advice on that.

But also the conservation measures, and now I'm beginning to understand it because the first thing is I had some alarm that further conservation methods or measures on fisheries themselves. If we could clarify that, that you're speaking to conservation measures as far as carbon emissions or whatever, I would feel a little more comfortable.

And I'm also going back to the original charge, I think, which you sent out a couple of days ago, Heidi. And I didn't quite understand how that -- I'm not saying it doesn't, I just don't see the connection on the original charge in this paragraph.

I'm not against it, but I would like

to see a second sentence come out and specify the conservation measures we're talking about a little bit more specifically so that we know it applies to environmental conservation measures, I think is what you're saying.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So -- go ahead, Heidi.

MS. LOVETT: So it seems like there's two, maybe I misheard. But either remove the second sentence or move it to the end, I guess are the two options? Just to be clear.

MEMBER MOORE: All right. Thanks.

Perhaps this could be solved by leaving the ocean sentence, the second sentence in, and then eliminating Mike's issue. And I agree with him on this conservation measure is unclear.

You could say, if you leave the second sentence in and then start the third sentence with many of these ongoing ecosystem changes could only be avoided, and then you don't even get into the conservation question, because that might sort of muck up the whole bullet point.

But I think it's important to mention what these issues are because all of the ones mentioned in that second sentence are affecting recreational, commercial subsistence no matter what fishery. So, I think it's important to have those in as a sort of give some specificity to this.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Columbus?

MEMBER BROWN: I agree with you,

Peter, and I think that it solves a problem for

me in terms of not getting too deep into the

doomsday approach because all change is not bad.

It depends on where you are. And if you're

catching more black bass in New England, that's a

happy day for you. Right, Bob?

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Go ahead, Mike.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think my comment will be along the line with what Columbus said.

That -- now I just lost the damn thing --- increasing intensity and frequency are all having extreme negative impacts on fishing communities.

But like in the west coast, we're

coming out of, you know, a lot of stocks are rebuilt. The whiting is at an all-time high, or close to it as far as biomass goes. Pollock in the Bearing Sea, I believe is still way up there.

So yes, there's changes going on, but these aren't -- well, if we get into the POP in the Gulf of Alaska, or perch for Gulf of Alaska, we could have an offset to the cod. Just saying that they're all having extreme negative impacts on fishing communities, I think that's true in certain cases.

But on the other hand, we're hearing about evidence anecdotal, but nevertheless, you know, we're seeing other stocks of fisheries that are coming into some of these areas where they're losing other stock.

So I don't know that it's -- it sounds like kind of a catastrophic event to all fishing communities going on. And I don't know that I really want to portray that. Or at least, maybe that's just my interpretation, how it sounds.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Could we say extreme

negative impacts on some fishing communities?

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: That would be an improvement over --

MS. LOVETT: Could we just take out "extreme"? I mean, frankly the domoic acid stuff, the effects on salmonids, crab, I can't speak to whiting and others, I won't. But if we took out the word "extreme," would that help in that sentence?

(Off microphone comments.)

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And then the comment was also to maybe add negative impacts on some fishing communities or even many, but just to indicate that there are some haves and have not's as we heard. But some people are going to, or some regions may actually benefit as fish move into those areas.

MEMBER BROWN: I just say get rid of the negative. Just leave it neutral; they're impacts. And depending what community you're in, they differ widely.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Bob?

MEMBER RHEAULT: I'm always a believer that less is more. And I would suggest taking out the first two sentences and just really focusing on the fact that we can minimize the risks of, you know, or the need for -- that resilience in fishing communities is important. But to significantly impact the climate change, we're going to have to reduce the carbon input.

I mean, let's put the main point up front and not hide it at the end of the sentence. All those points are made elsewhere in, you know, I just think that the point we're trying to highlight here is that if we really want to address the problem, it's emissions. Keep it simple.

I fully support your point. I'm just trying to put it out there -- not hide it at the end of the bullet.

MEMBER YOCHEM: I was just going to mention that you'll hear in a little bit from the ecosystem subcommittee that the review of the document on climate change includes, as one of

the bullet points that were pulled out of that report that we feel it's important to retain, specifically, that comment about the only way to avoid some of these problems is from emissions.

So MAFAC as a body is saying in another way, assuming everybody approves that language, that this is an important point.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, should we tighten this up and just say that we're going to explore opportunities to -- it's good for them to explore it, but ultimately the ecosystem changes can only be avoided with substantial reductions and put that right in the front? I have a problem with climate change being capitalized in both places.

Craft the first sentence so that it flows into the second one. And make one or maybe those two sentences, again getting rid of the one in the middle. And it's true that we discussed all of those, except we don't really spend a lot of time on weather.

PARTICIPANT: Good bye, Dick.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Good bye, Dick.

Washington DC

1 PARTICIPANT: Good bye, Dick. 2 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Good bye, 3 everyone. You've been very open. 4 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: What's your pleasure 5 on this? Does anybody have -- Peter, sorry. That's all right. 6 MEMBER MOORE: Ι 7 actually feel -- I'm not going to get into a 8 battle over this, but I think it's pretty 9 important to be specific to what we are managing, which is species in a body of water which is the 10 11 ocean. 12 So you could drop the impacts from the 13 impacts of climate change, and if you want you 14 could simply say from the impacts of ocean 15 warming acidification reduced oxygen in extreme 16 weather events. 17 And then, you know, come up with why 18 you need to reduce emissions. But I think if you remove that, unless there's somewhere but I can't 19 20 see the bullets above -- even though we worked on 21 this yesterday, I don't remember where we

specifically addressed those issues.

You know I don't want to water this down. I think it's important. I mean, you know, it's fair enough in the Pacific or Alaska, things are going to be okay, you know, other species are coming in.

I can tell you on the East Coast, we aren't going to replace a billion dollars of fisheries. We aren't. Lobsters and scallops, we're not going to replace them with scup and croaker. Sorry.

And I think that it's important. I think the economic impact of this alone for fishing communities is massive. And I think that we need to be taking it seriously. I think we need to be making a statement that's as specific as possible.

I don't want to be offensive

politically to anybody, but I think it's

important to, we know what the issues are that

are affecting, you know, to Bob's point with the

exception potentially of the ocean acidification

question, right?

1	But the others I think, particularly
2	the warming and the reduced oxygen, we saw it in
3	our ecosystem monitoring with the IOOS. You can
4	see it. You can see the thermal habitat
5	shrinking for certain species, and those are high
6	value species. So I think it's important to be
7	specific as to the point that we can without
8	belaboring the point.
9	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: One moment. I think,
10	Rasela, are you on the phone? Can she hear me,
11	or are we on mute? We're on hold?
12	(Off microphone conversation.)
13	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Rasela?
14	MEMBER FELICIANO: Hi.
15	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Hi. This is the rest
16	of the Members of the Committee. We're here.
17	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay.
18	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And we're discussing
19	the final executive summary.
20	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay.
21	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So I think, do you
22	have anything in particular that you would like

to say right now, and then we'll let you have that opportunity since you haven't been here. Have you, did she get the documents?

MEMBER FELICIANO: Yes, I received some of the documents and I have read -- I have not been able to read all of them. But anyway, my main concern is again, like, in our last phone conference call is the Pacific Island Nations and US Territories and Pacific Islands.

I somehow feel that there's a lack of or not enough assessment or knowledge as far as climate assessment is concerned in that area.

And that is mainly my concern at this point. I don't know how if I would require to write a letter to make it official, or that's partly what I wanted to input.

Yesterday, unfortunately, I was unable to connect. So that summarizes. That's my concern at this point. I'm reading the report at the moment, and I'll have the assessment on, you know, mostly on the mainland in the U.S. But I am wondering if in the future what are the plans

1	of the MAFAC as far as assessment and analysis of
2	the U.S. Territories.
3	MS. LOVETT: So is she talking, yes.
4	Okay. So Rasela, we are talking about the
5	resilience executive summary. I think what you
6	were just referring to is dealing with the
7	climate assessment report, which we will be
8	getting to later on in the meeting.
9	MEMBER FELICIANO: Oh, I see. I see.
10	MS. LOVETT: So, we don't want to
11	forget you, but sorry you didn't have context.
12	MEMBER FELICIANO: I apologize.
13	MS. LOVETT: No, no.
14	MEMBER FELICIANO: But and the same
15	thing, I'm talking as far in the resilience is
16	again to keep in mind that the U.S. Pacific
17	Territories as far as that is concerned as well.
18	MS. LOVETT: Thank you.
19	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Bob?
20	MEMBER RHEAULT: Thank you, Madam
21	Chair. And I'm sorry that Peter left. I didn't
22	realize he was departing.

The comment I wanted to make relative to Peter's comment is, that's certainly true, but it's also a localized thing. It's not 100 percent across the board. And to Columbus' point, there are localized areas that are going to see some positive stuff out of this. So to paint it as all negative seems to me to be misleading.

And so I would support Columbus' suggestion of taking out the negative as well as the extreme to support that statement. So I differ from Peter's position and, you know, from where he sits, I understand. But I think there are also areas that are going to be better off in some areas than others.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Heidi?

MEMBER FELICIANO: Can I ask. I'm having trouble hearing the, I'm sorry, the other Members' comments.

MS. LOVETT: Rasela, we're having a hard time with our audio here. We'll ask people to speak up, but I'm not sure if we're going to

1	be successful at that. We'll do our best.
2	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay.
3	MS. LOVETT: And you might want to
4	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay. I'll just
5	listen in and try to figure out what's going on.
6	MS. LOVETT: You might also want to
7	put yourself on mute when you're not talking.
8	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay. Thank you.
9	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Heidi?
10	MS. LOVETT: So what I've heard so
11	far, and what Peter said he supported before he
12	walked out, was Bob's comment about moving the
13	last sentence to the front and with the other
14	recommendations louder, okay.
15	I will may I read this bullet from
16	what I've heard from the conversation so far?
17	And the one thing I wanted to note was, I think
18	the point that Liz wanted to make is to include
19	the term risk because that term is not
20	necessarily brought up elsewhere in the report,
21	even though that was the focus of the work over
22	the last couple years.

1	So many of these ongoing ecosystem
2	changes can only be avoided with substantial
3	reductions and atmospheric carbon dioxide
4	emissions. NOAA should I'll include the word
5	"should" NOAA should continue to explore
6	opportunities for reducing risks borne by fishing
7	communities from the impacts of climate change.
8	Ocean warming and acidification,
9	reduced oxygen, and extreme weather events that
10	are increasing in intensity and frequency are all
11	having impacts on many fishing communities.
12	Maybe we should say, 'are having impacts on many
13	fishing communities.'
14	(Off microphone comments.)
15	MS. LOVETT: So take out "many."
16	Okay.
17	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Is this acceptable
18	for those around the table? Does that work?
19	(No audible response.)
20	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. Bob, did you
21	have your hand up?
22	MEMBER RHEAULT: I did. Similar, I

said this document outlines many approaches to 1 2 minimizing the risks of perturbations to fishing communities. However, to minimize these risks 3 4 would require global reductions in carbon But I'm perfectly happy with this. 5 emissions. MEMBER BONNEY: I think the concept is 6 7 nested in each other. 8 MEMBER RHEAULT: Exactly. 9 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Julie? So based on this 10 MEMBER BONNEY: conversation and sitting through two drafting 11 12 sessions as a committee, I would make a motion 13 that we approve the executive summary. 14 MEMBER GILL: Second. 15 MEMBER BROWN: Second. 16 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So having a motion 17 promoted and seconded, I'm going to move the 18 question. Is there any further discussion? 19 (No audible response.) Then all in favor of 20 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 21 this document being the executive summary for our 22 very consuming work that we've done on this issue

for the last two years. I know I'm dragging it 1 2 out, but it's monumental and a miracle in my And so anyway, if you would signify please 3 book. 4 by saying aye, if you are in favor. (Chorus of ayes.) 5 And anyone opposed? 6 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 7 (No audible response.) 8 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And anyone 9 abstaining? 10 (No audible response.) 11 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Then it is approved 12 by the Committee this day, 11/30/2017. Thank you 13 again. I'm going to say, you know, on behalf of 14 Ted who helped some on some of the groups, he was involved. 15 16 And I miss having him here, but I also 17 appreciate very much the work that was done by 18 the leads of the tasks and the people that filled 19 in when staffing was low on the groups to try to 20 make sure that we had the types of quality, 21 oversight, and involvement from the panel. 22 So, I'm very happy to see this

resilience project come to its conclusion. And thanks again to everyone who participated in crafting or being part of the lead. Thanks.

Julie?

MEMBER BONNEY: I was just going to call Heidi out because as task leader four, she was a big help in terms of all the interviews and writing assignments and all that. And I know for me as the task leader, I couldn't have done it without her help. So, thank you, Heidi.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And yes, that goes double from me. So I guess we're actually going to get a break this morning. And, do you want a break, or do you want --- do we have a few more things?

MEMBER BONNEY: How much time do we have left? Should we just push on through and get done or should we be breaking for lunch and coming back? That's my question.

MS. LUKENS: I'm all for ending early and working through lunch; however, I would like you all to take the time to talk about the

aquaculture letter and the summary from the 1 2 ecosystem from the climate assessment report. But then also ideas for future topics from MAFAC, 3 4 upcoming subcommittee assignments, and chairs, 5 and the next meeting. So I have a few things for us to talk 6 7 about that I want you guys to get out of here as 8 early as possible, but I think it would be good to take the time to have those discussions. 9 that's just my input, but I am not a Member of 10 11 the Committee. 12 So, well that's quite CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 13 a list. 14 I've got a list. MS. LUKENS: 15 Yes so, maybe we'll CHAIR BEIDEMAN: 16 do just an hour for lunch and be back. 17 that work? No, check back? 18 MEMBER BONNEY: I was just going to 19 see if people would be up for, we do have an hour built in for the lunch break, but I'm wondering 20 21 if people would willing to go out and get

something and bring it back and work through

1	lunch.
2	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I'm amenable to that.
3	MEMBER GILL: And the other question
4	is whether we'll lose members by extending the
5	time. You know, if we are, then I would suggest
6	we work through.
7	PARTICIPANT: I think Pam's suggestion
8	makes perfect sense.
9	MS. LOVETT: I agree with Pam, too.
LO	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, 12:10. So if you
L1	grab your lunch and come back, we'll try starting
L <b>2</b>	at 12:30. Okay.
L3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
L <b>4</b>	went off the record at 12:10 p.m. and resumed at
L5	12:49 p.m.)
L6	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay, it's 12:49.
L <b>7</b>	And we'll be resuming our section. So this is
L8	the comments and I guess the cover letter,
L9	transmittal letter, cover for the comments. Do
20	you want to walk through them Pam?
21	MEMBER YOCHEM: Sure. Thank you.
22	This is the comments on the draft climate

assessment document. And what the ecosystem subcommittee did yesterday was take the recommendations from the task force, which as I think everybody knows task forces work under MAFAC. They make their recommendations to MAFAC, and then MAFAC decides whether to pass those along or not.

And so after discussion, we took I think most of the recommendations of the task force with some minor wordsmithing. And then I wanted to show you, so Heidi sent that out last night. And then I believe the document that's on, so I hope everybody had a chance to look at that.

And I believe what Heidi has got on the screen now are some changes that came in after the first draft was circulated last night. So first, I'll ask if anybody has any additional kind of late changes or comments that they want to make. And if not, we'll just go ahead and review these that came in, I think this morning. Yes, go ahead, Bob.

MEMBER GILL: Well, I don't need to jump in line. I had a few comments, questions, suggestions to make as we go along. So wherever you would like to consider them, thank you, ma'am.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. It's a short document. Then, let's just start at the top, Heidi, and walk through it.

Yes, so basically the introduction just says that, you know, this is a memo that will go from the Chair of MAFAC to the assistant administrator. And really the only significant thing here is that second paragraph during the webinar.

And then we heard yesterday also on the presentation of this document that the best way to get your comments heard is to submit them through this website, because they're going to be tabulated and officially transmitted.

You can make comments outside the website, but it's better if you do it through the website, is my understanding. But MAFAC can't do

that directly, so we have to work through the chain of command. And so we're formally requesting that our comments be passed on in this way.

So then if you could just go down to the comment section. There's an introductory paragraph that talks about, you know, overall we thought the document was well done.

And again, a point that's been made multiple times is to make sure that you put in the parts that you liked as well as the parts that you didn't like, because they are severely space limited. And if you don't call out the sections that you like, it's possible that during the review process they would get edited out because nobody mentioned them.

So Heidi, thank you very much for setting this up so that it's really clear. The first section, series of bullet points are the things that we're referenced in the report that we think are important to retain, we in the task force. And then there's another section that

talks about things that we through were missing, or changes that we'd like to see.

And then before we go point by point,

I want to make the further comment that both the

task force and the subcommittee yesterday talked

about the importance of focusing on very high

level comments.

I know I, as an individual, had some specific comments about information that I through was incorrect in the report, and I'm going to submit those separately rather than getting down in the weeds. So this is supposed to be a bigger picture commentary on the report.

So with that, let's just go point by point. The first bullet point references the fact that the report made clear that some of these changes are happening now, and this isn't a future problem; it's a current problem. And so you can see the addition of the one sentence there; otherwise, this is pretty much as it came to us from the task force. Go ahead, Bob.

MEMBER RHEAULT: Thank you, Pam. A

suggestion on rewording on that added sentence. 1 2 Put something like intensity and frequency of events is increasing, period. 3 4 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So intensity 5 and --6 MEMBER RHEAULT: And frequency. 7 MEMBER YOCHEM: -- and frequency of events is increasing, period. Okay. Thank you. 8 9 Any other comments on this one? Okay, moving 10 down to the next point. 11 This one I think gets at something 12 that came up during our last discussion, too, 13 with regard to making sure that people recognize 14 that some of the changes that occur -- anyway, spelling that out a bit more about what exactly 15 16 is going to be happening to species as a result 17 of climate change. 18 Some will do well where they are. 19 Some may, you know, move and so on. everybody could take a minute to look at that and 20

see if they are okay with the bullet point and

with these additions. Yes, Bob, go ahead.

21

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Pam. The only question I raise there is the last part which says do not persist, the original intent was thrive and those that don't thrive.

By putting the "persist" in there,
you're talking about elimination as opposed to
minimal populations that are drastically
different and perhaps not as helpful as
previously. Seems to me that that is worthwhile
there. So my suggestion would be --

MEMBER YOCHEM: So you would --

MEMBER GILL: -- take out the persist portion, to allow for those populations that still exist, but they're no longer are at the level that they were previously.

MEMBER BONNEY: So again, this poorly written thing, again is mine. I'm not a writer. There are salmon populations that are probably going to go extinct. They're already on the pathway. It's likely to happen.

I mean, I can name a few right now that are on a trajectory that are probably not

So that's where the -- there's some 1 reversible. 2 stocks that just aren't going to be there. MEMBER GILL: And I don't disagree. 3 I 4 think you're exactly right. All I'm suggesting 5 that by focusing entire on them and eliminating consistent of the others. And if you leave it as 6 which do not in the future, doesn't exclude the 7 ones that are extirpated, right? 8 9 So by doing that, you leave a little more room for the minimalist populations or the 10 drastically reduced, plus those that no longer 11 12 exist at all. 13 MEMBER YOCHEM: So does anybody have 14 some suggestions for wording it? Seems like you want to add. 15 16 (Off microphone conversation.) 17 MEMBER RHEAULT: If you look at, say, 18 Long Island Sound Lobster, they're gone. 19 Southern Main Atlantic Salmon, don't exist. So 20 we've already seen the impacts of climate change. MEMBER YOCHEM: 21 Well let's see, so 22 what species thrive in their current locations,

where they may exist in the future, and where populations may decline or go extinct or something in the future. Or which will decline or cease to exist. Would that address both of your issues?

MEMBER GILL: Yes. That's fine.
Sure.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Because some of them will decline without necessarily ceasing to exist.

MS. LOVETT: Right.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Any other comments or suggestions on that one? Okay, the next point gets at the fact that I think was mentioned during the presentation yesterday, that of the four reports that have been done, only the last two -- this one and the one previous -- even had an ocean chapter.

And so, you know, we just want to call out that we like the fact that oceans are under consideration. So any comments or changes with this one? Okay, and this one -- do we still have

our caller on the phone?

(Off microphone conversations.)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Rasela, I was hoping you would take a look at this one in particular. It says it's important to identify the most vulnerable marine ecosystems, tropical and polar ecosystems in the U.S. And the document itself, I think on the very first page does call out, you know, the Caribbean, for example.

And then the tasks force, their attempt to capture the importance that some ecosystems are more vulnerable than others is with this bullet point. And I wanted to see if you had any --- or Raimundo -- if you had any other suggestions for how that could be strengthened or if you think that covers it.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Sorry. Pam wanted your input on the bullet on the current draft of the letter that will be going in as a comment, and the bullet says --

MEMBER FELICIANO: The current draft on the report?

1	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: The climate change
2	report.
3	MEMBER FELICIANO: Climate change
4	report.
5	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Excuse me.
6	MEMBER FELICIANO: The climate system
7	draft. I think my only informative input is the
8	inclusion of the the inclusion of the U.S.
9	Territories in the South Pacific region.
LO	As I understand it, a lot of the
L1	impacts here is based on mostly the U.S. extreme
L2	weather. However, within our tropical weather,
L3	we face a slightly different ecosystem as well as
L <b>4</b>	the climate change.
L5	And I would like to ask if we could
L6	include the inclusion of the U.S. Territories as
L <b>7</b>	far as the data, scientific data assessment and
L8	analysis
L9	(Audio cuts out.)
20	MEMBER FELICIANO: And that would be
21	really appreciated. And I'm looking at review
22	the whole assessment here and if it correlates

with that. But there are a lot of different applications.

And I am requesting that there's in the report for an inclusion of further assessment analysis, scientifically on the U.S. Territories in the South Pacific and speaking of American Samoa, perhaps.

I don't know, I can't speak for Guam and the other territories. But I specifically talking about our islands, our U.S. Territory and American Samoa. And that's one of my requests on the data points.

But everything else, I don't have any other comments on or any changes on the report except for the inclusion of an addition on the U.S. Pacific islands.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to read the bullet point to you that the report did call out that some ecosystems are more vulnerable than others, and highlighted tropical. But I think we can find a place in the document to specifically mention the South

Pacific Islands or the U.S. Territories. And then, Raimundo?

MEMBER FELICIANO: Yes.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: So, thank you.

Thank you, Pam and Madam Chair. I completely agree. I think we need to better understand the potential impacts to Native Americans is called out. I think a bullet specifically that says

U.S. Territories' jurisdictions would be appropriate because I think when we talk about the vulnerable ecosystems, those necessarily don't include, or they could include but they don't necessarily call attention specifically to the jurisdiction.

So we could call attention, we could be tropical and do Florida and do Hawaii, but then some of the island jurisdictions could possibly be overlooked.

So I think it's important what our colleague Rasela says. And I think it's appropriate to also include northern Marina Islands, Guam, as well as American Samoa, Puerto

Rico, and the USVI. And instead of just having that list, I think U.S. Territories is appropriate.

One thing I didn't see that would also could play a role into this is one of the, that is also U.S. Territories but it includes other U.S. based communities is the impacts to islands specifically.

And so the islands, the geography, you know, while we do address the ecosystem, it's something that calling out specifically islands are places that we can have U.S. refugees.

I think, I believe it's Louisiana or Texas, I can't remember the name of the island, that there is said to be one of the first U.S. refugees due to climate change. Can't remember the name of this island.

So I think it's one of those things that for U.S. folks, for U.S. continental areas, if we also focus on U.S. Territories, we kind of neglect some of the first refugees in the U.S. will be due to climate change, will be on the

mainland.

So that's also important to consider.

And it's, you know, encompassing. So I'm not sure how to make a suggestion and how to include

U.S. Territories as well as islands, but I'll put it out there for folks to think over.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Thanks. One of the things Heidi, if you can. It looks like you've identified a place where we can put this.

(Off microphone comments.)

MS. LOVETT: So, I just wanted to share what was reiterated at the front end of the webinar, which was that this document was not trying to illuminate or pull together all the science that has been done. It's really taking a high level look. And it looked at three key, and it identified three key messages.

And throughout the document, they do discuss Pacific Islands in three or four places. So when talking about the declining corals and that they are extremely vulnerable because they are in the topical areas. They are more

vulnerable than other areas.

So I didn't know where specifically people thought there was a lack of reference, and if there was something more specific because it is mentioned. So I just wanted to make sure that the comment is relevant to the reviewers.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, hang on just a second. Let's get her input first. Rasela, could you tell us what you comment was please now.

MEMBER FELICIANO: Yes. I just wanted to thank the gentlemen for his support and inclusion of the Pacific Islands. You know, we face a very unique -- the Pacific Ocean is one of the largest fishing grounds there is for the entire U.S. and certainly and for the entire U.S. facility and longline fleet.

And we are currently facing a lot of the, what they refer as the rise in temperature in the ocean and rise the ocean and, you know, also one of the islands, I don't know if they are a U.S. Territory on the verge of extinction. In certainly you know the impact of climate change there is in the South Pacific,

Pacific Ocean. And you know, Americans have a lot and I -- we're near the equator, and we feel the heat.

And if my main concern is we need scientific data that's more current then continuous because of the impact that we are facing right now with climate change and that the rise in the ocean levels that we're currently experiencing.

And that's my main point here is that we need to include within on that report that, you know, specifically the U.S. South Pacific Territories.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Let me propose some language. I think Heidi has referenced where this is covered in the report. And so in this section, we have the opportunity to say what we like about it.

So on two of these bullet points here,
I would suggest this first one, it's important to

1	identify, and perhaps we say and study the most
2	vulnerable marine ecosystems. And then it says,
3	for example, or e.g. tropical and polar
4	ecosystems in the U.S. and U.S. Territories.
5	That would be the first change. So in the
6	parenthesis there.
7	PARTICIPANT: At the end.
8	MEMBER YOCHEM: At the end. And U.S.
9	Territories.
10	MEMBER FELICIANO: Okay
11	MEMBER YOCHEM: And then there's a
12	bullet point further down that says the need to
13	better understand the potential impacts to Native
14	Americans. And then we would say and inhabitants
15	of, or residents of U.S. Territories.
16	MEMBER FELICIANO: Yes. Thank you very
17	much. I like that.
18	MEMBER YOCHEM: I mean, I don't know
19	if that's, if we need that if we say the other up
20	above?
21	MEMBER FELICIANO: Can both be
22	included?

1	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, so it sounds
2	like it addresses your issues. Raimundo, does it
3	address your issues, making these additions?
4	MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes, it does. And
5	if it could say tropical, polar, and island
6	ecosystems, because
7	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Yes.
8	MEMBER ESPINOZA: the island, it
9	was Isle de Charles in Louisiana. And so that,
10	no corals. Actually, that one, actually wouldn't
11	be addressed in one of these.
12	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Thank you.
13	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Heidi?
14	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, if we're good to
15	woops, I'm sorry. Did Heidi miss something
16	that
17	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: No. So Territories
18	would be capitalized in both? I don't know.
19	MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes.
20	MS. LOVETT: I'll check, but I think
21	it would.
22	MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes.

The next bullet point 1 MEMBER YOCHEM: 2 talks about something that we liked in the document was the importance of fostering 3 4 resilience in our marine ecosystems and resources 5 by taking specific actions. And the report is not supposed to call 6 out or recommend any actions. But we just listed 7 8 as two examples things that have been considered, 9 or are being tried, marine protected areas and 10 climate ready fisheries. Any comments there? 11 Yes, Bob? 12 MEMBER GILL: So my question is: 13 what's a climate ready fishery? 14 MEMBER YOCHEM: Jennifer, you want to 15 comment on that from NOAAs, the climate ready 16 fishery concept? 17 MS. LUKENS: I'm going to defer to 18 Heidi on that, to answer that. 19 MS. LOVETT: Okay. So it's something 20 that Roger has presented to us almost at every 21 single MAFAC meeting since he's come on board as

22

the climate coordinator.

And our climate science strategy in 1 2 particular speaks to climate ready fisheries, meaning that we incorporate climate change when 3 we develop assessments, and develop -- I forget 4 5 the term -- when we develop our targets for rebuilding that. 6 7 Besides just looking at the mortality 8 of a specific fishery -- say natural mortality 9 and fishing mortality -- that we include the fact that temperature is, for instance, causing 10 populations of fish to shift. So it's the 11 12 inclusion of climate-induced changes in our 13 assessments. Does that --14 Thank you, Heidi. MEMBER YOCHEM: Bob? 15 16 MEMBER RHEAULT: Can I suggest, 17 perturbation-resilient fisheries, is that better 18 than climate ready?

MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, the only thing I would say is that that's how NOAA refers to it.

And so that's why we -- I think that's why the drafters did that and the task force did that, is

19

20

21

because that's how it's called out as they're 1 2 trying to incorporate that in their management actions. Mike? 3 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Well, if we have a 4 5 difference of opinion on what NOAA thinks, is that permissible to express? 6 7 MEMBER YOCHEM: Well, this is what we 8 like about the document. And so there's a 9 section in a few minutes about the things we don't like about the document. 10 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think that this 11 12 was pointed out as being one area that at least 13 one person doesn't like about the document. 14 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, well we could, I 15 mean one thing we could do is not give any 16 examples. We could take out the examples. 17 are also people who objected to marine-protected areas, specifically establishing --18 19 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I just haven't got 20 around to objecting to that one. 21 MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, specifically 22 establishing, because that seems to be saying

that we should establish marine protected areas.

Likewise, the idea of implementing or focusing on
or something like that climate ready fisheries,
was felt to be too strong of a comment.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think when you're being prescriptive, if you're just handing out drugs that any nature to handle disease you don't understand, you know, the cure could be worse than the -- so, I mean, I'm just saying that, yes, we know we've got this condition and we do have to deal with it, but getting too far ahead -- too prescriptive at this stage I think is maybe the wrong answer.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Heidi, you've got a comment?

MS. LOVETT: So just to be clear, the term that is used in the report now is "climate ready fishery management", not just "climate ready fisheries", and that might make a difference to people. It might clarify. But anyway, that's the term that is in the document. So maybe this should read the same as it is in

1	the document.
2	MEMBER YOCHEM: Erika? Erika and then
3	Bob.
4	VICE CHAIR FELLER: Thanks. So I kind
5	of like the idea of taking out the examples. The
6	part I like about this is the idea of fostering
7	resilience by taking specific actions. I can get
8	behind that.
9	The idea of marine-protected, I don't
10	know what a climate ready fishery or a climate
11	ready fishery management is in terms of specific
12	management measures. So I'm having trouble
13	wrapping my head around that, and I'm not sure I
14	buy the marine-protected area one.
15	I think it would make sense to keep
16	that a little bit more wide open in terms of
17	encouraging action to foster resilience. That's
18	the part I like about it.
19	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Bob would that
20	address your concerns as well?
21	MEMBER GILL: Yes.
22	MEMBER YOCHEM: If we just took out

1 the parenthesis? 2 MEMBER GILL: Yes, I'm good with removing those. And I would comment to Heidi's 3 4 comment that adding the word "management" after 5 "fishery" changes the entire context. You notice Bob's proffered alternative was something totally 6 7 different. So it seems to me that that's ripe 8 for confusion, and taking it out is probably the 9 best approach. So I would support that. 10 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Anybody object 11 to taking out the parenthesis? 12 (No audible response.) 13 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. They're gone. 14 So the next bullet point talks about the importance of monitoring. And that in order to 15 16 manage our marine resources in the future we need 17 to, in the face of climate change, we need to

MEMBER GILL: So word-smithing, change "managing" to "manage".

continue monitoring. Yes, Bob?

MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, thank you. Any other comments?

18

19

20

21

(No audible response.)

MEMBER YOCHEM: The next one is that better understanding of the impacts of fisheries management and climate change is a key research priority. Yes, Bob?

MEMBER GILL: I think my take on this bullet is it could use some rewriting because I don't think it's saying what's intended to be said. Better understand the impacts of fishery management is a key research priority doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

So I think what's trying to be said here is: better understand the impacts of climate change on fisheries management is a key research priority. If that's not it, then I think we need to reword it to make clear what the intent of that bullet is. But as written, I think it's not getting to the point it's trying to address.

MEMBER YOCHEM: And if I remember correctly, this is one that was -- the subcommittee thought was even more confusingly worded in its first iteration from the task

1 force. 2 MEMBER GILL: Yes. 3 MEMBER YOCHEM: So, I'm open to -- we did the best we could, but I'm open to other 4 5 suggestions for how to clarify. MEMBER GILL: Yes, that's what I 6 7 thought, too. 8 So right, we went MEMBER RHEAULT: 9 round and round on this for quite some time. the point was is that both fisheries management 10 11 and climate change have impacts on fisheries that 12 need to be better understood. How's that? 13 Both climate change and fisheries 14 management have impacts on fisheries that need to 15 be better understood. Does that finally 16 encapsulate what we argued about for ten minutes 17 yesterday? 18 MEMBER YOCHEM: I'm not sure if it 19 I don't think so. does or not. I'm going to go Mike? 20 back and look at the original. MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Well, to Bob's 21

point, I think maybe you need to look at these

2 MEMBER YOCHEM: And I think that was the point of this bullet point was to look at the 3 4 interaction between the two. So if you're looking 5 at the resources, you need to examine not only the impacts of fishery management on the 6 resources, but the impact of climate change on 7 8 the resources and the interaction there, and that 9 that should be a research priority. But I'm 10 going to go back to the original now and see if I 11 can --12 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Just a question, this 13 is presumably in the section of things that we 14 like that we saw in the document. So we're doing a 'me too' essentially on these things? 15 16 MEMBER YOCHEM: Right, and I'm trying 17 to find --18 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So I'm not sure that 19 we have a 'me too' and we keep --20 MEMBER YOCHEM: Well I'm --21 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: -- smithing it might be different. 22

separately as he suggests, but also together.

1	MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, and I'm trying to
2	find that original language. Or maybe Heidi can
3	work on that and we can, if you can look for that
4	in the original document. Okay.
5	MS. LOVETT: In the original it said,
6	"The importance of better understanding how
7	fisheries management and climate change interact
8	is a key research priority."
9	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Can you type
10	that up there, Heidi and
11	MS. LOVETT: Sure.
12	MEMBER YOCHEM: see what people
13	think of it?
14	MS. LOVETT: Sorry, "The importance of
15	better understanding how fisheries management and
16	climate change interact is a key research
17	priority."
18	MEMBER YOCHEM: I don't understand the
19	importance of and then it's a key research
20	priority. Is it did it just say "a better
21	understanding of"?
22	MS. LOVETT: No, it said

1	MEMBER YOCHEM: It said, "the
2	importance of"?
3	MS. LOVETT: I've got yes. But
4	they use that term in a few places.
5	MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, Bob. Do you have
6	some other tweaking?
7	MEMBER GILL: No, I agree with you. I
8	think you can delete "the importance of" and
9	you'd have a better message than talking about
10	the importance, because what you're really trying
11	to do is say what do you do in the face of
12	climate change in terms of managing your
13	fisheries. It's not trying to research how
14	important it is or isn't, it's the details.
15	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So the
16	suggestion is to say a better understanding or a
17	better understanding of how fisheries management
18	and climate change interact is a key research
19	priority. Okay, how do people feel about it now?
20	(No audible response.)
21	MEMBER YOCHEM: Let's move onto the
22	next one. It's sold. This one is one that we've

already edited, so I'll just ask people to look at it again. The need to better understand, and again, this is a topic that we agree with, that there is need to better understand the potential impacts to Native Americans. And then the request was made to add the inhabitants to call out specifically U.S. Territories. Okay, good.

The next one was something that was added, and this is a statement that is made and emphasized in several locations in the report.

The acknowledgment that many of the ongoing ecosystem changes can only be avoided with substantial reductions in atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions. I think that was a key part of the first key finding, if I'm not mistaken.

Any issues with this one?

(No audible response.)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Hearing none.

Now these are the things that we are suggesting that these be added to the report for these reasons to promote clarification, address gaps and enhance key points already made.

So this first one, in addition to expected impacts to fish populations includes specific examples of expected social, economic, and cultural impacts to fishers and fishing communities.

And this was one we heard yesterday some feedback that we got from NOAA was that this would be a helpful suggestion because I think it's something they considered and had to take out because they didn't have the room. And so recognition that kind of human component is important would be helpful to them. So any issues with this one?

(No audible response.)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. The next one, share case studies of fishery management and technological advances relevant to climate ready fisheries. And this again was of the key findings, the second and third had some good news in the sense that they said that are things that we can do. We can have adaptive fishery management, and there are technological advances

that are helping.

And so the suggestion was that rather than simply stating this that some specific examples be given, and one of these was the level of harvest being adapted to the warm blob in the Pacific. Yes, Mike?

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I don't want to get too deep into this, but I think there's more of a tendency to ratchet down when you see something cod happens. I mean, you don't have much choice.

But on the same token, there seems to be pretty strong evidence that others -- perch, for example, in the Gulf of Alaska has taken a big turn up, but nothing is really, the spigot is not being opened in that direction.

So I don't know how you get that in there or if you even want to, but it's, at least I'll make note of it, I guess, because it has to be kind of a two way street in that process.

Your protection part, but also your ability to harvest when it's warranted and backed up by good

science.

MEMBER YOCHEM: So that an example is levels of harvest are being adapted to the Pacific warm blob. Would you suggest you say and could be adapted, or should be adapted where populations are increasing? Heidi's got to -
MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I would like Julie's help on this one because it's her back yard.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, Heidi and then Liz, and then Julie.

MS. LOVETT: I think yesterday during the conversation, I might be wrong, but I thought people felt this was encompassing of both harvest levels could go up or it could go down. It sort of opens the door, but doesn't say either direction specifically.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, Liz?

MS. BURMAN: And I don't know if these are notes from when we had our webinar or not, but we were asked to provide some examples of climate ready fishery management. And at least

to the North of Falcon it's pretty real time, 1 2 which I consider climate ready when you're responding to what's happening right then and 3 So I think that's where that came from, 4 5 but I'm not sure. 6 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: So, I'm going to 7 be laborious a little bit. 8 It's Mike, okay. MEMBER YOCHEM: Ιf 9 you've got a specific suggestion, let's get it in 10 there. 11 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Well you can 12 phrase it, but the case studies is what worries 13 me because where's the case study that we've 14 responded by raising quotas for a fishery? 15 MS. BURMAN: We do that too now. 16 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry. 17 MS. BURMAN: We do both in North of 18 Falcon. If there's more fish, the seasons are 19 If they're not showing up as extended. 20 predicted, which the variability is, we don't 21 know which way it goes, but it is done in real

22

time.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'm suggesting that when there's a market increase in the stock assessment, that that's a pretty good sign that, you know, maybe you could be fishing on at a little higher level. It seems like there's, you know, in halibut we used to call it, or they call it the fast decline in quotas when there's evidence that the population is shrinking and is slow.

But in this case what we're having is climate change effects and impacts. And for the communities to be resilient, they need some kind of economic income as an offset. So if there's evidence that we, in nimble, flexible fisheries management, if we had that then we should be able to respond more quickly to raise quotas where it's warranted.

That's all I'm saying. It would have to be proven in a stock assessment or some type of science that would make sure you're still hitting your targets for sustaining fisheries in the future. But, that's all I'm saying.

I don't know if any case studies so 1 2 far that you can point to that says. So and quite the opposite, I think in some cases they're 3 4 dragging their feet, you know, on the up-ticks 5 that are happening in the stock assessments. MEMBER YOCHEM: Is it, from what 6 7 you're saying, Liz, then can we say that levels 8 of harvest are being adjusted up or down in 9 response to, or something? If we were to take 10 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: 11 that approach, I believe you're right in the 12 vicinity of I would like to be. It's just that 13 to point it out that we need to be responsive in 14 both directions. And that is where, you know, this continual harangue I've done on the 15 16 regulatory side about not being responsive comes 17 into play here. 18 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, Heidi are you 19 going to try to do that, or Liz do you have 20 suggested way to word this? MS. BURMAN: Well, I think we've heard 21

over multiple meetings that the council process

isn't a climate ready fishery management. North of Falcon, which has to be consistent with but it is separate to, is very responsive to up or down.

But at the council process, I mean when Ted was here, I think it was, he went on about that quite a bit. So you're saying the same thing. I think you just -- we were looking at examples of where it works, and the council's an example, I think what you're saying, where it doesn't work.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, Pam?

MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, Julie, do you have some suggestions?

MEMBER BONNEY: Well, I think that on this point, we're asking them to put case studies in. And so we're not, we shouldn't be, I can think of three different case studies or ideas. One is the way that they shift opening dates to get around certain effects in the ecosystems in terms of demoic acid, for example. And then the shell condition, and lobster fishery in Maine.

And then I can also think of the

response that they found when they had the survey in the Gulf and there was no cod, the cod recruitment failed. I can also think of the maturity studies that have been done that find that some of the stocks are more resilient now in the climate change than they were in the past.

So I think the key here is to make sure that we give them examples of all three of those varieties because when I look at the first, I think of adapted to the Pacific warm blob says to me that it's all negative. So I think if we could address the example and give them some of that range of ideas, then it wouldn't be all negative.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, how about this:

levels of harvest are being adapted to the

Pacific warm blob, and then, Julie, you give an

example of one where it's been adjusted up and

we'll add that as a second example.

MEMBER BONNEY: Thinking of the seasonal dates is one. You know, adjusting timing.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Opening fisheries 1 2 earlier --Fishery timing. 3 MEMBER BONNEY: 4 (Simultaneous speaking.) 5 MEMBER BONNEY: And they've changed maturity curves. I don't know what the right 6 7 terminology would be to put in here, but they've 8 shown that the fish are maturing at a younger 9 age, meaning that they are adding to the 10 population and so therefore you can have a higher 11 uprate. But I don't know how you put that in a 12 e.g. 13 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So we've got 14 one negative example and one positive example. 15 Mike, would that address your concern? 16 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Partially. 17 been talking quite a bit about adaptive 18 management practices that could be utilized to be 19 responsive to climate change. And in some cases 20 framework actions, which would presumably move 21 faster than the council process. At least West Coast process moves like a glacier. 22

1	So in the case, I guess what I'm
2	saying is is if we just mention that we're
3	bringing attention to some of these adaptive
4	management measures throughout or these
5	reports we're giving in that if we employed some
6	of that to effect, we would be right on target, I
7	think of what this message is designed to
8	deliver.
9	So if even mentioned a couple of those
10	adaptive management itself is a tool to, in that
11	response mechanism.
12	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, so we'll have
13	e.g., adaptive management, levels of harvest
14	adapted to the Pacific warm blob, fishery
15	openings shifts
16	MEMBER BONNEY: Fishery timing, just
17	do it that way.
18	MEMBER YOCHEM: Fishery timing?
19	MEMBER BONNEY: Yes.
20	MEMBER YOCHEM: Shift? Or just
21	fishery timing, period.
22	MEMBER BONNEY: Well I don't believe

1	fishery timing and I don't know that the right
2	word is.
3	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Bob, did you
4	have another suggestion?
5	MEMBER GILL: Yes, ma'am. I just
6	noticed that once again we have our climate ready
7	fisheries at the beginning of the sentence. And
8	based on what Heidi read, I'm assuming it's the
9	same as before, which means we need to add the
10	word "management" because it's a totally
11	different thing.
12	MEMBER YOCHEM: So we put in climate
13	ready fisheries management?
14	MEMBER GILL: Yes. I still don't know
15	what a climate ready fishery is.
16	(Off microphone conversation.)
17	MEMBER BONNEY: I think it works there
18	because of the lead in of the sentence.
19	MEMBER YOCHEM: Because management is
20	addressed earlier.
21	MEMBER BONNEY: Yes.
22	MEMBER GILL: Doesn't to me.

1	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Or you could say:
2	share case studies of technological advances
3	relevant to climate ready fisheries management.
4	MEMBER BONNEY: There you go.
5	MEMBER YOCHEM: But it's more than
6	technological advances though. Technological
7	advances were the example that was given was the
8	monitoring device for harmful algal blooms, that
9	that's an actual new instrument. And under the
10	other point, the management is along the lines of
11	what we were talking about, the adaptive
12	management technique. So I think there's two
13	MEMBER BONNEY: Well you can put that
14	
15	MEMBER YOCHEM: different things
16	there.
17	MEMBER BONNEY: You could just say
18	share case studies of adaptive fishery
19	management.
20	MEMBER YOCHEM: And technological
21	advances.
22	MEMBER BONNEY: Yes.

Yes. I think that's a 1 MEMBER YOCHEM: 2 good idea. 3 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Or you could say, 4 of management actions and technological advance 5 relevant to --6 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, share case 7 studies of adaptive fisheries management and 8 technological advances. I'm wondering if we just 9 say relevant to climate, or climate impacts on fisheries or something like that if people don't 10 11 like the ---12 And then do we need adaptive 13 management as an example, because we've already 14 called that out as the overall process. And so an example of adaptive fisheries management would 15 16 be the levels of harvest being adapted and then 17 changes in fishery timing. So take a second to 18 read that and see if anybody's got any additional 19 tweaks to suggest. Yes, Mike? 20 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Just a question 21 for Julie. In the case of the perch, did I or did I not hear that the stock assessment shows 22

that there's a much higher level perch. We could be possibly going after as many as 200,000 tons, and we're going after how many?

MEMBER BONNEY: Yes. The problem that I'm seeing, and I don't know how you capture this, but because of the uncertainty, everybody's adding uncertainty buffers to push you lower, but nobody's celebrating the idea that things are changing in a positive way and release of getting rid of that, what, restriction.

You know, they don't want to swing high because they're worried about the uncertainty to try to make those adjustments, but I don't.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Well I see that as kind of a cover your behind mode, but we're having similar issues on the West Coast, I believe. And that's all I'm attempting to get to is under an adaptive management schematic that is intended to hit the goals and objectives in a lot of these FMPs and also of the national standards.

Then it's just that if we're going to

-- we know we're going to have some negative 1 2 impacts, and we're probably going to have some positive impacts on fishery stocks. We know that 3 income is a key role of keeping communities 4 5 resilient. So we have to take advantage when 6 these stocks are going up as well. If we put all 7 8 these buffers of uncertainty in there, it could 9 be years before we actually get out there and start, you know, harvesting at higher levels on 10 11 those stocks that have come up. 12 MEMBER YOCHEM: So does nimble and 13 adaptive address that. Nimble in terms of the 14 time crunch. 15 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: It certainly goes 16 in the right direction. Yes. Just simple yes. 17 Okay. 18 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. All right. 19 Great. 20 MEMBER BONNEY: So can we add one more 21 example. So updating life history characteristics because what's happening is 22

1	energetics change or whatever that you're getting
2	different characteristics out of the fish because
3	they're responding differently to climate change.
4	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, and then Roger,
5	I think you had another suggestion.
6	MEMBER BERKOWITZ: Yes. I mean in
7	terms of adaptability, how about the word
8	"flexibility"? I mean, because that takes in the
9	consideration up and down and then you can be
10	nimble in that regard.
11	MEMBER YOCHEM: So nimble, flexible
12	and adaptive fisheries management and
13	technological advances? Or is flexible implied
14	with adaptive?
15	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Personally, I like
16	"flexible" better than "adaptive". So if you
17	want to take "adaptive" out and leave "flexible"
18	and "nimble" in, I'm fine by that.
19	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, what do others
20	think about that?
21	(Simultaneous speaking.)
22	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay, so I'm hearing

disagreement about taking "adaptive" out. So Ray, and then Columbus.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: So I mean, I don't have a disagreement, it just depends on what you mean. Nimble or flexible, the definition of those words you know just means that you can bend them and rearrange. But adaptive, when you talk about adaptive management, that's an actual definition of a whole process that it is involved.

So it means starting that whole cycle. So, which is what I think, you know, management for specifically for this is what's needed. But again, if that's not what you're referring to, that's what you do not what, it's something that's different.

There are some as terms adaptive or flexible, you could interchange them. It could be something different. But "adaptive management" is actually, you know, a term that's something that brings a lot of specific action and mechanisms of a cycle that needs to be put in

place for fisheries management.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. We'll leave that in. Columbus? Columbus agrees. Okay, so now the question is whether we need to include "flexible", and Heidi's got a thought on that.

No. Go ahead then with what your thought was.

MS. LOVETT: Well I just wanted to help people or reflect back that what this document is that you're commenting on. It's the National Climate Assessment. And the goals are to summarize the impacts of climate change on the United States and its communities now and in the future.

So I just didn't want you to get too worried and think about this isn't directing just NOAA, it's really the aim is the assessment as a whole and what are the risks and the impacts to the U.S. from these changes.

So I understand the degree of interest by everybody on this, but I just wanted to make sure that you kept in mind what your comments are on, that original document.

MS. LOVETT: Well, I just wanted to help people, or reflect back that, what this document is that you're commenting on. It's the National Climate Assessment. And the goals are to summarize the impacts of climate change on the United States and its communities now and in the future.

So, I just didn't want you to get too, yes, too worried, and think about the -- This isn't directing just NOAA. It's really, the aim is the assessment as a whole. And, you know, what are the risks and the impacts to the U.S. from these changes?

So, I understand the degree of interest by everybody on this. But I just wanted to make sure that you kept in mind where, what you're referring to, what your comments are on, that original document.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So, would people be comfortable then with just the fact that we have called out that we would like to see examples of both adaptive, nimble and adaptive

fisheries management, and technological advances related to climate?

And the examples that we've given make it clear that we want to hear situations in which fisheries have been restricted. But also examples of where climate has been, or climate changes have been included to expand fisheries.

Because we do, I'm concerned about getting this done, so that we can get the other, get on to the other things that we need to vote on today. Mike, did you have one, another comment that you wanted to make? Or can you live with this wording?

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I can live with it. Just one quick comment. It, and I can't even remember when we came in the door here. But it seemed like we were kind of pointing out the negative impacts that climate change could have on our communities and fisheries.

And that's the part I wanted to balance out. If we totally just talked about nothing but climate change, and didn't refer to

1	communities and how it's going to affect
2	fisheries, then that was, it's pretty simple. We
3	just stick with climate. But once we open the
4	door I just want that balance to occur in there.
5	So, I think we've captured it, or come close.
6	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Thank you.
7	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And that's it.
8	MEMBER YOCHEM: Thank you. Roger, did
9	you have another comment?
10	MEMBER BERKOWITZ: Yes. I'm stuck on
11	the word flexible. Because right now I don't
12	think it is flexible. And I think that, you
13	know, having that word in there along with nimble
14	allows for, you know, looking at it a little
15	differently.
16	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Does anybody
17	have any heartburn with adding that word?
18	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I said it was my
19	key word to begin with. So, I'll leave it at
20	that.
21	MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Great. All
22	right. Anything else? All right. We're going

to move to the next point. And the comment here 1 2 was that the relationship between climate change and ocean acidification, discussion of the 3 chemistry of the water, and so on, is, the task 4 5 force felt that that was buried in the document, and that it should be mentioned earlier. 6 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: This is just 7 8 smithing. I think it would be a better sentence 9 if it said, either clarify or make the relationship of climate change and ocean 10 acidification clear early in the document. 11 And 12 instead of --13 MEMBER YOCHEM: Period. 14 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: -- all of that. Yes. Just, you know, that just states it. 15 16 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Then we don't 17 need the parentheses. Any other suggestions or 18 comments on this one? Okay. The next bullet 19 point gets at the fact that the document mentions 20 that fish distributions are shifting. 21 And the suggestion was made that it be pointed out, since this is a document that's 22

talking about climate change overall, and this is the ocean piece of that overall document, that it be pointed out that changes are happening in the marine community.

A lot of people aren't aware of that.

And in some cases they're happening faster than
they are in the terrestrial environment. So,
take a minute to read this, and see if you've got
any suggestions about wordsmithing or changing
that.

Okay? If people can live with this one, let's put the next one down. This one talks about dealing with uncertainty, actually kind of the last two bullet points address that. So, why don't you take a look at these together, and see what you think. Yes, Bob.

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Pam. If
you're going to combine them my question on the
last bullet is, I agree with the intent. My
question is, how the heck are you going to do it?

MEMBER YOCHEM: I think the, what we talked about yesterday is that there are some

examples. Peter mentioned a couple. And so, he 1 2 thought that that would be helpful if those could be incorporated into the document, situations 3 4 where that's been done. 5 Any other comments on these last two? Or anything else that you saw that was not 6 7 included in the document that you think we should 8 mention? 9 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Just --10 MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, Mike. 11 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: On the sentence at 12 the end there, first sentence on the first 13 bullet, and the potential role of management 14 strategy evaluation should also be specifically 15 raised, or applied. Or are we thinking --16 MEMBER YOCHEM: I'm sorry. Are you on the second bullet or the final bullet? 17 18 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: The second. I 19 quess the second one. The one above in that 20 screen. The top one. 21 MEMBER YOCHEM: The top one. Okay. And what, can you say again what language you're, 22

or how you're, what you're recommending change? 1 2 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And the potential role should be raised, specifically raised. 3 **MSE** should be specifically raised. I, isn't that 4 more or less ready for prime time already? 5 I mean, in other words, it could be a 6 7 valuable tool in this case. I think you were asking whether it would be a tool as a role. 8 9 Maybe I'm reading it wrong. 10 MEMBER YOCHEM: I think what, if I 11 remember correctly, what we're trying to get out 12 here is that incorporating climate change factors 13 into fisheries assessment is important. But that 14 we also need to deal with uncertainty around some of that information, and then evaluate it. 15 16 So, I guess it's getting at adaptive 17 management. Don't just incorporate it and move 18 But evaluate whether it's having the desired 19 impact. And then, I think Heidi's got some input 20 for us. 21 MS. LOVETT: I was just going to say 22 that the way I interpreted this was that MSEs are

not mentioned in the document now. I haven't checked that point. But that it's not in the document now.

And the commenters suggested that it be identified as a good tool, and to invest in it. It's not, it's at the cutting front edge now. I guess they're saying, you know, we should continue with that.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think the way you just phrased that is a better way to phrase it than what's up there right now. In my estimation.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, maybe we don't need the leading clause. And we could go right to the actual.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Mike, does that make it clear, make it more clear? And Terri?

MS. LOVETT: May I read it out loud?

"While authors raised the importance of incorporating climate change factors into fisheries assessment, the role of management strategy evaluation should be specifically raised

as an important area of scientific investment." 1 2 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Well, for me I think it loses the idea that we have to look at the 3 4 uncertainty. And that was I thought the point of 5 the bullet. Well, the, yes. 6 MEMBER YOCHEM: And 7 that does, the last bullet point is kind of 8 talking about uncertainty as well. So, I don't 9 know if we want to add it back in on that final bullet point, and go for two topics on 10 11 uncertainty, or if you want to figure out a way 12 to put it back in. Columbus, do you have a way 13 to put it back in? 14 MEMBER BROWN: Well, I think that sometimes we talk too much about quote, unquote 15 16 uncertainty as opposed to what we really need. And is that lack of information and data that we 17 18 need to procure to move systems further? 19 Uncertainty is only a symptom of the lack of 20 data. 21 MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes, Bob, do you have 22 a suggestion for how to word this?

MEMBER RHEAULT: So, this was my baby.

And it's morphed into somebody else. So, if we want to go this route I'm going to propose another bullet, and get it back to my baby.

But the problem that I see is that our current vulnerability assessments are being driven largely by fisheries' responses to perturbations that we don't understand well, such as the response of high value species to OA.

The science on this is weak. And that's my point. The vulnerability assessment is driving a lot of what's coming out of NOAA now.

And it's based largely on the responsive things like these very high value fisheries, such as sea scallops and lobsters, to OA.

And it's, there's a lot of fear. And that's very justifiable. Because the impacts are vast. But the scientific knowledge of the response of these organisms to the perturbation is not solid. And I don't know how you want to word that. But it's lost there.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So, while

others raise the importance of incorporating 1 2 climate change factors into fisheries assessment, the role of management strategy evaluation and --3 4 Well, that's a, MSEs are a thing, and 5 they're not in the original document. was wanting to make sure that they were in there. 6 7 And the uncertainty around, and how do you want 8 to put that? 9 Uncertainty around something should be 10 specifically raised as important areas of 11 scientific investment. So, you could say 12 uncertainty around something, and then give your EG the impact of ocean acidification on blah, 13 14 blah. So, put the EG up there. And then --15 How about --MEMBER RHEAULT: 16 MEMBER YOCHEM: -- move the 17 specifically raised as important areas of 18 scientific investment at the end. 19 (Off microphone comment) 20 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And we could say, the 21 uncertainty surrounding our current understanding 22 of the impacts.

(Off microphone comment)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Well, we're trying to get the uncertainty and your specific example both in this statement. So, if you can, now that Heidi's done that, let's see if we can clean it up a little bit. Mike.

(Off microphone comment)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. That's one suggestion would be, while authors raised the importance of incorporating climate change factors into fisheries assessment, the role of management strategy evaluation should also be specifically raised as an important area of scientific investment. The next bullet point, read it out loud.

MEMBER RHEAULT: Vulnerability
assessments are being skewed by assumptions on
the impacts of ocean acidification on high value
species that are not well understood.

MEMBER YOCHEM: So, impacts of ocean acidification on high value species, e.g., scallops and lobster, that are not well -- So,

vulnerability assessments are being skewed by 1 2 assumptions of the impacts of ocean acidification on high value species. And then you'd have EG 3 4 scallops and lobster. And then, what was the very last part of it? 5 (Off microphone comment) 6 7 MEMBER YOCHEM: Should we say untested 8 assumptions? Because I think you had something 9 in there about needing more information. then, Columbus had a comment too. 10 That's fine. 11 MEMBER RHEAULT: 12 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Columbus. 13 MEMBER BROWN: Every time I hear the 14 word uncertainty the hair just goes back on the back of my neck. We need more data. What kind 15 16 of data do we need? Can we get it? And, you 17 know, what will it take to make somebody happy? 18 And, you know, is it doable? So, I --19 MEMBER YOCHEM: So, Heidi, you need to 20 delete some of that stuff in the top bullet. 21 (Off microphone comment) 22 MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay.

1 MEMBER BROWN: So, you know --2 MEMBER YOCHEM: I think that's what he's getting at. 3 4 MEMBER BROWN: I think that, you know, 5 you can't keep cutting research budgets, and provide the level of information that you need to 6 7 make good decisions. 8 And that's why I put, MEMBER YOCHEM: 9 I thought putting untested assumptions would be important. Because that implies more research is 10 11 And then, we have the scientific done. 12 investment needed in the other one. Rai, did you 13 have another suggestion for tweaking? Okay. 14 something else that you feel is missing? If so, hold that point, and let's go to Mike. 15 16 have a tweaking suggestion? 17 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: No. I'm going to 18 leave the tweaking to somebody else. But the point I would like to bring out is, it's not just 19 20 data. That's the raw material. 21 The methodology, and the assessment 22 process itself is key to organizing that data to

a conclusion, or at least a better assumption, if nothing else. And so, I don't want to lose sight of that.

That's one reason I was kind of emphasizing the management, MSE. Because that is a tool that I think could be affective in some cases. I really like what Bob did there.

Because I totally agree with what he's saying on that point.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. So, we do have MSEs. And we've got the, I think the untested assumptions in there. Any other wordsmithing on these two before we move on to something else that folks feel is not included, or needs to be added? Rai, yes.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes. So, I agree with that. That's what I was going to say, that we do have data on acidification. We just don't understand it. We don't know how it's moving.

But, and that's what's creating uncertainty. So, that's, I mean, and so with a lot of the procedures that we're seeing. The one

1	thing I think maybe, see if you agree with me
2	with this, Bob.
3	With the validity assessment being
4	based by untested, instead of skewed, just as, I
5	feel that skewed is kind of a, you know, a strong
6	word that might
7	MEMBER YOCHEM: Good point. Are being
8	based on. Okay. Bob, is this a wordsmithing
9	thing, or a new thing?
10	MEMBER GILL: Neither. I'm a broken
11	record. Last bullet. First of all, I think the
12	wording is really cumbersome. Really cumbersome.
13	MEMBER YOCHEM: The wording of the
14	last bullet?
15	MEMBER GILL: But
16	MEMBER YOCHEM: So, it's a
17	wordsmithing thing.
18	MEMBER GILL: No.
19	MEMBER YOCHEM: Two thumbs up.
20	MEMBER GILL: No, it's more than that.
21	MEMBER YOCHEM: Oh, okay.
22	MEMBER GILL: But beyond that, I have

real heartburn with that thing. And I apologize for missing what Peter had to say, because I would have loved to have heard it. And so, I don't know the examples that he's used.

But I think it's a good idea. But practically speaking it's probably worthless.

And I can't think of any example that would render that statement not true. So, I'm really having trouble with that last bullet.

MEMBER YOCHEM: I don't remember the specific examples that he mentioned. But he talked about the fact that past projections with regard to changes in ocean temperature, for example, and certain things that were supposed to happen at three years, five years, seven years, or whatever, have been --

In other words, people have put the models out there. They've made the projections.

And then they've gone back and looked at how good those models were.

And so, that's all that is being suggested, is that we, besides doing all this

modeling, we make sure that we go back and test those assumptions. But then, furthermore than that, we make it clear that they have been.

So, in other words, I think what he was trying to get at there is that some people think that the models are completely worthless, and that they're always wrong.

And he wanted to make sure that they're, or was suggesting that we include some examples of where, in fact, they, you know, how well they have matched what actually happened.

Columbus.

MEMBER BROWN: Yes. When I think back on what Peter said, and I look at my phone, and look at the weather, you know, you've got a 15 day forecast, and you've got a one day forecast. And the one day forecast is a hell of a lot better than the 15 day forecast. It sort of gives you the ballpark.

And so, I think in terms of the point that he's trying to make, I don't even know if we need to deal with it. I think it's just a

natural situation that you deal with, with projecting the future. And as you get closer to real time moments, you have a better clue of what's going to happen in the next few seconds.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Mike.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Two minor tweaks.

On the last sentence you've got over project -or not quite the last. Over projecting, under
projecting, and future projections. I'd say
outcomes instead of projections. And on the last
word in the second sentence I might use format
instead of form.

MEMBER YOCHEM: Okay. Heidi, you were part of the discussion. Did you have a clarification you wanted to mention? And I can't remember, Jennifer, if you were here or not, if you remember? Okay.

MS. LOVETT: Yes. I think he was, I think you've described it pretty adequately. I think the, what you said, that models are always being updated.

But what, I think his point was that

last part. Visuals help tell the story was sort 1 2 of what he was striving at. And it's what we do in fisheries management, as I understand it, all 3 4 the time. You're always going back to see how 5 well your future projections were in a certain 6 kind of fishery model, so that you -- No? Okay. 7 Well, oftentimes. Retrospective analyses. 8 9 So, usually going back to see, did you project correctly what the stock was going to do 10 as you move forward? But I think that's what he 11 12 was getting at. 13 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Madame Chair. So, it 14 just says straight out, ground truth. Are we like demanding that they ground truth something? 15 16 Or, I mean, it seems like there is some sentence 17 structure missing. 18 MEMBER YOCHEM: Yes. I agree with 19 I was trying to think about how to do that. you. 20 Well, in, yes. What have we said where we had 21 suggested something be included?

(Off microphone comment)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Well, let me just put it this way. Do you have a suggestion for how we could better state this? Should we say include examples where past projections have been ground truthed?

(Off microphone comment)

MEMBER YOCHEM: Include examples where past projections have been, I don't know if ground truth's the right word, or been evaluated to determine whether they were over projecting or under projecting outcomes.

And then, they, it sounds like Bob's not aware of any examples of where this has been done. But, and unfortunately Peter's not here anymore. But I know he gave several examples of where it has been done. And Bob is not, or like you've seen them before too. So, are you comfortable if we leave this?

MEMBER GILL: I think we're getting closer. And from the explanations both Columbus and Heidi mentioned, I think what you're really saying here isn't what I got out of the original

wording of the bullet.

But what you're really saying is, incorporate the latest information and techniques to improve past projections. But that's different than trying to ground truth them.

MEMBER YOCHEM: No. Yes. Actually, no, that's not it. It was specifically to give examples where it has been done, and they've been evaluated.

So, I think maybe, so include examples where past projections have been evaluated to determine if we are over projecting or under projecting. And I think you just better say outcomes. Because projecting --

Okay. So, how are, yes, we need to kind of move on. So, if people can live with this? Okay. Bob. Bob and Bob. If you don't have any other wordsmithing issues, I think we're going to move, we need to move on. Because that's our last bullet point. And we have other documents that we need to review and vote on.

Okay. I'm going to turn it back to --

MEMBER RHEAULT: I make a motion to 1 2 accept this as written. (Off microphone comment) 3 And edited. 4 MEMBER YOCHEM: I second. 5 MEMBER BONNEY: I'll second it. 6 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. Well then, 7 there's a motion on the floor from the, to accept 8 the subcommittee's report to submit these 9 comments as they currently read. They'll be revised to reflect our discussion. And I'm going 10 to ask all those in favor signify by saying aye. 11 12 (Chorus of aye.) 13 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: And those opposed? 14 Anyone abstaining? Then the motion carries. 15 Thank you. So, we have one more document. 16 that would be from the Commerce Committee. 17 Julie. Then the aquaculture. 18 MEMBER BONNEY: I don't even have it 19 open here. But basically it's pretty 20 straightforward. Bob and Sebastian, who are the 21 two aquaculture guys, worked back and forth to 22 modify a letter to basically say to NOAA that

they're doing a good job, and we're ready to move 1 2 forward with a aquaculture initiative. But we need to have, the initiative 3 4 needs to be worked together with the industry, in 5 terms of a direction. And I'll look at Bob if he wants to add anything. 6 7 MEMBER RHEAULT: So, Sebastian and I 8 chatted about this. It was just a few comments 9 that I recall from our discussion at the bar, where Sebastian pointed out that he had added, 90 10 percent of the fish that we eat are imported. 11 12 And I edited it back to 80 percent. Because I didn't want to contradict the Admiral's 13 14 presentation. But it's absolutely correct that 15 the latest assessment says it's something like 92 16 percent. 17 So, I, you know, I'm willing to go 18 either way with that. Sebastian had some 19 concerns about, I'll let him speak for himself. 20 Excuse me. 21 MEMBER BELLE: Well, the one other 22 thing I pointed out was that the \$4 billion is a

typo. It should be \$14 billion. Or \$14.6 billion I think is the latest accurate figure.

And then, the other piece is that in the original version that I forwarded to Bob and the rest of the committee, I did not specifically use the terms, and where are we here? I think we've got to scroll down a little bit, if you wouldn't mind. Yes, the National Aquaculture Initiative.

And the reason I didn't is because although NOAA's staff presented to MAFAC that initiative, from my perspective the specific ingredients of that initiative, the National Aquaculture Initiative, haven't really had the level of industry input that probably they require.

And so, I didn't want to reference that specifically. And I had I think in my version some kind of weasel words that didn't use National Aquaculture Initiative, but recognized that NOAA would be taking the lead on this.

So, I don't honestly even remember

what my original language is. I can pull it up on my computer maybe. But I just felt it was premature to specifically recognize that particular term. Because it was a term that was used to specifically reference four things that NOAA staff was proposing to do.

And I talked a little bit to both

Michael and to Paul about this. And, you know,

my take is that it's not, I do not want to in any

way not support what they're trying to do.

I just want to make very clear that MAFAC is not, per se, endorsing the specifics of what they put up on the screen as their proposal, until it's gone through further industry input.

So, what we're suggesting from a MAFAC point of view is that that's the next step for them, is to go out and get industry input, to go and talk to some of the state regulators and managers who have been involved with aquaculture management for many years, get their input.

And I realize it sounds a little bit like parsing. But unfortunately, in my world

specific words come back to haunt you, and they 1 2 mean something. And so, that's why I proposed a slight 3 4 change there. So, if it's helpful I can drag up 5 the verbiage that I had, and put that out there 6 as well. 7 MEMBER RHEAULT: Well, if it's important we can do that. And happy to pull it 8 back out. 9 10 MEMBER BONNEY: So, I'm going to 11 recognize Pam. 12 MEMBER YOCHEM: I was just wondering, 13 Sebastian, if you don't capitalize National 14 Aquaculture Initiative? And if in the last 15 sentence we should ensure that this process 16 should not derail? Does that make it general 17 enough to you? 18 So, instead of National Aquaculture 19 Initiative like a thing, take away the caps. And then, rather than referencing the initiative with 20 21 a capital I, say process down below. 22 I'm fine with MEMBER BELLE: Sorry.

that. I would ask NOAA staff if that gives them what they need. Because the justification for using those three words, as far as I was told, was that they need to encourage the Secretary to take this seriously, and to move forward with it. And so --

MEMBER YOCHEM: And I agree. The three words are still there. But they're, by capitalizing them it makes it seem like more of a done deal. I don't know. Michael Rubino's in the room. Maybe he can weigh in on that. Or Paul.

DR. DOREMUS: From my vantage point the main thing that needs to be communicated, that we would recommend that the group communicate, based on the briefing that you heard from Michael and our related discussion, is that visible, bold support by the Secretary to advance domestic aquaculture is warranted.

This has, I think the highlighting here of regulatory streamlining opportunities, and the other kind of substantive comments that

were made are spot on.

phrase National Aquaculture Initiative. I think that's valuable. But I don't think that it's necessary for you to communicate to the Secretary that you are recommending as a body that he visibly and boldly support the aquaculture initiative, charge NOAA to streamline regulations, work with industry, improve the science base, however you want to say it. That to me is most important. Whether the words National Aquaculture Initiative are in there is less important.

MEMBER BELLE: So, from my perspective

DR. DOREMUS: And I'm hoping Chris concurs.

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

MEMBER BELLE: That's what I like to hear. No wordsmithing, just yes. So, from my perspective I really appreciate, Paul, how you've articulated that.

And I think, you know, if there's a way that we could actually strengthen our request to the, to ensure that leadership recognizes that they need to highlight that as a priority, I'm open to that.

But I, you know, I think the fact that you guys don't necessarily need those specific words helps me in terms of my angst. And I apologize to my colleagues on the Committee.

This is kind of the world that I live in. And perhaps I'm being overly paranoid. But I, it is my world.

MEMBER BONNEY: Go ahead, Paul.

DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Julie. I'm sorry for barging in again. One thing I'd like to highlight that came out of various discussions we've had with the Secretary, including one with members of the NAA Board that I think is important to communicate here.

And I've heard it from many, many
people in industry. And I think it's a
difference in perspective between where industry

is and the Secretary right now. And it's why this communication can be particularly valuable, in addition to the fundamental content that is provided here.

Industry tells us, and it's been the experience of the shellfish industry, that high level political leadership is in itself a very valuable thing. It focuses effort. It focuses organizations. It focuses people.

So, I think if this communication says, effectively says, we need your leadership, and we need you to direct NOAA to do these things. Also, maybe semantics.

But I do think the team needs to be aware that the Secretary of Commerce standing up in whatever words says, we want more seafood production in this country, is in itself a very valuable thing. And your voice to that effect would be a great contribution.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think that's an excellent comment to make. Just one quick thing.

Does it say 80 percent of the seafood is

Is that what I saw up there? 1 imported? And 2 everything I look at on Google that I can find So, I'm, by value. 3 says 91 percent. 4 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I think there's a 5 little confusion. Because some of the things 6 that are import, they're actually exported from 7 U.S., and then processed, and comes back --8 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: It still --9 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: -- as an import. 10 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: It's still 11 imported back into the U.S. And it transforms 12 through a major value added process in doing so. 13 And that is loss to the country as well, that 14 process. Not just the value of the seafood, but the jobs, and everything else that go with that. 15 16 I concur. 17 CHAIR BEIDEMAN: So, Bob. 18 MEMBER RHEAULT: So, let's 19 decapitalize national aquaculture initiative once 20 again in the top paragraph. And perhaps add a 21 sentence to that top paragraph saying, your bold 22 leadership in this effort would be welcomed.

(Off microphone comment)

MEMBER RHEAULT: By the U.S. industry.

Or, I don't know if we can speak for the entire

U.S. industry from the MAFAC. But it certainly

would be welcomed.

MEMBER BONNEY: So, one other thing I was thinking too is that MAFAC believes that these trends highlight, strongly believes. I would add, you know, so the next paragraph down. Probably, your bold leadership in this effort is welcomed by MAFAC. Because we can say that for certain, right?

Any other thoughts? Just trying to make it a little more along what Paul was recommending, just to do the double trump down, so to speak.

MEMBER BELLE: Can we just go back up to the first paragraph? Sorry. The rolling out a national aquaculture initiative, that to me again sounds like we are endorsing what was presented to us here. So, I think, how about supporting a national aquaculture initiative?

1	MEMBER BROWN: Paul, would it be
2	helpful to refer to the EEZ in specific in this
3	letter? Because that's really the area where
4	there's a paucity of aquaculture facilities.
5	And, you know, worldwide that seems to be where
6	things are shifting. And we need to be on the
7	forefront.
8	DR. DOREMUS: In my view that wouldn't
9	be necessary. I think we want to entertain
10	aquaculture production in the coastal zone, as
11	well as out in federal waters.
12	So, I wouldn't, especially for this
13	letter I don't think that it would be necessary
14	to divide the two in that respect. So, I would
15	leave it at that,
16	MEMBER BONNEY: So, any other
17	thoughts? I guess I would ask that we look at
18	the bottom, since I think we've fixed the top.
19	MEMBER RHEAULT: My only question is
20	whether we need a punchy sentence at the end or
21	not. But
22	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: I have a, Julie, I

have a -- Do we make, and I've read it. But I
like the idea. And a lot of what resonates with
people is food safety and food security issues.
And that's one of the areas where the U.S. is
quite outstanding.

And I don't know if that's
incorporated in here. And, you know, or how we
could fold that in. I know we've already got a
lot of long, commaed sentences. But I'd love to

MEMBER RHEAULT: Now, we're struggling to keep it to one page.

MEMBER BONNEY: Erika.

see that in there. I think that's a powerful

VICE CHAIR FELLER: This is partial a pet peeve, and partial answer Bob's desire for a punchy last sentence. Just, MAFAC believes, if MAFAC's sending the letter. I think it's implicit that MAFAC believes that. So, we can get rid of that.

I mean, I think it's a little bit more impactful to say, there are significant

piece.

opportunities to streamline existing regulations. 1 2 And then I might wrap it up with, you know, MAFAC 3 4 Per Julie's comment on the first day, 5 MAFAC stands ready to work with you to, you know, get this done, or however you want to do it. 6 7 Like, I think some kind of offer or, you know, 8 expressing a desire to engage in this would be 9 good. There's another issue 10 DR. DOREMUS: from many discussions with industry that I want 11 12 to recognize here, and make a small suggestion 13 for your text. 14 There's a lot of sensitivity. And one of the things that was a big factor in our most 15 recent conversation with the Secretary is concern 16 17 that this would be viewed negatively by the wild 18 catch based industry. 19 Indeed, one of the reasons we think 20 it's valuable for this body to speak on the 21 matter is because you cut across all sectors.

And we don't, and industry doesn't,

nor does NOAA want to imply that imports are bad, and domestic production is good. It's a global industry. The key point is that supply is insufficient to meet demand.

and I think if you took, if you moved up, hang on right there. This paragraph right in the middle there that says, MAFAC strongly believes that these trends highlight the need to substantially increase domestic aquaculture production.

This would reduce our seafood trade deficit, while advancing the blue economy, generating thousands of jobs, preserving working waterfronts, and complementing, I would say at the end perhaps, a recommendation. And complementing the economic contributions of wild capture seafood industry, or wild capture producers.

Something to that effect. Recognizing that MAFAC endorses, as I hope you do, sustainable seafood broadly. And we don't, we simply cannot meet demand.

The point about the trade deficit is 1 2 less that imports are bad, and more that demand is far outstripping supply. We've been replacing 3 4 it largely with farmed product from other 5 nations. And we could build our supply, meet future demand, et cetera. 6 7 So, I just wanted to draw your 8 attention to that sensitivity, and suggest some 9 reference here to wild capture producers. 10 MEMBER BONNEY: So, Mike is typing 11 As one of the few wild capture people that. 12 right here at this point in time, I think it's 13 potentially complementing. Because it would 14 depend on what the production is, and the 15 seasonality. 16 So, you could have an issue where you 17 are competing with wild capture. But you could 18 also develop a system that complements wild 19 capture. 20 And so, I think to say it boldly that

it will happen and it will complement wild

capture, I think it depends. So, I think, and

21

potentially complementing the economic 1 2 contributions of wild capture producers, I can live with that. 3 4 MEMBER BONNEY: Eddie. 5 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'd just like to 6 point out that for those optimists, which I still 7 am, in the industry, if you look at 91 percent there's a hell of a lot of room there to take 8 9 aquaculture and wild capture to much, much higher levels of consumption than what we're seeing 10 11 here. 12 And we've got a better product. 13 got, all the way around we've got things going 14 for us that we can compete. So, let's get game 15 on. 16 And I'm not fearful about aquaculture 17 stealing our thunder. Because we, the 18 potential's there to have both, and to, and a larger market share, period. And that's where 19 the real reward lies. 20 Go ahead, Erika. 21 MEMBER BONNEY: 22 VICE CHAIR FELLER: I have maybe a

	rriendly amendment.
2	MEMBER BONNEY: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIR FELLER: Maybe in the name
4	of kind of making this positive, instead of
5	without negatively impacting to say, you know, in
6	a way that complements the economic contributions
7	of wild capture producers. So, it's sort of like
8	it's less of a trade off, this or that. It's
9	more kind of a, we're all in this together.
10	MEMBER BONNEY: Yes. I like that. I
11	guess I should be asking other folks. But I'm
12	trying to walk that line, being from Alaska.
13	MEMBER BELLE: So, this is Sebastian.
14	I absolutely like that addition. I think it's a
15	great addition. And it's, it helps from the
16	perception point of view, which I think really
17	this issue is a matter of perception, not of
18	reality. But I think that that's, it's important
19	to deal with that.
20	MEMBER BONNEY: Any other comments on
21	the letter? Are we getting
22	MEMBED PUENITT. I think we just need

1	to unstrike the and.
2	(Off microphone comments)
3	MEMBER RHEAULT: You struck out the
4	and. And we kind of need to I think so. And
5	if anyone else doesn't have any objection, I
6	would make a motion to accept the letter, forward
7	it to the Secretary with all due alacrity.
8	MEMBER BONNEY: So, we have a motion -
9	_
10	MEMBER BROWN: I second.
11	MEMBER BONNEY: on the floor. And
12	who seconded it? Columbia, Columbus
13	MEMBER BROWN: Cleveland.
14	MEMBER BONNEY: seconded it. And
15	is there any All in favor say aye.
16	(Chorus of aye.)
17	MEMBER BONNEY: Any opposition? Done.
18	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: We did it.
19	MEMBER RHEAULT: Thank you.
20	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: We don't have to do
21	it again, right?
22	MS. LUKENS: No.

1	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: the wrap up. So,
2	there you go. Turn it over to our
3	MS. LUKENS: What's my name?
4	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: leader, our
5	fearsome leader here.
6	MS. LUKENS: Co-leader.
7	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Jennifer.
8	MS. LUKENS: All right. First of all,
9	thank you all so much. You guys have worked so
LO	incredibly hard at this meeting. Out of the
L1	handful of MAFAC meetings I've been with you all,
L2	you really, at this meeting I've seen a lot of
L3	sweat and effort go into this.
L <b>4</b>	So, I appreciate the time today. I
L5	know it can be painful. But sometimes we do need
L6	to go through that Committee editing to get it
L <b>7</b>	out the door, and really close out the resilience
L8	tasks that you all have been working on for two
L9	years. So, kudos to you all, and congratulations
20	to you all, I wanted to say.
21	We don't have too many follow-up
22	items, action items from this meeting. There's

some little things that we need to have some get backs on, like some of the, sharing some papers that Roger had from his presentation. And some little things like that.

However, I'm going to get back from
Dan on the composition of the regional grant
dollars by region, a different way of looking at
it than he displayed earlier today. So, we have
all of those in the meeting minutes. And we'll
be following up on those.

I did want to go over with you all real quickly, because I know you're, we're getting towards the end of our time. The email I sent out last night about Subcommittees, and how we are missing several chairs. And there is about five different things I was looking for.

I have heard back on the membership folks that are interested. From Protective Resources, Columbus has volunteered to chair that subcommittee. So, I haven't heard any other volunteers for that. Yes, Bob.

MEMBER GILL: Are you talking

1	specifically Protective Resources, or any of the
2	others?
3	MS. LUKENS: I'm talking Protective
4	Resources.
5	MEMBER GILL: I'm sorry.
6	MS. LUKENS: I'm going to get to other
7	ones in a second. So, just wanted to cover that
8	and see if there was any other takers there. I'm
9	also looking for people to be on that
10	subcommittee. Because it is very sparse. Rai.
11	MEMBER ESPINOZA: Yes. I was also
12	interested in that. But we can fight it out.
13	MS. LUKENS: Okay. I'm going to put
14	Rai down there also for that. For the
15	Recreational Subcommittee, I know there was, we
16	had a 50/50 thing going on over
17	(Off microphone comment)
18	MS. LUKENS: So, it looks like that
19	Rip, we've all, we nominate Rip. And he's not
20	here. But I think he's okay with that.
21	Likewise, I think, Bob, if you would be on the
22	Subcommittee that we're looking for other

1 members. 2 We do have, with the departure of a great amount of members, we do have likely eight 3 new folks coming on board after this last 4 5 solicitation, which just closed this week. after you all cycle out in February we will be 6 7 having eight new members. And hopefully we'll 8 have some folks on there for that. 9 Our next victim, I mean member, 10 volunteer, Mike's not laughing yet, for the 11 Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force. 12 volunteered to stand up and be MAFAC's liaison to 13 that task force. So, I know you have to, do you

have to consult anyone else before that volunteering is full, you mentioned yesterday?

(Off microphone comment)

MS. LUKENS: Yes. Or we --

(Off microphone comment)

MS. LUKENS: Okay. Okay. All right.

Be there.

(Off microphone comments)

MS. LUKENS: And then that leaves, the

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Ecosystems Chair is going to be vacant, of which
2	I have not heard anyone for Sorry, Mike. Yes.
3	(Off microphone comment)
4	MS. LUKENS: Yes. Okay.
5	(Off microphone comment)
6	MS. LUKENS: Okay, great. Thank you,
7	Mike. I appreciate. And then, the one last
8	chair that we are going to be losing is the
9	Commerce Committee. So, I did not have anyone
10	step up for that. But we will be soliciting this
11	again. But I will follow-up with you all. But I
12	appreciate those who have volunteered and stepped
13	up for that.
14	MEMBER BELLE: Jennifer, can I just
15	intercede?
16	MS. LUKENS: Yes.
17	MEMBER BELLE: I'm not volunteering
18	for Chair of the Commerce Committee.
19	MS. LUKENS: Okay.
20	MEMBER BELLE: Because time is
21	precious in my world, as it is in everybody's.
22	But I would like to be on that Committee, as a

1	member of that Committee.
2	MS. LUKENS: You may certainly be on
3	that.
4	MEMBER BERKOWITZ: Can I make a
5	recommendation?
6	MS. LUKENS: Yes, sir.
7	MEMBER BERKOWITZ: I'd co-chair it
8	with Sebastian.
9	MEMBER BELLE: I'm going to get you,
10	Roger. I would be glad to do that.
11	PARTICIPANT: All right.
12	MS. LUKENS: Sweet. Yes, Mike.
13	MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I'm not sure if
14	I'm not sure if I'm on that committee already,
15	but
16	MS. LUKENS: I think you are on that
17	committee. So, we'll get this all straightened
18	out afterwards. But I really appreciate you
19	stepping up to the plate there.
20	And, yes, your question for me
21	earlier, Roger, on Laurel and what she was
22	talking about earlier. I do believe that issue

would fall underneath as a Commerce Subcommittee. So, you're good to go on that.

So, with that I just want to move on to, we, since, in the interest of time, which we are five minutes over our ending time, I had talked about dedicating some time at this meeting to talk about new topics.

I think at this point in time a lot of us are ready to walk out the door. So, I'd like to open up, and we'll follow-up with an email, is for you all to go back, reflect on this meeting.

And go back to your recommendations that you made in December of 2016, and what you heard from three different presentations reflecting on those comments that you, recommendations you made.

And think about how you all might want to suggest adding value to the administration and any other advisory capacity. I need to, future topics that you might want to take on more in depth for us to discuss.

I also need to take back what has

happened at this meeting, and share that with our broader leadership. And see how MAFAC may be of use to us as we move forward, and work with you all on that.

I'd like to, after we have the new members on board, and well in advance of our spring meeting, have a teleconference call where we talk through, and the new issues you might be taking on. And really tee that up cleanly for our late spring, early summer meeting that we'll be having. Yes, Mike.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: So, are you looking for hints of what directions we might take now? Or you just want to do it in a email later? Or --

MS. LUKENS: I think at this point, if you really are dying to say something right now, that's, I'm not going to stop you from that. But I think I want to make it open to all members, and not, we don't have a full membership here right now. I don't, I want to make sure everybody has a chance.

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Well, as an official victim I do think that, you know, we've had a change of administrations. And obviously there's some new guidelines out there that the administration, from the top down, would like to see accomplished. Seafood trade deficit, those kind of things.

Just leave it in a general sense that I think it would behoove us to be cognizant of what their goals are. And to at least spend some time seeing if we can engineer some different projects that might enhance achievement of those goals.

And I'll leave it at that. But it's,
I guess it would be, focus on the economics, and
areas where they're not performing as well as
they might. And how we would reduce that seafood
trade deficit. And I'll just leave it at that.

MS. LUKENS: Thanks for sharing that,
Mike. Paul, did you have, what to say --

DR. DOREMUS: Just as a point of -- I think it's a great suggestion. There is a

meeting tomorrow of all of NOAA's leadership with Rear Admiral Gallaudet about the details under that third priority, about increasing the sustainable economic contributions of fishery and ocean resources.

So, and that's going to lead to a guidance memorandum that will be put out. And we can provide that to the Committee, as a way of focusing the effort that I think you just advised, which is a good idea.

DR. DOREMUS: Yes. This aquaculture piece is undoubtedly a major component of that.

There may be other pieces. Some might be related to trade. We're doing a lot of work, as you know, with traceability, particularly seafood inspection monitoring program.

There may be other aspects of fisheries. I know that the Rear Admiral has been asking a lot of questions about how we can improve through technology and other kinds of ways our core stock assessment work.

So, there may be other dimensions that

emerge from this. But for sure aquaculture will 1 2 be a big piece of it. MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: And, Paul, I'll be 3 4 so bold as to say, it's not may, there are other 5 dimensions that we can look at. underutilized species for one. 6 7 DR. DOREMUS: Oh, absolutely. 8 I was just speaking to what I have heard yes. 9 from Rear Admiral Gallaudet. But there are other contributions certainly that we could focus on, 10

if the Committee would like to go in that

MS. LUKENS: Okay. Thank you. Chris Oliver was able to come back with us for a short time. He had a very small window, and now has to leave. But I just want to give him a chance to say something before he departs.

MR. OLIVER: It was good to meet those of you I haven't met. And I really appreciate the opportunity to get more up to speed on what MAFAC does, and the importance of what you do, and the different issues that you tackle.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

direction.

And as Mike said, and Paul elaborated on, I think there's an opportunity here to maybe further focus your efforts in the future on some of those key important things that Mike was speaking to.

So, again, I appreciate your, a big part of my learning experience in the new position. And I appreciate the, some time I was able to spend with you here this week. And look forward to the next meeting. Thanks.

MS. LUKENS: Thank you, Chris. Okay. Okay, thank you. One last thing, which is really important, which is our next meeting, and scheduling our next meeting.

Right now we are currently looking at the week of June 25th as our next in person meeting. And we have not identified a location yet.

We had talked a little bit about syncing it up on the West Coast with one of the, with the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force meetings. We were unable to find a week where we

1 could have a joint meeting, or a sequential 2 meeting. So, another idea that folks had put 3 4 forward, I heard earlier today, several people 5 expressed an interest in Puerto Rico. So, as 6 being our next thing. 7 So, I wanted to see if anybody else 8 had ideas or thoughts on the next location. And 9 just for your input before we depart today. Raimundo's smiling, but does not have his hand 10 11 I'll go with Mike, and then Bob. 12 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: I think an 13 opportunity to see some fishing production in 14 Alaska would be really interesting for a lot of 15 you folks. So, and I'd --16 MS. LUKENS: Thank you, Mike. 17 MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: -- spent 17 years 18 in production up there. So, I mean, it's on a 19 scale that I don't think -- Some of you were 20 impressed when you saw a little operation there 21 in Clackamas.

Yes.

MS. LUKENS:

MEMBER OKONIEWSKI: Imagine something 50 or 100 times that big. So, that's -- Well, and the other one's Westport, Washington. But they, I mean, I'm just saying that some exposure to industrial fishing, without the bad vibes that sometimes come off that, would be I think good for everybody.

MS. LUKENS: Thanks, Mike. Bob.

MEMBER RHEAULT: I was enticed to come on this body by someone who told me you had met in Hawaii. And as someone who's rotating off after six years of meeting in Silver Spring, if I find out you go to Hawaii, I'm going to kill somebody.

MS. LUKENS: Rai.

MEMBER ESPINOZA: In light of murder, I think Puerto Rico's a good option. I'm sure it will still make him angry, because it's tropical. But on the bright side, a June meeting in Puerto Rico, it seems that it would, it could entirely be done.

Right now I know of two possible

One of them is where the Coast Guard is 1 venues. 2 currently using for their base of operation, the folks that are down there. 3 4 So, it has, we've had several NGO 5 meetings there, sector meetings, vessel removal So, it's something that I think could 6 meetings. 7 be seen as a different type of fishery that 8 occurs in the U.S. 9 It's a commercial, entirely artisinal fishery. And besides the boost to the economy 10 11 that it could be. But I think it's also one of the places that MAFAC has never actually met. 12 13 And being the first member from Puerto 14 Rico, and the second one from the U.S. Caribbean, you know, not counting you, Columbus. 15 16 Laverne Ragster that was on a while ago. I think 17 it would be something that could be very 18 interesting on who it could be -- But, yes, 19 thanks. 20 Thank you, Rai. MS. LUKENS: Yes, 21 Erika. VICE CHAIR FELLER: 22 I've been one of

the agitators for Puerto Rico. And I'm always excited to go to Alaska. But one thing I'd love to see, if there's like a chance for a field trip when we go, is I've never actually seen finfish aquaculture at any kind of scale. So, if there's someplace we could go to take a look at that, that would be a really interesting criteria for selecting a site.

MS. LUKENS: Great.

MEMBER BELLE: Thank you so much.

You've played right into my hands. I want to

offer Portland, Maine as a venue for -- No. I'm

only kidding.

MS. LUKENS: And you guys are making this way too difficult for me. But this is great to have your input. So, we'll put that one down there too.

There's a lot of different things we go through in terms of venue, how it relates, syncs up with what the Committee is looking into, and the interest of the membership. So, and then also cost, time of year, and a lot of different

factors. So, I appreciate your input. And we will use that as we get the next meeting scheduled.

So, one last thing I wanted to add.

And I feel horrible, because most of these people that I'm about to say here aren't here. I was unable to miss, I was unable to make the happy hour we had earlier this week for our departing members.

And I know Paul said a few things about them. But I really wanted to thank Ted, Peter, Heather, Dick, Pam, and Liz, who just walked out the door, and Julie, of course, and Bob. And I hope I hit everybody on that list.

But I, as they were running down the elevator there, I wanted to thank them. This Committee has evolved over the two and a half, three years that I've been in this position.

And I just have seen fantastic contributions from each and every one of you.

And not just individually representing your stakeholder group and your interest, but also

working collaboratively as a group together, to get to those recommendations.

I was a little skeptical taking up this role, and having to deal with that in the beginning. But really, I've been so pleased and thankful for you all volunteering your time, and putting your effort into this.

So, it really is of value to fisheries and NOAA, and quite frankly the Secretary of Commerce. And the advice and insight that you provide, that we can't get living in our little bubbles sometimes, of the Beltway here.

So, I really do appreciate that, and wanted to say thank you for your time and your efforts. So, with that, I think we covered all of the last minute details I had. Heidi, did I forget anything? I'm sure I did.

MS. LOVETT: Just, since there's a couple of new people here, we have a voluntary form that I will send to you all. But it helps you develop your reimbursement paperwork that we need to have. And we'd like to get that within

five days of your completing your travel.

So, I'll send that out to everybody.

And it's just a guide to help you remember all
your expenses. And in this case there shouldn't
be hotel expenses. It will be your local travel,
parking. And we'll provide the per diem. So,
that was all I wanted to share.

MS. LUKENS: Terri said I've missed one thing. And it's a very important thing.

CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Yes. Before I handed it over, I believe that with the tasks of the Ad Hoc Working Group for Resilience having been completed this day in the year 2017, that we would be in a position to disband, with my great appreciation and relief.

The Ad Hoc Working Group, I would need to entertain a motion, second, and a vote. But before I do it, I just want to thank again Bob,
Julie, Erika, Harlan, all the people on the
Committee that worked so hard, Mike, you know, coming in.

Even the new folks that helped us

1	craft our final document were exceedingly
2	helpful. We worked very well together. And we
3	had, it was a big, as I said, a big elephant.
4	And we ate it one bite at a time. So, I'm ready
5	to entertain a motion, should someone please
6	offer a motion.
7	MEMBER BROWN: So moved.
8	MEMBER RHEAULT: Second.
9	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Okay. Then I'm going
10	to say, this is the motion to disband the Ad Hoc
11	Working Group that was formulated in 2015, for
12	the express purpose of completing the tasks that
13	we have finalized. All those in favor?
14	(Chorus of aye)
15	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Anyone opposed? Any
16	abstention? Thank you very much. The Committee,
17	the Ad Hoc Working Group is dissolved.
18	MS. LUKENS: Yes, Julie.
19	MEMBER BONNEY: So, I'm wondering
20	about the, what is it, the Climate Subcommittee
21	under us. Does that still have a role? Or are
22	***

MS. LUKENS: Yes. That is still up and running. And that was created separately from the Resiliency Group. So, yes, that still is ongoing. Paul, did you want to say anything before we adjourn?

DR. DOREMUS: I think everybody's ready to go. I can only reiterate Chris' thanks. This has just been a fabulous committee, and very promising work coming forward from the work that you completed this week. And thank you very much.

MEMBER BROWN: I just want to say, on behalf of others, you know, Kudos to Neery who does such a wonderful job with our vouchers and handling our travel.

MS. LUKENS: Thank you for acknowledging that, Columbus. And then, I would be totally remiss without saying thank you to Heidi for everything, and Adele for helping support this meeting. So, this is why we're all here. So, they get us here. So, thanks to you very much. All right. It's a wrap.

	$oldsymbol{I}$
1	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Do I have a second to
2	adjourn this meeting? All in favor?
3	(Chorus of aye)
4	CHAIR BEIDEMAN: Walk out the door.
5	Thank you.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7	went off the record at 2:50 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

			310
	228:11	203:22 216:3	advisory 1:4,10 126:7
<b>a.m</b> 1:12 5:2 107:9	acrimony 157:20	address 6:11 11:22	163:18 294:19
	acronyms 78:19	12:16 17:5,20 27:1	<b>affairs</b> 3:9,11,12,17
166:7,8	act 12:13,15 15:7,17	30:5 37:13,16,21	14:6
<b>AA</b> 97:17	17:4 24:4 69:4 77:6	38:18 47:3 53:11	affect 249:1
abbreviated 109:19	77:10 83:7,11 85:22	71:11 83:12 89:15	affective 261:6
ability 44:3 82:7 138:14	114:17 115:3 117:11	93:16 97:5,7 115:2	after-thought 104:14
145:12 149:21 151:12	118:1,3 122:16	116:3 117:18 118:19	age 58:10 237:9
230:21	133:10 140:16 146:6	118:22 131:17 145:1	agencies 74:22 96:21
able 22:1 36:13 53:7	Acting 3:18	184:14 206:4 211:10	113:2,5 117:12
62:2 65:3 107:17	action 4:16 126:8,13	216:3 221:20 223:18	137:21
110:1,4 118:14	147:4 221:17 245:21	228:21 236:12 237:15	agency 11:13 71:12
147:18 148:6,6	288:22	243:13 251:14	89:1 93:6 97:22
172:16 189:6 233:15	actions 113:7 217:5,7	addressed 17:6 38:19	112:12 118:20 120:12
298:14 299:9	219:3 221:7 237:20	49:13 53:9 83:13,15	153:19 162:15
above-entitled 166:6	241:4	83:21 91:21 128:8	agitators 303:1
198:13 309:6	active 113:1,12,15	164:9 186:22 216:11	ago 11:2 23:6 64:20
absolutely 28:2 30:1,20	116:4 123:7,21 128:2	239:20	65:19 78:13 88:7
42:20 51:11 55:17	actively 129:21	addresses 47:9 48:6	177:2,11,13,18
56:1 63:10,18 73:5	activities 120:18,19	216:2	178:18 179:18 302:16
74:7,15 81:22 86:15	activities 120.10,15	addressing 12:12,14	agree 88:11 155:15,18
94:5 96:13 98:9	acts 50:6	39:10 85:20 134:16	180:15 181:9 198:9
100:14 105:16 107:15	actual 25:18 31:22	141:3	210:6 227:7 228:3
151:4 156:2 270:14	89:19 93:18 94:13	adds 15:2	251:19 261:8,16
286:14 298:7	120:20 122:12 240:9	Adele 308:19	262:1 266:18 274:7
abstaining 195:9	245:8 254:15	adequately 17:6 83:13	agreements 7:2,6 69:4
269:14	Ad 306:11,16 307:10,17	265:19	70:3
abstention 307:16	adaptability 244:7	adjourn 4:20 165:16	agrees 246:3
abundance 137:17	adapted 230:5 231:3,5	308:5 309:2	Agriculture 16:5
abundances 129:10	231:5 236:10,16	adjusted 234:8 236:18	ahead 24:15 28:17
<b>abuse</b> 103:19 107:3	238:14 241:16		
academic 70:20 87:19	adaptive 229:21 237:17	adjusting 236:21 adjustments 242:13	146:14 162:3 172:20 180:6 181:16 199:20
89:4 100:19	<u> </u>	administration 1:3 26:4	199:22 202:21 203:22
academics 42:2	238:3,10,13 240:11 240:18 241:7,12,15	80:21 112:17 162:15	220:12 246:6 276:13
Academy 164:9	242:19 243:13 244:12		285:21
accept 118:3 175:14		168:5 294:18 296:5	
269:2,7 287:6	244:14,16,17 245:1,7	administrations 296:3 administrative 15:5	Ahrens 160:10 aim 246:16 247:10
acceptable 193:17	245:8,17,19 247:22		
accepted 155:14	247:22 253:16	142:1	<b>Alabama</b> 136:16,17
access 142:2	add 28:19 74:18 82:2	administrator 2:13,14	alacrity 287:7
accomplish 70:8	118:22 128:3,5,19	87:12 200:12	alarm 179:10
151:11	146:2 170:8 172:19	Admiral 65:19 297:2,18	alarming 67:3
accomplished 296:6	183:12 205:15 228:6	298:9	Alaska 1:18 9:7 18:8
account 76:12 78:7	236:19 239:9 243:20	Admiral's 270:13	19:16 23:21 31:3
79:14 81:3 94:20 98:1	255:9 270:6 278:20	admit 104:12	54:11 87:2,4,6,15
159:18	279:9 304:4	adopt 126:16	89:18 90:13 91:2 95:6
accounting 141:20	added 169:20 175:20	advance 67:19 70:17	95:7 182:7,7 187:3
accurate 164:11 271:2	203:1 228:9,20	241:4 274:18 295:6	230:14 286:12 300:14
<b>achieve</b> 128:10	261:15 270:10 278:12	advances 65:21 229:17	303:2
achievement 296:12	adding 222:4 237:9	229:22 240:2,6,7,21	algal 121:15 132:12
acid 183:5 235:20	242:7 249:17 294:18	241:8 244:13 248:1	240:8
acidification 186:15	addition 79:17 171:9	advancing 283:12	align 70:9
187:21 193:8 250:3	176:1,12 202:19	advantage 116:5	aligned 10:12
250:11 257:13 258:18	209:15 229:1 277:3	137:21 243:6	aligns 79:6
258:21 259:2 261:18	286:14,15	advice 14:17 56:4 179:6	alive 28:15 100:22
acknowledged 135:8	additional 17:1 63:9,9	305:10	all-time 182:2
135:12 140:13	170:13 175:19 199:18	advise 126:7	allocate 102:6
acknowledging 308:17	241:18	advised 297:10	allocated 30:19
acknowledgment	additions 168:17	Advisor 2:19	allotment 20:3,12 94:13
-	l	I	

allotments 96:5 allow 12:11 204:13 allowed 17:5 40:4 65:8 allows 11:13 124:22 249:14 alternative 222:6 amazing 34:15,15 36:14 37:7 101:10 amenable 198:2 amended 77:11 amendment 286:1 amendments 169:10 **America** 100:11 American 9:11 113:11 123:6 133:13 209:6 209:11 210:22 **Americans** 16:12 210:7 214:3 215:14 228:5 amount 10:14 14:4,17 21:19 49:11 76:4 82:2 86:6 96:16 100:4 291:3 analyses 266:8 analysis 36:11 43:1 44:8,18,20 45:14 105:8 190:1 208:18 209:5 Analyst 2:16 analyzing 115:8 anecdotal 182:13 angler 124:3,8 132:19 133:19 135:6,13 136:7,16 137:4,20 138:4,6,9,18 140:14 159:7 angler's 142:10,11 anglers 128:15 134:7 135:3,20,21 137:22 139:21 141:6 161:1 anglers' 138:15 angry 58:15 301:18 angst 276:8 **announce** 166:12 Announcement 11:13 **annual** 79:8 **annually** 144:15 anomalies 25:2 answer 27:18 40:16 43:6 56:6,10 71:10 72:12 75:5,18 90:21 104:22 160:15 217:18 220:13 281:16 answers 43:10 108:19 anticipate 8:6 84:2 anybody 51:9 55:18 77:10 96:21 130:16 172:12 186:5 187:18 199:18 205:13 222:10

249:16 300:7 anybody's 241:18 **anymore** 267:15 anyway 5:5 58:19 67:3 155:19 169:13 179:4 189:6 195:3 203:14 220:21 **APAIS** 138:16 139:10 apologize 104:22 106:10 190:12 263:1 276:9 **app** 115:20 124:2,3,8 124:11,13 126:19 132:19 136:16,19 138:4,9,14 139:3,19 139:22 140:4,9 141:9 141:14,17 145:10 148:13 apparent 102:17 appendices 92:4 **Appendix** 167:12 **applaud** 150:4 apples 140:10,10 applicable 136:11 **applicants** 41:9 54:3 application 11:6 40:7 40:17 41:1,4,9 42:5 42:20 43:8 60:3 73:8 73:11 124:9 applications 40:22 42:9 44:12,15 45:1,3,19 46:9,10,14 47:15,17 51:21 83:21 90:12,14 90:18 91:5,11 96:1 105:19 209:2 **applied** 35:15 38:13 52:20 56:16 142:9 252:15 **applies** 180:4 apply 22:9 35:13 36:16 40:3,4 48:10,10 56:6 61:5 65:3 applying 35:1 91:8 **appreciate** 33:5 48:13 63:6 85:5 102:3 107:17 195:17 275:21 288:14 292:7,12 293:18 298:19 299:6

299:8 304:1 305:13

appreciated 208:21

appreciation 306:15

appreciative 167:19

222:9 234:11

approach 115:4 157:9 158:3 160:12 181:12

approaches 4:11 194:1

**appropriate** 78:9 107:7

133:16 134:5,19

136:2 141:4 142:6 210:10,21 211:3 appropriated 16:3 18:5 76:1,3 80:8 84:10 93:14 appropriateness 136:22 appropriation 13:9 20:4 76:2 77:20 78:4 79:2 84:10 appropriators 76:19 **approve** 169:11 173:9 194:13 approved 168:7 195:11 approves 185:6 approving 167:8,9 approximately 46:10 apps 123:19,20 133:20 137:22 138:6 140:22 151:8 aquaculture 1:17 2:17 14:5 17:2 21:3,8 22:19 45:10 70:19 71:17 72:8 88:19 104:16 106:3 197:1 269:17,21 270:2 271:8.14.20 272:19 273:14,18 274:19 275:3,7,12 278:19 279:19,22 280:4,10 283:9 285:9,16 297:11 298:1 303:5 architect 68:2 69:14 area 51:9 52:21 91:15 111:17 123:20 138:2 189:12 219:12 221:14 255:1 258:13 280:3 areas 8:11,18 13:1 14:9 21:10 23:4 47:12 90:1 121:9 126:8,11 182:15 183:17 191:5 191:14,15 211:19 212:22 213:1 217:9 219:18 220:1 257:10 257:17 281:4 296:16 **argued** 224:16 Arlington 163:15 **Array** 1:14 art 71:3 146:1 153:7 articulated 109:3 275:22 artisinal 302:9 **Ash** 113:10 **aside** 23:20 asked 11:14 56:7 86:5 113:19 120:8,9 172:18 177:3,11 231:21

asking 32:12 91:2 166:20 175:17 235:15 253:8 286:11 297:19 aspect 153:3 aspects 36:5 297:17 assess 136:2 assessment 4:10 139:4 139:9 140:5 151:19 189:11,12,20 190:1,7 197:2 199:1 208:17 208:22 209:4 233:3 233:19 241:22 246:10 246:16 247:4,11 253:13 254:21 256:11 257:2 258:11 260:21 262:3 270:15 297:21 assessments 15:8 18:21 23:11 79:9 94:5 121:13 123:4 129:12 137:13,18 138:13 139:8,15 218:4,13 234:5 256:6 258:17 259:1 assigned 29:19 assignment 29:13 assignments 196:8 197:4 assist 74:9 assistance 7:1 9:3 12:4 53:5 67:11,16 68:4 69:5,9 74:20 assistant 2:13,14,15 200:11 assisting 68:12 70:3 associated 12:6 140:3 **Association** 1:17,20 2:4,8 133:13 **assume** 29:20 33:12 162:3 **assuming** 29:11 185:6 239:8 assumption 140:3 261:1 assumptions 139:14,17 258:17 259:2,8 260:9 261:12 264:2 assurance 142:12 ate 307:4 **Atlantic** 1:19 9:13 19:14 125:18 145:14 175:1 205:19 atmospheric 1:3 177:22 193:3 228:13 attached 167:12 attempt 207:11 attempting 125:19 242:18 attend 164:3

beat 172:11 attention 21:10 34:20 197:17,22 198:11 227:17 228:2.4 104:15 210:13,15 224:20 225:10 231:8 **beats** 152:1 244:16 250:8 254:10 238:3 284:8 246:8 247:2 255:9,12 **BECKY** 3:11 261:1 264:18 265:3 audible 170:16 174:1 becoming 21:4 102:17 255:13 256:4 259:14 267:3 268:13 285:12 193:19 194:19 195:7 259:15 263:19 264:1 122:18 beyond 262:22 195:10 222:12 223:1 264:13 266:5,9 **beginning** 7:22 179:9 bias 49:6 53:3 55:1 227:20 228:17 229:14 268:22 269:21 270:12 239:7 305:5 135:9,18 140:14 audio 191:21 208:19 273:1,9 278:7,11 behalf 195:13 308:13 141:20 145:1 148:15 279:17 289:5,17 **behoove** 296:9 biases 159:18 **August** 168:8 Australia 143:10 294:11,12,22 298:14 belaboring 188:8 **big** 15:11 23:5 24:1,5 Australia's 131:22 **backed** 230:22 **believe** 99:19 125:8 27:9 29:1 46:22 48:7 **authorities** 70:6 117:10 background 51:2 169:8,19 176:21 55:12 56:3 64:7 65:1 authority 12:6 117:11 backs 289:2 182:4 199:12,15 65:1 100:9,13 142:19 117:13 **backup** 17:12 211:13 234:11 238:22 145:13 148:18 152:3 242:18 293:22 306:11 authorized 118:5 **bad** 181:12 283:1 284:2 166:19 168:2 174:8 believer 184:1 196:7 230:15 282:15 authors 254:19 258:9 301:5 automatically 59:4 **bait** 22:18 believes 279:7,8 281:17 298:2 299:6 301:2 available 95:15 107:19 **balance** 34:7 73:4 281:19 283:8 307:3.3 248:21 249:4 127:6 131:1,12 Belle 1:16 29:4,4,10 bigeye 28:5 138:20 141:14 142:3 balanced 34:5 31:10,18 70:11,18 **bigger** 6:6 202:13 164:15 **balances** 152:20 71:15 73:1 270:21 biggest 30:20 47:11 **ballpark** 16:20 264:19 bill 68:3 Avenue 1:11 273:22 275:14,19 average 151:18 bang 27:3 29:20 65:7 279:17 286:13 292:14 billion 31:2 80:16 92:22 avidity 140:14 149:6 **Bank** 1:19 292:17,20 293:9 187:7 270:22 271:1,2 150:13 **bar** 270:9 303:10 billions 144:14 avoid 185:4 bare 39:9.15 **Beltway** 305:12 bio-diversity 144:11 benchmarks 53:7 avoided 177:21 180:20 **barely** 112:4 **biological** 137:10,16 185:12 193:2 228:12 **barging** 276:15 bend 245:6 143:4 AWA-WILLIAMS 3:1 **base** 29:8 41:4 92:19 beneficial 99:21 101:13 biologists 139:4 award 12:5 15:11 93:10,14 95:8 275:10 101:16 **biomass** 182:3 113:11 302:2 beneficiary 120:21 bird 119:19 awarded 33:15 **based** 20:7 27:17 34:12 benefit 69:16,18 94:4 bit 16:9 17:2 26:10 awarding 36:21 34:18 35:6 36:20 41:5 137:14 144:6 170:10 30:14 33:6 35:11 awards 10:10,11,11,16 44:1 72:14 94:22 95:2 183:16 36:11 38:6 47:10 48:7 10:17 15:11 37:4 97:20 108:10 133:4.6 benefits 157:2 158:4 70:12 84:14 105:21 aware 109:3 150:20 133:15 134:5 141:2 **BERKOWITZ** 1:17 26:5 109:18 110:3 133:21 151:7 172:4 251:5 147:13,16 158:18 26:9 27:20 244:6 138:3 141:11,19 267:13 277:15 168:17 169:17 170:4 249:10 293:4,7 167:22 180:3 184:20 awareness 47:14 171:14 194:10 208:11 best 21:22 23:9 28:13 203:15 221:16 232:7 171:18 211:7 239:8 256:13 37:12 40:18 41:3 43:1 235:6 237:17 258:6 **awful** 148:9 262:4,8 274:16 47:3 50:15 51:20,21 271:7 272:7,21 282:18 281:21 299:19 aye 173:20 195:4 56:10 73:10 85:19 269:11,12 287:15,16 **basic** 136:5 99:17 102:12 127:5 **bite** 307:4 307:14 309:3 basically 71:22 80:22 140:11 144:18 145:19 black 181:14 ayes 173:21 195:5 92:19 94:8 122:9 160:17 192:1 200:16 blah 82:10,11,11 222:9 224:4 124:22 127:14 130:4 257:13,14 В 133:8,15 134:18 better 11:9 22:4 23:13 **blitz** 91:2 **B2** 123:8 140:19 159:10 160:4 23:13 26:19,20 27:2 blob 230:5 231:4 160:11 164:8 200:9 37:22 41:14 42:20 236:10.17 238:14 **baby** 256:1,4 48:8 62:18 67:22 69:7 blooms 121:15 132:12 back 5:4 16:13 22:3,21 269:19,22 24:18,22 27:21 28:9 Basin 291:11 299:21 72:9,18 75:7 91:1 240:8 28:21 44:8 52:14 basis 31:22 98:22 103:11 108:15 110:9 **Blow** 89:6 101:20 146:9 147:8,13 148:7 blue 8:18 28:12 283:12 56:18 64:7 73:8 75:5 bass 181:14 149:8 164:19 178:20 blurred 177:1 89:18 90:1 92:9 94:19 **battle** 186:8 board 87:8 93:11 107:5 108:13 129:16 191:14 200:21 210:6 132:6 141:5 143:20 **battles** 150:2 215:13 218:17 223:3 157:19 172:10 191:4 152:7 161:14 169:21 223:9,13 224:12,15 217:21 276:18 291:4 **Bay** 131:18 179:16 196:19 197:16 Bearing 182:4 226:6,15,20 227:9,16 295:6

I		1	1	i
	<b>Board's</b> 66:12	branch 63:22	210:8 214:21 215:12	<b>caps</b> 273:19
	<b>boat</b> 62:14	<b>BRANE</b> 162:7,9	217:1 222:14 223:7	capture 207:11 242:5
	boats 23:3 55:15	bread 11:9 38:1 41:15	223:17 225:3 250:18	283:17,17 284:9,11
	<b>Bob</b> 24:16 28:17 150:16	42:21	251:14,19 252:13,17	284:17,19,22 285:2,9
	168:14 175:12 181:15	break 52:3 86:12,14	252:17 255:5,7,10	286:7
	183:22 190:19 193:20	95:16 109:6 161:17	256:4 258:14 259:20	captured 176:10 249:5
	199:22 202:21 203:22	166:4 196:13,14	262:11,14 263:9	carbon 177:7,22 178:11
	217:11 218:15 221:3	197:20	268:1,20	179:14 184:8 193:3
	221:19 222:18 223:5	breakdown 95:22	bullets 14:3 172:1	194:4 228:13
	227:5 239:3 251:16	breaking 196:18	176:3 186:20	care 166:21
	255:21 261:7 262:2,8	breakout 24:20	bump 162:4	careful 53:2
	267:16 268:17,17,17	breaks 14:22	bunch 51:2 115:7	carefully 157:10
	269:20 270:5 271:4	breeze 124:16	160:22	cares 166:22
	278:17 289:21 290:21	BREP 21:14,17	burden 99:8	Caribbean 32:17 33:7
	300:11 301:8 304:14	bridge 174:7	buried 250:5	33:13,18 34:4,11,13
	306:18	brief 52:3 89:16 162:22	BURMAN 172:16 177:1	34:18 36:9 46:1 47:13
	<b>Bob's</b> 187:20 192:12	166:4 174:12	178:17 231:19 232:15	49:11 61:21 207:9
	222:6 224:21 267:12	briefing 274:16	232:17 234:21	302:14
	281:16	bright 301:19	burnout 73:22	Carl 87:12
	<b>Bobs</b> 173:12	brilliant 11:4	business 99:3 106:15	carries 269:14
	<b>bodies</b> 53:17 55:21	bring 28:8,21 65:1	154:8	case 31:2 43:21 47:2
	<b>body</b> 185:5 186:10	102:11 116:21 165:12	businesses 19:7	72:19 97:8 114:4
	275:6 282:20 301:10	174:17 197:22 260:19	buy 16:12,17 221:14	125:4,18 229:16
	<b>bogged</b> 114:10,14	bringing 60:12 156:16	bycatch 21:14 23:17	232:12,13 233:10
	<b>boil</b> 118:18	238:3	26:11 27:22 28:6,21	234:1 235:15,17
	<b>boils</b> 22:15	brings 35:19 245:21	28:22 30:11 31:6	238:1 240:2,18 241:6
	<b>bold</b> 274:18 278:21	broad 11:13 64:15	38:12 88:1	241:21 253:7 306:4
	279:10 298:4	112:1 115:4,10	bye 185:21,22 186:1,2	cases 10:22 93:17
	<b>boldly</b> 275:7 284:20	117:11	byproduct 87:18	118:14 124:10 130:12
	<b>bombarded</b> 51:18	broadcast 54:14	byproduct or . 10	130:21,22 131:8
			С	1
	<b>BOND</b> 3:2	broaden 70:11		182:11 234:3 237:19
	<b>BOND</b> 3:2 <b>BONNEY</b> 1:18 92:3,8	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2	calculations 29:21	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7
	<b>BOND</b> 3:2 <b>BONNEY</b> 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7	broader 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15
	<b>BOND</b> 3:2 <b>BONNEY</b> 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18
	<b>BOND</b> 3:2 <b>BONNEY</b> 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19 189:8 196:6 201:13	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19 189:8 196:6 201:13 206:19 207:8 209:19	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19 189:8 196:6 201:13 206:19 207:8 209:19 210:13,15 217:6	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19 189:8 196:6 201:13 206:19 207:8 209:19	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15 134:22,22 137:16 145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13 51:10 81:11 83:9 94:12 128:14 161:19 189:8 196:6 201:13 206:19 207:8 209:19 210:13,15 217:6 228:6 233:6,6 295:7	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capital 273:21	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1 bottom 99:1,2 154:22	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4 175:20 180:22 184:18	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capital 273:21 capitalize 273:13	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10 centers 11:5 22:1 25:3
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1 bottom 99:1,2 154:22 280:18	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4 175:20 180:22 184:18 185:1 192:15 201:19	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capital 273:21 capitalize 273:13 capitalized 185:14	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10 centers 11:5 22:1 25:3 26:1 85:16 121:1
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1 bottom 99:1,2 154:22 280:18 box 81:1	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4 175:20 180:22 184:18 185:1 192:15 201:19 202:15 203:21 207:13	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capitalize 273:13 capitalized 185:14     216:18	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10 centers 11:5 22:1 25:3 26:1 85:16 121:1 central 127:16
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1 bottom 99:1,2 154:22 280:18	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4 175:20 180:22 184:18 185:1 192:15 201:19	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capital 273:21 capitalize 273:13 capitalized 185:14	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10 centers 11:5 22:1 25:3 26:1 85:16 121:1
	BOND 3:2 BONNEY 1:18 92:3,8 92:13,16 93:4,20 94:7 95:6,20 96:14 166:20 167:4 171:4 173:4,8 175:22 178:5 194:6 194:10 196:5,16 197:18 204:16 235:14 236:20 237:3,5 238:16,19,22 239:17 239:21 240:4,13,17 240:22 242:4 243:20 269:5,18 273:10 276:13 279:6 280:16 281:14 284:10 285:4 285:21 286:2,10,20 287:8,11,14,17 307:19 Bonnie 4:14 book 195:3 boost 302:10 borders 20:19 borne 193:6 bother 35:1 bottom 99:1,2 154:22 280:18 box 81:1	broaden 70:11 broader 112:9 295:2 broadly 155:21 283:21 broken 262:10 brought 34:20 43:13 64:18 168:3 192:20 BROWN 1:21 74:18 173:11 181:9 183:18 194:15 255:14 259:13 260:1,4 264:13 280:1 287:10,13 307:7 308:12 bubbles 305:12 buck 27:3 29:20 65:8 budget 3:7,15 5:17 18:4 78:12 79:21 80:12,15 80:18 94:9,13 budgetary 74:21 budgets 260:5 buffers 242:7 243:8 build 63:16 144:1 284:5 builds 171:18 built 69:21,22 197:20 bullet 119:3 170:4 175:20 180:22 184:18 185:1 192:15 201:19 202:15 203:21 207:13	calculations 29:21 California 127:13,15     134:22,22 137:16     145:18 156:17 California's 127:16 call 16:22 18:19 19:13     51:10 81:11 83:9     94:12 128:14 161:19     189:8 196:6 201:13     206:19 207:8 209:19     210:13,15 217:6     228:6 233:6,6 295:7 called 10:10 11:12     73:21 130:2 153:22     210:7 219:1 241:14     247:21 caller 207:1 calling 74:1 211:11 calls 6:1 camera 153:8 capacity 89:5 146:19     294:19 capitalize 273:13 capitalized 185:14     216:18	182:11 234:3 237:19 251:6 261:7 catalog 112:16 113:15 catastrophic 182:18 catch 22:14,21 23:18 110:6 133:2,4,5 134:5 137:8 143:6 145:9 151:21 164:14 282:18 catcher 143:6 catches 149:3 catching 22:14,16 26:19 129:9 181:14 categorical 130:5 categorize 159:16 caught 21:5 23:10 48:20 140:2 causing 218:10 caveat 50:6 cease 206:4 ceasing 206:9 celebrating 242:8 census 134:20 center 24:2 25:9,15 57:2,6 60:14 113:10 centers 11:5 22:1 25:3 26:1 85:16 121:1 central 127:16

	1	1	,
CEO 1:14,17	changing 102:15 132:9	City 163:14	Co-owner 2:3
certain 10:13 28:5 36:7	242:9 251:9	Clackamas 300:21	coast 2:7 9:7 18:2,15
46:14 48:19 76:4 82:2	chapter 206:18	clarification 228:21	53:21,22,22 54:12
90:1,4,5 94:11,12,17	characteristics 133:17	265:15	58:16,22 121:13
100:4 137:6 139:8	243:22 244:2	clarify 179:12 220:20	124:8 127:17,21
140:7 155:12 158:20	characterize 159:12,16	224:5 250:9	157:16 181:22 187:6
171:10 182:11 188:5	charge 179:17,21 275:8	clarity 167:3	237:22 242:17 299:20
235:19 263:14 266:6	<b>Charles</b> 216:9	classes 111:18	302:1
279:12	charter 148:1	classified 125:9	coastal 1:15,20 18:2
certainly 28:2 31:1 32:5	chatted 270:8	clause 254:14	19:14 280:10
32:6 47:2 61:11 73:13	cheaper 101:20 143:21	clean 258:5	coastline 143:10
74:4 91:13,15,17 96:6	cheating 74:7	cleanly 295:9	cod 182:8 230:10 236:2
97:7,22 102:4,6	check 136:15 197:17	clear 57:20 144:19,22	236:2
105:13 176:14 191:2	216:20	145:4 180:11 201:18	Cody 3:3 4:5 110:15,15
213:16 214:1 243:15	checked 254:2	202:16 220:16 223:16	124:5 127:8 128:5
279:4 293:2 298:10	checks 152:20	248:4 250:11 254:17	132:16 146:3 158:11
cetera 284:6	chemistry 250:4	254:17 264:3 272:11	158:14 160:6 164:8
<b>chain</b> 201:2	<b>Chief</b> 2:18	clear-cut 119:10	cognizant 296:9
chaired 135:6	China 66:2,15,20	Cleveland 287:13	coins 165:21
Chairman 167:1	<b>choice</b> 77:10 96:6	Cliff 3:6 55:20 107:18	collaboration 32:22
chairmanship 165:14	230:11	climate 4:10 101:3	55:11 105:2 115:5
<b>chairs</b> 197:4 289:15	<b>choked</b> 57:16	172:19 177:4 184:7	164:1
<b>challenge</b> 73:15 74:3,6	<b>Chorus</b> 173:21 195:5	184:22 185:14 186:13	collaborative 25:16
124:13 148:4 151:22	269:12 287:16 307:14	189:12 190:7 193:7	99:20 101:14 116:19
<b>challenges</b> 70:19 111:8	309:3	197:2 198:22 203:17	127:13 135:1 145:18
111:13 144:16 146:13	Chris 2:13 51:12 275:16	205:20 208:1,3,6,14	156:17
163:21	298:13 299:11	211:16,22 214:2,9	collaboratively 14:18
<b>chance</b> 63:11 159:4	Chris' 308:7	217:10,13,15,22	69:10 305:1
168:16 199:13 295:22	chunk 30:12	218:1,2,3,18 220:3,17	colleague 210:20
298:16 303:3	circle 43:3	220:18 221:10,10	colleagues 276:9
change 15:18 27:14 75:1 93:10 101:4	circulated 174:20	222:17 223:4,13	collect 94:3 128:3
166:10 169:2 181:12	199:17 <b>Cls</b> 7:14	224:11,13 225:7	<b>collected</b> 16:3 76:8 143:9
184:7,22 185:14	Cisco 2:17 56:18 97:18	226:7,16 227:12,18 229:17 231:22 232:2	collecting 18:20 115:8
186:13 193:7 203:17	157:17	233:11 235:1 236:6	116:11 122:2 133:21
205:20 208:1,3,14	cite 12:11 48:17,18	237:19 239:6,12,15	133:22
211:16,22 214:2,9	cited 119:20	240:3 241:9,9 244:3	collection 13:22 17:2
215:5 218:3 222:17	cites 49:1	246:10,11 247:4,5	19:22 45:11 94:4
222:19 223:4,14	citizen 3:18 4:3,4 39:12	248:2,6,6,18,22 249:3	101:17 106:4 134:12
224:11,13 225:7	100:2 109:7 110:18	250:2,10 251:1	136:7 142:18 147:9
226:7,16 227:12,18	111:16,20 112:9	253:12 254:20 257:2	171:10 172:4
233:11 236:6 237:19	113:22 114:8,13,17	258:10 307:20	collection's 42:22
244:1,3 246:11 247:5	114:21 115:3,13,16	climate-induced	collective 27:10
248:18,22 250:2,10	116:8 117:2,11,12,15	218:12	<b>color</b> 93:10
251:1 253:1,12	118:1,8,13 119:6,7,13	<b>close</b> 4:16 46:17 76:8	colored 81:18
254:20 257:2 258:10	119:21 120:1,3,4,6,10	121:17 182:3 249:5	colors 81:4
273:4 296:3	122:14 124:19 125:20	288:17	Columbia 287:12
changed 50:4 237:5	127:1,11 129:17,19	closed 23:4 291:5	291:11 299:21
changes 81:4 95:1	132:17 134:9 143:8	closely 7:7,22 8:22	Columbus 1:21 181:8
119:18 138:1 157:16	143:12 144:6,11	14:13 18:15 20:15,15	181:18 245:2 246:3,3
164:17 170:3 172:13	145:4 146:5,18	closer 110:3 265:2	255:12 259:10,12
177:21 180:19 182:5 185:11 193:2 199:16	147:16 148:8 151:9	267:20 closures 138:2	264:12 267:20 287:12
199:19 202:2,17	151:14 152:14 158:3 168:18 170:4,15	clue 265:3	289:19 302:15 308:17 <b>Columbus'</b> 191:4,9
203:14 206:21 209:14	171:13,15 172:2,3,6	CNMI 9:12	combine 251:18
218:12 222:5 228:12	citizens 111:2	co-chair 293:7	come 6:2,3 11:15 13:22
241:17 246:18 247:13	citizenscience.gov	<b>co-created</b> 116:12	15:12 20:19 27:22
248:7 251:3 263:13	113:16	Co-leader 288:6	39:8 40:22 41:17
п			

II			
45:19 47:15 54:15	247:17 250:18 252:5	143:11	concerning 49:6,12
64:10 69:8 76:5 82:9	269:9 270:8 274:22	comparison 100:12	concerns 6:12 12:1
84:22 97:20 107:18	286:20 287:2 291:21	140:11,12	21:5 34:19 43:12
109:13 113:22 130:11	294:15	comparisons 137:2	46:20 108:2 128:19
142:20 150:9 174:9	commerce 1:1 4:13	160:14,17,19	142:19 221:20 270:19
180:1 186:17 196:1	16:7 75:11 76:7 77:18	compensated 118:2	concludes 164:20
198:11 217:21 243:11	167:4 269:16 277:15	119:7	conclusion 196:1 261:1
249:5 273:1 298:14	292:9,18 294:1	compete 285:14	concur 278:16
301:6,9	305:10	competing 99:6 155:2	concurs 275:17
comes 13:21 20:5	commercial 62:8 71:19	284:17	condition 220:10
25:17 40:15 41:1 50:9	72:2,6 73:2,4,12,12		235:21
	104:16 105:6 181:4	competition 21:21 22:12 54:18 90:11	conditions 137:6 140:7
61:1 64:7,9 68:3 88:4	302:9		140:9
96:7 100:1 114:20		96:13 99:16 125:12	
132:18 142:7 149:12	Commission 2:2 18:16	competitions 66:1	conduct 117:12
150:20 234:16 278:7	commissions 13:7,9	114:22 115:22 116:4	conducted 25:14 135:5
comfortable 179:15	20:14 21:1 64:3 85:14	competitive 10:8,20	138:17
247:20 267:18	committee 1:4,10 31:13	13:3 17:7 22:6,8	conducting 37:3
coming 8:7 47:21 65:15	113:4 126:3 188:16	81:15 83:10,14,16,19	<b>conference</b> 163:1,19
75:16 77:18 82:21	194:12 195:12 197:11	83:21 89:20 94:8,16	164:4 189:8
96:11 103:14 107:11	269:16 271:5 276:9	95:11 96:2 100:6	confession 104:20
132:22 135:17 149:22	288:16 292:9,18,22	competitively 16:20	confidential 142:4
152:11 158:14 167:14	293:1,14,17 297:8	complement 284:21	confusing 81:9
175:11 182:1,15	298:11 303:20 304:17	complementing 283:14	confusingly 223:21
187:5 196:19 256:12	306:20 307:16 308:8	283:16 284:13 285:1	confusion 222:8 278:5
291:4 306:21 308:9	commonly 139:10	complements 284:18	congratulations 288:19
commaed 281:9	communicate 164:17	286:6	Congress 10:4 12:8
command 201:2	274:16 275:5 276:19	complete 169:12	22:3 75:3 77:22 79:2
comment 61:19 63:6	communicated 274:14	completed 120:14	82:13 84:3 95:4 96:8
74:19 102:4 106:21	communicating 48:9	163:10 171:9 306:13	96:9,10
151:7 156:15 157:13	communication 164:19	308:10	Congressional 10:11
165:6 175:16 181:17	277:2,10	<b>completely</b> 26:6 42:1	10:12
183:11 185:3 191:1,2	277:2,10 <b>Communications</b> 126:9	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5	10:12 Congressionally 96:5
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1	10:12 Congressionally 96:5
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complimentary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considerations 142:5 considered 217:8 229:9
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10 191:19 193:14 198:18	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11 companies 100:11	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4 159:14 189:7,13,19	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5 consistent 205:6 235:2
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10 191:19 193:14 198:18 198:19,22 199:19	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11 company 99:2 153:21	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4 159:14 189:7,13,19 214:6 237:15 282:16	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considerations 142:5 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5 consistent 205:6 235:2 constantly 49:21,22 50:8 82:22 83:2 102:15
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10 191:19 193:14 198:18 198:19,22 199:19 200:2,17,20 201:3	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11 company 99:2 153:21 153:22 comparability 161:3 comparable 140:8	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4 159:14 189:7,13,19 214:6 237:15 282:16 concerned 54:19 66:8	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considerations 142:5 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5 consistent 205:6 235:2 constantly 49:21,22 50:8 82:22 83:2
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10 191:19 193:14 198:18 198:19,22 199:19 200:2,17,20 201:3 202:7,9 203:9 206:13	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11 company 99:2 153:21 153:22 comparability 161:3	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4 159:14 189:7,13,19 214:6 237:15 282:16 concerned 54:19 66:8 67:4,7 95:10 105:12	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considerations 142:5 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5 consistent 205:6 235:2 constantly 49:21,22 50:8 82:22 83:2 102:15
183:11 185:3 191:1,2 192:12 201:6 202:4 207:19 213:6,9 217:15 220:4,15 222:3,4 248:12,15 249:9 250:1 257:19 258:1,7 259:6,10,21 266:22 267:6 269:3 277:21 279:1 282:4 290:17 291:16,18 292:3,5 commentary 202:13 commenters 254:4 commenting 246:9 247:3 comments 4:9,11 5:11 5:14 6:14 48:22 49:4 49:5,7 65:14 74:13 79:15 88:5 98:4 100:16 150:18 152:8 168:12,20 183:10 191:19 193:14 198:18 198:19,22 199:19 200:2,17,20 201:3 202:7,9 203:9 206:13 206:21 209:14 212:10	277:2,10 Communications 126:9 communities 17:21 19:10 47:3 62:7 73:13 102:21 176:16 181:21 182:10,19 183:1,13 184:6 187:13 193:7 193:11 194:3 211:7 229:5 233:12 243:4 246:12 247:6 248:19 249:1 communities.' 193:13 community 2:5 39:20 39:20 55:4 66:9 68:9 70:21,22 71:2 103:3,4 106:5 111:4 112:10 112:10 113:1,9,12 115:18,19 125:6 128:20 152:14 171:14 183:20 251:4 community-based 62:11 company 99:2 153:21 153:22 comparability 161:3 comparable 140:8	completely 26:6 42:1 71:19 165:22 210:5 264:6 completing 306:1 307:12 complex 143:5 complexes 112:3 complementary 133:3 component 121:4 147:22 229:11 297:12 components 133:2 149:17 composition 289:6 compositions 129:10 129:11 computer 272:2 concept 57:1 65:22 177:17 194:6 217:16 conceptualize 85:4 conceptually 56:19 concern 34:6 47:11 48:7 91:6 127:4 159:14 189:7,13,19 214:6 237:15 282:16 concerned 54:19 66:8 67:4,7 95:10 105:12 134:10 137:4 189:12	10:12 Congressionally 96:5 connect 189:18 connected 56:18 connection 179:20 connections 62:6,12 conscious 19:9 conservation 1:15,20 13:19 17:18 18:6 58:17 121:19 143:4 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4,16,21 consider 30:21 37:3 115:12 149:6 200:4 212:2 232:2 consideration 55:11 101:2 102:1 107:1 135:22 141:8,15 150:13 206:21 244:9 considerations 142:5 considered 217:8 229:9 considering 63:5 102:5 consistent 205:6 235:2 constantly 49:21,22 50:8 82:22 83:2 102:15 constituencies 95:12

27:13 41:8 42:3 46:21 corral 176:8 criteria 22:10 30:4 38:3 177:13,18 179:18 48:9 64:5,11 70:4 correct 99:14 165:11 38:20 39:18 41:6,12 306:1 72:17 85:18 94:2,6 170:9 270:14 43:15 54:21 56:8 65:6 **de** 216:9 102:20 303:7 deadline 57:7 consult 291:14 correctly 223:20 253:11 Consultant 1:22 2:5 266:10 critical 56:15 89:9 deal 5:9 58:19 100:9 consultations 123:15 correlates 208:22 117:19 124:8 174:8 178:11 consuming 194:22 **Cosgrove** 3:6 51:13 critically 169:20 220:11 253:14 264:22 consumption 285:10 79:17,19 80:1 105:9 criticism 88:17 265:1 274:10 286:19 criticisms 52:12 contact 57:8 106:17 305:4 content 48:16 277:3 cost 42:11 98:22 99:7 critique 53:10 dealing 29:15 190:6 **CONTENTS** 4:1 143:22 151:9 303:22 croaker 187:10 251:13 context 190:11 222:5 costs 124:1 145:17 **cross** 84:8 deals 23:17 continental 211:19 crowd 88:5 153:10 debris 143:9 146:21 continual 234:15 council 34:22 88:20 crowdsourcing 114:17 decapitalize 278:19 December 126:4 continually 102:14 91:16 125:19,20 114:22 115:17,21 **continue** 10:19 36:13 126:2,4,15,22 135:7 117:10,22 120:11 294:13 decent 12:19 28:10 62:17,21 193:5 145:15 147:12 149:18 124:17 171:15 222:18 254:8 234:22 235:4 237:21 crunch 243:14 77:21 continues 178:2 decide 40:2 93:15 council's 235:8 **Crystal** 163:14 cultural 135:18 229:4 102:12 **continuing** 15:13 63:2 councils 13:7,9 14:11 continuous 214:8 15:1 64:3,6 85:13 **culture** 75:1 90:6 decided 95:4 contracts 69:12,18 117:18 cumbersome 262:12 decides 76:18 153:2 count 7:8 20:13 262:12 80.20 199:6 contradict 270:13 **counted** 155:18 cure 220:8 decision 27:16,17 contribute 125:1 133:3 curious 97:1 102:7 121:16 counting 153:12 155:1 144:13 current 69:12 141:18 decisions 4:16 19:4.8 302:15 contributing 115:11 country 8:1,5,12,17,20 174:17 202:18 205:22 23:12.14 55:6 260:7 contribution 146:18 13:6,15 14:20 15:1 207:18,21 214:7 decline 206:2,3,9 233:7 151:4 277:19 19:13 21:20 53:17 256:6 257:21 declining 212:20 contributions 122:22 55:20 64:2 70:20 currently 104:17 decreasing 66:9 277:17 278:13 144:15 283:16 285:2 213:18 214:10 269:9 dedicated 100:6 286:6 297:4 298:10 couple 14:2 30:5 43:10 299:15 302:2 dedicating 294:6 currents 122:5 304:20 46:3 50:3 53:12 54:13 deemed 42:7 contributory 116:10,16 65:14,18 66:13 89:17 **curves** 237:6 **deep** 26:13 62:6,12 control 68:20 155:12 177:11,12,18 178:18 customer 104:15 181:11 230:8 159:9 179:18 192:22 238:9 customers 106:15 deeper 121:20 125:16 controlling 176:5 252:1 305:19 cut 40:5 282:21 defending 49:19 conversation 70:12 course 9:16 13:18 14:5 **cuts** 208:19 defense 66:4 95:10 102:9 109:1,14 19:9 21:11 23:13 cutting 28:14 254:6 defer 217:17 161:12 188:12 192:16 32:13 33:11 34:15 260:5 deficit 98:20 283:12 194:11 205:16 231:13 36:18 38:7 45:6 58:13 cycle 245:11,22 291:6 284:1 296:6,18 239:16 282:16 70:5 80:21 96:4 97:18 define 34:6 115:3,17 D conversations 6:2 63:8 132:18 304:13 135:19 damage 150:7 defined 114:19 207:2 cover 111:11 121:12 **cooperative** 7:2,6,9,14 122:12 198:18,19 Defining 141:7 damn 58:11 181:19 19:14 32:22 69:4 70:2 242:16 290:7 definite 144:6 **Dan** 3:14 4:2 5:16,20 79:10 99:20 117:3,5 **covered** 9:12 146:3 24:17 28:18 86:20 definitely 122:15 117:14,17,20 118:4 214:18 305:15 107:11 108:17 289:6 definition 115:10 118:11,15 119:5 covering 127:16 date 125:4,10 116:20 245:5,9 122:17 covers 172:7 207:16 dates 130:10 235:18 **definitions** 111:1 114:9 cooperatively 154:2 **CPUEs** 140:8 degree 246:19 247:14 236:21 coordinator 217:22 crab 131:20 183:6 **DAVE** 3:2 Delaware 153:7 cracks 177:13 delete 227:8 259:20 coral 13:19 day 5:5 14:15 60:18 corals 212:20 216:10 craft 185:15 307:1 deliver 238:8 90:2 145:11 169:15 core 62:19 113:6 114:7 crafting 196:3 181:15 195:12 264:16 **delving** 123:19 demand 283:4,22 284:2 297:21 created 11:12 308:2 264:16,17,18 282:4 **Cornell** 150:20 284:6 creating 261:20 306:13 Corporation 1:14 creatively 154:6 days 65:19 97:18 177:2 demanding 266:15

demographic 130:13 demoic 235:20 demonstrate 129:21 **denied** 178:4 **depart** 300:9 departing 190:22 304:8 **Department** 1:1 16:4,7 76:7 95:7 116:1 departs 298:17 departure 176:21 291:2 depend 118:16 284:14 dependent 134:11 137:7 depending 183:20 depends 159:6 181:13 245:4 284:22 depth 294:21 Deputy 2:14 derail 273:16 **Derrick** 26:15 38:14 describe 43:16 described 52:15 147:19 265:19 **deserves** 104:15 design 68:2 113:22 116:2,10,13 126:1 129:4,4 133:6 designated 2:12,15 126:4 127:15 designations 123:6 designed 46:22 127:22 238:7 designs 128:21 134:17 135:2 desire 281:16 282:8 **desired** 253:18 desires 10:3 desk 113:20 despite 8:13 11:3 13:11 49:17 80:3 84:9 105:13 107:2 detailed 113:20 details 61:3 114:11,15 227:14 297:2 305:16 determine 11:16 267:10 268:12 determined 117:18 develop 16:16 62:10,17 62:22 76:12 78:7 79:14 81:3,11 87:22 124:2 126:19 141:17 163:19 218:4,4,5 284:18 305:21 developed 136:20 139:19 140:16 141:9 163:6 developing 16:14 137:14

development 2:5 13:14 66:18 87:4,17 88:21 88:22 124:9 132:20 deviations 44:20 **device** 240:8 devising 96:17 **Dick** 1:19 4:7 161:18 162:4 164:21 165:4 166:14 185:21.22 186:1 304:12 dictates 84:11 95:3 **Didden** 135:7 **DIEDERICK** 3:8 diem 306:6 differ 117:2 183:21 191:12 **difference** 69:15,17 70:7 143:14,18 219:5 220:20 276:22 differences 117:7 143:15 different 21:7 28:1 36:1 37:21 38:3,6,18,20 50:22 51:5 81:8 91:22 95:11 99:22 106:14 108:17 117:10 141:11 147:12 149:18 160:18 176:2,12 204:8 208:13 209:1 222:7 225:22 235:17 239:11 240:15 244:2 245:16 245:19 268:5 289:7 289:16 294:14 296:11 298:22 302:7 303:18 303:22 differently 102:6 244:3 249:15 difficult 136:1 148:9,13 160:6 174:9 303:15 difficulty 124:12 digging 120:5 dimensions 297:22 298:5 dioxide 193:3 228:14 dioxin 178:1 direct 69:16,18 103:2 113:7 277:12 directed 12:8,9 directing 246:15 247:10 direction 48:14 55:18 134:9 230:16 231:17 243:16 270:5 298:12 directions 234:14 295:13 directive 134:10

director 1:15.16.18.20 2:2,3,7,13,16,17 3:14 3:16 5:16 9:21 disagree 68:21 205:3 disagreement 245:1,4 disasters 13:20 disband 306:14 307:10 discard 126:20 136:3 138:11 140:3 discards 28:20 123:9 138:19 discourage 40:3 discovered 120:17 discovering 120:16 discrete 163:21 164:5 discretion 166:22 discuss 212:19 294:21 discussed 170:2 177:2 185:18 discussing 188:18 discussion 67:11 114:21 115:16 144:4 164:16 173:15 177:14 177:16 194:18 199:8 203:12 250:3 265:14 269:10 270:9 274:17 discussions 197:9 276:16 282:11 disease 220:7 dismissed 57:17 59:7 disparity 31:8 displayed 25:19 289:8 disseminated 32:7 dissolved 307:17 distort 71:20 distributed 42:17 52:5 distribution 43:13 44:5 131:10 132:2 139:22 distributional 137:8 distributions 132:8 250:20 ditch 152:4 **Ditto** 167:4 diver 132:3 divers 122:1 130:4 diverse 9:10 146:10,10 divide 280:14 **Division** 3:14 5:17 53:20 divisional 99:2 divvied 20:22 divvying 125:15 doable 259:18 dockside 138:17 **document** 106:19 166:18 172:13 173:9 178:8,21 184:22 194:1,21 199:1,12

200:7.16 201:8 207:7 209:22 212:13,18 217:3 219:8,10,13 220:21 221:1 225:14 226:4 246:9,22 247:3 247:18 250:5,11,19 250:22 251:2 252:3,7 254:1,3 257:5 269:15 307:1 **documents** 189:3,5 268:21 doing 8:6 10:15,21 12:22 15:14 18:5 23:3 26:19,20 28:4 32:19 35:8 44:8 50:13,15 53:16 54:10 62:21 68:10,11 69:20 79:2 85:12,19 88:12 100:20 101:5 102:17 119:14 138:6 143:6 143:22 148:22 176:15 205:9 225:14 263:22 270:1 278:12 297:14 dollar 27:2 31:2 dollars 8:16 16:3 20:5 66:14 68:8.12 76:1.3 78:1.5 80:17 84:10 92:22 93:14 187:7 289:7 domestic 274:19 283:2 283:9 domoic 183:5 doomsday 181:12 door 10:2 32:11 94:2 231:16 248:16 249:4 288:17 294:9 304:13 309:4 **DOREMUS** 2:14 274:13 275:16 276:14 280:8 282:10 296:21 297:11 298:7 308:6 double 196:12 279:15 downs 60:18 dozen 163:2 dozens 96:19,19 Dr 35:8 274:13 275:16 276:14 280:8 282:10 296:21 297:11 298:7 302:15 308:6 draft 4:10 106:19 198:22 199:17 207:18 207:21 208:7 drafters 218:22 drafting 194:11 drag 273:4 dragging 195:1 234:4 dramatically 151:10 drastically 204:7

directly 39:21 48:3 69:3

98:3 103:3 151:19

201:1

205:11 **edge** 254:6 employed 238:5 equivalent 44:12 draw 284:7 editable 22:18 employee 69:15 Erika 1:15 221:2,2 dreamed 77:3 edited 201:15 228:1 employees 112:5 281:14 285:21 302:21 driven 29:13 256:7 269:4 270:12 enacted 114:18 129:6 306:19 driver 90:3 editing 172:17 288:16 encapsulate 224:16 **ESA** 13:17 drivers 12:4,10,15 education 121:4 130:3 encompassing 212:3 especially 171:16 drives 12:21 19:4 64:8 144:9 149:17 231:14 280:12 EEZ 112:2 280:2 driving 13:13 15:22 encountered 111:8 **ESPINOZA** 1:22 32:8 16:11 30:20 31:1 37:6 48:12 61:17 effect 238:6 277:18 114:5 139:10 64:13 256:12 encourage 40:3 89:1,12 210:4 216:4,8,19,22 283:19 245:3 261:16 290:11 drop 186:12 effective 127:11 136:10 89:14 106:12 114:10 143:22 144:22 153:13 drown 65:10 274:4 301:16 drugs 220:7 effectively 127:20 encouraged 46:8,18 essential 93:6 drum 138:12 138:11 277:11 91:9 essentially 39:13 81:14 effects 183:6 233:11 134:21 225:15 due 12:12 68:3 211:16 encouraging 48:9 211:22 287:7 235:19 establish 220:1 221:17 **Dunn** 162:11 efficiencies 171:16 Endangered 12:13 establishing 219:18,22 duties 16:4 76:5 effort 18:13 19:22 25:17 **endorses** 283:20 estimate 82:22 123:9 **duty** 76:8 59:9 128:13 132:13 endorsing 272:12 130:6 131:12 134:5 estimates 129:1 130:19 dying 295:17 133:2,4 134:5 137:10 279:20 **dynamic** 156:18 143:7 145:15 151:21 ends 31:12,20 164:14,15 **dynamics** 130:14 152:13 164:14 277:8 energetics 244:1 estimating 133:16 278:22 279:10 288:13 enforcement 14:5 23:1 estimation 254:12 Ε 297:9 305:7 153:1 et 284:6 efforts 13:22 121:4 **engage** 282:8 **ETHS** 61:8 **e.q** 215:3 237:12 238:13 132:21 150:4 299:3 engineer 296:11 **European** 131:20 258:21 earlier 94:20 141:16 305:15 **England** 181:14 **evaluate** 37:2 41:4 **EFH** 123:5 160:7 237:2 239:20 enhance 57:5 228:22 131:4 160:13 253:15 eight 14:22 51:5 64:20 296:12 253:18 250:6 289:8 293:21 293:22 300:4 304:8 113:4 162:19 291:3,7 **enhanced** 146:19 evaluated 136:22 267:9 early 89:19 196:20 either 40:4 55:20 100:7 **ensure** 73:9 102:19 268:9.11 197:8 250:11 295:10 103:2 155:14 158:22 171:11 273:15 276:3 **evaluation** 22:9 30:4 **earmarks** 90:2,4 180:9 231:16 250:9 entail 36:20 38:2,19 39:18 41:5,12 **easier** 75:19 270:18 **entered** 157:3 43:15 44:1 54:21 56:8 easily 32:6 elaborate 26:10 **enterprise** 6:5,18 64:7 65:6 102:20 252:14 East 2:7 53:21 187:6 elaborated 299:1 enterprise-wide 61:9 254:22 257:3 258:12 easy 119:14 141:17 electronic 23:6,7 entertain 280:9 306:17 evenly 42:17 44:16 132:20 134:11,20 147:15 307:5 event 182:18 eat 270:11 136:14 152:10 **enticed** 301:9 events 186:16 193:9 eating 167:22 element 116:17 118:6 entire 143:10 205:5 203:3,8 elements 39:10 141:14 213:16,16 222:5 ever-changing 72:9 **echo** 104:9 economic 66:4 187:12 **elephant** 168:1 307:3 279:3 **everybody** 5:4 51:17 229:3 233:13 283:16 elevator 304:16 entirely 155:9 301:20 74:1 159:3 185:6 285:1 286:6 297:4 eliminating 180:15 199:4.13 203:20 302:9 205:5 entities 10:13 90:5 246:20 247:15 295:22 economics 296:15 elimination 204:6 entity 44:6 46:19 47:7 301:7 304:14 306:2 economy 283:12 302:10 **ELIZABETH** 2:3 48:5 55:14 91:12 everybody's 44:16 **EM/ER** 23:6 103:12 153:20 242:6 292:21 308:6 ecosystem 4:9,11 environment 72:10 131:9 177:21 180:19 email 156:9,11 165:7,13 **everyone's** 5:9 168:15 289:13 294:10 295:14 119:2 251:7 184:21 185:11 188:3 **evidence** 182:13 193:1 197:2 199:1 embellish 57:4 environmental 1:22 230:13 233:8,14 208:13 211:10 228:12 **emerge** 298:1 15:7 122:12 130:3 evolved 141:10 304:17 emissions 178:1 180:4 evolving 102:14 141:18 ecosystems 207:6,7,12 179:14 184:14 185:4 environmentally 19:8 209:19 210:11 215:2 158:6 186:18 193:4 194:5 21:9 **ex** 2:2 215:4 216:6 217:4 235:19 292:1 228:14 **egual** 159:3 exact 45:5 104:21 **ECS** 3:3 emphasized 228:10 **equally** 44:10

equator 214:4

emphasizing 261:5

**Eddie** 285:4

105:12

exactly 14:19 30:16

38:5 41:16 59:20 60:2 76:9 91:20 93:8 152:1 154:21 194:8 203:15 205:4 examine 225:5 **example** 28:16 35:20 42:19 48:2,17 66:13 84:1 115:21 116:17 119:8,10,15 121:14 129:16,17 134:22 135:2 137:16 207:9 215:3 230:14 231:2 235:9,20 236:12,18 236:19 237:14,14 240:7 241:13,15 243:21 258:3 263:7 263:14 **examples** 111:6 115:8 116:15 121:18,22 122:11 125:16 127:11 131:6 141:8 174:22 217:8 219:16,16 221:5 229:3 230:4 231:21 235:8 236:8 247:22 248:3,6 252:1 263:4.11 264:10 267:4,7,13,15 268:8 268:10 exceedingly 307:1 **excellent** 25:5 26:16 29:2 68:15 86:9 104:18 277:21 **exception** 25:3 187:21 **excited** 110:18 303:2 exclude 205:7 **Excuse** 208:5 270:20 **executive** 1:16,18 2:2,3 2:7,9 167:11 172:21 174:5,10 188:19 190:5 194:13,21 **exercise** 72:6 120:13 exist 129:15 204:14 205:12,19 206:1,4,10 existed 135:9 existing 145:5 170:4 282:1 **expand** 139:13 248:7 expanded 79:8 **expect** 45:1 133:19 140:15 expectation 135:15 expectations 140:21 141:2 144:18 151:16 **expected** 229:2,3 expenditures 32:1 **expenses** 306:4,5 **experience** 36:10 52:10 59:18 60:15 87:1

167:16 277:6 299:7 experienced 73:22 experiencing 214:11 **expert** 48:16 **expertise** 70:22 71:1 **experts** 40:9,9,14 73:20 74:5 132:5 explaining 49:18 explanation 79:18 108:16 159:22 explanations 267:20 exploration 119:22 123:21 explore 111:19 154:15 185:9,10 193:5 explored 111:21 **Explorer** 154:12 **exploring** 127:1 146:9 exponential 65:21 exported 278:6 exposure 301:4 **express** 219:6 307:12 **expressed** 10:4 108:22 300:5 expressing 282:8 extended 140:18 232:19 extending 198:4 extensive 146:20 **extent** 109:2 external 3:14 5:16 7:15 8:17 42:1 72:16 80:6 externality 63:3 externalized 153:19 **externally** 22:5,7 80:9 81.18 **extinct** 204:19 206:2 extinction 213:22 extirpated 205:8 extra 5:6 14:3 112:6 extreme 181:21 182:9 182:22 183:5,8 186:15 191:11 193:9 208:11 extremely 50:17 72:10

F

212:21

eye 110:6

eyes 112:6

fabulous 308:8 face 208:13 213:14 222:17 227:11 faced 176:16 facet 73:12 facilities 78:18 162:1 280:4 facility 213:17 facing 213:18 214:9 fact 8:13 11:3 12:12 13:11 49:18 50:5 63:14 67:7,8,10 71:20 80:3 84:9 102:14 105:13 107:2 122:17 135:13 137:22 160:22 175:4 184:4 202:16 206:14,20 218:9 247:20 250:19 263:12 264:10 276:6 factor 15:22 31:1 41:16 282:15 factors 253:12 254:20 257:2 258:11 304:1 failed 236:3 fair 10:7 14:4,17 22:8 50:1 96:13 187:3 Fairbanks 90:16 fairly 6:10,10 14:10,12 24:7 37:17 41:5 44:16 59:5 122:20 Falcon 232:1,18 235:2 fall 116:16 119:5 294:1 familiar 124:7,18,19 125:17 130:1 136:19 153:6 154:1 fantastic 304:19 far 30:19 42:21 53:13 54:19 56:19 68:18 69:2 91:18 96:2 120:17 123:22 134:9 137:3 165:9 179:13 182:3 189:11 190:1 190:15,17 192:11,16 208:17 220:11 234:2 274:3 284:3 fare 54:18 farmed 284:4 fast 233:7 faster 143:21 237:21 251:6 favor 140:9 173:20 194:20 195:4 269:11 287:15 307:13 309:2 fear 256:16 fearful 285:16 fearsome 288:5 feature 154:17 February 165:20 291:6 federal 2:12,15 3:3 20:21 41:7 61:10 69:19 111:3 112:4,16 112:22 113:1,5,9 117:12 154:4 280:11 feds 42:1

feedback 16:15 58:7 65:17 151:1 229:7 feel 12:1 68:8 74:4 95:14 176:2 177:17 179:14 185:2 186:7 189:10 214:4 227:19 260:14 261:14 262:5 304:5 feeling 98:1 104:13 135:20 feels 51:9 feet 234:4 Feli 2:1 **FELICIANO** 2:1 188:14 188:17,20 189:4 190:9,12,14 191:17 192:2,4,8 207:21 208:3,6,20 210:3 213:11 215:10,16,21 **fell** 177:13 **FELLER** 1:15 221:4 281:15 285:22 286:3 302:22 felt 157:5 164:18 220:4 231:14 250:5 272:2 fence 157:6 **FFO** 22:11 41:6 43:14 102:16 106:19 field 65:12 103:9,14 133:21 303:3 fight 290:12 figure 31:7 120:5 144:12 192:5 255:11 271:2 **figured** 75:15 files 125:1 fill 101:20 145:10 **filled** 28:20 195:18 filling 129:13 films 152:12 153:11 **FIN** 19:16 final 168:9 172:17 175:14 188:19 252:17 255:9 307:1 **finalists** 113:10 finalized 175:20 307:13 finally 117:1 124:14 125:15 168:6 224:15 **finance** 126:9 financial 7:1 9:3 12:4 24:19 67:11,12 69:5 74:20 financially 118:1 find 40:18 41:3 52:22 114:2 143:15 151:4 209:21 225:17 226:2 236:4 278:2 299:22 301:13

fee 67:17

feed 22:19 23:11,12

II	1	ı	ı
finding 124:12 134:19	238:14,16,18,21	56:1,5,12 72:16 86:3	fought 150:2
141:4 168:2 228:15	239:1,15 240:18	86:13 90:15 97:15	found 45:13 119:19
findings 229:19	241:17 243:3 266:7	110:5 111:5 117:6	140:7 143:13 150:22
fine 52:18 98:3 170:15	297:4 302:7,10	124:18 165:21 172:20	236:1
170:20 206:6 244:18	fishing 14:20 16:14,16	211:19 212:6 261:14	foundation 1:16 87:4,5
259:11 273:22	19:7 27:15 28:5 39:20	286:11 289:18 291:4	130:3 136:21 139:20
finfish 303:4	47:4 72:15,18 73:12	291:8 300:3,15 302:3	four 39:2 90:9 95:22
fingers 84:8	101:8,18 104:8,17	306:22	113:10 196:6 206:16
FINS 18:19 82:3 83:8	105:2,4,6,7,14 106:2	follow 54:22 75:9 95:5	212:19 272:5
first 26:6 30:2 32:15	106:13 111:10 132:15	96:8,10 158:16 179:6	four-step 39:7
34:20 37:15 52:4	148:1 163:1,6,13	follow-up 31:10 72:21	fox 152:16
56:16 59:17 61:1	164:4 176:16 181:21	288:21 292:11 294:10	framework 135:10
65:15 66:14 67:1	182:10,18 183:1,13	following 289:10	237:20
75:11 88:15 95:7,21	184:6 187:13 193:6	follows 133:8	FRANCISCO 2:17
107:16 125:20 126:18	193:11,13 194:2	food 100:13 281:3,3	frankly 183:5 305:9
132:18 147:5 157:3	213:15 218:9 229:4	Foods 1:18	free 12:1 155:9
162:12 167:9 172:18	233:4 300:13 301:5	footprint 178:12	freeze 88:6
174:14 177:2 179:10	fit 111:2,3,4 112:9	for-profit 47:7	frequency 181:20
184:3 185:15 199:17	169:1 178:20	force 10:19 13:13 16:11	193:10 203:2,6,7
199:18 201:19 202:15	fits 131:3 176:6	30:20 147:7 167:21	friendly 286:1
207:8 211:15,21	five 8:19 11:2 15:12	199:3,10 201:22	front 24:2 82:15 92:22
213:8 214:22 215:5	23:6 69:21 99:1,1	202:5,21 207:10	144:19,22 167:11
223:22 228:15 229:1	126:8,8 155:14	218:22 224:1 250:5	184:10 185:13 192:13
236:9 252:12,12	263:15 289:16 294:5	291:11,13 299:21	212:12 254:6
262:11 279:18 282:4	306:1	forces 199:4	frustrations 71:16
288:8 302:13	five-year 15:10 64:5	forecast 264:16,16,17	full 39:5 41:13 46:10
fiscal 11:17	fix 31:7	264:18	47:17,19 57:5 170:10
fish 1:15,21 2:6 16:12	fixed 91:9 280:18	forefront 280:7	291:15 295:20
16:12,17 18:21 19:6	flat 82:3	foreign 99:8	full-fledged 116:14
20:18 27:21 51:3	flatfish 87:17	forget 190:11 218:4	125:20
82:20 95:7 113:6	fleet 213:17	305:17	full-time 126:4
116:1 127:22 128:3	flexibility 244:8	Forgive 26:5 98:7	fully 184:16
130:7 137:20 140:1	flexible 233:14 244:11	form 7:16 81:19 115:5	function 9:19 26:3
147:11 149:1 183:16	244:13,16,17 245:5	265:12 305:20	functions 70:16 80:7
218:11 229:2 232:18	245:18 246:5 249:11	formal 132:22 133:6,11	fund 11:16 18:2
237:8 244:2 250:20	249:12	134:2 135:2	fundamental 100:21
270:11	flip 24:21	formally 201:2	277:3
<b>FISHER</b> 2:2 75:9,13	floor 154:22 269:7	format 265:11	funded 15:9,10 19:19
76:14,17,22 77:2,8,12	287:11	formed 126:2	35:21 46:4 78:6 79:11
77:16 78:15 81:20	Florida 136:21 138:12	forms 7:5	79:13 82:3 83:22 91:7
82:1,6 108:8	139:4 160:10,22	formula 10:10,12 13:3	91:11 96:1 136:14,22
fisheries' 94:3 256:7	210:16	20:3,4,7,8,12 94:13	160:8
fisherman 58:20 126:19	flows 176:6 185:16	94:16 95:2,4,4 96:5	funding 3:14 5:16 14:22
132:3 148:5 171:18	fluctuates 95:2	formulated 307:11	21:11 25:8 36:17 39:5
<b>fishermen</b> 33:3 55:14 150:1	fly 55:20	forth 133:9 149:4 269:21	41:13 63:3 67:18
fishers 27:15 229:4	FMPs 242:21 focus 40:10 132:14	forward 6:16 14:19	68:20 91:18 92:18,19 93:5,10,15 95:8,8
fishery 20:6 21:19	192:21 211:20 296:15	17:14 37:19 46:17	96:21 118:6,6 145:21
94:21 111:21 116:16	298:10 299:3	49:15 51:21 117:9	157:21
121:11 125:18 127:20	focused 62:22 64:15	140:20 153:18 161:5	funds 6:21 7:4,16 15:16
129:14 134:11 137:7	focuses 277:8,8,9	161:13 162:5 266:11	17:5 18:5 19:22 20:7
137:15 148:7,10	focusing 184:4 202:6	270:2 274:5 287:6	32:18 39:3 81:7,17
149:9 181:5 217:13	205:5 220:2 297:9	295:3 299:10 300:4	83:12 96:12 99:9
217:16 218:8 220:18	fold 281:8	308:9	101:2 102:6
221:10,11 222:5	folks 8:4,7 9:1 11:4	forwarded 271:4	funneled 31:19
223:9 225:6 229:16	22:9 25:12 28:3 35:13	foster 221:17	further 14:19 37:9
229:21 231:22 232:14	35:15 36:7,16 41:20	fostering 217:3 221:6	43:14 52:4 119:11,22
235:1,21 237:3	41:22 42:17 54:12	<b>fosters</b> 171:19	121:17 161:12 179:10
••			

194:18 202:4 209:4 give 15:11 25:6 56:5 green 131:20 **HALL** 1:21 215:12 255:18 272:14 68:20 98:8 109:13 ground 42:4 67:8 72:5 **hallway** 86:11 299:3 110:21 111:1 112:8 118:15 127:19,21 **HAMILTON** 2:3 52:2 115:7 122:21 138:8 furthermore 264:2 148:16 150:12 266:14 53:18 104:4,7,20 future 151:16 161:13 148:3 161:18 163:2 266:15 267:4,9 268:5 106:11 189:22 197:3 202:18 181:6 219:15 236:8 Groundfish 1:19 hand 11:20 57:18 67:15 205:7 206:1,3 222:16 236:12,17 257:12 grounds 213:15 182:12 193:21 300:10 233:22 246:13 247:7 268:7 298:16 group 2:6 4:6,8 58:16 handed 101:2 306:10 handful 288:11 265:2.9 266:6 284:6 given 57:10,14 58:5 58:17 60:5,8 89:13 71:18 92:6 230:4 117:5 128:15 139:21 handing 220:6 294:19 299:3 handle 220:7 **FY** 22:12 50:10 83:4 240:7 248:3 161:21 168:11 170:21 106:18 gives 264:19 274:1 274:15 304:22 305:1 handling 308:15 giving 65:16 75:18 306:12,16 307:11,17 hands 24:15 126:13 G 238:5 303:11 308:3 glacier 237:22 hang 213:7 283:6 gaining 66:15 grouper 130:15 131:10 Gallaudet 297:2 298:9 glad 64:18 293:10 131:11 happen 44:19 50:7 game 82:19 95:7 **global** 194:4 283:2 groups 96:16 115:6 60:10,19 82:17 83:5 130:7 134:6 195:14 285:14 globe 14:7 84:7 89:8 204:20 **Gamefish** 136:21 goal 68:22 263:15 265:4 284:21 195:19 **goals** 62:19,19 121:10 grow 149:12 happened 48:18 59:20 139:20 gaps 101:20 228:21 144:8 242:20 246:10 Growers 2:8 60:2 65:4 264:11 247:4 296:10,13 growing 72:10 148:4 295:1 gates 47:21 **GDP** 67:3 happening 8:17 25:22 **God** 50:6 149:10 godfather 87:13 grows 149:11 151:9,9 **gear** 54:22 52:14 61:11 148:6 **geared** 102:20 goliath 130:14 131:11 growth 130:18 162:14 202:17 203:16 geek 25:11 **Google** 278:2 Guam 209:8 210:22 232:3 234:5 243:22 general 6:4,10 11:21 gotten 35:2,4,6,21 91:1 **Guard** 302:1 251:3.6 21:3 27:8 38:10 65:14 141:5 guarding 152:16 happens 25:18 77:13 164:11 273:16 275:2 **government** 41:7 58:19 230:10 guess 31:11,15 94:7 296:8 61:10 68:9 69:19 100:15 157:3 158:7,9 happily 130:17 generating 283:13 113:11 167:7,16 176:1,3 happy 55:22 56:11 grab 86:14 198:11 gentleman 26:15 178:5 180:10 196:12 59:21 105:10 115:2 gentlemen 213:12 gracious 65:17 198:18 230:19 238:1 156:8 158:6 174:8 geographic 29:8 **grade** 34:9 252:19 253:16 254:7 181:15 194:5 195:22 grant 5:19 10:5 14:9 geography 211:9 280:17 286:11 296:15 259:17 273:8 304:7 Georgia 1:11 16:2 25:11,18 26:3 guidance 134:13 harangue 234:15 getting 21:10 39:1,2 36:21 41:8 53:4,6 142:22 297:7 hard 5:9 7:19 40:5 44:21 45:18 47:12 54:9 55:2 56:17 62:18 **quide** 306:3 72:11 78:19 85:3 89:2 51:10 53:13 73:10 74:22 76:21 80:7 guidelines 117:20 91:4 103:8 105:20 82:20 91:5,8 114:7 92:18 93:4,17,18 296:4 191:21 288:10 306:20 148:12 152:7 159:12 94:21 95:8 103:13 **guides** 114:3 harder 45:8,10 91:17 159:13 174:7 177:14 289:6 gulf 19:16 122:11 124:7 Harlan 306:19 181:11 185:17 190:8 grant-making 4:2 131:14 147:21 148:20 Harlon 2:6 4:8 147:5 151:15 168:10 202:12 220:11 223:18 granting 80:5 149:9,18 150:6 182:7 242:9 244:1 248:9 grants 6:4,5,17 7:1,3,5 182:7 230:14 236:2 Harlon's 2:6 harmed 135:13 253:16 260:3 266:12 7:6,12,20 9:22 13:4 guys' 21:13 267:19 286:21 289:13 13:19 15:19 23:22 harmful 121:15 132:11 Н 24:6 25:13 33:15,19 240:8 **giants** 100:13 **GILL** 2:3 24:17 25:1 35:22 43:22 46:21 **ha** 77:16 98:5,5,5 104:1 harness 135:3 138:15 52:20 53:1,20 54:4,17 Harvard's 113:10 28:18 150:17 165:5 104:1,1 61:9 62:3 69:3 70:2 ha-ha 77:16 harvest 230:5,22 231:3 175:13 194:14 198:3 200:1 204:1,12 205:3 71:9,10,18 79:13,21 habitat 9:18 13:19,21 231:14 234:8 236:16 238:13 241:16 206:6 217:12 221:21 80:12,13,19 81:16,17 122:3 130:13 188:4 harvesters 87:9 222:2,19 223:6 224:2 81:19 89:6,7 94:1,10 hack-a-thon 116:2 harvesting 147:22 95:11 108:1 224:6 227:7 239:5,14 hair 259:14 239:22 251:17 262:10 grants.gov 61:5 half 25:21 89:7 92:22 243:10 Greater 9:13 112:18 177:20 304:17 **Harvey** 175:2 262:15,18,20,22 267:19 289:22 290:5 greatly 146:18 halibut 233:6 **hat** 25:11

I	1	•	Ī
hatcheries 24:4	63:16 65:2 70:7 104:8	<b>HOLMES</b> 3:9	IJ 13:4
hate 56:14	104:10 113:7 116:2	home 136:5	illuminate 212:14
hats 15:18	118:19 119:1 127:17	honest 106:7	image 155:15
haunt 273:1	128:1,10 130:13,18	honestly 89:3 271:22	images 125:2,7,9
haves 183:14	131:4 144:1 148:7	hooks 43:3,3	154:22 155:7
Hawaii 9:11 210:16	149:14,16 183:8	hope 84:7 102:16	imagine 158:10 301:1
301:11,13	196:7,10 231:8 246:8	159:19 168:16 174:15	imbedded 152:18
He'll 51:14	247:2 266:1 306:3	199:13 283:20 304:14	imitations 141:3
head 97:17 106:9	helped 58:14 88:5	hoped 174:15	impact 23:14 55:5
221:13	195:14 306:22	hopefully 16:15 47:9	73:11 103:2 151:20
headed 105:10	helpful 31:13,21 32:3	48:6 92:4 131:20	184:7 187:12 214:1,8
headquarters 8:14 9:17	54:6 101:9 107:13	168:10 291:7	225:7 253:19 257:13
21:16 30:8,12 31:20	204:8 229:8,12 252:2	hoping 164:22 178:1	impactful 281:22
40:11 55:21 85:15	273:4 280:2 307:2	207:3 275:16	impacting 17:19 39:21
healthy 19:7	helping 14:15,16 19:9	horrible 304:5	286:5
hear 6:9 46:20 61:11	48:10 62:10 63:2,10	hostage 76:2	impacts 105:5 177:5
63:18 91:13 95:9	107:11 116:13 121:8	hotel 1:11 306:5	181:21 182:9 183:1
96:11 133:20 138:9	230:1 308:19	hour 122:7 197:16,19	183:12,20 186:12,13
168:5 184:20 188:10	helps 23:10,12 65:9	304:8	186:14 193:7,11,12
241:22 248:4 259:13	132:1 276:8 286:15	hourly 122:9	205:20 208:11 210:7
275:20	305:20	hours 112:18	211:7 215:13 223:3,9
heard 17:10 98:2	hen 152:17	house 10:5 67:15	223:13 224:11,14
108:11 170:5 173:13	hey 54:16 65:7 87:21	152:17	225:6 228:5 229:2,4
183:15 192:10,16	91:3	How's 224:12	233:11 241:9 243:2,3
200:15,17 229:6	Hi 86:20 188:14,15	how-to 114:3	246:11,17 247:5,12
234:21 263:3 274:16	hidden 30:7 105:3 hide 184:10,17	Hubbs 2:9	248:18 256:17 257:22
276:20 289:17,20 292:2 294:14 298:8	high 36:6,7 52:11,17	<b>huge</b> 18:12 45:7 80:14 90:6 91:2 96:16	258:18,20 259:2 impetuous 124:11
300:4	54:3 157:9 182:2	124:13 151:21	implanted 152:13
hearing 61:19,22 99:16	188:5 202:6 212:16	human 65:6 229:11	implementation 163:9
100:16 102:10 107:6	242:12 256:9,14	hundred 7:12 112:3	implementing 220:2
170:17 182:12 191:18	258:18,21 259:3	122:10 144:14	implicit 281:19
228:18 244:22	277:6	HUNT 3:10	implied 244:13
heart 70:10 102:4 119:4	higher 44:17 121:2	hurdles 114:5	<b>implies</b> 260:10
128:19	124:1 159:2 164:13	hurricane 175:2	imply 283:1
heartburn 249:17 263:1	233:5 237:10 242:1	hurricanes 35:12 50:6	import 16:12,16 278:6,9
heat 170:19 214:5	243:10 285:9	hurry 166:19	importance 129:8
Heather 304:12	highest 58:18		202:6 207:11 217:3
heavily 55:3	highlight 116:18 184:13	I	222:15 226:6,14,19
heck 152:2 251:20	276:4,16 279:8 283:8	iAngler 136:19 138:10	227:2,8,10 254:19
<b>Heidi</b> 2:15 92:7 156:9	highlighted 209:20	139:19 140:7 141:9	257:1 258:10 298:21
169:22 172:22 176:4	highlighting 274:20	<b>ID</b> 153:3	important 32:14,19
179:18 180:7 191:16	highly 146:10	idea 9:4 11:8 27:2 220:2	64:12,19 116:21
192:9 196:6,10	hints 295:13	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8	135:12,21 137:12
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8	hints 295:13 hire 68:1	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 <b>Heidi's</b> 175:16 222:3	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 <b>Heidi's</b> 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 <b>Heidi's</b> 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19 258:5	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10 307:17	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12 163:21 207:5 215:1	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13 260:10 273:8 275:11
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 <b>Heidi's</b> 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 <b>Heidi's</b> 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19 258:5 <b>held</b> 76:2,20 172:5	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10 307:17 hold 41:8 83:15 109:22	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12 163:21 207:5 215:1 identifying 134:16	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13 260:10 273:8 275:11 275:13 276:19 286:18 299:4,13 306:9 importantly 8:16 10:7
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 Heidi's 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19 258:5 held 76:2,20 172:5 hell 264:17 285:8	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10 307:17 hold 41:8 83:15 109:22 188:11 260:15	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12 163:21 207:5 215:1 identifying 134:16 141:3 155:1	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13 260:10 273:8 275:11 275:13 276:19 286:18 299:4,13 306:9
192:9 196:6,10 199:11,15 200:8 201:17 212:8 214:17 216:13,15 217:18 218:14 220:14 226:2 226:10 231:10 234:18 239:8 259:19 265:13 267:21 305:16 308:19 Heidi's 175:16 222:3 231:6 246:5 253:19 258:5 held 76:2,20 172:5 hell 264:17 285:8 help 14:15 53:6 55:7,18	hints 295:13 hire 68:1 hiring 62:13 historically 21:17 45:13 74:16 history 91:19 243:21 hit 37:14 152:3 242:20 304:14 hitting 233:21 Hoc 306:12,16 307:10 307:17 hold 41:8 83:15 109:22 188:11 260:15 holding 127:3	221:5,6,9 241:2 242:8 255:3 263:5 281:2 297:10 300:3 ideas 11:14 21:22 87:19 87:20,20 150:9 197:3 235:17 236:13 300:8 identified 212:9,17 254:5 299:17 identify 119:14 125:7 131:19 135:18 153:12 163:21 207:5 215:1 identifying 134:16 141:3 155:1 identity 123:5	135:12,21 137:12 141:8 142:13 145:3 150:1,14 151:12,15 156:20 168:4 181:1,5 184:6 185:2,7 186:9 187:2,11,19 188:6 201:21 207:5 210:19 212:2 214:22 227:14 229:12 253:13 255:1 257:10,17 258:13 260:10 273:8 275:11 275:13 276:19 286:18 299:4,13 306:9 importantly 8:16 10:7

Ī
278:1,11
imports 76:4 99:8,11
283:1 284:2 impressed 300:20
impression 179:4
<b>improve</b> 119:1 131:9
142:22 171:16 268:4 275:9 297:20
improved 66:7 171:19
improvement 49:9
183:3
in- 67:14 inability 148:16
inaccurate 52:13
inadvertently 35:21
incentive 116:7 include 7:14 33:12
91:14 107:7 174:22
192:18 193:4 208:16 210:12,12,21 212:4
210:12,12,21 212:4 214:13 218:9 246:4
264:9 267:3,7 268:10
included 49:5,7 136:15
139:15 171:7 215:22 248:7 252:7 261:14
266:21
includes 9:13,15
105:15 184:22 211:6 229:2
including 39:13 113:5
276:17
inclusion 208:8,8,16 209:4,15 213:13
218:12
income 233:13 243:4
incorporate 218:3 219:2 253:17 268:3
incorporated 252:3
281:7
incorporating 253:12 254:20 257:1 258:10
incorrect 202:10
increase 47:14,15
233:2 283:9 increased 146:20
increases 171:17
increasing 66:22
171:14 181:20 193:10 203:3,8 231:6 297:3
incredibly 153:13
288:10
independence 129:15 independent 127:21
137:15
indicate 183:14
indices 129:9 individual 73:8 151:1,1
158:19 202:8

individually 40:17
304:21
individuals 115:6
167:14,21 industrial 301:5
industry 2:4 31:3 47:4,8
87:2,15,21 88:3,20,21 89:10 91:14,20 95:12
96:17 100:22 101:8
101:13 102:21 104:9 104:11,12,15,17
104:11,12,15,17 106:12,13 152:9,19
153:10,16 154:7,14
270:4 271:15 272:14
272:17 275:9 276:21 276:22 277:5,6 279:2
279:4 282:11,18,22
283:3,17 285:7 industry-type 100:7
infancy 136:8
inflation 66:19
inform 130:13 information 18:18 19:3
19:12 32:6 51:2,10
57:17 58:3 79:9 94:1 94:3 108:15 121:9,11
94:3 108:15 121:9,11 122:2 125:1 126:20
127:6 137:8,10,16,17
138:11,18,22 139:1 152:12 154:4,18
169:13 172:5,19
175:16 202:9 253:15 255:17 259:9 260:6
268:3
informative 208:7
informed 108:18 infrastructure 39:12
63:16
ingrained 74:21
ingredients 271:13 inhabitants 215:14
228:6
inherent 159:19 inherently 45:9
initial 75:18
initially 29:5
initiative 27:1,9 270:2,3 271:9,12,13,14,20
273:14,19,20 275:3,8
275:12 278:19 279:19
279:22 <b>initiatives</b> 25:16 124:6
innovating 26:21
Innovation 113:11 innovative 11:14 22:13
input 88:3,20 151:19
184:8 189:16 197:10

253:19 271:15 272:14 272:17,20 300:9 303:16 304:1 inquiry 72:1 insight 305:10 inspection 297:16 installment 15:16 instance 88:20 137:7 139:19 148:19 158:17 160:21 218:10 Institute 2:9 **institutes** 7:10,15 institutional 10:16 institutions 89:5 instrument 240:9 insufficient 283:4 insulated 157:6 integration 33:2 intended 223:8 242:20 intending 89:9 intensity 181:20 193:10 203:2,4 intent 55:3 72:14 74:17 85:22 96:8,10 144:19 204:3 223:16 251:19 intention 141:12 intentional 25:4 intentions 10:3 inter-jurisdictional 13:5 interact 226:7,16 227:18 interaction 225:4,8 intercede 292:15 interchange 245:18 interest 32:2 107:12 108:22 124:15 161:11 246:19 247:15 294:4 300:5 303:21 304:22 interested 32:17 37:8 63:5 91:3 111:6 136:12 146:7 289:18 290:12 **interesting** 36:3 109:7 112:14 113:3 127:10 131:2,7 132:1,9 143:3 145:15 147:3 154:13 154:16 174:16 300:14 302:18 303:7 Interestingly 126:21 interjurisdictional 20:2 20:10,17 79:12 94:22 internal 21:18,21 72:16 international 14:6,7 71:5 72:13,19 internationally 71:3

interpreted 253:22 interrupt 11:20 12:2 interviewed 51:6 interviews 196:7 intro 174:11 introduce 5:15 51:12 introduced 177:18 introduction 200:9 introductory 201:6 invading 131:20 inventory 112:15 **invest** 254:5 invested 35:11 156:18 investigating 141:22 investigators 161:6 investing 66:21 investment 66:10,22 67:2,13 255:1 257:11 257:18 258:14 260:12 investments 66:18 **involve** 4:4 116:6 123:17 141:1 involved 55:16 56:19 59:8 87:13 97:10 134:15 147:8 177:15 195:15 245:10 272:19 involvement 55:4 132:19 152:9 195:21 involving 147:12 170:14 **IOOS** 188:3 Irma 175:2 irrelevant 71:20 island 88:6 189:8 205:18 210:17 211:14 211:17 216:5,8 **islands** 9:8,15 34:14 189:9 209:10,16 210:1,22 211:7,9,11 212:5,19 213:13,21 **Isle** 216:9 ism 133:11 **iSnapper** 136:18 148:13 150:8 issue 29:1 35:17 50:9 60:3 61:10 66:4,4 157:13 178:3 180:15 194:22 282:10 284:16 286:17 293:22 issues 6:12 29:14 30:21 31:5 35:14 49:13 61:6 116:4 142:2 145:2 162:20 174:17 175:2 181:2 186:22 187:19 206:5 216:2,3 228:16 229:13 242:17 268:18 281:3 295:8 298:22 item 18:4 94:9

interpretation 182:21

207:18 208:7 213:8

items 4:16 96:7 101:22 law 14:5 15:22 23:1 liaison 291:12 key 113:21 120:3 121:9 288:22,22 126:8 129:13,18 lead 196:3 239:18 Liebert 150:21 iteration 223:22 140:21 147:10 212:16 271:21 297:6 lies 285:20 212:17 223:4,10,14 leader 196:6,9 288:4,5 life 104:1 131:14 243:21 J 226:8,16,19 227:18 **leadership** 64:2 85:15 **lifting** 88:13 **J** 43:3 228:14,15,22 229:18 97:10,17 157:18 light 178:3 301:16 236:7 243:4 249:19 276:3 277:7,11 lighter 143:21 **January** 114:18 125:22 260:22 283:3 299:4 278:22 279:10 295:2 liked 201:11 217:2 126:12 Jason 135:6 kicked 101:15 125:22 297:1 Likewise 220:2 290:21 **JAZZMIN** 3:1 kicks 59:4 leading 254:14 limbo 169:4 **JENNIE** 3:12 leads 167:20 195:18 limitations 134:17 **kidding** 303:13 Jennifer 2:12 4:18 **kill** 301:13 lean 40:13 91:15 limited 133:12 139:1 killer 123:11,14 leaning 97:14 201:13 217:14 265:16 288:7 292:14 kinds 28:7 138:16 learn 50:5 line 13:9 18:4 72:1 Jennifer's 165:7 160:13 161:7 297:20 learned 50:10 99:4 85:21 94:9,14 96:7 100:7 181:18 200:2 123:22 **JIM** 3:13 knew 84:21 job 26:16,19,20 27:3 **knowing** 8:8 40:13 learning 50:8,15 299:7 286:12 30:16 35:7,8 48:8 78:20 **leave** 57:10 111:13 lines 15:6 30:22 99:1,2 56:6 57:11 69:7 74:6 knowledge 41:4 101:19 135:19 161:19 180:17 240:10 link 156:1 189:11 256:18 183:19 205:6,9 75:7,17 77:21 99:4 102:18 168:1 270:1 known 111:18 244:17 246:2 249:19 lion 125:5,8 knows 74:2 199:4 260:18 267:18 280:15 list 40:20 115:9 128:15 308:14 jobs 278:15 283:13 kudos 288:19 308:13 296:8,14,18 298:16 197:13,14 211:2 leaves 59:12 291:22 304:14 **Joe** 89:6 listed 18:9 26:1 30:8 joint 300:1 leaving 177:8 180:13 Julie 1:18 4:14 173:7 **LA** 2:6 left 16:8 81:14 84:6.11 41:6 52:7 174:13 194:9 196:4 231:11 laborious 232:7 84:17 165:9 169:4 217:7 235:12 236:17 241:21 labs 8:20.21 170:5 190:21 196:17 listen 192:5 leftover 81:13 listening 64:11 103:20 269:17 276:14 280:22 lack 148:17 189:10 304:13 306:19 307:18 213:3 255:17.19 **legal** 1:17 117:6 lists 96:20 Julie's 179:3,6 231:8 **Lakes** 9:14 legislation 12:21 little 5:5 16:9 17:2 legislative 3:9,11 12:4 282:4 Landing 2:3 26:10 29:6 30:14 **July** 126:3 landings 95:1 12:15 77:10 31:15 32:9 36:10 jump 200:2 language 78:4 115:14 **Lei** 1:12,14 37:20 38:6,20 43:10 **jumped** 29:6 185:7 214:17 226:2 length 129:10 43:18 47:10 48:7 **June** 126:6 299:16 252:22 272:1 lesson 123:22 59:19 70:12 81:1 301:19 large 53:3 113:1 116:6 **let's** 87:16,17,17 110:20 84:14 91:21 98:8 jurisdiction 210:14 128:2 135:9 166:1 184:9 200:7 104:14 105:21 106:21 jurisdictional 94:15 largely 115:18 256:7,13 202:14 205:21 213:8 107:3 109:4,18 110:2 jurisdictions 210:9,17 284:4 227:21 232:9 251:12 116:18 117:19 118:10 justifiable 256:17 larger 74:11 285:19 258:5 260:15 278:18 121:20 125:16 128:5 285:14 138:3 141:11 155:21 justification 274:2 largest 58:21 100:10 112:2 213:15 letter 189:15 197:1 160:3 166:9 167:22 Κ 179:15 180:3 184:20 lastly 103:18 164:7 198:18,19 207:19 269:22 280:3,13 205:9 221:16 232:7 K 74:16 late 199:19 295:10 233:5 249:14 258:6 **Kachemak** 131:18 lately 158:15 281:18 286:21 287:6 **KATE** 3:16 latest 125:4 268:3 **level** 54:4,4 65:12 70:22 271:7 272:7,21 278:5 270:15 271:2 100:19 103:8,14 279:14 281:21 289:1 keep 6:10 28:6 52:2 laughing 291:10 112:22 120:9 126:3 289:4 299:19 300:20 65:12 101:8,8 128:16 305:3,11 172:9 184:14 190:16 Laughter 29:9 37:11 147:13 149:19 151:2 77:1 98:13 103:21 154:7 157:22 202:7 Littoral 123:6 221:15 225:19 260:5 104:6 204:15 212:16 230:4 live 248:12,14 251:11 281:13 Laura 3:8,18 4:4 109:8 233:5 242:1 260:6 keeping 100:22 124:13 268:16 276:10 285:3 271:15 277:7 living 120:13 305:11 141:17,18 167:7 109:10 110:13 128:11 128:17 141:16 **levels** 99:22 160:19 **Liz** 2:3 104:3,5 172:14 243:4 Kennedy 12:15 71:10 **Laura's** 109:9 214:10 231:3,15 172:15 175:17 192:18 234:7 236:16 238:13 231:11,18 234:7,19 77:5 **Laurel** 293:21 **Laverne** 302:16 241:16 243:10 285:10 304:12 kept 246:21 247:16

"			325
LIZAMA 3:11	212-9 200-19	110:12 165:11 166:1	00.2 270.42 207.42
- II	212:8 290:18	110:12 165:11 166:1	90:3 278:12 297:12
<b>LLC</b> 1:18 2:7 3:3	lose 198:4 261:2	166:11,15 196:20	majority 7:9 8:15,15,16
loaded 51:1	loses 255:3	197:14 217:17 287:22	12:21 30:9 64:13
lobby 76:19	losing 66:11 67:8	288:3,6,8 290:3,6,13	81:15 96:3,12
lobster 122:7 205:18	182:16 292:8	290:18 291:17,19,22	making 5:19 17:18
235:21 258:22 259:4	loss 149:13 278:13	292:4,6,16,19 293:2,6	18:11 21:8 22:20 23:8
lobsters 187:8 256:15	lost 178:12,19 181:19	293:12,16 295:16	27:4 63:17 87:16
local 306:5	256:21	296:19 298:13 299:11	105:12 125:11 141:4
localized 191:3,5	lot 5:7 8:4 9:22 13:17	300:16,22 301:8,15	187:15 203:13 216:3
located 13:12	13:20 18:13,14 19:2	302:20 303:9,14	286:4 303:14
location 27:7 299:17	21:2 23:16 24:15	306:8 307:18 308:1	<b>mammals</b> 13:18
300:8	25:20 29:1 37:10	308:16	manage 112:5 222:16
locations 90:5 122:2,10	40:15 44:8,18,19	lunch 196:18,21 197:16	222:20
137:9 205:22 228:10	45:14,15 46:5,6 49:13	197:20 198:1,11	management 3:4,6,15
logged 132:7	54:16 59:9 61:22 63:1	<b>LYONS</b> 3:12	5:17 14:11,16 15:1
logically 44:16	64:9 67:6 74:14 84:16		17:19 19:4 23:12
long 10:18,21,21 53:14	85:9,17 88:7 89:22	M	27:16 52:6,8 53:20
62:14 86:7 98:10	90:11 91:19 93:5	M 1:19	55:6 70:21 71:2,12
122:7 128:6 150:15	97:14 99:18 100:17	ma'am 92:12 170:22	105:7 118:20 121:3
205:18 281:9	100:21 104:9,22	200:5 239:5	125:19 126:9 127:18
longer 32:9 204:14	108:1 120:5 128:13	Madam 31:11 32:8	137:19 144:21 146:13
205:11	137:20 138:4,9 147:4	53:12 98:10 108:9	154:2 219:2 220:18
longline 213:17	147:19 150:5,7 153:8	150:17 162:9 165:5	221:11,12 222:4
look 29:17 30:3,4 35:3	154:2 157:15,19	167:1 168:15 172:11	223:4,10,14 224:10
40:22 41:1,2,11,16	158:4 159:14 164:16	175:13,22 190:20	224:14 225:6 226:7
44:4,9 45:12 46:7,12	164:18 167:19 182:1	210:5	226:15 227:17 229:16
46:19 51:17 56:8	185:19 208:10 209:1	Madame 266:13	229:22 231:22 233:15
62:16 65:9 73:16	213:18 214:4 223:11	MAFAC 1:15 31:13	235:1 237:18 238:4
80:15,18 88:2 91:3,7	242:20 245:21 251:5	108:10,12,21 109:1	238:10,13 239:10,13
96:9 97:20 102:22	256:12,16 261:22	161:12 167:15 171:8	239:19 240:3,10,12
112:22 138:7 169:1	264:17 281:2,9		
172:1 175:18 199:13	282:14 285:8 288:12	175:11 178:1 185:5	240:19 241:4,7,13,15 242:19 244:12 245:8
203:20 205:17 207:4		190:1 197:3 199:5,5,6	
212:16 224:20,22	294:8 297:14,19	200:11,22 217:21	245:12,20 246:1 248:1 252:13 253:17
	300:14 303:18,22	271:11 272:12,15	
225:3 226:3 228:1	lots 107:12 147:4	279:4,7,11 281:17,19	254:21 257:3 258:12
236:9 251:15 255:3	loud 171:2 254:18	282:2,5 283:7,20	261:5 266:3 272:20
264:14,15 270:5	258:15	288:11 295:2 298:21	manager 15:20 51:15
278:2 280:17 285:7	louder 192:14	302:12	73:16
298:5 299:9 303:6	Louisiana 211:13 216:9	MAFAC's 281:18	managers 121:16
looked 29:5 40:17	love 68:21 75:9 281:9	291:12	171:20 272:19
42:13 46:8 119:16	303:2	magnitude 122:22	managing 140:21
140:6 160:12 168:18	loved 263:3	Magnolia 1:11	144:18 151:16 186:9
212:16 263:19	<b>LOVETT</b> 2:15 80:11	Magnuson 52:7 117:13	222:20 227:12
looking 21:7 22:13,20	170:1 173:1,6 175:19	118:4 133:9	mandate 148:10
38:6 39:17 42:15,18	180:8 183:4 190:3,10	Magnuson-Stevens	mandated 96:6 147:22
43:2 44:7,10,11 45:6	190:13,18 191:20	12:20	148:2
45:7,17 47:22 54:7	192:3,6,10 193:15	main 42:8 163:20 184:9	mandates 133:8
64:5 73:6,9 74:11	198:9 206:11 212:11	189:7 205:19 214:6	mandatory 55:10
92:21 103:15 105:19	216:20 217:19 220:16	214:12 274:14	manner 134:8 156:20
106:22 112:1 139:12	226:5,11,14,22 227:3	Maine 1:16 122:11	manpower 18:14
144:11 161:6 162:16	231:12 246:7 247:1	235:21 303:12	<b>Map</b> 131:22
176:1 178:5 208:21	253:21 254:18 265:18	mainland 189:21 212:1	<b>maps</b> 131:10
218:7 225:4 235:7	305:18	maintain 114:1 124:1,1	March 126:14 163:13
249:14 289:7,16	low 47:12 52:11 53:10	145:21,22	164:3
290:9,22 295:13	195:19	maintaining 17:17 93:5	Maria 175:3
299:15 303:20	lower 103:6 242:7	124:9 128:14	Marina 210:21
looks 5:8 24:8 67:6	Lukens 2:12 4:18	major 8:20 12:10 13:1	marine 1:4,15 6:18,21
82:6 121:1 153:1	108:13 109:9,11	13:21 14:9 15:4 58:21	13:18 21:19 143:9
	•	l	
"			

207:6 215:2 217:4.9 220:1 222:16 251:4 marine-protected 219:17 221:9,14 market 22:17 71:21 233:2 285:19 marketing 100:8,9 marks 36:6 **MARS** 130:20 Maryland 1:11 massaging 83:2 **massive** 187:13 master 176:4 match 62:4 64:20 65:1 65:5 161:2 matched 66:19 264:11 **matches** 15:15 material 260:20 matter 40:8,14,21 56:3 73:20 74:5 117:14 119:4 166:6 181:4 198:13 282:21 286:17 309:6 maturing 237:8 maturity 236:4 237:6 maximize 161:7 maximum 60:2 MCCALLUM 3:13 mean 26:18 44:9 49:19 50:5 59:3 62:15,20 64:6,15 76:20 92:16 93:7,13 108:11 113:21 122:21 124:5 124:6 145:17 158:10 172:14 177:5 183:5 184:9 187:2 204:21 215:18 219:15 220:9 230:10 235:4 244:6,8 245:3,5 253:6 261:21 266:16 273:2 281:21 291:9 300:18 301:4 meaning 218:3 237:9 meaningful 123:7 means 20:3 21:11 36:19 78:8 80:8 120:15 142:9,10 239:9 245:6,11 meant 78:16 measure 149:1 180:16 **measured** 138:20 measures 17:19 160:1 178:11 179:8,11,13 180:2,4 221:12 238:4 mechanism 144:1 154:11,20 238:11 mechanisms 155:12 245:22 **media** 91:2

meet 39:10 41:17 53:7 70:8 76:18 127:5 283:4,22 284:5 298:18 meeting 1:6 4:17 5:4,5 26:6 62:19 126:13 162:10,18,19 164:3 165:2 190:8 197:5 217:21 288:10,12,22 289:9 294:6,11 295:1 295:7,10 297:1 299:10,13,14,17 300:1,2 301:12,19 304:2 308:20 309:2 meetings 6:1 234:22 288:11 299:22 302:5 302:5,6 meets 70:5.6 megatrends 65:20 members 1:13 96:18 112:11 113:2 161:16 165:15 174:21 188:16 198:4 276:18 291:1,3 291:7 295:6,19 304:9 **Members'** 191:19 membership 289:17 295:20 303:21 memo 200:10 memorandum 297:7 mention 75:10 113:14 113:18 114:20 124:3 137:15 150:19 172:2 175:4 181:1 184:20 209:22 238:2 252:8 265:15 mentioned 48:16 65:20 66:2,3 75:20 89:18 128:11,17 141:16 144:3 148:15 150:7 177:9 181:3 201:16 206:15 213:5 238:9 250:6 252:1 254:1 263:11 267:21 291:15 **mentions** 250:19 merit 40:6 44:2 103:15 103:16 meritorious 42:7 Merrill 75:17 message 136:5 141:5 227:9 238:7 messaged 95:13 messages 212:17

messaging 69:8 75:7

met 1:10 298:19 301:10

method 115:17 148:3

102:18

302:12

metadata 141:22

methodology 260:21 methods 134:21 135:17 179:11 **metrics** 142:13 **Mexico** 131:14 147:21 Michael 2:16 272:8 274:10,17 microphone 109:14 168:12,20 183:10 188:12 193:14 205:16 207:2 212:10 239:16 257:19 258:1,7 259:6 259:21 266:22 267:6 269:3 279:1 287:2 290:17 291:16,18,21 292:3,5 mid-Atlantic 135:7 middle 43:11 185:18 283:7 migration 119:19 Mike 2:6 56:13 98:6 104:1,9 107:3 154:9 178:22 181:16 219:3 224:20 230:6 232:8 237:15 241:19 248:11 252:10 254:16 257:5 258:6 260:15 265:5 284:10 292:2,7 293:12 295:11 296:20 299:1,4 300:11,16 301:8 306:20 Mike's 52:1 88:5 152:8 153:15 180:15 291:10 million 7:21 8:9 9:5 15:2 16:20,21 17:1 18:3 19:20,20 20:11 22:6 66:6 76:9,9,13 77:17 78:6,10,11 79:3 81:2 89:21 90:3,4 91:20 92:18 93:3,18 95:17 112:18 144:13 144:14 million-7:3 19:21 million-plus 24:6 million-worth 7:15 **millions** 122:9 mind 61:1 92:19 99:9 132:18 179:4 190:16 246:21 247:16 271:8 minds 11:5 mine 204:17 minimal 160:2 204:7 minimalist 205:10 minimize 184:4 194:3 minimizing 194:2 minimum 39:9,9 40:8 141:13 **minimums** 39:15

minor 143:15 199:10 265:6 minus 147:20 minute 131:16 172:15 203:20 251:8 305:16 minutes 219:9 224:16 289:9 294:5 miracle 195:2 mirror 139:22 misheard 180:9 misleading 191:8 missed 68:16 165:3 169:21 177:16 306:8 missing 202:1 260:14 263:2 266:17 289:15 mission 70:5,9 93:16 105:17 mistaken 228:15 Mitchell 24:3 mode 242:16 model 130:20 132:9 266:7 modeling 130:13 264:1 models 99:7 122:4 129:22 131:9 263:18 263:20 264:6 265:20 moderate 146:21 modify 126:15 269:22 moment 166:1 188:9 189:20 moments 265:3 money 10:2,14 12:7,7 12:12,16 16:6,13 18:13 19:2 21:20,22 22:4 29:6,18 30:7,9 30:17,17,19 31:12,19 52:5 59:10 65:7,11 67:7 75:10,11 76:21 78:17 81:4,5,10,12 82:2,8 83:7,18 84:3 84:11 87:6,21 89:4,22 95:15 99:17 101:7 155:8 money's 91:6 monitor 127:17 136:17 monitoring 23:2,7 79:12 121:15 131:17 132:11 152:11 171:15 188:3 222:15,18 240:8 297:16 month 67:16 monumental 195:2 **MOORE** 2:5 86:20,22 87:8 88:10 92:1 152:6 155:22 156:3,7,10,13 180:12 186:6 morning 5:3,6 115:20 122:8 196:13 199:21

needing 259:9 morphed 256:2 70:4 85:21 120:18 76:10 101:21 104:13 mortality 131:13 218:7 133:10 needs 11:22 12:13,14 110:16 111:3 112:10 218:8,9 national 1:3,15 6:18,21 12:17 17:6 30:18 112:10 113:6,17 15:6,20 16:22 17:8 38:18 55:18 67:19 **motion** 173:9,10,17,19 116:5 117:4 120:9,20 174:2 194:12,16 21:18 38:9 50:18 70:8 80:10 83:13,14 122:18,18 123:17 83:20 85:20 93:16 269:1,7,14 287:6,8 51:14 66:3,12 78:21 124:17 125:11 163:2 306:17 307:5,6,10 83:9 127:5 132:13 97:21 105:7 117:15 164:8 172:5 193:4,5 motivated 139:21 161:1 133:9 163:9 164:9 117:19 118:20 127:3 218:20 219:5 229:7 130:16 141:18 148:22 246:16 247:10 256:12 mountaintop 51:7 242:21 246:10 247:4 mouth 59:13 271:8,13,20 273:13 149:11 164:18 165:10 269:22 271:21 272:6 mouthful 19:15 273:18 275:3,12 169:14 174:18 245:22 274:1 275:8 277:12 move 9:6 14:19 17:14 278:19 279:19,22 261:14 270:4 274:14 283:1 305:9 30:17 37:19 41:19 277:14 NOAA's 46:21 271:11 nationally 30:13 82:7 147:13 154:6 nations 189:8 284:5 Neery 308:13 297:1 162:2 175:14 180:10 Native 210:7 215:13 negative 51:18 181:21 **NOAAs** 217:15 183:16 194:17 203:19 228:5 182:9 183:1,12,19 nobody's 242:8 227:21 237:20 250:1 natural 131:13 218:8 191:7,10 236:11,14 nominate 290:19 non-competitive 10:9 253:17 255:18 257:16 265:1 237:14 243:1 248:18 261:13 266:11 268:16 nature 65:7 68:7 117:21 negatively 282:17 100:5 non-competitively 268:19,19 270:1 167:15 220:7 286:5 274:5 294:3 295:3 NAUGHTEN 3:16 negatives 142:8 16:21 moved 76:7 283:5 neglect 211:21 non-probability 133:12 **NCA4** 4:11 307:7 near 8:9 129:14 151:2 **Neither 262:10** 133:15 134:17 158:9 moves 237:22 214:4 **NESDS** 7:11 78:21 non-profit 47:8 58:16 moving 11:19 18:1 **nested** 194:7 **nearly** 112:3 normally 41:20 46:17 51:21 192:12 necessarily 35:17 network 35:18 North 91:16 232:1.17 203:9 261:19 192:20 206:9 210:11 **networks** 18:18 19:12 235:1 **MPAs** 127:15 210:13 276:7 79:9 94:1 132:11 northeast 9:12 19:13 MRIP 3:3 123:8 132:17 **neutral** 183:19 29:7 30:9 44:15 89:7 necessary 100:19 132:18 133:2,22 177:4 275:5 280:9,13 never 35:2 82:8 132:4 121:3 134:3 135:5 136:13 neck 259:15 302:12 303:4 northern 210:21 nevertheless 182:13 137:2 138:6,16,17 need 10:14 24:21 30:4 northwest 2:4 52:9 139:1 140:6 160:9 30:18 31:6 37:2 39:17 new 24:1 51:14 120:15 121:2.18 122:15 136:3 154:16 161:2 164:8,17,20 42:18 43:6,8 61:6 not's 183:14 **MSE** 253:3 261:5 71:11 72:15,17 75:1 156:18 164:14 167:14 note 192:17 230:19 **MSEs** 253:22 257:4 78:8 87:22,22 94:18 176:1,11 181:14 noted 112:17 261:11 101:5 129:13 134:7 240:9 262:9 291:4,7 notes 21:13 231:20 muck 180:22 148:11 161:22 169:10 294:7 295:5,8 296:4 **notice** 222:5 multi-year 15:11 169:14 178:7 184:5 299:7 305:19 306:22 noticed 239:6 multimedia 125:1 186:18 187:14,15 news 51:4 229:19 notification 156:16 multiple 131:13 144:8 200:1 210:6 214:6,13 **NFS** 113:5 notifications 137:20 201:10 234:22 **NGO** 302:4 215:12,19 222:16,17 notified 138:1 multiply 73:18 223:15 224:12,14,22 nice 114:2 **NOVEMBER** 1:8 murder 301:16 225:5 228:2,4 233:12 **NSF** 114:11 nickname 104:5 mustache 97:13 234:13 239:9 241:12 **night** 165:7,14 199:12 number 12:19 57:12 mute 188:11 192:7 246:4 248:10 250:17 73:19 77:3 78:5,10 199:17 289:14 253:14 254:14 255:16 **mutton** 130:15 **nights** 178:18 90:12,13,15 93:1 96:2 255:18 259:15,16,19 nimble 233:14 243:12 105:19 121:2 122:8 Ν 128:2 142:20 155:6 260:6 264:22 268:15 243:13 244:10.11.18 268:19,21 270:3 245:5 247:22 249:13 155:13 164:2 **NAA** 78:2,5,12,16 80:16 274:2,4 276:4,7 **NMFS** 4:3 9:1 43:22 numbers 7:20 25:10,20 80:17 276:18 NAA's 77:19 79:20 277:11,12 280:6,20 64:2 80:12,15,18 29:11 30:13,15 55:12 283:8 286:22 287:4 85:14 87:11 92:20 67:5 82:15 106:9 **NAA/OF** 78:13 288:15 289:1 294:19 97:10 118:5 129:8 143:9 172:13 **name** 20:17 57:10 204:21 211:14,17 294:22 305:22 306:16 134:10 154:2 0 286:3 288:3 **needed** 54:6 69:21,21 **NOAA** 2:12 3:18 4:2,3 149:19,20 169:20 5:18 8:4 35:22 49:1,2 **OA** 256:9,15 **named** 26:15

53:20 54:4 57:2 62:3

245:13 260:12

nation 12:17 68:10,11

OAR 7:11 78:20

**object** 158:5 222:10 objected 219:17 objecting 219:20 objection 287:5 **objective** 50:2,16 51:16 105:15,16 163:20,20 **objectives** 20:10 47:2 163:19 242:20 obligate 17:5 oblique 31:15 observers 154:5 obtain 115:17 **obviously** 29:7 53:16 59:17 68:19 71:8 296:3 occur 203:14 249:4 occurs 140:1 160:21 302:8 ocean 78:22 111:19 122:4 180:13 186:11 186:14 187:21 193:8 206:18 213:14,20,20 214:3,10 250:3,10 251:2 257:13 258:18 258:20 259:2 263:13 297:5 OCEANIC 1:3 oceans 206:20 offensive 187:17 offer 282:7 303:12 307:6 **office** 2:13,16,16 3:4,6 3:9,10,11,12,15,16 5:17 9:18,19 13:3,12 13:21 14:1,8 21:15 64:1 97:13 110:17 offices 8:4,19 9:17,19 14:4 official 2:12,16 189:15 296:2 officially 165:19 200:19 officio 2:2 offline 59:19 61:3 offset 77:22 78:13 79:4 84:4 92:17 99:10 182:8 233:13 oftentimes 266:8 ogrants 7:17 **OKONIEWSKI** 2:6 56:14,22 57:21 58:2,5 58:10 59:2,12,21 60:7 60:11,14,17,22 61:13 61:16 98:7,11,14,17 99:6,13,15 100:15 101:12 103:18 156:22 158:12 159:21 179:1 181:17 183:2 186:2 219:4,11,19 220:5

224:21 230:7 231:7 232:6,11,16 233:1 234:10 237:16 241:3 241:20 242:15 243:15 244:15 248:14 249:7 249:18 252:9,11,18 253:2 254:9 260:17 265:6 277:20 278:8 278:10 285:5 293:13 295:12 296:1 298:3 300:12,17 301:1 **old** 81:5 Oliver 2:13 275:18 298:14,18 **OMB** 75:3 omission 25:4 once 41:10 42:14 93:13 162:2 239:6 249:3 278:19 one's 58:20 91:8 176:10 301:3 one-on-one 50:22 ones 41:19 120:15 124:7 133:20 136:10 168:7,7 176:11 181:2 205:8 290:7 ongoing 177:21 180:19 193:1 228:11 308:4 online 115:19 124:21 124:22 125:6 153:11 ono 28:6 opa 28:6 open 6:11 10:7 22:8 50:1 96:13 111:13 115:5 186:3 221:16 224:3,4 249:3 269:19 276:5 294:10 295:19 opened 32:11 155:8,21 230:16 opening 235:18 237:1 openings 238:15 openly 41:5 opens 231:16 operate 9:17 operation 300:20 302:2 operations 2:15 78:17 153:21 opinion 133:14,14 219:5 opinions 176:5 opportunities 10:6 80:6 169:15 185:10 193:6 274:21 282:1 **opportunity** 39:5 41:13

62:1,10,16,21 107:17

130:4 131:2 163:15

299:2 300:13

189:2 214:19 298:20

130:6 173:22 195:6 204:6 255:16 269:13 307:15 opposite 234:3 opposition 287:17 opt 128:20,21 opt-in 135:6 137:4 optimists 285:6 option 57:14 301:17 options 180:11 **orange** 96:9 order 149:7 166:21 222:15 **Oremland** 3:18 4:4 109:17 110:7,10,13 110:16 124:14 127:9 129:7 142:16 146:4 154:10 156:2,5,8,11 156:14 **ORF** 81:5 93:15 **Organic** 77:6 83:7 organisms 122:13 155:1 256:19 organization 52:20 56:3 63:17 organizations 10:17 53:3,7 62:1,5,11,17 63:1,11 65:3 277:9 organizing 260:22 original 75:5 87:12 179:17,20 204:3 224:20 225:10 226:2 226:4,5 246:22 247:18 257:5 267:22 271:4 272:1 originally 56:18 **Orleans** 136:3 **Ormeland** 109:11,12 other's 106:15 **outcome** 164:11 outcomes 164:6 265:10 267:11 268:14 outliers 45:7 outline 110:22 outlines 85:11 194:1 **output** 177:7 outreach 42:13 55:5 63:9 127:2 144:5,9 145:22 outside 68:9 82:20 157:4 200:20 outstanding 281:5 outstripping 284:3 overall 79:21 143:17 176:22 201:7 241:14

**opposed** 38:9 68:11

overcome 149:7 overlap 23:16 overlooked 210:18 overly 276:11 oversee 15:19 69:12 oversees 6:6 15:19 oversight 195:21 overwhelmed 157:5 Owner/Operator 2:6 oxygen 186:15 188:2 193:9

## Ρ

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 5:1 107:8 **p.m** 198:14,15 309:7 PacFIN 93:20 101:9 Pacific 2:2,6 9:7 18:2 18:16 19:16,17 28:3,4 34:4 54:11 91:16 126:22 174:22 187:3 189:8.9 190:16 208:9 209:6,16 210:1 212:19 213:13,14 214:2,3,14 230:6 231:4 236:10,17 238:14 page 39:10 207:8 281:13 paid 57:2 painful 288:15 paint 191:7 **painted** 139:6 Pam 4:12 74:19 171:21 198:9.20 202:22 204:1 207:17 210:5 235:11 251:17 273:11 304:12 Pam's 75:6 198:7 Pamela 2:8 4:10 panel 41:21,22 42:1,2,3 42:6,16 43:5 44:3 45:2 48:16 106:4,4 126:7 128:14,15 157:11 163:18 195:21 panel's 42:15 panels 53:1 135:6 paper 129:18 144:10 146:17 160:7,7 176:6 papers 114:3 119:20 163:7 289:2 paperwork 305:21 paragraph 177:10,12 179:21 200:13 201:7 278:20,21 279:9,18 283:6

251:1,2

overarching 12:20

parameters 128:22

paranoid 276:11

П
parcel 153:20
parentheses 250:17
parenthesis 215:6 222:1,11
parking 306:6
parsing 272:22 part 6:8 40:12 71:7 72:3
72:4,21 80:11 83:6
90:21 93:10 98:19
105:16 111:5 128:12 147:16 148:18 151:7
153:15,20 157:17
159:1 169:16 174:14 177:19 196:3 204:2
221:6,18 228:14
230:21 248:20 259:5
265:14 266:1 299:7 partial 281:15,16
partially 160:8 237:16
participant 124:22 170:19 174:4 185:21
186:1 198:7 215:7
293:11
participants 118:11 participate 115:6
participated 196:2
participating 2:11 128:16
participation 89:10
114:12 118:8 153:16 particular 19:1 20:6,8
22:1 73:10 92:20
121:12 152:15 171:4
178:3 188:22 207:4 218:2 272:4
particularly 13:16
176:17 188:1 277:2 297:15
partly 189:15
partner 120:20 partners 18:15 116:14
126:2 163:22
Partnership 291:11
299:21 partnerships 123:17
parts 174:11 201:11,11
pass 199:6 passed 174:3 201:3
<b>passes</b> 39:15
path 49:14
pathway 204:20 paucity 280:4
Paul 2:14 82:2,9 83:3
272:8 274:12 275:21 276:13 279:14 280:1
296:20 298:3 299:1
304:10 308:4
<b>pay</b> 155:8
II

paycheck 67:14,15 payment 69:19,22 Pearce 2:6 4:8 147:6 168:13,21 170:9,17 170:20 171:3,21 172:8 173:12,16 peer 15:8 145:12 146:14
peer-to-peer 52:6
<b>peeve</b> 281:16
Pelagic 58:16
<b>people</b> 6:20 10:1 17:12
24:13 40:2,18,21 41:3
42:11,16 45:10,11 54:15 59:8 60:10
64:19,22 65:10,10
70:7 73:5,19 74:10,11
85:17 86:2,8 88:12
90:9 95:10 114:4,10
114:13 119:12 136:20
146:7,9 153:10
155:13,14 163:3 164:18 174:19 176:17
176:20 183:15 191:21
195:18 197:19,21
203:13 213:3 219:17
220:20 226:12 227:19
228:1 231:14 241:10
246:8 247:2,20 251:5
251:11 263:17 264:5 268:16 276:21 277:9
281:3 284:11 290:9
300:4 304:5 305:19
306:19
perceived 142:10
percent 26:18 30:10
33:18,20,22 34:17
39:2,22 45:18,18,20 45:21 46:3 64:21
66:15,16,20,22 76:6
76:10,18 77:2 79:10
79:20 81:17 98:18
99:13 103:1 127:16
163:11 191:4 270:11
270:12,16 277:22
278:3 285:7
percentage 45:1,3,19 46:2,11,14,16 47:6,20
67:2 90:18
percentages 47:12
percention 69:7 70:10

perception 68:7 70:10

perch 182:7 230:13

perfect 86:22 115:21

performing 296:16

241:21 242:1

119:8 198:8

perfectly 194:5

286:16,17

period 33:19 66:21 203:3,8 238:21 250:13 285:19 periods 10:21 171:17 peripherally 115:1 permissible 219:6 persist 204:3,5,12 person 49:2 55:21 107:14 219:13 299:16 personal 60:15 personally 69:7 90:8 244:15 perspective 61:21 133:1,11 134:1,2 137:20 138:8 271:12 275:14,21 276:22 pertains 53:15 perturbation 256:19 perturbation-resilient 218:17 perturbations 194:2 256:8 pet 281:16 Peter 2:5 86:17 152:5 181:10 186:5 190:21 192:11 252:1 263:2 264:14 304:12 Peter's 100:16 191:2,12 267:14 phase 39:14,15 42:8 43:9 146:14 **PhD** 2:16,17 phenological 119:18 **phone** 166:5 188:10 189:7 207:1 264:14 **phrase** 73:21 232:12 254:10 275:3 **phrased** 254:10 Phytoplankton 132:10 **picking** 101:6 **picks** 140:11 **picture** 24:5 132:5 139:5 202:13 pictures 85:4 piece 89:10 158:8 251:2 271:3 281:11 297:12 298:2 pieces 297:13 **pilot** 140:6 144:21 pinniped 23:21 **pissed** 58:8 place 23:9 66:11 150:6 209:21 212:9 246:1 places 30:7 97:16 185:14 211:12 212:19 227:4 302:12 plan 108:12,21 163:10 **planned** 109:20

planning 35:12 176:18 176:20 **plans** 8:6,7 14:16 64:6 189:22 plant 58:21 plaques 165:21 **plate** 293:19 platform 124:18 155:3 155:5 play 211:5 234:17 played 303:11 playing 65:12 82:19 103:9,14 pleasantly 106:6,8 please 11:19 58:11 107:20 108:3 171:3 173:20 195:3 213:9 307:5 pleased 305:5 pleasure 82:14 186:4 **plenary** 161:20 plus 52:7 128:11 205:11 plus-up 78:12 pluses 147:20 pocket 57:3 101:6 poignant 63:7 pointed 55:9 144:17 219:12 250:22 251:3 270:10,22 pointing 248:17 points 30:6 37:13,15 43:15 53:12 56:15 65:18 68:15 72:8 83:17 89:17 97:12 107:1 168:3 179:3 184:11 185:1 201:19 209:12 214:21 228:22 251:14 polar 207:6 215:3 216:5 **policy** 2:13,16,16 15:7 29:12,16 political 49:4,6 277:7 politically 187:18 pollock 154:3 182:3 **pool** 72:11 74:5,11 118:10 pools 70:13 poorly 204:16 **pop** 165:1 182:6 populating 165:10 population 128:22,22 130:14 131:4 133:17 134:8 158:19,20 159:2 233:8 237:10 populations 204:7,13 204:18 205:10 206:2 218:11 229:2 231:6

portal 11:12 61:5 **portion** 15:5 16:7 80:14 91:19 106:2 133:4,5 161:20 204:13 **Portland** 303:12 portray 182:20 **position** 69:12 126:5 191:12 299:8 304:18 306:14 positive 16:15 162:13 191:6 237:14 242:9 243:3 286:4 positives 142:8 possibilities 111:13 143:20 possibility 72:2 **possible** 74:9 89:16 108:9 139:12 144:22 178:2 187:16 197:8 201:14 301:22 possibly 210:18 242:2 **poster** 163:3 potential 54:2 111:10 111:17 112:6 135:9 161:7 210:7 215:13 228:4 252:13 253:2 potential's 285:18 potentially 110:2 152:17 187:21 284:13 285:1 **pounds** 48:19 power 65:22 powerful 281:10 **PPA** 15:4 practically 263:6 practice 112:11 113:2,9 practices 237:18 **pre** 52:16 pre-53:8 73:17 pre-proposal 40:1 57:16 73:17 103:1 pre-proposals 39:16 46:5,6 47:19 50:13 51:19 precious 292:21 **precise** 164:11 predicted 232:20 preferences 130:14 premature 272:3 **prepare** 177:5 prescribe 161:4 prescriptive 220:6,12 present 1:13 2:12 3:1 110:1 120:17 162:5 presentation 11:21 25:7 65:16 68:17 86:13 96:15 108:12 110:5 121:7 122:7

147:3.7 150:18 157:1 161:10 169:1 170:11 200:16 206:15 270:14 289:3 presentations 5:7 169:18 294:14 presented 217:20 271:11 279:21 presenters 163:3 preserving 283:13 **President** 1:17 2:1,9 12:9 presiding 1:12 press 51:4 presumably 225:13 237:20 pretty 11:21 28:9 31:3 43:21 52:8 54:3 58:11 64:7,15 87:5 106:7 112:19 140:1 161:2 165:2 168:1 172:1,7 172:12 174:15 186:8 202:20 230:13 232:1 233:3 249:2 265:19 269:19 previous 112:17 144:4 206:17 **previously** 204:9,15 **price** 28:10 priesthood 157:9 primarily 44:2 95:1 **primary** 117:13 **prime** 253:5 principle 172:3 principles 171:10 print 41:10 **prior** 83:1 **priorities** 22:9 30:3 33:9 36:7 37:16 38:16 39:2,11 43:16 44:5 46:12 63:21 64:8,10 85:12 87:14 91:15 96:18 97:9,15 102:20 prioritize 96:20 priority 21:4 33:21 34:1 34:4,6,8 36:19,20 37:1 38:4,13,19,22 45:16 47:6 48:4 56:8 85:9 88:13 118:20 121:10 223:5,10,15 225:9 226:8,17,20

227:19 276:4 297:3

private 71:16 72:5

116:6 125:12

prize 114:21 115:22

probabilities 159:1,3

probability 133:1,6,11

134:2,21 135:2

158:18,20 probably 8:10 47:22 56:5 59:18 60:5 72:9 75:3 100:5 121:6 123:18 127:7 132:17 145:19 161:14 164:14 178:18 204:18,22 222:8 243:2 263:6 271:15 279:10 **problem** 32:4,5 58:12 68:14 86:21 92:2 149:14,15 166:16 181:10 184:14 185:13 202:18,18 242:4 256:5 problematic 74:20 **problems** 31:6 147:20 149:7 150:15 172:9 185:4 procedural 134:10 procedures 261:22 **proceed** 168:15 **proceeds** 122:18 process 10:20 17:7,13 22:6,8 25:12,12,18 26:3 37:17 39:6.7 40:1.7 41:10.21 42:6 44:21 49:18 50:12 51:3,6 54:7 59:5 63:21 72:4 73:17 76:3 77:20 79:3 83:10.14 83:16,19 84:11 90:11 103:1 115:7,12 121:17 147:17 157:22 158:6 159:19 167:18 173:8 176:10 201:15 230:20 234:22 235:4 237:21,22 241:14 245:9 260:22 273:15 273:21 278:12,14 processed 278:7 **processes** 4:2 5:19 processing 58:21,21 processors 87:9 **procure** 255:18 **produce** 131:10 164:13 produced 133:14 producers 98:19 283:18 284:9 285:2 286.7 produces 133:4 product 88:22 284:4 285:12 production 277:17 280:10 283:2,10

professionals 55:2 proffered 222:6 program 3:3 13:1,11 15:20,21 16:2,8,22 17:8,13 19:15,21 20:1 20:3,11 21:14,17,18 23:21 30:2,3 32:17 33:1 35:17,18 36:13 36:14 37:6,22 38:3,9 38:10,14,14 42:13 43:20 51:14 55:10 72:14 74:17 79:7 81:13 83:9 84:5,12 88:22 89:20 94:21 102:12 105:14,15,17 122:17,18 123:1,7 125:21 126:1,16 127:14,18,21 128:6 128:12 130:2 131:18 132:1 145:19 148:1 150:21 151:5 156:18 297:16 program's 22:20 26:13 47:1,14 programmed 94:10 programs 2:18 6:6 16:2 21:12 23:2.16.20 24:13 34:15 37:20 38:7 41:8 43:22 46:22 49:22 50:4,16 64:14 74:15,22 79:10 84:6 92:20 93:5,17,19 94:11,12 108:2,17 119:9 122:16 131:17 136:8 137:14 145:5 148:1,20 171:11 progress 27:4 161:15 163:11 project 56:17 72:1 105:3 114:1 116:10 116:13 126:17,18 128:16 151:9 155:10 196:1 265:7 266:10 projecting 265:2,8,9 267:10,11 268:12,13 268:14 projections 263:12,18 265:9,10 266:6 267:4 267:8 268:4,11 projects 4:4 27:14 33:17 34:11,11 35:21 35:22 36:3 71:18 100:7 101:14 112:15 112:19 113:15,17 116:2,9 120:10,11 123:17 124:17 126:10 167:15 296:12 **promise** 98:14

284:14 300:13,18

professional 103:13

profanity 98:15

107:20

promising 308:9 promote 16:17 35:13 36:13,15 76:12 78:6 79:14 81:3,11 228:21 promoted 194:17 promotion 13:13 **proof** 57:1 proportionality 29:12 proportionally 44:12 proposal 53:9 59:16 88:6 272:13 proposals 11:1 47:20 73:18 propose 214:16 256:3 proposed 126:17 273:3 proposing 272:6 protected 9:18 23:15 23:17,18 112:4 217:9 220:1 protection 230:21 protective 121:19 130:19 289:18 290:1 290:3 protocol 57:15 protocols 158:17 160:2 **proven** 233:19 **provide** 118:5 121:9 126:20 128:22 130:18 135:3 137:5 138:11 138:15,22 141:13 142:21 155:22 161:1 231:21 260:6 297:8 305:11 306:6 provided 127:17 140:4 277:4 provides 117:11 134:13 providing 68:11 121:10 146:19 **public** 1:6 3:12,16 32:5 114:11 123:13 133:13 157:13 164:17 publication 119:17,18 130:10 publications 120:2 129:20 130:17 131:7 142:21 **Puerto** 9:15 33:13 34:13 35:7 175:1,6 210:22 300:5 301:17 301:19 302:13 303:1 Puget 122:1 130:19 131:5 pull 86:10 173:2 212:14 272:1 273:8 **pulled** 185:1 pumped 20:6 90:4 punchy 280:20 281:17 purchased 82:20

**purpose** 71:8 140:17 141:9 307:12 purposes 79:5 81:6 push 23:5 196:17 242:7 put 12:16 15:3 16:13,19 18:13,13 19:21 22:17 27:2 41:10 50:5 57:19 59:9 68:22 81:15,16 88:6,11 89:5 106:3,4 106:20 110:6 121:7 133:9 155:10 163:17 175:7,16 177:3,12 184:9,17 185:12 192:7 201:10 203:2 212:5,9 235:15 237:7 237:11 239:12 240:13 243:7 245:22 251:12 255:12,13 257:8,14 260:8 263:17 267:1 272:13 273:5 290:13 297:7 300:3 303:16 putting 12:11 57:15 78:11 102:1 176:5 204:5 260:9 305:7

## Q

**Q&A** 108:19 **QC** 153:14 quality 131:9 133:10 142:12.19 143:1 145:7 155:12 195:20 quantified 27:18 quantify 34:9 quantitative 153:3 query 105:22 question 25:6 26:17 27:1 29:10,22 31:11 32:12 40:15 48:3 52:19 64:9 70:13 71:4 71:7,11,13 72:3,21 75:16 76:15 77:14 81:21 84:13,22 87:1 94:19 104:8 108:8 116:22 120:8 145:7 145:13 158:8 165:6 169:17 176:4,12 180:21 187:22 194:18 196:19 198:3 204:2 217:12 225:12 241:20 246:4 251:18,20 280:19 293:20 question's 86:4 questions 6:3 11:20 16:10 17:11,12 21:13 24:11,12,14 43:10,12 50:21 56:7 107:13 108:3 109:22 110:2 111:14 113:21 115:2

118:22 125:13 128:7 142:20 147:1 165:4 200:2 297:19 queue 86:2 110:6 quick 6:10 61:18 79:19 104:7 109:6 112:8,21 175:18 248:15 277:21 **quicker** 147:13 quickly 14:9,10 24:6,8 24:22 72:10 76:17 106:17 118:15 123:16 233:16 289:12 quite 9:10,11 31:7 38:2 38:10 57:9 117:9 132:19 133:21 139:5 141:19 158:10 174:6 179:18 197:12 224:9 234:3 235:6 237:17 265:8 281:5 305:9 quota 154:1 quota's 28:20 quotas 232:14 233:7,16 quote 146:17 255:15

R **R&D** 66:10 67:2 **radio** 51:5 **Ragster** 302:16 **Rai** 260:12 261:15 290:10,14 301:15 302:20 **Raimundo** 1:22 9:9 55:9 90:22 207:14 210:2 216:2 **Raimundo's** 300:10 raise 11:20 156:21 204:2 233:16 257:1 raised 108:14 252:15 253:3,3,4 254:19,22 257:10,17 258:9,13 raising 165:16 232:14 ran 57:1 84:6 Randy 2:2 152:21 **Randy's** 100:17 range 118:9 122:12 236:13 rank 41:15 **rapidly** 151:3 Rasela 2:1 161:19 188:10,13 190:4 191:20 207:3 210:20 213:8 ratchet 230:9 rate 36:17 130:18 131:13 143:6 raw 260:20 **Ray** 245:2

reach 8:9 51:16 74:12

**reaches** 125:6 read 39:5 43:14 47:1 78:3 129:18 171:2 172:13 174:15 189:5 189:6 192:15 209:18 220:22 239:8 241:18 251:8 254:18 258:15 269:9 281:1 reading 27:4 176:13 189:19 253:9 reads 83:12 96:22 ready 5:10,13 162:7 217:10,13,15 218:2 218:18 220:3,18,19 221:10,11 229:17 231:22 232:2 235:1 239:6,13,15 240:3 253:5 270:1 282:5 294:9 307:4 308:7 real 48:22 76:17 147:14 148:2,3 151:2 156:15 174:17 232:1,21 263:1 265:3 285:20 289:12 reality 72:6 95:15 286:18 realization 11:3 realize 6:20 59:6 148:11 190:22 272:21 realized 57:3.7 realm 137:7,15 157:4 realms 140:18 **Rear** 297:2,18 298:9 rearrange 178:15 245:7 reason 32:16 42:5 64:22 69:11 105:12 133:7 261:4 271:10 reasonable 42:12 reasoning 69:6 reasons 38:11 48:2 83:3 102:3 228:21 282:19 rebuilding 17:17 218:6 rebuilt 182:2 rec 47:8 105:2,4 106:1 106:13,13,13 recall 270:9 recaptured 123:3 receive 11:7 112:18 received 36:5 163:8 169:7,18 189:4 **receives** 104:17 receiving 70:14 recession 66:17 **RecFIN** 19:17

recognition 229:11

recognize 33:5 71:8

167:13 203:13 272:3 271:17 272:5 284:9 191:1 47:9 163:4 273:11 282:12 **referenced** 69:13 171:8 relatively 139:9 146:21 representing 45:20 recognized 113:8 201:20 214:17 release 15:16 28:15 304:21 represents 134:1 271:20 references 202:15 242:9 recognizes 276:3 referencing 120:4 releases 51:4 request 74:8 108:14 Recognizing 283:19 relevance 39:17 42:18 112:16 228:6 276:2 273:20 recommend 54:2 74:10 referred 114:11 72:15 73:1,3 requesting 201:3 209:3 179:6 217:7 274:15 referring 190:6 245:14 relevant 168:4 174:16 requests 209:11 recommendation 127:1 213:6 229:17 240:3 247:17 require 33:2 62:4 164:10 170:12 171:5 refers 158:15 218:20 189:14 194:4 271:16 241:5,9 175:10 178:10 283:15 reflect 246:8 247:2 relief 306:15 required 33:3 155:6 293:5 269:10 294:11 rely 159:11 requirement 64:20 recommendations reflecting 88:4 294:15 remaining 81:7 requirements 39:9 126:14,16 147:17 refugees 211:12,16,21 **remember** 157:12 133:10 170:14 171:6,7 176:3 regard 58:18 203:13 186:21 211:14,16 requires 33:1 178:9,14 192:14 244:10 263:13 223:19 248:16 253:11 research 2:8,9 7:5,16 199:3,5,9 294:12,16 regarding 6:3 263:10 265:16,17 22:2 25:7 31:7 56:17 305:2 regardless 103:12 271:22 306:3 64:6 66:18 68:21 69:1 reminding 165:20 recommending 46:10 region 9:7,13,18,20 78:17 79:6,10 80:5,9 remiss 51:12 308:18 253:1 275:6 279:15 25:13,18 29:18 40:14 80:21 88:21 93:18 record 5:11,14 6:14 42:16 44:17 45:8 47:6 remnants 165:8 96:18 99:19,21 100:8 74:13 79:15 98:4 48:4 146:11 162:19 removal 302:5 100:18 101:22 114:12 166:7 198:14 262:11 163:8 208:9 289:7 remove 180:9 186:19 117:3,5,14,17,18,20 309:7 removing 222:3 118:4,5,11,16 119:5 regional 8:19 14:11 recorded 145:8 24:19 31:22 132:12 render 263:8 119:19 127:14 128:7 recording 125:2 160:18 162:18 163:6 repeat 73:7 131:19 133:11.14.21 recordings 125:3 289:6 repeats 86:5 135:1 136:6.9.14 replace 118:21 145:5 recovered 90:10 regionalized 8:3 38:8 145:18 146:19 156:18 regions 9:2 29:13,14,19 223:4,10,14 225:9 recoveries 23:22 187:7,9 recovery 18:2 121:20 31:21 32:1,13 40:10 replacing 284:3 226:8,16,19 227:13 44:5 45:16 46:2,11 recreational 4:6 19:18 report 66:12 123:4,12 227:18 260:5.10 62:7 104:10 105:6.14 50:19.20.22 52:4 130:4 138:21 161:18 researchers 143:8 106:5 111:10 132:15 55:22 85:16 120:22 162:6 164:20,22 reserve 131:19 133:22 148:5 149:8 162:20 183:16 168:9 169:2 170:7,7 resident 123:11.13 149:22 162:5,10,12 registered 155:19 171:12 174:9 175:9 residents 215:15 regular 81:5 162:14 163:1,6,13,16 175:14 177:10 185:2 resilience 4:8 166:18 164:4 181:4 290:15 regularly 138:6 189:19 190:7 192:20 174:18 175:7 184:6 recruit 145:22 regulations 275:9 197:2 201:20 202:10 190:5,15 196:1 217:4 recruitment 236:3 282:1 202:13,16 207:22 221:7,17 288:17 red 131:22 136:17 regulators 272:18 208:2,4 209:4,14,19 306:12 regulatory 27:16 28:19 138:12 214:13,18 217:6 resiliency 13:19 308:3 reduce 87:22 176:20 resilient 233:12 236:5 99:8 138:1 234:16 220:17 228:10,20 177:4,7 184:8 186:18 274:21 269:8 243:5 reimbursement 305:21 reported 130:7 resonates 281:2 283:11 296:17 reduced 171:17 186:15 reiterate 308:7 reporting 23:7 122:3 resource 9:19 33:1 188:2 193:9 205:11 reiterated 212:12 132:20 134:20 136:14 70:21 71:12 155:20 reducing 176:19 193:6 rejected 35:22 139:7 137:10 resources 13:16 23:15 reduction 21:14 30:11 relate 121:19 reports 4:6 27:4,8 23:17,19 121:11 162:4 166:19 206:16 38:13 172:19 177:22 related 129:1 171:13 141:19 171:17 217:4 reductions 23:18 176:15 248:2 274:17 238:5 222:16 225:5,7,8 185:12 193:3 194:4 297:13 repositories 172:4 289:19 290:1,4 297:5 228:13 relates 151:7 165:6 repository 27:6 respect 280:14 Reef 130:2,2,9 131:11 303:19 represent 98:19 100:11 respects 142:4 reefscaping 35:7 relations 171:19 134:8 respond 233:16 refer 213:19 248:22 representation 165:15 relationship 250:2,10 responded 232:14 280:2 relationships 62:12,13 representative 134:8 responding 232:3 reference 113:20 114:3 62:14 144:2,5 135:19 244:3 114:6 138:4,10 213:3 relative 137:17 151:11 represented 25:3,9 response 48:13 132:6

195:4 219:22 220:9

170:16 174:1 193:19 203:6 205:17 218:16 224:8 256:1 257:15 194:19 195:7,10 222:12 223:1 227:20 258:16 259:11 269:1 270:7 273:7 278:18 228:17 229:14 234:9 236:1 238:11 256:9 279:2 280:19 281:12 256:19 286:22 287:3,19 responses 256:7 301:9 307:8 responsibility 154:8 Rhode 88:6 responsible 99:1 Rich 3:3 4:5 109:15 111:11 132:14 144:17 **responsive** 234:13,16 **Richard** 110:15 164:8 235:3 237:19 256:13 rest 81:16 166:17 **RICHEN** 1:19 170:21,21 188:15 Rico 9:15 33:13 34:14 271:5 35:7 175:1,6 211:1 restricted 115:9 117:16 300:5 301:20 302:14 248:5 303:1 restriction 242:10 Rico's 301:17 result 108:12 203:16 rid 64:21 65:2 183:18 results 27:17 143:12 185:17 242:10 281:20 156:19 rightie 5:13 resumed 166:7 198:14 rigorous 37:17 129:3 **resuming** 198:17 **rip** 75:14 290:19,19 ret 1:21 ripe 222:7 retain 185:2 201:21 rise 146:6,8 213:19,20 Retrospective 266:8 214:10 return 137:9 risk 157:11 172:19 returned 28:16 138:19 176:19,20 177:8 returning 65:22 192:19 revealing 145:16 risks 176:15 177:5 reversible 205:1 184:5 193:6 194:2,3 review 4:3.16 11:15 246:17 247:12 39:6.7 40:7 44:21 road 101:4 **Rob** 160:10 50:12 72:4 111:12 126:15 145:13 146:14 **Robert** 2:3,7 170:18 152:20 153:11 184:21 172:9 199:21 201:15 208:21 robust 22:8 39:6 87:5 268:21 rockfish 129:11 131:5 reviewed 49:1 rockfishes 121:13 reviewer 70:14 72:11 122:1 130:19 73:22 Roger 1:17 28:19 87:12 reviewers 35:18 36:2,4 217:20 244:4 249:8 40:16 52:11 54:21 289:3 293:10,21 70:13 71:5 72:13,19 role 211:5 243:4 252:13 73:5,10 213:6 253:3.8 254:21 257:3 reviewing 53:1 152:11 258:11 305:4 307:21 167:9 rolling 161:13 279:18 reviews 15:8 36:5 37:3 room 1:11 49:9 147:10 40:8,11 46:6 48:17,21 172:12,17 205:10 229:10 274:11 285:8 70:15 73:18 74:12 153:1 rose 160:7 revised 174:21 269:10 rosy 139:5 reward 285:20 rotating 301:11 reword 223:16 round 88:15 224:9,9 rewording 203:1 roundtables 162:18 rewriting 223:7 route 256:3 **RHEAULT** 2:7 96:15 **ROV** 153:8 97:4 184:1 190:20 royally 58:8 193:22 194:8 202:22 **RUBINO** 2:16

Rubino's 274:10
rules 41:9,11
run 21:15 26:14,14
30:11 52:9 58:13
116:1
running 304:15 308:2
runs 30:2 58:20
Russ 162:11

S
S-74:15
S-K 15:20,21 16:2,8

17:11,13 19:20 23:17 24:10 30:9 32:17 33:10 35:1,18,19 36:1 36:8 38:9,13 43:20 47:1 51:2,14 52:10 54:19 56:16 62:2,5,16 62:19 63:14 64:15,19 72:12 75:21 79:6 81:9 81:9,10,13,18 84:5 85:22 87:1,6 89:19 94:21 **S-K's** 49:20 **S&T** 19:19 **SAC** 34:21 safe 165:18 **safety** 281:3 **sake** 12:7 32:2 **salient** 177:19 salmon 13:17 18:2.7.10 24:4,4 204:18 205:19 salmonids 183:6 Saltonstall 77:6 **Saltonstall-** 12:14 71:9 Saltonstall-Kennedy 13:10 15:17 30:8 75:22 **Samoa** 9:11 209:7,11 210:22 sample 135:19 158:9 158:18,19 159:10 **samples** 158:16 161:2 **sampling** 57:15 121:18 128:1 129:4 133:6,12 133:16 134:2,17,21 158:17 Sartwell 162:17,21 saving 66:6 saw 21:12 24:11,15 97:9 130:6 188:2 225:14 252:6 278:1 300:20

saying 48:22 68:15

79:3 93:9 100:18

130:6,21 155:16

180:5 182:8 185:5

172:22 173:20 179:19

223:8 233:18,22 234:7 235:6,9 238:2 254:7 261:8 267:22 268:2 269:11 278:21 301:4 308:18 says 20:5 43:5,19 78:4 94:14 106:20 107:3 171:14 200:10 204:3 207:5,20 210:8,20 215:2,12 234:2 236:10 266:14 270:15 277:11,11,16 278:3 283:7 scale 112:1 116:19 126:22 127:2 151:8 151:10 300:19 303:5 scales 146:21 scallop 153:9 154:22 scallops 153:12 155:1 155:15,18 187:8 256:15 258:22 259:4 scamp 126:20 scenarios 140:11 schedule 110:3 scheduled 86:16 304:3 scheduling 299:14 schematic 242:19 science 3:4,18 4:3,4 11:5 13:22 22:1 25:2 25:9,15,22 33:11 34:2 42:21 46:13,15 47:3 47:18 51:21 57:6 62:22 66:7,9,12 85:16 100:2 103:16 109:7 110:17,19 111:2,17 111:20 112:9 113:22 114:8,17,21 115:4,13 115:16 116:8 117:2 117:11,12,15 118:1,8 118:13,19 119:6,8,13 119:21 120:1,3,4,6,10 120:22 122:14 124:20 125:20 127:1,11 129:17,19 132:17 134:9 143:8,12 144:7 144:11 145:4 146:1,5 146:18 147:14,16 148:8 151:9,14 152:14 157:4 158:3 168:18 170:4,15 171:13,15 172:3,6 212:15 218:1 231:1 233:20 256:10 275:10 **Sciences** 164:10 scientific 2:18,18 71:1 71:1,11 114:12 115:7 115:12 117:16 127:6

II.			1
128:20 129:3 208:17	302:14 306:17 307:8	sentence 50:11 103:16	<b>shorter</b> 109:18
214:7 255:1 256:18	309:1	177:20 178:7 179:5	show 49:6 55:12 111:16
257:11,18 258:14	seconded 173:17,19	180:1,10,14,14,18,18	124:16 173:3 199:11
260:11	194:17 287:12,14	181:3 183:9 184:10	showed 52:13 66:5
scientifically 42:10	Secondly 59:18	185:15 192:13 202:19	96:1 163:5
209:5	seconds 157:12 265:4	203:1 239:7,18 250:8	<b>showing</b> 30:16 67:6
Scientist 2:8	Secretary 76:11 77:18	252:11,12 265:7,11	232:19
scientists 21:20 25:17	274:4,18 275:5	266:16 273:15 278:21	shown 237:8
34:16 43:1 116:10	276:17 277:1,15	280:20 281:17	shows 45:14 63:21
127:22 143:13,17	282:16 287:7 305:9	sentences 50:4 184:3	112:5 119:12,15
159:15 171:20 172:2	section 43:18 44:1	185:17 281:9	241:22
SciStarter 154:11,12,20	123:14 174:11 198:17	separate 235:3	Shrimp 2:3
scope 15:15 41:2	201:6,19,22 214:19	separately 202:11	shrinking 188:5 233:8
score 39:22 45:10 48:1	219:9 225:13	225:1 308:2	side 9:3 59:15,15 66:5
52:12 55:3 103:6	sections 201:14	separation 45:16	105:11 132:15 167:5
scored 38:1 43:7 45:8	sector 72:5 110:19	sequential 300:1	234:16 301:19
scorer's 53:10	111:10,22 116:6,16	series 201:19	sidebar 48:8
scores 41:17 44:2,2,3	302:5	seriously 187:14 274:5	sight 261:2
45:15 52:11,17	sector's 71:16	serve 82:14 144:8	sightings 123:11,13
scoring 44:16,17	sectors 126:19 282:21	served 22:4 70:15	130:5
102:22	security 281:3	service 1:21 6:19,22	Sigmacell 105:22
scraped 81:3	seeing 99:16 157:2	21:19 67:17 68:10,12	sign 133:9 137:22
scream 51:7	182:14 242:5 261:22	78:22 104:16 136:4	233:3
screen 170:2 199:16	285:10 296:11	services 115:18 118:3	signed 15:21
252:20 272:13	seek 145:21	sessions 194:12	significant 143:14,18
scroll 271:7	seen 33:8,14 90:8,17	set 20:4 22:10 23:20	200:12 281:22
scup 187:9	132:4 138:20 157:15	30:3 36:4 57:13 85:9	significantly 90:14,16
se 272:12	205:20 267:17 288:12	87:15 97:9,15 99:10	90:19 129:13 184:7
sea 1:17 2:9 88:6 125:5	302:7 303:4 304:19	140:9 141:2	signify 173:20 195:3
125:8 154:1,22 182:4	segment 148:10	sets 143:16	269:11
256:14	select 43:17 128:1	setting 63:21 91:14	signing 159:7
<b>Seafloor</b> 154:12	selected 38:15 40:16	201:18	Silver 1:11,11 8:14
seafood 2:6 98:18,20	126:7 158:21 159:4,6	seven 33:17 155:17,18	301:12
100:10 277:16,22	163:18	263:15	similar 111:20 118:22
278:14 283:11,17,21	selecting 303:8	severely 201:12	193:22 242:17
296:6,17 297:15	selection 45:4	share 126:14 130:18	simple 184:15 243:16
search 113:16	<b>self-</b> 159:5	154:18 156:19 212:12	249:2
seasonal 236:21	self-interest 74:7	229:16 240:2,18	simply 115:17 116:9
seasonality 284:15	self-selected 134:6	241:6 285:19 295:1	186:14 230:3 283:22
seasons 232:18	self-serving 29:8 32:14	306:7	Simultaneous 237:4
seat 109:13	sell 28:9,9,11,12	<b>shared</b> 44:10	244:21
seatrout 138:12	selling 73:12	sharing 42:12 289:2	single 14:14 28:16
seats 113:7	semantics 277:13	296:19	40:17 50:3 217:21
Seattle 53:22 153:22	<b>Senator</b> 77:5,6	shark 28:12 122:17	sir 76:16 81:22 82:5
Sebastian 1:16 29:4	send 96:20 98:3 172:21	sharks 123:2,3	293:6
32:11 269:20 270:7	305:20 306:2	sheepshead 139:9	sit 8:14 9:1 25:13 41:22
270:10,18 273:13	sending 97:4,7 281:18	shell 235:21	42:15 88:19 96:16
286:13 293:8	Senior 2:8	shellfish 2:8 277:6	site 124:21 156:19
second 27:19 66:15	sense 10:19 101:6	Sheraton 1:11	303:8
71:7 72:21 90:21	110:21 111:2,20	shift 90:7 218:11	sites 128:1
112:2 156:15 173:11	112:8 117:9 122:21	235:18 238:20	sits 191:13
178:7 179:5 180:1,10	159:20 198:8 221:15	shifting 250:20 280:6	sitting 63:22 76:12
180:14,17 181:3	223:11 229:20 296:8	<b>shifts</b> 238:15	97:13 102:8 194:11
185:16 194:14,15	sensitive 157:13	<b>ship</b> 57:2	situation 136:11 148:8
200:13 213:8 229:19	sensitivity 282:14	<b>ships</b> 101:21	150:7 175:6 265:1
236:19 241:17 252:17	284:8	<b>shore</b> 87:16 129:14	situations 248:4 252:3
252:18,19 265:11	sent 132:5 165:13	<b>short</b> 128:7 200:6	six 8:20 23:6 47:18 48:1
269:4,5 287:10 290:7	179:17 199:11 289:14	298:14	301:12
	l	l	1

II			
size 6:17 30:22 60:3	<b>solving</b> 150:15	298:8 299:5	spotted 138:12
94:20 129:10	somebody 59:5 77:3	speaks 218:2	spread 9:4,11 30:12
<b>SK</b> 107:21 152:8	88:11 106:20 144:3	spear 100:20	spring 1:11,11 8:14
skeptical 305:3	145:9 149:3 256:2	special 111:9	120:8 295:7,10
skewed 30:6,14 258:17	259:17 260:18 301:14	species 12:13 23:22	301:12
259:1 262:4,5	someplace 303:6	24:2 28:5 48:19 112:4	
skilled 52:21 53:4 59:5			sprung 165:22 SR 1:21
99:3	something's 37:1 somewhat 79:6 99:10	121:19 123:2,3,12	* · · · · · · ·
skills 99:17	soon 22:11	131:5,10,13 132:2,3,8	stability 163:16 stabilized 18:11
		139:2,10 146:11	
skip 113:13 125:12	sorry 57:21 59:17 68:16	153:3 160:20 186:10	stable 21:9
sliced 11:9 38:1 41:15	78:18 84:15 109:17	187:4 188:5,6 203:16	staff 2:12 53:4 55:19,19
42:20	166:11 175:21 186:5	205:22 256:9 258:19	126:5 271:11 272:6
<b>slid</b> 93:11	187:10 190:11,21	258:21 259:3 298:6	274:1
slide 7:18 8:13 14:21	191:18 207:17 216:15	specific 13:8 17:11	<b>staffing</b> 195:19
21:2 24:19 29:5 31:14	226:14 232:16 252:16	23:20 24:11,14 29:14	stage 220:12
63:19 86:22 88:2 97:8	273:22 276:15 279:18	50:21 54:5,9 75:21	stages 131:14
111:15 121:6 122:6	290:5 292:2	89:17 90:13 108:20	stakeholder 118:11
127:9 146:5	sort 88:4 89:6 114:3	128:6 175:4 186:9	151:18 171:18 304:22
slide's 6:16	117:1 122:19 130:5	187:15 188:7 202:9	stakeholders 144:2
slides 17:12 24:10,15	143:6 145:13 146:1	213:4 217:5 218:8	stalwarts 165:7
32:10 37:18 67:10	148:2,8 149:13	221:7,11 229:3 230:3	stand 291:12
84:17,19 92:4,5 95:22	150:12 152:13 153:16	232:9 245:21 258:3	<b>stand-</b> 14:3
142:17 156:4	154:5,6,7 155:2 169:4	263:11 271:12 273:1	standalone 176:11
slight 273:3	177:20 180:22 181:6	276:7 280:2	standard 44:19
slightly 30:6 208:13	231:15 264:18 266:1	specifically 26:2,2	standards 127:5 141:7
slipping 84:14 86:3	286:7	27:21 38:7 43:20	242:21
<b>slow</b> 233:9	sound 33:20 34:1 42:7	45:22 54:16 66:2 79:5	standing 277:15
<b>slowly</b> 51:13	42:10,21 43:7 103:10	140:16 176:15 177:9	standpoint 158:5
<b>small</b> 7:18 49:10 56:4	121:14 122:1 125:2	180:3 185:3 186:22	stands 175:9 282:5
62:5,10 81:1 100:12	130:20 131:5 152:16	209:9,22 210:8,13	star 157:11
104:14 154:17 158:8	205:18	211:8,11 213:2	start 40:20 45:18 46:4
282:12 298:15	<b>sounds</b> 68:16 147:16	214:14 219:18,21	47:16 68:15 99:15
smaller 8:21 55:14	160:4 161:10 172:8	228:7 231:17 245:13	110:22 111:15 132:12
61:22 62:16 65:3	172:10 182:17,21	252:14 253:3,4	150:6 152:3 154:17
126:22 127:2	216:1 267:12 272:21	254:22 257:10,17	160:15 161:5 180:18
smart 11:4	279:20	258:13 268:7 271:5	200:7 243:10
smiling 300:10	<b>sour</b> 59:13	271:18 272:3,5 290:1	started 54:10 79:2,14
smithing 225:21 250:8	source 130:22 131:1	specificity 181:6	101:16 112:10 124:11
<b>snap</b> 132:4	145:6	<b>specifics</b> 59:20 60:5	127:14
<b>snapper</b> 130:15 136:15	<b>sources</b> 142:1 159:11	272:12	<b>starting</b> 23:5 79:1
136:17	<b>South</b> 125:18 145:14	specify 180:1	164:15 175:7 198:11
snapshot 112:21	208:9 209:6,22 214:2	spectrum 116:9	245:11
snapshots 163:7	214:14	speech 98:8	stat 144:10 163:10
<b>snook</b> 136:21 139:18	southeast 9:14 25:4,8	speed 298:20	state 20:20 71:2 95:3
139:20,22 160:20	33:16 105:4 160:21	spelling 203:15	116:1 136:16,17
snooks 138:12	southern 123:10,13	spend 12:7,8 14:17	138:13 139:4 154:1
social 229:3	205:19	19:2 96:16 185:19	160:19 267:3 272:18
societally 177:4	southwest 57:2,6	296:10 299:9	statement 187:15
Society 123:6	160:21	spending 12:7	191:11 228:9 258:4
soft 105:21	<b>space</b> 111:18 201:13	spent 30:17 32:13	263:8
sold 227:22	<b>sparse</b> 290:10	33:22 300:17	states 1:19 2:2 10:13
solicitation 11:10 107:6	spatial 146:20	<b>spigot</b> 230:15	13:6 18:7,7,16,16
291:5	speak 5:18 159:17	<b>split</b> 21:22 92:10	20:7,12 64:4 66:10
soliciting 292:10	168:13 183:7 191:22	Sportfishing 2:4	94:17,17 138:5
<b>solid</b> 256:20	209:8 270:19 279:3	<b>spot</b> 27:10 275:1	246:12 247:6 250:15
<b>solve</b> 149:14,14	279:16 282:20	<b>spotlight</b> 24:3 111:9	stating 230:3
<b>solved</b> 180:13	<b>speaking</b> 179:13 209:6	123:12	statistic 112:14
<b>solves</b> 181:10	237:4 244:21 263:6	<b>spots</b> 51:5	statistical 44:8,20
	I	I	I

statisticians 136:4 statistics 19:14 66:13 67:3 status 26:10,17 131:4 136:6 163:10 statutory 70:6 stay 86:7 staying 176:8 stealing 285:17 steelhead 18:10 steer 168:10 169:6 steering 113:4 stellar 125:5,5,7 step 30:2 41:21 179:2 272:16 292:10 STEPHANIE 3:10 **stepped** 167:21 292:12 stepping 120:7 293:19 **steps** 4:17 57:12 stick 108:6 249:3 stock 15:7 18:21 23:11 52:8 79:8 94:4 112:3 123:5 137:13,18 138:13 139:3,8,14 151:19 182:16 233:2 233:19 234:5 241:22 266:10 297:21 stocks 21:6 52:7 112:3 182:1,14 205:2 236:5 243:3,7,11 **stop** 22:13 158:7 295:18 **stories** 145:20 story 104:1 266:1 straight 117:9 266:14 straightened 293:17 straightforward 269:20 strategy 145:1 218:1 252:14 254:22 257:3 258:12 streamline 275:8 282:1 streamlining 274:21 street 230:20 strengthen 276:2 strengthened 207:16 strict 158:17 striving 266:2 **strong** 220:4 230:13 262:5 strongly 54:2 279:8 283:7 struck 287:3 structure 103:17 266:17 structured 118:10 129:3 178:13 struggling 117:1 281:12

Stuart 75:16 77:21 stuck 249:10 studies 114:4 136:15 141:21 229:16 232:12 234:1 235:15,17 236:4 240:2,18 241:7 study 119:16 127:22 136:22 140:6,14 143:2 144:21 160:8 215:1 232:13 stuff 22:14 58:19 100:5 100:20 101:3 157:22 183:6 191:6 259:20 sub- 160:18 **subbing** 55:13 subcommittee 4:6,6,9 162:4,6,11 165:8,10 165:14 166:22 184:21 197:4 199:2 202:5 223:21 289:20 290:10 290:15,22 294:1 307:20 subcommittee's 269:8 subcommittees 166:17 289:14 **subject** 40:8.14 73:20 74:5 82:13 117:14 119:20 submit 112:15 200:17 202:11 269:8 **submitted** 46:3 49:5 105:20 177:14 submitting 159:8 subsidizing 71:22 subsistence 181:4 substantial 112:20 163:10 177:22 185:12 193:2 228:13 substantially 283:9 substantive 274:22 **success** 36:16 145:19 147:11 151:5 successful 57:13 62:2 63:11,12 65:2 72:2 140:22 192:1 succinct 86:4 sufficiently 98:2

suggest 184:2 198:5

suggested 177:3

suggesting 205:4

suggestion 61:18

266:21

272:15

214:22 218:16 231:4

241:19 284:8 294:18

234:20 254:4 263:22

228:19 233:1 264:9

191:10 198:7 203:1

239:4 244:5 250:21 255:22 258:9 260:13 260:16 267:2 282:12 296:22 suggestions 108:10 200:3 205:14 206:13 207:15 224:5 235:13 250:17 251:9 suggests 225:1 suitability 122:4 **suite** 163:21 summarize 246:11 247:5 summarizes 189:18 **summary** 167:11 172:22 174:5,10,12 175:14 188:19 190:5 194:13,21 197:1 **summer** 295:10 **Summit** 163:13 **sums** 171:22 supplement 145:6 supplemental 81:16 84:19 142:1 145:6 suppliers 159:17 **supply** 283:3 284:3,5 **support** 25:14 57:5 92:19 123:8 127:2 129:22 134:15,20 171:6 184:16 191:9 191:11 213:12 222:9 272:10 274:18 275:7 308:20 supported 136:14 177:18 192:11 **supporting** 16:14 18:6 25:21 63:17 83:8 121:3 279:22 supportive 178:20 supports 132:21 134:16,18 supposed 49:3 202:12 217:6 263:14 surimi 87:16 **surprised** 106:7,8 surrounding 257:21 **survey** 57:2 96:17 127:21 129:15 133:3 138:17 159:15 164:10 236:1 surveying 79:11 surveys 96:17 133:19 153:9 159:5,6 **survive** 145:12 sustainability 116:3 sustainable 3:10 13:4

204:10 212:4 227:16

229:8 230:2 232:9

13:12.14 17:17 18:22 21:15 26:14 27:12 28:14 283:21 297:4 sustainably 66:6 sustaining 233:21 sway 65:10 sweat 288:13 Sweet 293:12 swing 242:11 **symptom** 255:19 **syncing** 299:20 syncs 303:20 synthesis 119:17 system 16:15 57:16 58:1 61:4,8 208:6 284:18 systems 255:18

table 30:21 65:1 102:11 113:7 193:18 tables 69:21 tabulated 200:19 tackle 298:22 tackled 117:1 tag 125:7 127:7 137:9 tagged 123:2 149:4 tagging 119:9 122:17 123:7 148:20,22 tail 167:14 taken 98:1 116:5 230:14 takers 290:8 takes 120:5 123:12 141:15,19 244:8 talent 67:15 68:1 152:18 talk 6:16 52:4 54:15 59:18 61:12 81:8 102:11 105:11 110:18 138:3 165:13 173:4 196:22 197:6 210:10 245:7 255:15 272:18 294:7 295:8 talked 13:1 48:8 51:6 54:12 65:19 66:5 67:18 85:8 99:19 101:15 115:15 135:1 163:9,12 168:18,22

172:18 202:5 248:21

251:22 263:12 272:7

talking 9:9 10:22 17:16

97:16 100:2 152:21

176:9 180:2 190:3,4

190:15 192:7 204:6

77:21 85:3 88:18

43:20 46:1 48:3 75:21

294:6 299:19

II.	i	ı	i
209:10 212:20 227:9	temperatures 122:4,10	249:8 251:17 269:15	260:9
237:17 240:11 251:1	temporal 146:21	276:14 287:19 288:9	thoughts 279:13
255:8 289:22 290:3	ten 79:20 128:18	292:6 298:13 299:11	280:17 300:8
293:22	163:17 224:16	299:12 300:16 302:20	thousands 283:13
talks 201:7 202:1 217:2	tendency 230:9	303:10 304:11,16	three 20:14,22 33:18,20
222:14 251:12	term 62:14 70:9 74:21	305:14 306:18 307:16	33:22 40:8 42:15
tangible 163:22	75:6 77:15 103:8	308:10,16,18 309:5	73:18 87:9,9 90:9
tapping 67:22 85:18	128:6,7 129:19	thankful 305:6	95:22 142:17 155:17
target 238:6	158:14 192:19,19	thanks 5:22 61:17	212:16,17,19 235:17
targets 218:5 233:21	218:5 220:17,21	86:20 92:1 110:11	236:8 263:15 274:3,8
tariffs 16:4 76:5 82:21	227:4 245:20 272:4,4	147:6 161:15 180:12	294:14 304:18
99:10	terminology 69:2 237:7	196:2,3 212:7 221:4	thrive 19:10,10 204:4,4
task 4:8 147:7 167:20	terms 26:11,17 31:11	296:19 299:10 301:8	205:22
168:6,9,11 169:12	67:2 71:12 81:8	302:19 308:7,21	thriving 17:22
173:10 196:6,9 199:3	117:14,21 129:7	theme 163:15 176:22	throw 169:21
199:4,9 201:21 202:5	134:14 140:1 142:13	thermal 188:4	thrown 27:21
202:21 218:22 223:22	151:12 153:3 161:3	Thiel 146:17	thumbs 262:19
250:4 291:11,13	176:4 177:14 181:11	things 5:8 10:1 15:9	thunder 285:17
299:21		_	THURSDAY 1:8
tasks 147:7 167:9,20	196:7 221:11,16 227:12 235:20 243:13	17:3,10,14 22:21 24:1 28:7 30:22 33:8 35:9	tie 178:6
174:12 176:14,17	244:7 245:17 264:20	39:4,8 42:13 43:19	tied 39:19
•	270:5 271:6 276:8	1	
195:18 207:10 288:18 306:11 307:12	303:19	48:11 49:8,17 51:11 55:6 58:12 63:13	tighten 185:8 Tim 162:17,21
taste 28:11 59:13	terrestrial 251:7	65:11 67:19,21 68:19	timberline 84:14
tax 76:5			timeframe 118:12
	Terri 1:12,14 250:6	73:15 74:19 102:10	
taxed 16:13	254:17 306:8 territorial 33:10 34:2	113:3 125:22 128:9	timely 144:1 156:19 times 105:1 172:14
taxpayer 157:21 team 3:4 127:7 132:5		134:14 135:11 137:9	
	46:13,15 47:18	138:8 139:2 143:22	201:10 301:2
277:14	territories 20:13,13	147:12 148:14,15,17	timing 236:22 237:3
teams 126:8,13	33:11 39:13 189:9	149:5,6,18 150:8,14	238:16,18,21 239:1
technical 36:4 40:6	190:2,17 208:9,16	155:4 162:13,16	241:17
70:22 103:15,16	209:5,9 210:1 211:2,6	165:12 174:18 175:5	tiny 89:20 104:14
166:5	211:20 212:5 214:15	187:3 196:15 197:6	tip 100:20
technically 42:7,21	215:4,9,15 216:17 228:7	201:20 202:1 211:18	title 38:5,17 105:4 143:20
43:7 94:16	Territories' 210:9	212:8 217:8 219:9	today 6:4 11:22 65:16
technique 240:12		225:13,15 228:19	102:3 108:11 110:13
techniques 101:19 268:3	Territory 209:10 213:22 test 264:1	229:20 240:15 242:8	
		248:10 256:13 263:14	110:18 116:18 165:15
technological 229:17 229:22 240:2,6,6,20	Texas 136:18 211:14 text 282:13	272:5 277:13 278:5 280:6 282:15 285:13	169:18 170:5 248:11 288:14 289:8 300:4,9
241:4,8 244:13 248:1	thank 5:19,21 24:17	289:1,4,16 296:7	token 230:12
technologies 23:9	28:18 29:3 32:8 61:16	299:4 303:18 304:10	told 34:22 274:3 301:10
134:11	65:13,15 68:13 69:20	thinks 41:14 151:18	tomorrow 297:1
technology 3:5,19 14:1	69:22 70:17 73:3 75:8	219:5	tons 242:2
65:21 110:17 297:20	103:19 106:16 107:10	third 5:4 6:20 24:18	too' 225:15,19
Ted 195:14 235:5	107:16 108:4 110:10	50:14 80:13,18,19,20	tool 144:9 149:2 154:21
304:11	110:12 147:2 150:17	164:3,4 180:18	238:10 253:7,8 254:5
tee 295:9	150:18 152:4,7	229:19 297:3	261:6
teleconference 168:8	156:13,16,22 157:17	Thirty 99:13	tools 118:19
295:7	159:21 161:9 162:9	thorough 108:16 147:4	top 41:19 106:9 174:11
telephone 2:11	164:21 165:2,5,16	164:22	178:14 200:7 252:20
tell 26:22 41:20,21 83:4	167:2,6 190:18,20	thoroughly 52:15	252:21 259:20 278:20
161:16 187:6 213:9	192:8 195:12 196:10	thought 11:5 37:22	278:21 280:18 296:5
266:1	198:21 200:4 201:17	57:11 116:21 147:17	<b>TOPHER</b> 3:9
telling 165:3	202:22 203:8 204:1	162:13,15 173:1	topic 108:22 109:8
tells 136:9 277:5	209:17 210:4,5	176:22 201:8 213:3	111:12 168:3 228:3
temperature 213:19	213:12 215:16 216:12	223:21 224:7 231:13	topical 126:8 212:22
218:10 263:13	218:14 222:21 249:6	246:5,6 252:2 255:4	topics 197:3 255:10
-15116 255116			
II			

294:7.20 263:8 148:14 195:20 undoubtedly 297:12 typically 47:16 53:22 **Torres** 35:8 trump 279:15 unequal 158:22 unfortunately 189:17 toss 22:21 trust 59:16 135:13 72:12 total 33:18 47:18 66:14 144:4 171:19 typing 284:10 267:14 272:22 93:1 95:17 trust-building 100:1 typo 271:1 uninitiated 157:4 totally 157:4 222:6 truth 72:5 150:13 unique 16:1 49:21 U 239:10 248:21 261:8 266:14,15 268:5 63:14 89:11 175:6 308:18 truth's 267:9 **U.S** 1:1,21 14:20 16:17 213:14 **United** 66:10 246:12 touch 161:14 truthed 267:5 32:16,20 33:6,12,17 34:4,11,12,18 36:9 247:6 tough 52:8 73:20 try 23:18 28:13 40:18 41:3 52:2 55:1,7 39:12 49:11 189:21 **universe** 124:18 tower 157:7 toxins 121:14 65:12 73:4,9,14 89:14 190:2,16 207:7 208:8 universities 46:22 traceability 297:15 89:16 103:8 109:18 99:18 208:11,16 209:5,10 track 7:21 8:8 132:1,8 125:6 132:8,11 148:9 209:16 210:1,9 211:2 **university** 34:13,14 166:4 174:16 192:5 211:6,7,12,15,19,19 55:13 90:15,19 103:4 132:11 153:6 160:9,9 tracking 23:10 119:17 195:19 198:11 234:19 211:20,21 212:5 119:18 242:13 213:16,16,22 214:14 unmentioned 57:10 trade 98:20 283:11 trying 6:10 35:12 38:17 215:4,4,8,15 228:7 **unquote** 255:15 284:1 286:8 296:6,18 49:22 51:7 53:2 70:7 unsolicited 11:1 246:18 247:12 278:7 82:22 88:14 131:19 unstrike 287:1 297:14 278:11 279:2,4 281:4 untested 259:7 260:9 trained 143:13 151:11 178:6,13 302:8,14 training 53:15 63:9 184:12,17 212:14 261:11 262:4 ultimately 13:14 23:11 219:2 223:12,18 51:20 107:22 185:11 unweighted 140:8 148:17 trajectory 204:22 225:16 226:1 227:10 **up-ticks** 234:4 umbrella 119:6 transfer 79:11 80:7 227:13 253:11 258:2 unable 189:17 299:22 upcoming 163:12 197:4 85:4 264:5.21 266:19 **update** 162:11,17,21,22 304:7.7 transfer's 82:17 268:5 272:10 279:13 unallowed 63:15 163:10 164:8 transfered 16:6 286:12 **unbiased** 150:11 updated 265:21 transferred 76:10 77:15 tuna 28:10 updating 243:21 uncertainty 242:6,7,13 79:3 80:4 81:12 84:3 turn 111:11 132:14 243:8 251:13 253:14 **uprate** 237:11 transfers 16:9 168:9 230:15 268:22 255:4,8,11,16,19 **ups** 60:18 transforms 278:11 288:2 257:7,9,12,21 258:3 **upward** 129:9 transition 51:15 turtles 43:4 259:14 261:21 **upwards** 81:17 transmittal 198:19 tweaking 49:21 227:6 uncle's 74:1 use 8:12 22:18,19,22 260:13,16,18 transmitted 200:19 unclear 180:16 28:3 40:21 71:5 72:13 tweaks 241:19 265:6 transparency 142:14 undergoes 40:7 72:16 75:5 77:14,19 157:22 twisting 97:13 underneath 294:1 81:14 83:1 98:15 transparent 10:6 50:17 **two** 34:12 38:22 50:13 understand 5:22 26:7 103:8 121:16 125:11 traps 122:7 50:18 52:11 65:19,20 48:15 52:13 58:12 133:19 139:7,13 travel 50:21 306:1,5 81:8 83:17,19 88:7 60:2 69:7 72:17 93:8 140:17,22 141:3,22 308:15 90:17 96:16 133:9 148:7 149:8 179:9,19 146:9,10 147:18 travels 165:19 142:17 144:13 150:18 149:2 154:20,21 191:13 208:10 210:6 **Trembanis** 153:7,7 165:7 172:7 174:10 215:13 220:8 223:9 158:15 162:1 171:14 223:13 226:18 228:2 223:7 227:4 265:11 trends 279:8 283:8 176:9 177:1 180:9,11 tribes 18:17 184:3 185:17 194:11 228:4 246:19 247:14 271:6,19 295:3 304:2 useful 107:4 137:6 195:1 206:17 214:21 tricky 30:15 256:8 261:19 266:3 tried 160:17 217:9 217:8 225:4 230:20 understanding 31:12 user 120:21 tries 72:4 240:12 251:14 252:5 users 139:21 108:16 119:1 169:6 trip 138:19 303:3 255:10 261:13 262:19 200:22 223:3 226:6 uses 134:19 136:2 265:6 269:21 280:14 137:1,12,13 141:4 trivial 145:20 226:15,21 227:16,17 tropical 207:6 208:12 288:18 301:22 304:17 usually 132:16 266:9 257:21 209:21 210:16 215:3 type 11:6 46:19 47:7 understands 147:10 **USVI** 33:13 211:1 216:5 301:18 48:5 91:12 131:3 utilization 87:18 understood 113:19 trouble 191:18 221:12 133:18 135:9 147:14 utilize 22:16 40:9 55:21 154:14 224:12,15 61:8 74:15 149:21 263:9 226:9 233:19 302:7 258:19 true 46:2 48:4 64:13 types 21:7 44:6 96:1 undertaken 160:1 160:5 103:12 130:6 134:14 underutilized 298:6 utilized 160:3 237:18 80:16 94:12 117:6 182:10 185:18 191:2 134:19 136:7 140:22 **underway** 157:18

V
vacant 170:6 292:1
validation 142:13
validity 262:3 valuable 253:7 275:4
277:2,8,18 282:20
value 29:17 118:22
188:6 256:9,14
258:18,21 259:3
278:3,12,14 294:18
305:8
values 145:8
vantage 274:13 variability 232:20
variable 118:12,13
varieties 236:9
variety 91:12 123:5
various 96:21 124:6
276:16
vast 1:14 256:18
vehicle 118:16 129:5
venue 303:12,19
venues 302:1 verbatim 36:1 169:9
verbiage 273:5
verge 213:22
version 109:19 271:4
271:19
versus 43:3 81:10
104:14
vessel 23:2 302:5 vessels 101:18 154:5
vibes 301:5
vibrant 100:22
Vice 1:15 2:1,9 221:4
281:15 285:22 286:3
302:22
vicinity 234:12
victim 291:9 296:2
video 125:2
view 29:17 71:17,19 168:3 272:16 280:8
286:16
viewed 282:17
Virgin 9:15 34:14
<b>visible</b> 274:18
visibly 275:7
visual 85:6
visually 75:19 85:11
Visuals 266:1 vital 151:4
VMS-type 147:22
voice 277:18
voluntarily 115:6,11
137:22
voluntary 65:5 117:21
118:3 122:22 305:19

128:21 133:18 134:6 135:4,14,15 136:7 137:5 141:1 143:16 158:16 159:5 291:10 volunteered 289:19 291:12 292:12 volunteering 291:15 292:17 305:6 volunteers 114:1,2 116:11,12 118:9 119:6 121:15 125:10 126:10 128:1,2,9,12 129:4 142:9 143:17 144:13 145:22 289:21 vote 169:9 248:10 268:21 306:17 voted 170:22 vouchers 308:14 vulnerability 256:6,11 258:16 259:1 vulnerable 207:6,12 209:20 210:11 212:21 213:1 215:2

## W wait 32:9 142:8 166:17

waiting 76:1 86:18 142:6 walk 114:4 198:20 200:8 286:12 294:9 309:4 walked 57:11 192:12 304:13 wanted 57:4 65:18 74:18 79:20 91:20 111:8 124:3 128:8,10 154:18 161:16 166:13 170:3,8 171:11 173:2 175:15 189:16 191:1 192:17,18 199:11 207:13,17 209:18 212:11 213:5,11 246:7,20 247:1,15 248:12,20 264:8 265:15 284:7 288:20 290:7 300:7 304:4,11 304:16 305:14 306:7 wanting 257:6 wants 70:4 109:13 161:20 164:5 270:6 warm 53:17 55:21 230:5 231:4 236:10 236:17 238:14 warming 186:15 188:2 193:8 Warner 26:15 Warner's 38:14

warning 58:6

warranted 230:22 233:17 274:19 Washington 301:3 wasn't 50:8 57:3 99:3 172:16 watch 125:5 126:11 watching 145:14 water 101:8 112:6 186:10 187:1 250:4 waterfronts 283:14 waters 20:20,21 280:11 way 10:6,7,8 11:10 13:2 17:4 25:19 27:15 28:14 40:4 41:16 70:18 75:2 83:6.11 88:4 91:22 93:9,15 95:13 97:21 98:21 102:19 111:19 115:11 116:11,13 134:7 143:21 148:7 149:12 150:15 160:11 161:5 167:7 168:2 170:12 178:12 182:4 185:3,6 200:17 201:4 230:20 232:21 234:20 235:18 238:17 242:9 253:22 254:9.10 255:11.12 267:2 270:18 272:10 276:2 285:13 286:6 289:7 297:8 303:15 ways 22:13 139:12 146:9,12 154:15 160:12 161:7 297:21 **Waze** 115:20 weak 52:8 256:10 wearing 25:11 weasel 271:19 weather 185:20 186:16 193:9 208:12,12 264:15 webinar 177:11 200:14 212:13 231:20 webinars 50:18,19 website 24:1 51:1 124:21 200:18,21,22 weeds 6:13 26:13 38:8 53:14 107:21 202:12 week 291:5 299:9,16,22 304:8 308:10 weeks 130:11 177:11 weigh 97:19 274:11 weighed 97:2 weight 159:1 welcome 5:4

67:1 78:17 81:10.10 91:19 166:7 172:21 198:14 224:8 235:5 309:7 **WERNER** 2:17 west 9:7 18:1,15 53:21 53:22 54:12 58:16,22 121:13 127:21 157:16 181:22 237:21 242:17 299:20 western 18:6,7 19:17 28:3,4 126:21 Westin 163:14 Westport 301:3 whale 123:11 whales 123:14 whim 84:9 White 10:5 whiting 182:2 183:7 wide 118:9 176:21 221:16 widely 142:3 174:15 183:21 widespread 60:19 wild 21:5 282:17 283:16 283:17 284:9.11.17 284:18,21 285:2,9 286:7 wildlife 1:16,21 113:6 137:21 willing 130:17 139:16 197:21 270:17 willingness 135:3 138:15 win 51:20 window 97:8 298:15 winning 55:13 winnow 96:19 winter 87:3 wish 67:12 177:15 wonder 96:21 wonderful 308:14 wondering 53:5 189:22 197:20 241:8 273:12 307:19 woops 216:15 word 38:17 51:8 104:2 104:5 106:1,12 114:13 119:21 120:16 129:18 138:21 183:8 193:4 222:4 234:20 239:2,10 244:7 249:11,13,17,19 255:22 256:21 259:14 262:6 265:11 267:9 word-smithing 222:19 worded 223:22 wording 205:14 248:13

welcomed 278:22

went 13:2 24:7 52:14

279:5,11

**welfare** 153:17

volunteer 112:18

1	1	ı	
262:12,13 268:1	66:11 67:1 69:17 70:3	50:14 64:20 78:13	<b>168</b> 4:8
words 21:2 120:3	112:2 124:20 163:1	82:4 83:1 90:9,18	<b>17</b> 90:3 91:20 300:17
155:13 245:6 253:6	272:22 276:10,12	91:4,10 101:4 102:16	<b>17,000</b> 123:3
263:17 264:4 271:19	292:21	128:18 192:22 195:1	<b>170</b> 119:19
273:1 274:3,8 275:11	worldwide 280:5	243:9 263:15,15,15	<b>18</b> 22:12 82:16 83:4
276:8 277:16	worried 242:12 246:15	272:20 288:19 300:17	<b>19</b> 50:10 106:19,22
wordsmithing 199:10	247:9	301:12 304:18	<b>19.5</b> 66:22
251:9 261:12 262:8	worries 232:12	yelling 173:13	<b>1954</b> 15:22 77:7
262:17 268:18 275:20	worse 220:9	yesterday 75:17 152:21	<b>1962</b> 123:1
work 6:7 7:9,10,11 8:5	worth 7:4 19:22	162:10 168:22 169:15	<b>1977</b> 69:4
8:11,15,17,22,22	worthless 263:6 264:6	175:20 177:15 179:2	<b>198</b> 4:10
10:15,20 13:6,7,17,17	worthwhile 204:9	186:21 189:17 199:2	196 4.10
14:4,6,7,12,14 15:14	wouldn't 60:8 68:21	200:15 202:5 206:15	
15:15 17:2 18:14			
11	96:9 128:14 216:10	224:17 229:6 231:12	<b>2</b> 39:15 89:20 130:7
20:14,15 21:8 24:4	236:13 271:8 280:8	251:22 291:15	<b>2.4</b> 20:13
25:22 32:19 37:7	280:12	younger 56:5 237:8	<b>2.5</b> 22:6
40:10 41:2 43:4 56:12	wow 90:11		<b>2:50</b> 309:7
57:4 58:7,15 59:16	wrap 131:15,17 142:18		<b>20</b> 66:16 101:4 127:16
61:6 63:1 68:10 69:20	143:19 146:16 167:10	<b>zero</b> 84:5 145:8,11	<b>20-30</b> 10:22
70:3,5 75:2 82:11	282:2 288:1 308:22	175:8	<b>20-page</b> 60:3
87:3 88:8 91:13,17	wrapped 5:8	<b>zone</b> 280:10	<b>200</b> 112:11
93:6 107:5 109:5	wrapping 221:13	<b>Zooniverse</b> 154:19,21	<b>200,000</b> 242:2
110:8 150:5 152:1	write 38:22 54:20,22	156:6,7	<b>2007</b> 122:16 127:15
161:17 166:18 167:19	56:9,9 102:19 106:22		<b>2010</b> 84:2
171:8 178:19 192:21	172:20 174:9 177:11	0	<b>2011</b> 84:3
193:18 194:22 195:17	189:14	<b>0.8</b> 66:19	<b>2012</b> 22:3 79:1 135:5
197:17,22 198:6	writer 204:17		<b>2013</b> 112:11 133:14
199:4 201:1 226:3	writers 103:13	1	<b>2014</b> 33:14 119:16
235:10 275:9 282:5	writing 53:4 54:10 55:2	<b>1,500</b> 40:11	<b>2015</b> 144:10 307:11
295:3 297:14,21	59:15 62:18 99:17	<b>1.6</b> 19:21	<b>2016</b> 66:12 123:1 126:1
308:9,9	106:17 107:5 196:8	<b>10</b> 16:20 78:13 90:3	126:3 294:13
work's 25:14	written 17:4 53:6 83:7	130:8	<b>2017</b> 1:8 33:15 114:18
worked 5:9 87:2 117:4	169:11 178:18 204:17	<b>10,000</b> 155:7	306:13
117:5 165:1 186:20	223:17 269:2	<b>10:31</b> 107:9	<b>2018</b> 164:15
269:21 270:4 288:9	wrong 97:5 220:13	<b>100</b> 26:18 44:15 66:6	<b>219</b> 33:15
306:20 307:2	231:13 253:9 264:7	79:10 130:8,8 191:3	<b>23</b> 52:7
workforce 146:20	wrote 41:12	301:2	<b>233</b> 4:12
working 4:6,8 6:15 7:7		<b>106</b> 25:21	<b>239</b> 4:14
7:13 8:6 10:18 14:18	X	<b>109</b> 4:4	<b>25</b> 39:2,22 64:21 66:15
17:16 18:10,20 19:3	<b>X-</b> 78:4	<b>11</b> 16:20 130:8	<b>250</b> 44:14
27:11,12,12 37:9	X-number 20:5 78:1	<b>11/30/2017</b> 195:12	<b>25th</b> 299:16
39:21 42:11 43:2		<b>11:00</b> 86:17	<b>26</b> 13:6
48:15 49:20 54:9 55:7	Y	<b>11:30</b> 166:7	<b>27</b> 106:1
55:8 64:4 69:10 85:13	yard 231:9	<b>11:31</b> 166:8	<b>28</b> 18:9
85:13,14,15,17	year 6:22 7:12,17,22	11th 67:1	<b>285,000</b> 123:1
102:18 103:2,3,5,7	8:1,8 11:18 15:2,13	<b>12:10</b> 198:10,14	<b>288</b> 4:18
117:5 147:4 149:9	16:21 17:1 18:3,4	<b>12:30</b> 198:12	<b>28th</b> 163:14
153:2 161:20 163:19	22:10 37:18 46:5	<b>12:49</b> 198:15,16	<b>29</b> 33:16
196:21 283:13 288:18	47:18 50:3,9,14 51:5	<b>124</b> 4:5	<b>29th</b> 163:14
305:1 306:12,16	52:15,17 53:9,20	<b>125</b> 44:15	
307:11,17	54:11,20 56:22 66:6	<b>130</b> 78:5,10 79:3 81:2	3
workings 56:20	66:20 67:1 78:4 80:17	92:17	<b>3</b> 42:8 45:18,20
works 51:13 77:22 99:4	82:8,10 84:8 88:7	<b>14</b> 271:1	<b>3,000</b> 112:4
235:8 239:17	91:10 95:2 112:19	<b>14.6</b> 271:1	<b>3.2</b> 20:11
workshop 126:1 135:5	113:9 136:13 176:9	<b>14.6</b> 27 1.1 <b>145</b> 76:9,13 77:17 78:11	<b>30</b> 1:8 15:2 76:6,10,18
135:8,12 136:3	303:22 306:13	<b>15</b> 78:13 82:4 264:15,18	77:2 157:12
workshops 53:21 54:10	years 10:22 11:2 15:12	<b>150</b> 46:8	<b>300</b> 47:19
world 2:9 43:2 54:4	23:6 30:10 34:17	<b>162</b> 4:7	<b>300,000</b> 125:9
WOIIG 2.0 70.2 07.7	23.0 30.10 34.17	102 4.7	300,000 120.9
II	•	ı	•

<b>309</b> 4:20		
<b>33</b> 123:3 130:6		
<b>35</b> 20:12		
<b>350</b> 113:2		
<b>37</b> 11:17		
4		
<b>4</b> 16:22 270:22		
<b>40</b> 30:10 95:16 103:1		
108:1 113:17 120:18		
<b>400</b> 7:3,21 8:9 9:5 24:6		
93:2,18		
5		
<b>5</b> 4:2		
<b>50</b> 301:2		
<b>50/50</b> 290:16		
<b>500</b> 7:15 76:9 112:3		
<b>52</b> 123:2		
JE 123.2		
6		
<b>6</b> 4:8 147:8 168:6		
173:10		
<b>60</b> 113:2		
<b>600</b> 46:5 47:19 51:19		
73:17		
<b>65</b> 18:3		
7		
<b>7</b> 19:20 123:14		
<b>7,000</b> 125:9		
<b>700</b> 7:3,20 24:5 108:1		
<b>70s</b> 87:3		
8		
<b>8</b> 19:20		
<b>80</b> 119:22 163:11		
270:12 277:22		
<b>800</b> 51:19		
<b>800,000</b> 20:22		
<b>80s</b> 87:2,3 89:19		
<b>850</b> 128:11		
<b>8777</b> 1:11		
8th 163:1		
9		
<b>9:00</b> 1:11		
<b>9:01</b> 5:2		
<b>90</b> 81:17 270:10		
<b>90s</b> 89:19		
<b>91</b> 98:17 278:3 285:7		
<b>92</b> 270:15		
<b>92</b> 21 0.10		
		1

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee

Before: DOC/NOAA

Date: 11-30-17

Place: Silver Spring, MD

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

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &