

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
(NOAA)  
Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee  
Meeting  
Thursday, December 1, 2022

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee met at the DoubleTree Silver Spring DC North, 8777 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland, at 9:30 a.m., Megan Davis, Chair, presiding.

## Members Present:

Megan Davis, Ph.D., Chair; Research Professor, Aquaculture, Florida Atlantic University, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute

Janet Coit, Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service (ex officio member of MAFAC)

Thomas Fote, Retired, Recreational Fisherman\*

Donna Kalez, Owner and Manager, Dana Wharf Sportfishing and Whale Watching

Sara McDonald, Ph.D., Director of Conservation, South Carolina Aquarium

Meredith Moore, Director, Fish Conservation Program at Ocean Conservancy

Stefanie Moreland, Director of Government Relations and Seafood Sustainability, Trident Seafoods

Linda Odierno, Fish and Seafood Development Specialist

Jocelyn Runnebaum, Ph.D., Fisheries Project Manager, The Nature Conservancy

Ervin "Joe" Schumacker, Marine Scientist, Quinault Department of Fisheries, Quinault Indian Nation\*

Sarah Schumann, Fisherman; Owner/Principal Consultant, Shining Seas Fisheries Consulting, LLC

Patrick Sullivan, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University

Clayward Tam, Cooperative Fisheries Research Coordinator, Pacific Islands Fisheries Group\*

Matthew Upton, Attorney, United States Seafood

Brett Veerhusen, Principal, Ocean Strategies.

## NOAA/NMFS Staff Participants Present:

Heidi Lovett, Alternate Designated Federal Officer

Jennifer Lukens, Director, Office of Policy, and  
Designated Federal Officer\*  
Gabriela McMurtry, Fishery Policy Analyst  
Cisco Werner, Ph.D., Director, Scientific  
Programs and Chief Science Advisor

Also Present (NMFS Staff and Visitors):

Laura Diederick, External Affairs Lead, Office  
of Communications  
Lindsey Kraatz, Senior Science Advisor\*  
Kate Naughten, Director, Office of  
Communications\*  
Michael Rubino, Ph.D., Senior Advisor for  
Seafood Strategy  
Brianna Shaughnessy, Communications  
Specialist, Office of Communications\*  
Zack Klyver\*

\*participating via webinar.

## Contents

Opening Remarks	5
NOAA Fisheries Seafood Communications Update	6
Approval of Draft Recommendations	32
Work Plan Discussion - Part III	71
Close Out	116
Adjourn	121

## Proceedings

(9:49 a.m.)

### Opening Remarks

Chair Davis: Good morning, everyone. It's great to see you all here this morning. Hope you had a good evening, and this is our last day of our meeting session.

I wanted to just give you a quick update on how the schedule is going to flow today. So, we have Laura Diederick here with us this morning, so we're really happy to have her presentation. And then we're going to move into the discussion around the workforce development and, hopefully -- no?

Ms. Lovett: They need time to finish.

Chair Davis: They need time to finish. Okay.

Ms. Lovett: Right. Can it be done in 15 minutes? It's going to be done in 15 minutes. We're just going to discuss it as a group.

Chair Davis: Okay. So we will move into workforce development. There's a couple of maybe new areas that we just have to look at as a group together and then we can do the action on the vote for that. So it'll be exciting to get that.

We have a potential letter for remote working that Sarah put together that we wanted to talk about so we can fit that in this morning, and then we also want to spend some time talking about our work plan.

So we've had some -- a couple of PowerPoints on that, slides that's been condensed from our meeting yesterday, and we have also had some leadership input, which has been great. And then Janet's going to come at around 1:00 o'clock, and Cisco as well.

So are we going to break after that? Are we going to have a lunch break and then come back at 1:00?

Okay. So I'll keep you on track, make sure that there's plenty of time to have lunch and be back here when Janet and Cisco are here as well and, hopefully, that will help us to start to zero in on our -- on our work plan direction.

So without further ado, I'm going to go ahead and introduce Laura Diederick, who is the External Affairs Lead in the Office of Communications in NOAA Fisheries and we're happy to have you here with us today.

Thanks, Laura.

#### NOAA Fisheries Seafood Communications Update

Ms. Diederick: All right. Thank you. Happy to be here day three. Well, we all made it. Thank you, Megan. Thank you to the MAFAC team for inviting me here to share an update with you all on some of the seafood communications that we have been working on.

Just to give you a little additional background, so my role within the -- within Fisheries Communications Office is the Lead for External Affairs and stakeholder engagement around commercial fishing and seafood as well as my -- I'm sort of a point person for some of our broader NOAA initiatives like America the Beautiful.

So that is -- and I work very broadly with all of our different program offices in trying to sort of connect and unify our seafood messaging.

So I want to just start off by saying thank you all for the great conversation these past couple of days involving communication and the recognition of the importance of communication.

I think a lot of what I heard the past two days and have also heard in previous conversations is communication sort of being a catch-all phrase for a lot of different activities, including education and outreach and stakeholder engagement and

amplification of shared messaging, and so a number of different activities that we are always, like, looking to see how we can incorporate into our communications plan.

To be most effective our communications need to be similar to, like, a DEI or EEJ initiative. Needs to be threaded through every stage and every aspect of what we're doing.

So our team really tries to make sure that that's happening whenever possible, not just as sort of like a -- we build the product, we come up with the policy, we, you know, build the plan and then think about communications afterwards.

We really strive to be thinking about communications in advance, and it also needs to be, as some of you have noted, very targeted to specific audiences and that is a difficulty in creating those products that meet the needs of everyone.

So what I am going to focus on today -- and so we have specific products that we try and use to reach specific audiences but our number-one web tool or number-one communications tool is our website and it really has been designed with the idea of having - - of meeting the user where they are in the sense of we have different levels of information.

So we have our -- what we call surfer level information, swimmer level information, and divers. So we -- the deeper you want to go into a topic the more we have available.

We try to push people to our website to find the information that they need. But we can always, always, always use more assistance in that. We try to be a resource to you all and to partners and then encourage our partners and collaborators and -- to point to the website.

So with that being said, I'm going to kind of go over some web updates that we have and show you some of the new features that we're going to be

releasing in March, and then -- and also just kind of wanted to point out that all of -- everything that you're going to see here is, in part, comes from multiple, multiple conversations with lots of different stakeholders in various sectors so -- and that we also recognize that what I'm going to show you today is not the end.

The website is -- you know, the beauty of the website is that we can always -- we can continue to make changes and updates and make it -- make it more user friendly.

So everything that we have done has been with the input of SEO -- search engine optimization -- expertise and user experience expertise. So those are -- that's, ultimately, what we're trying to achieve here.

We're trying to make it easier to find when you go to Google and you type in what is or is -- what is sustainable seafood and -- or is X sustainable, should I eat fill in the blank, we're trying to make sure that our content rises up higher in the -- in the search returns.

And then also once we have folks at the website can they navigate around and find the information they need. Are the headline -- or are the headers indicative of what content they're going to find there and is the content that we are presenting what they are actually looking for.

So that is all top of mind as we have been going through this redesign, and what you're seeing here is the back end of the website. This is not public facing yet.

If you go to our -- if you go to our Sustainable Seafood page currently, this is not exactly what it looks like. We are in the process of doing some reorganization and that is, largely, to incorporate the content from FishWatch.

So I think most of you are probably familiar with



FishWatch.gov and it's been a go-to resource for a lot of folks with profiles around U.S. seafood for a number of years now.

We found, in talking with experts, that the -- it was important to -- it would be more helpful to increase the availability and discoverability of our content by bringing it under the umbrella of the Fisheries website. So we're going to be integrating it into the Fisheries website.

However, if you are someone who bookmarks a lot of content or if you -- or if there are other websites that are pointing to content, we are going to set up one-to-one redirects for all of our profiles and for most of our content pages as well to go.

So we're not losing anything. We're just gaining the advantage of having it under one umbrella website and the improved navigability of this -- of the Fisheries website.

So, with that being said, I just kind of want to walk you through some of the changes that you'll see in the landing page and then also on the profiles.

So, right now, if you go to the Sustainable Seafood website the only thing that you will see the same here that you would see what we have currently is this overview tab. We have reorganized all of the other tabs.

The overview, obviously, just sort of provides a very quick overview of introductory text and then some quick links. You'll see we are retaining the FishWatch branding. In talking to some people that was still -- or talking to some of our stakeholders they felt that that was still an identifiable logo and term that they were familiar with.

So we are going to retain that branding, and then as we go through the process of bringing these new features online we'll reevaluate and see if that still retains that same recognition, moving forward.

So the landing page is not going to change too much. But the way that we have reorganized the content here at the top and to these tabs is directly based on feedback that we have heard from a number of stakeholders.

So we have this content "What is sustainable seafood?" currently on the website. But it's located in a place down here. We realized that most people are not scrolling that far down. That page does get a number of hits, though.

So when people are searching it directly from the website but it doesn't connect back as easily to the other content. So we have reorganized so we're putting "What is sustainable seafood?" right up front and have all of that same content right at the top there.

I'm also going to caution you as I move forward. This is -- like I said, this is not only the back end of the website but this is the back end of the test website.

So the content that you see here, the images that you see here, is not going to be the final stage. So this is sort of very draft format so that I could demonstrate it for you all.

So, again, we'll have -- be able to take advantage of these More Information -- the More Information box on the side -- to also be able to point to partners and other relevant information.

The Seafood Consumers tab, so we're trying to make it very obvious to users based on their audience, like, what information is targeted for them.

So that's not to say that they might not find some of the other information useful but we're trying to make it a little bit more obvious who the content is intended for.

That was a comment that came especially from a lot

of the interviews with industry that Michael Rubino and others were doing early last year and not seeing a space for themselves on the website.

So seafood industry -- we're just pulling together some additional resources for -- some that are available currently on the website and others pointing out to -- directing them to other federal partners and some of their -- some of their resources.

So just to kind of give you an idea of some of the content that might be included there.

And then with the initial launch -- so when we launch we'll have this overview tab, the "What is sustainable seafood?" tab, Seafood Consumers, Seafood Industry, and then Seafood Profiles.

Seafood Communities will be sort of a phase two of the launch, but I just kind of -- I want to walk you through it now what we're thinking of.

We want to focus more on the people who are -- who make our seafood in the U.S. sustainable and available, and so we want to focus on the faces of U.S. seafood, increasing grower and harvester and, you know, profiles and profiles of other people who work in the industry.

As we start to develop those, I'll likely be reaching out to some of you and other partners to help us with that, some of the research in the diversity and inclusion work, pointing out some of the initiatives that other industry organizations are promoting, and then our -- and then also having space for global seafood community and some of the work that we're doing on a global scale.

So that will be -- that is the most draft content space right now. So if you all have ideas then I -- we are open to those for how we can develop and use that seafood community space.

And then the last thing that I want to point out to

you and, in fact, let me -- I'm going to switch over to the Seafood Profiles page. So this is to, again, replicate the functionality of FishWatch.

So we have not had this connection on our Sustainable Seafood page currently. This will -- like I said, this will, essentially, mimic the functionality of the profile search on FishWatch currently.

One thing that has changed, however, is that we're adding some additional explainer text wherever we can that these are -- that this is U.S. seafood that we're highlighting because that is a question that we get a lot.

Like, I have looked for, you know, name of an imported species, and so we want to be more intentional about reasserting that we are talking about U.S. seafood here.

And then we can also -- people can still search by region, by if they want to distinguish between wild caught or farmed.

But another nice feature is that this is -- will only allow us to show, I think, nine to -- nine or 12 profiles and we -- this will be manually curated.

So if we want to promote something in -- maybe we wanted to celebrate West Coast seafood. Then we can focus on some of the specific species that we see here with a little blurb.

Here, I just chose as an example, like, we're celebrating Aquaculture Week and here are some of the farm species that you may find. And then if you -- and then that just sort of allows us an extra space to sort of -- you know, to focus folks.

So I'm going to show you -- you can also search by name, so I just typed in pollock there, hit search, and by taking -- by clicking search that takes you to our "Sustainable Seafood" directory and that will have all of the species.

So you can see by typing in pollock it brought up not only Alaska pollock and Atlantic pollock but this group profile that includes some -- that includes a number of species.

The search function has been expanded so it also allows the search of common names, scientific names, and -- so yeah. So we can make sure that whatever people are typing in that, hopefully, they're getting to the content they need.

So looking at Alaska pollock, if you click on that -- oh, shoot, I do need to sign in again. Sorry. It kicked me out. Oh, no, I'm just trying to get this -- this thing is in the way.

Dr. Sullivan: I saw this happen to Bill Gates once at a AAAS meeting.

Ms. Diederick: All right. Well, then I am in good company. Thank you for that, Pat. Good thing I don't have to type in any secret codes.

So the reason I have to sign back in is because, like I said, not all of this content is publicly available yet. It's still on our back end. So here, what I was trying to access, what you didn't see before is we have added a seafood tab to the species profiles.

So depending upon where you come from, if you come from the seafood profile page then it will direct you -- when you click on that link it'll direct you to the seafood tab of that profile.

And, again, we have reorganized some of the content. So right at the very top it asks the question is this sustainable, and the answer is if it's harvested in the U.S. then it is a sustainable product and you should feel good about eating that.

We have added in this additional information that came from -- that is currently on FishWatch about the availability and, you know, tastes and texture -- things that the consumer might be looking for -- the nutrition facts -- and then we'll also have -- we

have a small collection of recipes and we are going to be migrating that over.

And then we're using this format that will allow us to sort of, again, manually create sort of, like, mini cookbooks so we can pull things together.

Like, here we have just three examples of recipes for Alaska pollock but we could also pull together a mini cookbook -- online cookbook -- of salads or, you know, good things to eat in the summer.

So we have these resources. We know people like recipes. It's not necessarily the thing that brings them to us but it is -- we have heard from a lot of folks that if they're coming here for the information then it's nice to at least get an idea of, like, what are some things to do.

So we're not -- we're not turning into a test kitchen or anything. But with the resources we already have we have heard that there is value in those, especially for some species that some people are not -- like, you know, you can go into Google and look for a salmon recipe and you're going to find a million salmon recipes.

But you might go look for a monkfish recipe and maybe there's only a couple. So we have heard and have seen through some of the Google analytics that some of those recipes are, in fact, actually driving traffic. So we're going to retain those.

Last thing I wanted to point out is that for people who navigate to the overview tab of the species here that we -- again, we're retaining that FishWatch branding here and if you click on that it just takes you over to the seafood tab.

So if people are familiar with that and don't necessarily see the seafood tab at the top, then that's -- it'll bring them here.

And then we -- the layout here, this is a layout -- a design that we're already using, the overview,

management, science, resources. So we're really trying to use our species profiles as a portal for all of the information that you could want on the species.

There's also additional tabs not displayed here because there's not currently content in them. But there are also additional tabs available that includes information on if it's a recreational important fish, if it -- species -- if it is -- there's an Aquaculture tab, Commercial Fishing tab. There's the Management tab, a Conservation tab.

So there's all sorts of different opportunities or opportunities to bring in different information and the various ways that we work with these organisms and with these species and the various ways that they might be meaningful to the different audiences.

So I think with that I will stop and -- oh, actually, one thing I will make mention of, I mentioned that we're aiming for a March time line for the launch. Right now we are working furiously on the back end on all of this and migrating content over.

In January, we will -- right now our -- all of our species profiles on the website are pulling content over from FishWatch. So if we make updates on FishWatch to the content then it's pulled over to Fisheries.

So in January we're going to be sort of severing that connection and then so we'll have -- we'll maintain - - both websites will exist -- will coexist.

But while that -- once that tie has been severed then we'll be working to migrate -- manually migrate some additional content over, make final changes, clean up during January/February, troubleshoot, make sure that everything is all polished and works as it should and then be ready to launch in March, at which time when you type in FishWatch.gov you would be directed to -- I keep getting these timeouts -- you would be directed to

this page unless you -- like I said, unless you have it bookmarked to a specific profile and then you would be redirected to that profile.

So now -- I think I've said that three times -- now I'm going to finish up and I'm going to take questions. So thank you all for listening.

Yes, Pat?

Dr. Sullivan: Great. Thanks. I just thought I'd get things started.

So I was noticing when we were looking at the Alaska pollock one there's no scientific species names in there that I saw. Is that something that you guys include?

Ms. Diederick: There should be.

Dr. Sullivan: I find that, as a scientist, it's nice to have that. I just didn't see it. Oh, there it is. It's in there.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Yeah. It's on -- so it's on the -- we do include the scientific name. You can see it is not italicized as it should be. But that might be because I'm on -- I'm not sure which version I'm on.

Dr. Sullivan: Okay.

Ms. Diederick: But, yeah, so that -- so we do include that in all of our -- and on all of the species and, in fact, we have even recently added a -- okay, it's not here but we have also added a classification from kingdom down to genus.

Dr. Sullivan: Great.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Or kingdom of the species.

Dr. Sullivan: I find those key words -- those are really helpful to get, like, deeper than some of the more superficial stuff that's on the line. So --



Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Absolutely. And it's also helpful to know, like, for those people who are looking for that information. I mean, I always do a cross check. Like, am I looking at the species that I think I'm looking at, right.

Dr. Sullivan: Yes. Exactly. Yes.

Ms. Diederick: So no, that's helpful. And we also have changed it, like I said, recently so that you can now search. Previously, it would only search on the primary name and we have changed it so it's also searching the --

Dr. Sullivan: The phrase. Yes.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah, the scientific name as well as the also known as name.

Dr. Sullivan: Great. Great. Great. Thanks.

Ms. Diederick: Stefanie?

Dr. Sullivan: Well, I have a second question, if that's okay.

Ms. Diederick: Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. Do you have another question?

Dr. Sullivan: No, that's okay. Yeah. Do you mind?

Ms. Diederick: No.

Dr. Sullivan: Okay. So the second question is, this is really great for putting information out. I'm wondering if there's any processes in your group about listening for information.

Ms. Diederick: For listening for information?

Dr. Sullivan: Yes. Yeah.

I mean, one of the important things that we're trying to communicate here is it's important to have a dialogue, that communication isn't just a one-way street.

It's -- it involves sort of figuring out what -- and I could see a real benefit to things like if you saw a general set of comments coming in somewhere or if you wanted to, say, conduct a survey to figure out how people feel about catch shares or something like that, that might be a mechanism to actually -- I recognize you did, you know, test cases with specific people and so on.

But, I mean, just generally getting information back, comments and so forth, from stakeholders and other community members.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah.

Dr. Sullivan: Have you thought about that?

Ms. Diederick: So we have a number of ways in which we engage with stakeholders to get their feedback and so one of those ways is just, you know, conversations with individuals and that's an important part of the work that I do.

I have a lot of phone calls and Zoom meetings and in-person meetings with folks who are sharing feedback and that is always considered when -- you know, when we're making updates.

It'll be a big part of what we do, like, when -- I mean, that'll be one of my big focuses when -- at the Boston Seafood Show in March is, you know, talking to different stakeholders and is this -- you know, does this work for you and if not, like, what else do you need.

There's also additional -- we have -- if you look at the side here where it says, "Send us your feedback," this is something that we installed a couple -- almost two years ago now where you can click on that and provide immediate feedback on that particular page.

So if you see something that is, well, you know, I want to address and sometimes it's things like a typo, sometimes it's things like can I use that

photo, but occasionally it's something, you know, of real substance like have you considered fill in the blank.

So -- and so that would be, you know, I guess, unsolicited. As far as, like, the organized solicitation of feedback around an issue like catch shares, for example, I would hope that this would be -- that this being either the species profiles or the -- our catch shares page -- our catch shares program page would be a tool that is shared and used as a -- this is where we're -- like, sort of this is the baseline. This is where we're starting from, and then -- and then ask for additional information.

But that would -- that would not necessarily -- we don't have, like, a means of, like, collecting that advice or that input directly on the website.

So but I would hope that it would be shared and --

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah. I mean, I think you guys are positioned in a really good spot to open that door and I think that door needs to be open, generally. And so if one thinks about that -- I know it's not an easy thing to do but something to consider.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Yeah. Absolutely.

Dr. Sullivan: Anyway, thank you for that.

Ms. Diederick: Thank you. Thank you.

Ms. Moreland: Thank you. Like, that's really what I wanted to say. I feel like this is quite responsive to years of input on simpler, more accessible summary information along these lines. So appreciate the work and think it looks great.

You spoke to the timeline. I was thinking about the North American Expo Boston. There are many who see value in the FishWatch website, and do you plan to have a media industry fish buyer pack so that those who use the site could help amplify the transition?

Ms. Diederick: Yeah, that's a great question.

So we, in the past, have had a number of tools that have been available both digital and print, and we are currently evaluating what is possible.

In the past, we have had an API available so that, basically, pulls the content from FishWatch onto a user site so that if they want to highlight a profile that they can do that.

Because this is an entirely new system and because it is now, like I said, under the umbrella of the Fisheries website, we're looking from, like, sort of a -- from a security standpoint and also just from a -- like, a usability, I guess. Like, have people actually been using that in the past.

We're trying to determine, like, how has that actually been useful to people, and if we have to rebuild it then let's be thoughtful about it and rebuild it in a way that is actually going to be used.

So that's one aspect. And then, of course, we're always looking -- I mean, we also always encourage people to -- you know, to link to the site.

As far as print materials go, we have in the past created FishWatch recipe cards and with, like, a little bit of information.

Ms. Lukens: I just want to clarify. Will there be any advanced notification or a media and user advance notice --

Ms. Diederick: I see.

Ms. Lukens: -- so that transition could be amplified when you roll out the new.

Ms. Diederick: Got you. Yes, thank you.

Okay. So a couple things. One, yes, there will be advance notice and that we're sort of using the seafood show as a launching point.

So we're looking -- we're TBD if we have a special event where we invite people or if it'll be something that we just have set up at the booth.

Then we'll also have -- on the website there will be both a banner on FishWatch starting in -- I think, in January that says we'll be moving and then we'll also have a banner on the Fisheries site that will be at the top that when you are rerouted to -- so if you are rerouted to the new site that it'll say, like, welcome to the new home of FishWatch.

So we'll also -- we're also planning to do a web story about the launch and then a -- have a short tutorial video that sort of, like, walks you through, like, here's how to find all the information.

We did that when we relaunched the website -- the new Fisheries website a couple years ago and that proved to be really helpful.

Yes? I think -- Liz? I'm sorry. Linda. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry.

Ms. Odierno: Thank you.

One of the things that I wanted to share is the National Aquaculture Association on their old website had a Kids tab at the top and that might be a really good vehicle to talk about careers in fisheries and aquaculture on this website, and that kind of folds in with the recommendations of the Workforce Development Task Force. So just something to think about in the future.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Thank you for that.

We do have -- we have some -- the nice thing about bringing it over to -- the FishWatch content over to the Fisheries site and the reorganization of the -- of those top tier tabs -- navigation tabs -- is that we can pull in resources that are currently on the website a lot more sort of organically and there are a number of educational resources available from especially our -- we have some really good

resources from the regions that are intended for audiences -- student audiences -- and of all ages.

And then also that's another thing that we're hoping to sort of drive home with the faces of seafood and highlighting some of those different -- like, these are different jobs that you can have if you want to work in this industry.

And Sara?

Dr. McDonald: Hey, Laura. Thanks. It looks really nice.

Just a question about the also known as names. I just wanted to find out if you were using, like, FDA, sushi names, Hawaiian names, because there's -- like, I think there are different Hawaiian names for different ages of each fish and native tribal names and things like that.

Ms. Diederick: Thank you. Yeah. So when we pull those -- so the name that we use at the top, like, the name that I've highlighted here are Alaska pollock. That is what we call a profile name and the profile name is always the FDA seafood list name.

So it's always the one that is the seafood market, you know, what it needs to be known as. And then we include -- under the also known as we do include other names that -- some that come from that list and then we really rely on the regions to share.

So we do have a variety of Hawaiian names in the also known as. I'm not sure. I'll have to look into the inclusion of names that tribes and tribal nations might know them as.

That is an excellent suggestion. And if we're not doing it then, yeah, I would -- I would really like to look into that.

Mr. Fote: Before you ask the next question, Joe and I are online. We both have our hand raised.

Ms. Diederick: All right, Tom. Go ahead, Tom.

Mr. Fote: Yeah. I was wondering if you could do me a favor and pull lobster up -- New England lobster.

Ms. Diederick: I will gladly do that. This -- it will not show all of the features that I'm showing you here because they're not yet available.

Mr. Fote: Well, what I'm saying is you're going up to Boston with this in March and right now lobster is no longer on the -- they've been pulled off of some of the watch lists of sustainable because of the Right whale. Are you going to do that on this page also?

Ms. Diederick: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure I heard the question.

Mr. Upton: Tom, if you zoom in you'll see the lobster is riding on the Right whale, actually. It's very small. You got to zoom in.

Mr. Fote: I didn't hear -- I didn't hear Sebastian in the audience and I knew this would be a question he would probably ask because of all the controversy right now with the New England lobster.

Are you going to basically take it off the list or whatever -- sustainable fisheries -- because then you're going into New England at the fish show and watch and I wouldn't want to be there.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Yeah. No, we're not taking any of our -- any of our profiles off. We -- I mean, I -- I think it's -- our messaging around lobster has not changed as far as its -- as far as its sustainability. So that's what you see here.

Mr. Fote: Thank you.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Jocelyn, do you want to --

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah. I just wanted to ask a follow-up question. This was sort of on my list of questions.

I'm just curious how you will handle conversations about third party certification and certain fisheries

losing their certification, as Tom pointed out.

To Brett's point -- was it yesterday -- where seafood is just confusing. I think that it'd be helpful to hear how NOAA is talking about it because I feel like I get that question a lot.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. I mean, our stance has been and will continue to be that as it is regulated in the U.S. that U.S. farmed and harvested seafood is a sustainable seafood choice, and so that -- when we are talking to different groups and when we try to simplify it -- when I am out there talking to folks and I try and simplify it for them I tell them, like, is it a product of the United States? Then you can feel confident when you're eating it.

And then from there then, you know, there are additional -- there are additional resources that they can go to look for. But our stance is that U.S. seafood is sustainable seafood. Yeah.

Oh, Joe?

Mr. Schumacker: Thanks, Laura.

This is great stuff and, as noted earlier, one of the most important parts of the NOAA Fisheries' mission is the communication piece. Thank you.

Hey, just from what your -- your first comments I went ahead and went into Google and put in what is sustainable seafood. You come right to the top, as you indicated.

First question, do we have to pay for that?

Ms. Diederick: No. That's a great question. Yeah, getting to the top is -- it's sort of a -- like, understanding how Google works is -- it's a little bit of a black box.

No, we did not have to pay for that. It really is about how things are configured on the back end, how things are tagged with metadata, how we use headings. The fact that we are a government and,



therefore, a trusted site helps us out.

But, yeah, there are a number of tricks and tools. They are, unfortunately, always changing, which is why we do pay for consultants and expertise in SEO -- search engine optimization -- and they help guide that from a technical aspect and then also from just the way the content is presented and organized.

So yeah, great question. Also just to -- just to further address that, that page that you're looking at that is what we are transferring that content over to the tab, to the Sustainable Seafood tab -- "What is sustainable seafood?"

So that's where all of that content is going and we have been working with our SEO experts to make sure that we don't lose that sort of, like, ranking and that -- and the results.

Mr. Schumacker: Oh, excellent. Yeah, just to -- and to follow up on that, I went to Bing and because we have got to see what Microsquish is up to -- and you got buried below at least one ad and then the sustainable seafood -- ocean, why seafood, and another one.

So you might want to work on Bing. Thanks.

Ms. Diederick: Thank you. Oh, yes. Sorry. Megan, I didn't see you.

Chair Davis: No problem. Yeah. Thanks so much, Laura. It's very exciting to see the robust site coming together with the different areas.

I do have a couple of questions. So you showed us the landing page here but how do you actually find it? If you go to, like, the NOAA Fisheries page, like, what is the link that -- how would somebody -- if somebody typed in NOAA seafood would it come right here?

I'm just trying to figure out the navigation if somebody's going to your front -- the front NOAA

Fisheries page. That was one of the questions.

Ms. Diederick: Okay. First of all, if they -- if they land on the Fisheries page then the first thing -- so you'll see fishing and seafood at the top and we -- and it's right here, Sustainable Seafood.

I'm not sure if you type NOAA seafood -- yeah, it takes you to fishing and -- fishing and seafood.

Chair Davis: Okay. Great.

Ms. Diederick: So, yeah.

Chair Davis: The other question, and this actually goes back to a little bit about what Pat was saying about the dialogue and making sure that NOAA is showing that they're engaged with community and whether or not there's a way to connect species with stories.

It sounds like your profiles -- you're having a profile page on stories, but how to kind of link the two from FishWatch to also having some link to the stories.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. No, that is great, and if my computer would speed up a little bit here then I can show you.

So we do have a few ways that we're doing that. One, we have -- on the More Information box on the side here we have -- so these are all -- like, so there's a podcast on pollock and the -- there's a web feature on pollock, and then we'll also -- again, this is not fully functioning yet so it is not exactly what you would see.

But then we would also have seafood news down here, that that would be connected with a profile. So --

Chair Davis: Yeah. I've heard -- I've heard from the industry that you don't have faces of people and I'm just wondering if that's something you want to keep into consideration is being able to not just show the

fish but also show a person --

Ms. Diederick: Yes.

Chair Davis: -- that's in the field or just to bring it into a community setting.

Ms. Diederick: Absolutely, and that's why we're adding that Seafood Communities tab to the landing page during the second phase, partly because you're right, we have not -- we have not been as good about featuring the faces of seafood as we have the science and management pieces and even the nutrition and recipe pieces that FishWatch was also built on.

So we need to work to create that content. We do have some. We have been doing -- our Office of Aquaculture has done a fantastic job the past several years of doing the tide-to-table and farmer profiles.

We want to do more of that and so we need to build that content first and then we'll launch that with that -- the seafood communities.

I don't -- we will be able to tie it directly so and I don't -- again, I don't have it here. But, again, that'll be another place where -- under that More Information box.

So if we are -- have highlighted a -- if we have a grower profile for, let's say, oysters then on the oyster profile then we can say under this box right here, you know, meet me, oyster farmer so and so. So that we will be able to connect that individually as well, species to species.

Chair Davis: That sounds -- that sounds good. Just as a suggestion, you still might want to have a representative photo even if you don't have the story yet --

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Sure.

Chair Davis: -- so you can get the feel. When

somebody lands on the page, whether it be on aquacultures of fisheries or public they're seeing the fish, but just something that represents the community from an aquaculturist or of fisheries just so it just pops out as an image because you know we're all drawn to the images.

Ms. Diederick: Yes, definitely.

No, that's helpful and I appreciate hearing that. We have shifted on -- and this is based on some marketing research that partners have shared -- that we are using more.

We actually went from showing just the fish in -- on a dock, in a net, or whatever the species into showing prepared because what people like to think of they like to -- they like to look at what the prepared food is going to look like when they're thinking about their seafood choices.

So we have made a deliberate change to that in most of our -- when we're specifically talking about seafood. But, yeah, I love the idea of including more, like, actual faces of people.

Sarah?

Ms. Schumann: Along those lines, I think that -- I have an additional suggestion that can -- sort of more of a long-term suggestion but that can be integrated into this and that's in terms of thinking about how you can be supplying media assets to third parties.

For small seafood businesses, nonprofits, and the media there's a real dearth of available imagery and video, and the images that exist are, you know, expensive.

So for a lot of us that's a real bottleneck in terms of our ability to promote U.S. seafood and show and tell the story of that seafood.

I can't tell you how many times a magazine or other

publication has run a piece about how important it is to eat local and support your local seafood producers and, yet, the photo accompanying that piece shows some seafood caught in China or a fishing boat in Iceland.

Even if you go to the commercial sites like Shutterstock there just aren't that many images available and they're expensive, which is a bottleneck for all but the biggest seafood companies.

NOAA has a photo library but it's extremely limited and out of date. ASMI -- the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute -- has a media library, which is probably a good model.

But there are -- there's sort of a firewall for third party people who don't meet the criteria that ASMI has identified. So that's available to some but not to everyone.

I could see this website being tied into sort of having a bank of photos associated with each species that people could utilize for their purposes to help market these species as well as sort of a more general media library that people can use to tell the story of seafood.

It would cost money to acquire those images but I think a lot of us can help connect you with photographers out on the coast who are, in a lot of cases, also participants in the seafood industry themselves and who utilize those opportunities to document what they and their peers are doing.

And so purchasing some images and video from those people would not only help you acquire and distribute imagery but would also support those folks and their creativity.

Electronic monitoring also represents a potential source of video and still shots that you'd have to sort of figure out how to appropriately access the rights to those but could be a really interesting way

of leveraging electronic monitoring to provide a real service to the industry.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Thank you. I appreciate that comment and also -- and recognize the struggle is real because even we have that struggle sometimes.

Fortunately, we do have some means to purchase some of those. So I do have a lot of empathy for small businesses.

One thing I did here and that I just wanted to point out also in the -- in the design of the species profiles in particular not -- and it doesn't help with the images per se but I've talked to some distributors who have wanted to be able to just print off the profile so that they can share a printed profile with their customers that shows the NOAA tag, that has the words this is sustainable and here's why and has that information that -- so that they can just print it from the website and share it as -- you know, as a handout.

That, just the construction of the website previously, didn't allow that. We ensure that that would be available.

Chair Davis: Laura, we have about -- maybe we could go another five or 10 minutes but then we'll need to wrap up. Yeah.

Participant: And you need to leave anyway.

Ms. Diederick: And I also need to leave. So, Matt?

Mr. Upton: Thanks. I totally agree with Sarah's comments. Another way to kind of drive traffic to the website might be through social media whether it, like, links over there. Within the social media -- I'm just looking at the NOAA Fisheries Instagram -- one thing I'd like to see is more pictures of commercial fishing.

There's awesome shots of coral, people in kayaks

with fish, a lot of marine mammals and birds, which I always love. But it's good to see boats fishing, and the only one that I've seen if I scroll back is a picture of a boat under the National Marine Sanctuary system, which is kind of ironic because usually you can't fish in National Marine Sanctuaries.

So, you know, just to try and, like, get that going that'd be nice. And I think Corey Arnold is another person that does great photos, because it'd be nice to have the connection between commercial fishing and NOAA Fisheries. Thanks.

Ms. Diederick: Excellent. Thank you.

Chair Davis: All right. Okay, that's great. Laura, thanks again.

Lots of great input from MAFAC and we may also choose to follow up with some other suggestions. But we're really excited to see the new launching happening.

Ms. Diederick: Yeah. Thank you. I think you all know how to contact me. So I'm happy to talk communications and outreach on -- around seafood anytime. So thank you for having me.

Chair Davis: Gabriela?

Ms. McMurtry: Yeah. I didn't know if Joe was just waving goodbye to Laura or if he had something to say.

Okay. Yeah, just wanted to flag that. Okay.

Chair Davis: Tom, did you have a comment as Laura is packing up? Oh. What's that all about? Oh, he's gone.

Bye, Laura. Thanks again.

Mr. Fote: No, I wanted to explain what that picture is about as my backdrop there. Those are handicapped wheelchairs that we have brought from

Jersey Coast from the governor's surf fishing tournament 20 or 30 years ago, and it allows fishermen and individuals to, basically, use them.

Over the years, I think we've bought about 35 of them from Island Beach State Park in New Jersey. But other townships saw that and they now have it along the whole Jersey Coast where you go to a township and if you, you know, need a wheelchair, there's somebody -- you can borrow one and they let you go down to the beach. And the only thing that's unique about the ones at Island Beach is they all have rod holders on them. So I figured I'd just let you know why I put that picture up there when I'm on Zoom or a lot of the calls, just so we can --

#### Approval of Draft Recommendations

Chair Davis: That's wonderful. Yeah. Thanks for sharing that, Tom. That's really great.

Okay. So we're going to -- going to switch gears and wrap up the workforce development document and then, hopefully, bring it to a vote. Thumbs up from Joe.

So I'm going to turn this over to Joe and Gabriela to help guide us through the document.

Mr. Schumacker: Thank you, Madam Chair. Let's see. Are we sure -- yes, thank you.

Chair Davis: And, Heidi, I just wanted to say we have plenty of time to -- for this discussion. So go ahead. Thank you, Gabriela and Joe.

Mr. Schumacker: Thank you. Yes. So we had some really good input yesterday from the -- from the working group, the members here and --

Chair Davis: Joe, can you speak up? It's a little hard to hear you.

Mr. Schumacker: There we go. How's this? No?

Chair Davis: Yeah. Thank you.



Mr. Schumacker: Is that a little better? Okay. Thank you.

Yeah, so we had some really good input yesterday from the working group and we want to make sure and go over those inputs today and that's about it.

We don't want to get into any other major revisions today. I want to get this thing wrapped up and see if we can get it in front of the full committee.

I believe we should just go ahead and start from the top and note where we're at there. There's no changes to the executive summary at this time. There might be as we work through this.

We entered the -- added the statement paid and unpaid in the sentence -- maybe you can highlight that sentence there, incorporate internship opportunities paid and unpaid into high school programs, for example, the MATES program.

There was comment made to whether these were paid or unpaid. We just went ahead and threw them both in there for those types of opportunities.

Dr. Sullivan: Sarah, is that okay? Joe, I'm asking Sarah if that's okay and she says it's okay.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay. And very good and that's -- because this is in the executive summary recommendations it also exists below. Thank you. Scrolling.

Okay. Sarah Schumann has put in some -- a good sentence at the end of the paragraph that begins "over the past several years," and if you guys would read through that, take a look. I have one suggested change on that.

And, Sarah, I'm putting this in a suggested edit on the document. Now, I really want to keep it as will be a vital part of preparing the seafood sector, if that's appropriate for you.

Ms. Schumann: Sounds good, Joe.

Mr. Schumacker: Other changes or suggestions on that? We're done? Accept.

We have some --

Participant: Can you scroll up a little, Gabriela?

Mr. Schumacker: Pages here --

Ms. McMurtry: Oh, yeah. These are just hyperlinks. Yeah.

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. Yeah, these are just --

Ms. McMurtry: It's a little confusing with everyone's suggestions.

Mr. Schumacker: Thanks, Gabby. Yeah, these are -- so these are references as asked for by some of the folks to make sure we add them in there, and then a great paragraph by Sarah there in the second paragraph in the background section, if folks want to read through that and --

Ms. McMurtry: And also just wanted to flag Pat had sent me a link for this networking group and I just added that. Just a very minor edit.

Ms. Lovett: Joe, for the record, could you please describe the paragraph briefly just so in case people can't read the whole thing?

Mr. Schumacker: Sure. So this is in the background section for the report. We were -- the first paragraph we define resilience and resiliency.

Sarah made the comment that it was really unclear that what kind of occupations we are really referring to when we refer to workforce development, and I agree, and we just hadn't put that laundry list place there.

And her paragraph reads, American seafood workforce includes but is not limited to captains, owner operators, and crew of commercial and recreational fishing vessels and aquaculture farms,

makers and sellers of fishing and grow out gear, hatchery operators, owners and staff of bait and tackle shops, boat yards and engine dealers, mechanics, welders, boat builders, lumpers and icemakers, seafood wholesale managers and processors, warehouse personnel and delivery truck drivers, and the seafood sales force -- fish counter clerks and managers, seafood chefs, and more.

And I just thought that was a really, really well done laundry list and nicely thought out. Thank you, Sarah.

And you make a comment to the right on that as well about whether educators -- science and management educators, nonprofits, should be included. I think, in my opinion, it's included in the "and more" and also in our education sections below. But I leave that to you for discussion.

Chair Davis: Seems like it'd be fine to add in the background area. Since we have already started along with I'd recommend we add it, educators and science managers and -- yeah.

Mr. Schumacker: Very good. Leave it to the educators, right?

Ms. Schumann: Is there any other roles that are missing from this list? I tried to be as comprehensive as I could but there may be people I don't know about or didn't --

Chair Davis: Linda, did we get everybody in the culinary aspects?

Ms. Odierno: I think so.

Chair Davis: Good.

Dr. Sullivan: Under -- is that what we want to say, science managers, or do we want to say scientists comma managers or -- scientists comma managers? Okay. Is that all right? Okay. Great, thank you. That's great.

Mr. Schumacker: Very good. More input? Comments?

Ms. Schumann: Do we want to also reflect nonprofits? I mean, it's a --

Mr. Schumacker: That's a good question. What do folks think?

Dr. Sullivan: Looking over at the nonprofits, are you included with managers or scientists? Is that -- yeah. Yes.

Ms. Lovett: Yeah. I would say that's a category of -- I don't know how to describe it -- employment. But the people that they hire are oftentimes fishermen, scientists, managers. They have those expertise or skill set.

So I'm not sure that's -- and I come -- I used to work in the NGO world. But I don't know if that's important to add. But --

Mr. Fote: It would be like getting the trade associations. I don't think that's appropriate. It's covered under scientist and managers.

Ms. Schumann: I feel like a trade -- I feel like there is something missing and trade associations is also a good example of it, like, the people who are doing -- I don't like -- I don't think the word advocacy is the right one either. But the people who are doing the work of policymakers or --

Ms. McMurtry: I just want to acknowledge Matt.

Mr. Upton: I don't know. I just think in terms of the workforce I was thinking about some of the more, like, blue collar workforce. Those are the jobs, I think, that there's some issues around. I think there's no shortage of folks interested in policy. That's just my perspective.

But people that want to do the work sometimes that's a little more difficult. Not that policy is not work. It's just more, though, like cutting fish,

catching fish, selling fish, work in the restaurants. So that can be difficult. Matt, do you feel like that's already represented?

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah, that's --

Mr. Upton: I was just worried that we were kind of straying afield from that. Great. Great. Thanks.

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah. I think I'm in agreement with Matt on this one that it sort of feels like this is a communication piece that's directed towards on the water -- folks on the water, boots on the ground, and my extra toughs are tucked away in a closet so I will -- I don't feel like I need to be represented in this list or fellow folks that fall in this category.

So we do talk about education, though, that's higher level education, like, post-high school. What do we call that, bachelor's degrees? That seems like it sort of straddles this science/management/policy world. Anyway, I'm quite happy with the list as it is.

Mr. Schumacker: All right. Are there -- is that -- any other comments on that?

Chair Davis: Meredith?

Ms. Moore: Yes. Thanks.

I also don't feel like I need to be in this list. I was actually a little surprised about adding scientists, managers, and educators because I'm not sure how much the actual recommendations of the document are particularly useful to that section.

That doesn't mean that's how we have to define this. But, like, I feel like we're already slightly in mission creep a little bit by adding all of them. I'm happy to have them included. I'm not going to suggest not. But that's my -- that's where I am on it.

Chair Davis: Yeah, that's a good point. But it does start off saying America's seafood workforce, and

the scientists, observers, managers, educators are all sort of part of that workforce.

Ms. Moore: Yeah. Certainly, observers I feel like are --

Mr. Schumacker: You bet. That'd work.

Chair Davis: I see your point.

Mr. Schumacker: They're all -- they all get in those bottlenecks. Yeah, I mean -- I mean, ideally, we're looking at the -- you know, the smooth running of our American seafood industries and they depend upon all of those.

Ms. McMurtry: Sarah has a comment.

Ms. Schumann: I just wanted to say that if we do include scientists, managers, educators, and more, I think it's really important to -- you know, to recognize that when we think of the nonprofit sector we're not just talking about Nature Conservancy and Ocean Conservancy, but there are people in the seafood industry and trade associations and nonprofits serving -- you know, on the coast serving those people who work around the clock to make sure that those people are taken care of and represented.

And that comes back to what Meredith said yesterday about building capacity for stakeholders to engage in processes and those people. There's a severe shortage of capacity in that group of people both due to sort of human resources but also funding.

And so if we're going -- if we're going to include people who might sit at a phone or sit at a desk on the phone or on a webinar all day long we should be including those people as well.

Dr. Sullivan: So do you have a name for those people?

Ms. Schumann: I need to think about it. But, first,

we need to decide whether we're including people who sit at a desk at all.

Mr. Schumacker: So scientists, managers, and educators, as Heidi noted earlier, seem to encompass many of those folks that you're referring to. Policymakers -- is that the thing that's missing?

Dr. Runnebaum: Can I offer a suggested word?

So, Sarah, when you were -- and when this -- when nonprofits came up I was immediately thinking of somebody like Maine Coast Fishermen's Association, who is providing significant support to the fishing industry and also has a partner organization that is a sector manager.

So I'm wondering if we take out scientists, managers -- scientists and managers and replace that with something along the lines of supporting industries to -- or supporting -- I'm not --

Chair Davis: Maybe like support personnel?

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah, to -- right. So just sort of indicating that it's supporting this industry in a variety of means but it is a little bit more descriptive than more.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Support personnel sounds good because, really, at the end of the day, they may also need to be trained if there's a change in fisheries. You know, they have to be adaptable, too. That's a good catch-all.

Dr. Runnebaum: Do we think we need sector managers or -- okay. Too specific.

Mr. Veerhusen: I was just going to add that we definitely need to have lawyers.

(Laughter.)

Dr. Runnebaum: Thank you, Brett.

Mr. Schumacker: No. Yeah, support -- I mean, the

regulatory support personnel or support personnel, period, I think -- I think that begins to encompass everything we're thinking of. I think folks will get the gist of it.

Ms. Lovett: This is Heidi. So you're leaning towards now support personnel, educators, and more? Okay.

Yeah. I know I'm staff but I'll just say that I think that is better and I feel like this effort often -- the whole work of this committee has -- there's been creep, like, away from where you started and I lean to what Matt said was the whole initial purpose was very much sort of the blue collar workers, bringing people into the fishing industry writ large.

So I think this works much better for you all for what your original intentions were.

Mr. Fote: Thank you, Heidi.

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. Thank you, Heidi.

Yeah. And with that, I'm going to go ahead and call for a -- call for the vote on this one, if you will, and let's accept these changes.

Ms. McMurtry: Meredith has a comment.

Ms. Moore: Sorry. I did actually want to take a second and think about whether we should add observers.

Mr. Schumacker: I consider those support personnel, in my mind.

Dr. Sullivan: You know, we're kind of discussing it here at the table without the microphones. But I think people are in agreement that that would be a useful thing to include.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay.

Chair Davis: But I would put it before support personnel.



Mr. Upton: Yeah. No, I think that makes sense. Yeah. I mean, for me, this is just -- like, I think of it as trying to actually recruit people without college degrees.

That's -- I mean, to be blunt, that's what I think about them and I think also people in, like, the business -- like running a seafood business. I mean, that's the bias that I bring.

But I know that people may feel that there should be more folks advocating for fishermen, which I think is important. But you also got to get, like, the people actually fishing in there.

In my experience, usually when you go to hearings or participate in different things in D.C. usually there's maybe one or two people that run commercial fishing businesses there and the room is full of advocates.

And I understand that people may feel like there should be more funding but I think this could be a unique opportunity to focus on folks who want to do this type of work, don't have college degrees, and this is a good opportunity for them.

Because folks that, generally, are observers, for example, have an advanced degree -- a master's -- and, like, those are folks that -- like, I think it's important to have observers. I think there is a little bit of a shortage at times.

But I think that's not necessarily the group that I was thinking about. But I know folks may have other views.

And I'm not necessarily sure if you have a college degree you're out. But that's kind of the other -- kind of more other blue collar approach that I was thinking of.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah, if I can comment on that.

That's a good point that you make, Matt. We have

been going back and forth and from the beginning I had been sort of not recognizing that we were actually aiming for the group that we're actually talking about but also recognizing that we do need stock assessment scientists and other, and I kept trying to think of how we could kind of work that into the -- because the stock assessment scientists like me are graying, too.

So but this is not the point of this particular one. When I think of observers, though, I thought they often had a bachelor's but not necessarily a master's and it is a pathway that a lot of people take to get into the fishing industry, writ large.

Maybe not fishermen but -- so this is my -- this is my hesitation being on the fence for that and I'm happy to have it excluded. But I'm curious what Meredith has to say about this.

Ms. Moore: My perspective on it is if I'm -- this isn't the most elegant way but if I'm thinking about who's -- who I feel like is on boats and working it includes observers. And so, to me, the -- America's seafood workforce includes observers.

Dr. Sullivan: Joe, what do you think?

Mr. Schumacker: I'm going to go ahead and go with that. I believe that's -- we have had good discussion on it. It's supported and I think we're going to end this here.

Dr. Runnebaum: I have one more thing to add.

Mr. Schumacker: What?

Dr. Runnebaum: Sorry. This is Jocelyn. I'm sorry, Joe.

Mr. Schumacker: Makes sense. I'm just trying to get her done.

Dr. Runnebaum: I know you are. I'm just wondering, we have seafood wholesale managers and processors and then warehouse personnel.

But do we have employees in the processing sector captured? Because I feel like the managers behind the seafood wholesalers and processors is more of, like, higher level, seems like. I don't know. Maybe I'm getting really nitpicky now that we just debated wordsmithing.

Ms. Schumann: As a former seafood processor, I call my -- employees of seafood processors are called processors.

Dr. Runnebaum: Great.

Ms. Schumann: But if that's not clear to everyone we should clarify that.

Ms. McMurtry: Yeah. Well, does the support personnel at the end is that broad enough of a catch-all or --

Ms. Moore: You could say seafood processors and wholesale managers, and then the terms -- like, just reversing the "and" I think you might get -- then seafood processors would be -- feel more inclusive of not just managers because of the way that it's listed, I think.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay.

Ms. Schumann: Okay.

Ms. Moreland: This is Stefanie. So because we're doing this, one of the real drivers of this was skilled trades to start with and now we're starting to dilute that. So while I agree that that covers seafood processors, there's mechanics, welders, in here.

I was -- when we were general that was enough. Does everyone else think that that's enough to cover that skilled trades category that we were talking about -- refrigeration, electricians, and the mechanic category that's collected here. I'm fine with it being this general but it's very important that they're a target.

Ms. McMurtry: Heidi?

Ms. Lovett: Hopefully, to be helpful, we could just use the word Stefanie used -- you know, trades, other trades, expertise, or whatever the right word is there, but just the trades.

And instead of wholesale managers, it could just be wholesalers with an RS at the end instead of the manager side of it.

Although I know, Stefanie, in the past meetings and conversations you have -- things that you have stressed is that you hope that the career paths -- so people see that there's future careers above the stepping stone jobs in these various industries is something we hope people aspire to and they stay in and sort of move -- you know, progress through up to more responsibilities in those positions.

But anyway, yeah. So it becomes -- you'll never satisfy the entire list, potentially. So having some of the catch-all phrases like trades -- experience or trades might do it.

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. Skilled trades. Skilled trades.

Ms. Lovett: Skilled trades. I don't know.

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. And, Stefanie, we do call that refrigeration specifically in our recommendations under training programs.

Ms. Schumann: I would like to add Stefanie's. As the original creator of the list, I would like to add refrigeration and electricians.

I think the value of this list is not only to show what's in scope and out of scope but to bring these roles to life and for people to see themselves in this and celebrate the diversity of -- and the multitude of different roles that make our seafood system go. So I like adding more specifics rather than catch-all categories where possible.

Dr. Sullivan: Can we make a suggestion as to where

they should go?

Ms. Schumann: I think Stefanie suggested they go with welders, mechanics, refrigeration technicians, electricians.

Dr. Sullivan: Great. Thank you.

Ms. McMurtry: Pardon the spelling. Technician. Oh, my gosh. Sorry. There we go. Okay.

Mr. Schumacker: Great. Okay. We're done. I'm going to say that we -- I think we're pretty close now. This looks -- this looks about as good as I could think of. I mean, we -- as noted earlier, we could add a lot more, but let's take one last look, one last go around. Are we good?

Dr. Sullivan: I would say except -- but Gabriela has been plugging for --

Chair Davis: It looks like consensus around the room.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay. Let's accept.

Dr. Sullivan: And do we want to eliminate the scratched out part below that where it says a key component?

Mr. Schumacker: That's my little change here and I'll get into that now if you want, Pat.

Dr. Sullivan: Okay. Sure. That'd be great.

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. Sure.

So I took that section out because of the WF -- excuse me, the EEJ suggestions for WFD and I thought that was just absolutely spot on, that it needed to be highlighted and pulled out.

So I pulled out that minor paragraph that we had that referred to diversity and brought it into another section below equity and environmental justice and WFD and you saw this yesterday.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah, I think we all agreed with that. So that can be taken out. Yeah.

Mr. Schumacker: Right. Okay. Let's go ahead and remove -- then remove the scratched out part.

Dr. Sullivan: And then that gets us to, as you're saying, equity and environmental justice, right, Joe?

Mr. Schumacker: Correct. Correct. And we have some additions or suggestions down below from Stefanie, I believe, primarily, and I -- Stef, you -- Stefanie, you're asking about celebrate versus promote. I liked promote and it looks like we have got it in there at that last sentence.

Dr. Sullivan: Looks like people are --

Mr. Schumacker: And to ask a question on this diversity, did you mean diversity in career pathways for advancement where they exist or where they occur? Is that any difference there, in your mind?

Ms. Moreland: Occur is fine.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay. Real good.

Dr. Sullivan: Looks like we're in agreement here, Joe.

Mr. Schumacker: Real good. Looks like we have got a footnote down below about the EEJ strategy link below, so good.

Ms. McMurtry: Which I will add.

Mr. Schumacker: Thank you. Okay. Jocelyn is speed reading through the document.

Okay. I think we're down to the top of page eight. Is that correct here? Let's see where we're at.

Ms. McMurtry: We're in the education section now?

Mr. Schumacker: Correct, and that's where I'm at in my copy here as well. We have got Sarah's comments about the awkward wording of ways of

knowing.

Pat referred -- mentioned that, no, this is an actual term within the education field out there and that we have references in that regard.

Discussion?

Dr. Sullivan: We get -- that's fine from Sarah.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah, it's actually a specific statement, yeah. Topic, yeah. So it looks like we'll go with that, Joe?

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah, I think so, Pat. It looks like we have got at least -- what do we have, two or three different references down there for this? Do we need more of those?

Dr. Sullivan: Two references.

Mr. Schumacker: Okay. Okay. Good enough. Okay. We have got some edits here in the next paragraph.

Dr. Sullivan: I think we went through all of these and accepted them yesterday, I think.

Mr. Schumacker: Just go ahead and scratch them down the line and make sure they all work in the context and we're not missing anything.

Dr. Sullivan: These are all minor, yes, and we did them all yesterday.

Chair Davis: Yeah, you can always go back and reread it because they are minor.

Mr. Schumacker: Right. All right. Looks to read well. Okay.

Ms. Lovett: Joe, this is Heidi. I see on page nine you've already described the paid -- adding paid and unpaid and so there's no other changes to the recommendation section of that.

Mr. Schumacker: That's correct. So that paid amount -- yes, thank you, Heidi. That paid and unpaid came up in the -- when we were up in the executive summary so I did make comment that it was down below as well. Correct.

Ms. McMurtry: I think Jocelyn or somebody else suggested these, too. I suggested the Eastern Maine Skipper program. So we just added it into the list and the footnote, just acknowledging that.

Mr. Schumacker: Very good. Okay. Training section nine and 10 -- pages nine and 10. This gets to the list.

Ms. McMurtry: Yes, the training inventory. So based on the conversation last night, I decided to click placeholder for recommendation number nine, recommending that we develop this inventory.

Mr. Schumacker: Yes, and I saw that. That was a -- did you put that --

Ms. McMurtry: Yeah, a publicly available inventory for seafood training opportunities. Very broad language for you all to consider and/or tear up. That's fine. But just putting that there for discussion.

Dr. Sullivan: I think that's a great solution and I think we should accept that in the line.

Mr. Schumacker: I would agree with that. I think so as well, and if we do we want to make sure it's at the top as well and solid.

Ms. McMurtry: To clarify at the top, the exec summary?

Mr. Schumacker: That's correct --

Ms. McMurtry: Got it.

Mr. Schumacker: -- where we call the recommendations.



Ms. McMurtry: Okay. Oh, okay. That comment's resolved, too. Okay. Thanks, Heidi.

All right. Going through the innovation and entrepreneurship section, we didn't have any major edits to discuss for today. We are good and clear there.

Lastly, coming to the conclusion that we have all agreed to remove, just because we have the executive summary that's pretty detailed and covers everything that we want to cover in this report anyway. So accepting that.

Mr. Schumacker: No, I wanted to write a couple of paragraphs there.

Ms. McMurtry: Well, Joe, you can go ahead and do that. But I think the working group is pretty set.

Mr. Schumacker: Well, I'm the one that crossed it out. So, yeah, write it in.

Ms. McMurtry: And with that, congratulations, group.

Mr. Schumacker: I think we're there.

Hey, I just want to thank you for --

Chair Davis: I just have one suggestion. I'm just wondering about -- sorry. Not to change any wording but when you have references that are in the footnote it feels, to me, awkward -- that I just wonder if they should be at the bottom of --

Ms. McMurtry: Oh, just change the formatting so that they're all at the very end?

Chair Davis: If there's, like, a reference, like a publication reference.

Ms. McMurtry: Ah, I understand. Okay.

Chair Davis: I mean, it can still be in the reference section at the bottom or cited or --

Dr. Sullivan: But that can be done after we --

Chair Davis: Yeah, I'm just -- it was just a -- I mean, it doesn't affect the overall, but just to clean it up.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah. For me, it's not -- it's not always clear when we put these white papers together whether we should follow the sort of science citation kind of format or whether we should just put footnotes. So if you think -- okay. Yeah, I agree. So --

Ms. McMurtry: Okay. Yeah, that's not a problem. I can shut those down and that'll be good.

Dr. Sullivan: So can I pop the vote?

Ms. McMurtry: Waiting for a motion.

Dr. Sullivan: Yes.

Ms. McMurtry: A motion.

Dr. Sullivan: A motion that we accept this paper.

Mr. Schumacker: Well, we're just a working group right now, are we, or is this the full MAFAC?

Chair Davis: We have full MAFAC here, Joe, and I think -- I think Tom and Clay are still with us and we have -- we have a substantial number of MAFAC members in the room.

Mr. Schumacker: Then call -- go, go, go, Pat.

Dr. Sullivan: So I made the motion. Does it need to be seconded? Yes.

Dr. McDonald: I second.

Chair Davis: Okay. So we have a motion and a second on the table so we have time for a discussion.

Mr. Schumacker: Just a comment from the -- as co-chair along with Roger and the staff, Gabriela and

Heidi, we just really appreciate everybody's input and work into this document. I think it's been a really good effort and thank you all.

Chair Davis: Well, thank you, Joe and Roger, and also Heidi and Gabriela and all those that have contributed to this document over the course of the year.

It's a really powerful document that's going to be referenced quite a lot. I mean, it's just the beginning because it's going to blend into our future work plan as well.

Jocelyn, do you have a comment?

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah. I just wanted to say thank you for Joe and the team pulling this together. I think it's pretty cool. So thank you.

Chair Davis: Okay. Very good.

Well, we will go for a vote then, and so all in favor? And those that are digital if you can raise your hand either physically or - okay.

(Show of hands.)

Chair Davis: It is unanimous. So congratulations.

(Applause.)

Mr. Schumacker: Thank you, all. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Davis: You're very welcome.

So it is now 11:15. I know -- Heidi? Participant: Sara has a document to discuss.

Chair Davis: Yes. Thank you for that. Okay. So, I think it was during the first day that Janet and Jim had talked about remote workforce and at the time they said there wasn't a lot of flexibility in it. And so Sara has gone ahead and drafted some wording that we'd like to put a letter together and go on record

with our thoughts around that.

So, Heidi, I think we can share that?

Ms. Lovett: So, yeah, I'm going to share -- so I did email it to everyone and I will share my screen. So give me one second.

Dr. McDonald: Just to let you guys know, it's rough and I'm very open to suggestions. I just wanted to put some thoughts on paper and give a straw man for us to use.

Let me just save the notes I was taking. Okay. Where am I here? Let me just find it. Sorry. Okay, there we are. Get into the webinar, webinar, webinar, webinar. Okay. Share.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Sara, if you could work through it. I thought it was great. Sara sent it to me last night to take a brief look. So maybe there might be some reorganization or whatever but the points are really good.

Dr. McDonald: Yeah. So -- well, some of these are Matt's points. I just put them on paper. So yeah, I tried to capture -- tried to capture what we discussed.

So the first one is, you know, the seafood industry. This came up a few times. I think other folks talked about it, too, that, you know, it often takes place in remote and rural areas.

Agency employees who live in seafood-producing communities will improve trust and social capital with its stakeholders. So that was really trying to talk about if you live in the community or you're a member of the community and you're a little bit more trusted maybe, and it might break down some barriers in communication and trust. So that's what that one's supposed -- but it can be restated however you guys want.

Allowing employees to work remotely will improve

retention and morale, which is something that Janet, I think, expressed a concern about employee retention and she said there -- you know, somebody said there was a big exodus, a lot of people retiring.

So, hopefully, that this -- improving this morale and retention will increase the agency's capacity to address these priority issues, which we heard they're hiring 40 to 50 people just to work on offshore wind but that there's not enough -- Janet mentioned there's just not enough staff to tackle all the issues that are coming and the new funding that -- you know, that's happening.

Allowing employees to work remotely reduces greenhouse gas emissions associated with commuting. This is -- you know, we're talking about climate change in every single thing that we -- you know, we -- you know, it's overarching everything.

Why would you encourage people to commute if they can work from home and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions? So I think that's a really important point.

Ms. Lovett: This is Heidi. It also relates to your facility footprint.

Dr. McDonald: Right. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So if you're not paying to heat and cool a facility it's also reducing that as well. So we could add associated with commuting and somehow add that, too.

And then last thing is that, you know, federal buildings, which they said that was their other, like, Flexispace. I can't remember what they called that. Flexispace.

Participant: We thought that was sort of --

Dr. McDonald: Yeah, that -- so I added other federal buildings because, apparently, that's, you know, part of the thing. But they're often in really high cost of living areas.

They're in urban areas. They're in -- you know, they're expensive. It's expensive to live here especially but and a lot of -- you know, I think about the Southwest Fishery Science Centers in La Jolla. It's one of the most expensive cities in California.

So allowing employees to work remotely gives them an opportunity to live in more affordable areas, which is more inclusive and can increase diversity of the workforce as well as improve work-life balance and, again, employee retention. So I think it goes to that.

There was one thing -- I wasn't quite sure how to incorporate this but when you're talking about interns as well and paying interns, if you pay an intern but they -- you require them to move to, like, Washington, D.C., like, it's -- you're going to get the wealthy privileged interns that can afford to live in those places.

So I didn't know how to quite say that in this. So I'm open to suggestions on how to say that, too, because if you want to increase the diversity of your workforce you got to make it easier for people to intern and you got to pay them and they can't be spending all of their money on their rent. They need to actually be able to live.

So those are just some of -- that's my little -- my little soapbox. Sorry, that sounded really preachy. I think it's just because, you know, given -- when I think of my career path, like, I was fortunate.

I was privileged and I did a lot of volunteering and a lot of unpaid internships, and that's not the way we're going to increase the diversity in our workforce.

So, anyway, those are my points. Feel free to modify the wording, make it sound better, and if there's a way to add that internship one I just couldn't -- it was, like, 11:00 o'clock last night when I did this so I was -- I was kind of grasping at that

point for better ways to phrase things. So open to suggestions.

Mr. Upton: I think this looks great. I think we should just -- if people have things that they want to add, great. But if not, let's just get it done.

Chair Davis: I'm wondering if the bullet number three -- allowing employees to work remotely reduces greenhouse gas -- that we put that at the end because it's kind of like a -- like a cap for the information.

But we also might want to add in there that also the footprint of the -- of the infrastructure -- I mean, not needing as much infrastructure and not having to heat and cool or all the things that go with that. So I don't know quite the wording on that.

But is the word support communities in there? I was just conversing a little bit with Heidi here. Support - - can you go to the first bullet?

Seafood industry often takes place -- producing communities will -- is there some way to talk about supporting coastal -- as a way to support coastal communities?

Dr. McDonald: Maybe, and will help support coastal communities. So it's an and statement.

Chair Davis: By having a representative --

Dr. McDonald: Yeah.

Chair Davis: -- by having a representative there will show the support of the local community --

Dr. McDonald: Yeah, which is all, yeah, wrapped into that. Yes. I like that, being explicit about that. So --

Chair Davis: Yeah, they will --

Ms. Lovett: I just -- this is Heidi. I just shared -- I had actually taken notes. I kind of was -- this is

Heidi.

I had -- I had taken notes when you had the conversation and in the notes I took support coastal communities having reps there and just support communities. I wrote it down twice because I think you all said it a few times. So that's why I shared that.

Dr. McDonald: No, I think that sounds good.

Chair Davis: Okay. We have -- I don't remember the way the cards came up. Gabriela, then --

Ms. McMurtry: Hi. I just want to acknowledge -- sorry -- that there are people on the screen that have their hands up. Joe, Clay --

Chair Davis: Oh, thank you. Okay. Thanks for that, Gabriela.

Ms. McMurtry: Joe, Clay, and Tom.

Chair Davis: So good. So those that are on this -- is that Tom and Clay? Or who has their hands up, Gabriela?

Ms. McMurtry: All three.

Chair Davis: Oh, all three. All right. Let's take our virtual participants and then we'll go down the row here. Thank you, Pat. I need an assistant chair right now.

All right. Let's go in alphabetical order and start with Clay.

Mr. Tam: Okay. Hello. Thank you.

Anyway, I think it's just a broad statement. I mean, we're talking about, to Pat's point, is increasing capacity and communications. By broadening -- broadcasting it to a bigger community and getting it to the areas we need to get into it gives us a huge opportunity and advantage, I believe.



Anyway, that's all I have. Thank you.

Chair Davis: Yeah, that's a really good point. Clay, do you feel like it's captured?

Mr. Tam: I think the emphasis and the thread that we have talked about in terms of communication, I think it could be, perhaps, stand-alone.

But I'll leave it to the committee to decide because it's -- it allows for us to reach back into some of these distant communities, especially when you're talking about some of these and it could be involving some of our, you know, distant and indigenous groups or people that are in remote areas. That's what I -- that's what comes to my mind. Thank you.

Dr. McDonald: I'm wondering if we can just add communication. Community who live in seafood-producing communities will improve communication, trust, and social capital.

Chair Davis: I like that. Yeah.

Mr. Tam: Sounds good.

Ms. McMurtry: Indigenous knowledge and learning is what I think he said.

Chair Davis: Oh. So an exchange of the dialogue. The exchange of information and also the building of capacity means that when those grants or things like that are there then there's actually someone from staff that might be able to help to build capacity.

Dr. McDonald: So capacity communication?

Chair Davis: I know, because the list goes on. Okay. That sounds -- that sounds great, Heidi. Thank you.

So, Joe?

Mr. Schumacker: Yeah. And I don't know if I'm going to open up a can of worms here or not. But,

you know, in the -- in my experience with remote working to date it has been successful to a point.

Where we're lacking is we seem to find bottlenecks with administrative support and I'd really like to know from -- if NOAA -- if the NOAA employees can speak to this, and I don't know if they can.

Has there been any in the -- do you have the capacity for the administrative support within NOAA to work remotely in this type of -- I guess, because we're calling for all employees in this thing, correct?

Ms. Lovett: This is -- this is Heidi. I would say that this language is opening up an opportunity.

Jennifer, I don't know if you're on with us right now. But so I would say that when remote work has come up it's -- we have not directed -- the agency has not directed people necessarily except that in some cases we do have remote staff for particular purposes.

Ms. Lukens: Yeah. Heidi, do you want me to jump in?

Ms. Lovett: Yeah. Thank you.

Ms. Lukens: Okay. Thanks, Joe.

I think with the intent of what you all were talking about yesterday, I think we do have the administrative support in order -- like, administratively whether it's travel for someone or providing the resources that they need to get their job done we certainly can support that.

I think the intent of what I heard from you all -- the intent of this is opening up the ability to have remote work.

Right now, it is an incredibly high threshold for us to reach remote work, which is different than even telework of which the department has set the line that you have to be in the office at least three days a week, which is less flexibility than pre-pandemic.

So as I understand it from the conversation that you all had you want to encourage that opportunity for remote work and I think the agency is, in fact -- you know, I don't think the whole agency is going to go or ever can go to remote work.

There's certain positions that are not well suited to remote work. But for those that are this would be encouraging that. So I don't know if that's helpful to you or not. I don't think it causes a huge administrative constraint if more folks were working remotely.

Mr. Schumacker: Thank you, Jennifer. Yeah, appreciate that. Yeah, I did. Yeah, that was basically my concern is that those positions that can work remotely that we're talking about here.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Thank you, Jennifer and Joe, for your input.

I just want to circle back to Clay really quick and, Clay, make sure that we have captured what you were thinking about in the first bullet. Let us know if there's any additional information needed. And while you're doing that, I'm going to move on to Tom.

Mr. Fote: Yeah. I started thinking about internships and, you know, if you're interning to, basically, be connected to Congress you got to be in D.C. Or maybe it's more, like, we should design intern programs for remote areas to be included.

I was going to go EJ -- environmental diversity in communities. So design some internship programs that we can work remotely, that those interns can, basically, work remotely. So I think it's designing those programs.

Some programs you can't have an intern not be in the locale, but we should design internships for people that are not located or can stay where they are and, basically, design around them around it if there is jobs that we can do by interns. Do you

understand what I'm saying?

Chair Davis: Yeah. Thanks for that, Tom. And, Heidi, just let me know that there are interns that are located remotely to do their work. So I think that's - - I think that category is taken care of so thanks for bringing it up.

Clay, any thoughts just before we move to those that are in the room?

Mr. Tam: I think you captured it. I mean --

Chair Davis: Okay.

Mr. Tam: -- ideas on that. Yeah. Thank you.

Chair Davis: Thank you. Thank you, Clay. We'll go Brett, Stefanie, Jocelyn, and then Donna and Meredith.

Mr. Veerhusen: More of a question for, I don't know, the agency, the staff, or others whether or not to say something to the effect of remote work guidelines.

Are they consistent with other agencies? Would it be helpful to point to the -- you know, instead of us asking to kind of create -- for NOAA to create its own is there any other agencies within the existing model that we can point to as good examples that you'd like to --

Ms. Lukens: I can take that, Megan.

I think we could do that. I'm not familiar with other agencies.

But, Heidi, if you or whoever's working on here if there's a way to maybe get to that because there is a remote work option. It's just an incredibly high threshold right now.

Maybe in that bullet allowing employees to work, have -- maybe allowing employees greater flexibility to work remotely will improve retention. Does that

get to what you're talking to, Brett?

Mr. Veerhusen: I was actually going to -- I was kind of pointing to being really, like, more specific and to demonstrate how the agency and the department is not being consistent across, you know, the best practices of other agencies.

Ms. Lukens: Yeah. I don't -- I can't say that for certain that I know the remote work policies. I do know other agencies have better telework policy, which is -- remote work is different where remote is -- remote work is where you don't ever come into the office. Your office is your home, and so that's different than telework.

So I'm only familiar with the telework flexibilities of other agencies and I can't speak to the remote work for other agencies.

Mr. Veerhusen: Okay. Maybe that's one step too far.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Thanks for bringing that up.

I think the greater flexibility was a good addition and we're very specific here to the seafood industry because it's -- you know, being in the community there. So something that we could look into some more, Brett, as time goes on, for sure.

Stefanie, and then Jocelyn.

Ms. Moreland: Yeah, it's somewhat related. I'll read what my suggested addition is once and, hopefully, it speaks for itself, for any feedback.

MAFAC is sensitive to the importance of a strong workplace culture, cross-functional informal collaborations and training opportunities the in-person work environment often enables.

MAFAC encourages more intentionally building these opportunities into a long-term hybrid model, drawing from best practices as they evolve. Agree?

Participant: Yeah. Agree.

Ms. Moreland: Okay. Say it again or email it?

Chair Davis: Or yeah, you can email it but you can -  
- if people want to hear it again. That way we can --

Ms. Moreland: MAFAC is sensitive to the importance of strong workplace culture, cross-functional informal collaborations and training opportunities that an in-person work environment often enables.

MAFAC encourages more intentionally building these opportunities into a long-term hybrid model, drawing from best practices as they evolve.

Ms. Lovett: A clarification. So are you -- do you -- is -- are you requesting that that potentially replace the opening statements or be in addition to or ahead of that statement?

Ms. Moreland: A final statement, not under the bullets but below them.

Ms. Lovett: Got it. Thank you.

Ms. Moreland: Not within the bullets.

Chair Davis: That's a nice conclusion. Yes, Meredith?

Ms. Moore: Yeah, just a clarifying question on that.

Is -- because I think we have heard a few terms here, that telework policy or a flexible work policy is different from a full remote working policy and now you've introduced, like, hybrid model, and I just want to understand that we know the difference clearly between all of those in our letter.

Ms. Moreland: My suggestion is that I replace hybrid to a more flexible model drawing from best practices as they evolve for consistency.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Good point. Thank you, Stefanie.

So Stefanie's going to email it to Heidi and she will incorporate it as a concluding section.

Jocelyn?

Dr. Runnebaum: Just following up on that same bullet point and to Meredith's comment. Does remotely need to have "and telework options" added to it since we're speaking very specific agency language here? So that's one question that I have that -- maybe I'll pause there for a second.

Dr. Sullivan: Could we say remotely in the broadest sense or something like that to make it more general or do we need to list all the possibilities, which would be hard to do? There's only two? Okay.

Ms. Lukens: Again, I -- can I answer the question there? Is it how we define it internally within the Department of Commerce?

Remote work and telework are two different things and it depends on what you're trying to get at here, whether you want people to be working in remote rural areas or you want people -- I mean, the lack of telework flexibility is also another negative.

It's not a driver to bring people to the agency -- let's put it that way -- and people are looking for other options -- other agencies that do have greater telework flexibilities.

So they are two distinct things, telework and remote work, and I think they would all fall underneath of a hybrid work model.

But those are -- again, just want to be clear on the two different things that we're talking about here because unless you are an administrative policy geek like I am you probably wouldn't know the difference between the two.

Dr. McDonald: And just so you know, when I drafted it I did not know that there was a difference. I had no idea that telework is different from remote work.

I was thinking broadly that it included everything because I was also thinking of workforce retention even in the urban areas and climate impacts even in the urban areas.

So I was thinking when I -- my intent when I drafted this was it was going to be more inclusive. So --

Chair Davis: That's great, and Heidi put both of them in the opening statement and she's adding it in, so a good addition.

Dr. McDonald: Great. I have one more. I have one more critical --

Chair Davis: Sure. Go ahead.

Dr. McDonald: -- not critical, I guess, thing to change.

So the Northeast Fisheries Science Center is in Woods Hole and the Greater Atlantic -- GARFO is in Gloucester. I would not consider those urban areas but they do have a very high cost of living.

So I don't know if there's something we can say -- urban areas or other high cost of living areas -- to recognize that there's some diversity across.

Chair Davis: Okay. Great additions.

Meredith, and then Donna, and then Sarah.

Ms. Moore: I have a couple.

One, to the top of the page I think we should be directing this at the Secretary of Commerce because that is the problem. So I think we should say MAFAC recommends to the Secretary of Commerce that they develop for NOAA Fisheries these policies. So that's one.

Two, I would say to the one where we have said that working remotely actually reduces climate emissions or something because you don't have to heat and cool a building, I think we have put a lot of assumptions in there about what types of fuel or capacity or energy systems are in remote places and assumed that smaller is just immediately going to mean cleaner energy, and I'm not sure that



that's true.

So I just wanted to highlight that. It also means that in a lot of cases we're shifting the burden of paying for heating and cooling to a person as opposed to the federal government and I'm not, like, thrilled with that idea.

So, Heidi?

Ms. Lovett: So I added to capture that just that it may support reduced facility footprints. Does that capture that?

Ms. Moore: Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. I just wanted to make that point, too.

The next thing is I feel like we have not used one of the current magic words for the agency, which is to talk about identifying and connecting with underserved communities. Like, in particular, that is a key priority for them and we haven't said those words and I feel like those are necessary to include somewhere.

Chair Davis: First bullet in remote and rural areas it could say "and underserved"?

Ms. Moore: Yeah. Fine with that.

Chair Davis: Yeah, those are all good points. Thank you, Meredith.

Ms. Moore: I have more.

Chair Davis: Oh, you have more? Keep going.

Ms. Moore: The last one is that I just -- I don't know -- again, thinking about if we're saying this to the Secretary of Commerce.

I feel like it might be useful to note and I think some of what Stefanie said got at this. But we did see that the agency was able to -- like, certainly, not all tasks and work can be done remotely.

But we did see the agency succeed at a large amount of their work in a remote working environment, and we just might want to note that we see and note and respect that and that that is part of our driving thinking behind recommending that as a possibility here, too, just to give that feedback that remote work can and has been demonstrably successful in certain but not all cases.

Okay. I'm done.

Chair Davis: Go ahead, Heidi. Thank you, Meredith.

Ms. Lovett: Since I'm sharing my screen, what I was going to recommend is I accessed the email that Stefanie sent. If you want to add that, like, make a bullet and send it to me we can finish this work and when we break for lunch come back and look at a more complete version and do one final review before you consider a vote.

Does that work for everybody? Oh, sorry.

Chair Davis: That's great, Sarah. Thanks for showing it. So I want to let you all know it's 11:42. We should really try to break for lunch in three minutes.

So I suggest that, Donna and Sarah, you go ahead and get your comments in and then let's break for lunch after that and be back exactly at 1:00.

Ms. Kalez: It's just really quick, and Jennifer, Joe, Brett -- everybody's kind of already addressed it.

But when I read it and I -- that we recommend that NOAA Fisheries adopt a flexible work policy, so they kind of already have because they only require people to come in three days a week.

So we really need to put in fully remotely because I just believe that that's what we're asking and I think that anybody that read it would go, like, oh, well, we're totally flexible because we only make them come in three days a week.

So I just want to point that out and -- but I realize that for certain sectors of NOAA Fisheries you can't be remote. So --

Ms. Lukens: Can we just put more in front of flexible?

Ms. Kalez: Yeah, or the other thing, Jennifer, is it reads now adopt a flexible work policy to allow employees to telework and remote work for the following reasons, and remote work is defined within our guidance or our own HR policies now, Donna.

So remote work does mean, as Jennifer noted, not coming to an office at all. So but we could -- you could add the word more flexible work policy. Yeah.

Chair Davis: Very good. Sarah?

Ms. Schumann: So it just occurred to me that we're sort of making an assumption in the first bullet point that a lot of these people who choose to work remotely are going to choose to co-locate with the seafood industry in coastal areas.

But what if they choose to locate in Arkansas or Australia? They'll still get the benefit of all the other bullet points but we won't be achieving the first one.

So I wanted to ask if we want to be sort of more intentional about specifically what geographies we want people to work remotely from.

Participant: U.S. coastal communities.

Chair Davis: Very good point.

Dr. McDonald: I didn't really -- that wasn't my intent. I mean, I think that this gives people the ability to do that.

But we don't want to make everybody work in -- like, if they want to work from Arkansas it still has a lot of these benefits. It just doesn't -- you're right, it doesn't hit the first one.

But I think it -- I don't know. I wouldn't want to be super prescriptive with this. That's my initial opinion.

Ms. Lukens: Can I add something to the conversation? Just -- when remote work decisions are made the supervisor of the employee takes into account a lot of things and so that is one of the things.

I can just give you my own perspective as a supervisor that unless there's a strong personal need of an employee to move to Arkansas and I really want that employee to stay -- they have great work -- Arkansas, yes, maybe for a personal reason.

But, again, connecting to the community and being closer to that, that is a factor of the seafood community and if it aligns with their job is a factor that I think any good supervisor would want to bring into the equation whether approving an employee's remote work application.

So just that's -- you can't say -- state anything about that, I think, in this letter in regards to how it works, but just that's for your own knowledge of part of the equation that goes into the remote work approval process.

Chair Davis: Thanks, Jennifer, for that. Meredith, do you have a --

Ms. Moore: Can you scroll back down to the one about infrastructure again? Sorry. I think it's -- oh, may support reduced facility footprints. Okay, that's probably sufficient.

I was trying to think whether there was a point we needed to make about, like, reducing the backlog of overhead repair costs if they didn't need to maintain as many facilities, etcetera. But I might be trying too hard. Okay, great.

Chair Davis: But I do have a question now that Jennifer provided that and also Sarah's point about

where to live. This is directly related to bullet one because all the other bullets -- if you didn't have bullet one it doesn't -- it's really just talking about remote working.

You know what I mean? It's, like, it's because we want people to be able to be in the seafood communities. Because the rest of them are very general, right?

Dr. McDonald: I was also thinking of workforce retention so -- which would be more broad than just working in the remote community. I mean, the remote, it's really -- you're right. The reason why the remote communities and connecting with the seafood communities is the first bullet is because I think that's really important.

But I also think if you've got an employee who is able to work remotely and, like, they have a spouse or a loved one that moves and they have the opportunity to work remotely wherever their family is moving to then that increases workforce retention and --

Chair Davis: Yes. Yes, I understand what you're saying. I'm just thinking about from MAFAC's point of view. We are -- so I think all of them go together but bullet one helps us to bring out the other bullet.

Dr. McDonald: Got it. I see what you mean. Yeah.

Chair Davis: So --

Dr. McDonald: I just didn't want to be -- I wanted to be -- I wanted this to be more inclusive because --

Chair Davis: Yeah, I understand.

Dr. McDonald: -- because there is a workforce drain right now and there are so many priorities that we heard that -- so I guess --

Chair Davis: Are we talking more about NOAA Fisheries or just overall?

Dr. McDonald: What Janet was saying, that, you know, Janet said, like, people are retiring. We don't have the capacity to meet all of our demand --

Chair Davis: So it is very specific to NOAA Fisheries and not the Department of Commerce as a whole?

Dr. McDonald: Correct. But --

Chair Davis: Okay. So as long as we're clear about that as well.

Dr. McDonald: Yeah, that this was -- this is specific to NOAA Fisheries but it's addressed to the Department of Commerce since they're the ones who are making the rules.

Chair Davis: Okay. Great work. I really like these ad hoc when we hear something, like, that we hear. So we should keep that in mind during all of our meetings.

We also -- I was talking with Heidi yesterday and I didn't end up doing this but I think also when we find things that -- like, that we want to endorse that we can also have those as part of the notes for the meeting.

Like I say, we really appreciate the work that Cisco is doing, which we do, you know, if we wanted to endorse more of that or if we had some endorsements or some other comments.

So I was really happy that Sara, you know, took the initiative of our discussion earlier and came up with the letter. But we have that flexibility to do that on a number of levels in the future.

So thanks again for taking the initiative and for the discussion this morning on that. We're going to go ahead and break for lunch and we'll be back here at 1:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:49 a.m. and resumed at 1:03 p.m.)

## Work Plan Discussion - Part III

Chair Davis: Okay. Good afternoon. I hope you all had a good lunch. We have a few MAFAC members that are still winding their way back here. We're going to start off with the letter.

So I think we have enough in the room that we can at least start to look at the letter, and Heidi is going to bring that up and then we'll move into Work Plan Session 3, and we have -- Janet's coming. She said she'll be here about 1:10. So this will give us a little time to work on the letter and then we can move into the work plan.

Ms. Lovett: The letter has been sent to all of you as well and the link to the document I'm going to share. I just had to pull it up.

Chair Davis: Heidi, does this need to go for a vote, too, or the letter or --

Ms. Lovett: Does it need to --

Chair Davis: Go for a vote? Okay. All right. Thank you.

Ms. Lovett: Mm-hmm. Let me make it bigger. Do you want me to read it or someone else read it?

Participant: Yeah, you can go ahead.

Ms. Lovett: Okay. Excuse me. So this is the letter based on the edits we did together this morning as well as the two additions that came from Meredith and Stefanie.

MAFAC recommends that the Department of Commerce and NOAA adopt a more flexible work policy to allow NOAA Fisheries employees to telework and remote work and -- I'm sorry, to telework and remote work for the following reasons.

The seafood industry is often located in remote, rural, and underserved areas. Agency employees who live in seafood-producing communities will

improve exchange of information, knowledge, trust, and social capital with its stakeholders and can help support those communities.

Allowing employees greater flexibility for telework and remote work will improve retention and morale, which increases the agency's capacity to address its priority issues.

NOAA Fisheries' offices and federal buildings frequently are located in urban and other areas with a high cost of living.

Allowing employees more telework and remote work options provides them an opportunity to live in more affordable areas, which is more inclusive and can increase diversity of the workforce as well as improve work-life balance and employee retention.

Allowing employees more flexible telework and remote work can reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with commuting and may support reduced facility footprints.

While not all of the work of NOAA Fisheries can be conducted remotely, staff demonstrated over the years of the COVID-19 pandemic that substantial amounts of the mission could be achieved under remote work working conditions.

MAFAC is sensitive to the importance of strong workplace culture, cross-functional informal collaborations, and training opportunities that an in-person work environment often enables.

MAFAC encourages more intentionally building these opportunities into a long-term flexible model, drawing from best practices as they evolve.

Chair Davis: Thank you for reading that, Heidi.

Any comments? That really captures everything we talked about before lunch.

Thank you for the additions that Stefanie and Meredith sent remotely and just all the input that



we had around the discussion today. If anybody has no other suggestions -- I can't see Clay and Tom and Joe.

Ms. Lovett: Gabriela is monitoring that.

Chair Davis: Okay. So we can have a motion.

Mr. Veerhusen: I'll make a motion to adopt the MAFAC recommendations on NOAA Fisheries' telework and remote work flexibility.

Chair Davis: Thank you. In just a second -- okay. Any further discussion?

Mr. Veerhusen: Just a great job and a good suggestion.

Chair Davis: Yeah.

Mr. Veerhusen: And if Sarah was here I'd just give major applause for running with that.

Chair Davis: Exactly. Yeah. Okay. Well, with that, let's go ahead and take a vote. All those in favor, raise their hand. Those remotely -- Tom? I mean, I'm not pushing you to raise it but --

(Laughter.)

Chair Davis: Donna and Meredith, did you vote?

Ms. Moore: Yes.

Chair Davis: Okay. Very good. It looks like unanimous. Very good. Thank you all very much. Thank you, Heidi and Gabriela, for your support around this.

Participant: Who seconded?

Chair Davis: And Jennifer as well. Thank you for your input during our discussions. It was really helpful.

Participant: Who moved?

Chair Davis: It was Brett first and Jocelyn was second.

Participant: Thank you. Thank you.

Chair Davis: Okay. So I think we can move ahead. Janet is going to be here in a couple of minutes.

Ms. Lovett: Can we have those slides, please?

Chair Davis: We can go ahead and set the stage for our afternoon's discussion on the work plan.

Ms. Lovett: In just a few minutes they should come up.

Chair Davis: Okay. We -- are we going to --

Ms. Lovett: Slides, please.

Chair Davis: Okay. We're going to work on this from now and -- we're going to work on this for now until about 2:00 o'clock. At that time, we'll start to wrap up the meeting. So just wanted to give you a time frame on that. Oh, look at that. Perfect timing.

Ms. Coit: Your ranks are dwindling.

Ms. Lovett: Can we just go to the next slide? Thank you.

Chair Davis: Thank you. Okay. Okay.

So yesterday we ended the discussion with Meredith pointing out five different areas to work on, which was sort of an overview of the discussion and -- of the last couple of days that we've had.

So with that in mind, let me see if I can get this to go to the next -- this isn't working suddenly. Ah, there we go.

With that in mind, as we continue our discussion this afternoon we want to remind ourselves that what areas can MAFAC add the most value to NOAA Fisheries as we work on our work plans and provide recommendations and advice.

We also want to remember that we came up with a lot of -- a lot of big topics yesterday and last couple of days, and that we want to remind ourselves that they don't all need to be worked on at one time.

And we need to consider each of your own capacity and time, and all of you now have been on one or two different tasks, if not more, over the course of your time on MAFAC and you know that there is a commitment to this.

I want you to keep that in mind as we start to narrow down our work topics and then I also want you to keep in mind, you know, what topics each of you want to commit to work on and we can, hopefully, come to some decision on that today. If not, we can follow up as well after the MAFAC meeting.

Okay. So these are the five areas that we talked about and we just rearranged them a little bit based on maybe weight in terms of potential priorities but, really, they're not a prioritized list except that, really, climate-ready marine resource management and community resilience kept on coming to the top in terms of our discussion in terms of the bullet points and so it was, in fact, moved up into the number one bullet point here.

And then communications engagement was definitely another high priority that came up many times throughout our discussions. The other one is lowering barriers to participation or access for young fishermen, tribes, and those that represent different interests.

And we talked about the EEJ actually being put within any of these topics, not just necessarily a stand-alone, and I think that's actually going to be great value to NOAA Fisheries in terms of looking at the budget that Brian presented as well. This might be a way to help it just be incorporated into these other things.

Recreational fisheries -- this was an area we

realized that there's still, you know, angler access similar to the barriers of participation and also improved data. That needs to be fleshed out a little bit. And then the seafood -- discussion around that had to do with trade, tariffs, improve regulatory environment for aquaculture as well.

I do want to remind you all that the National Seafood Strategy, which we were presented by Paul, I believe, in Puerto Rico was first time we were presented that -- that that will be rolling out the early part of the year and that it's great when we, MAFAC, can work on something that's, you know, in the works with NOAA. So I just want to keep that in mind as we talk about that topic as well.

So that's the -- that's the high-level list and then it breaks down into more detail into just looking at this -- into these two slides. Okay. Oh, I might need you to -- so --

Participant: Do you want to go back one?

Chair Davis: There you go.

So I want to pause for a minute and -- because, I mean, I could spend time reading these but we went through a lot of these yesterday.

So I don't want to go into all the words here, rather, open up for discussion. I'll leave it on this one here and then we can go into the detail as we need to. How does that sound?

So yeah, let's open the floor up to some discussion around these points, remembering to keep in mind what value we can add to NOAA, where you want to work, and then also the capacity of our work.

And I see Meredith is up.

Ms. Moore: Yeah. I wanted to make one, like, clarifying thing because I realize the -- oh, can you put the slide back up? This is somewhat derived.

I'm so sorry to make you jump around like this. Heidi, probably.

The one on lowering barriers to participation, I think I used, like, lazy words when I described that and I -- so I realized that it could be thought of in a couple of different ways.

It could be participation actually in the industry, etcetera, and I was thinking of it more as participation in the management system, like, the various mechanisms and that sort of thing and, you know, advocating for themselves and working through the management -- science management system.

We could interpret it either way. I just wanted to be clear that in my brain it was, like, helping people figure out and navigate the fishery management system because that's where my brain always is, and it could be much broader than that.

So I just wanted to note that and I want to make sure that if we move into that one, which I still really support, we are clear about what we think goes under it because I don't know that I was.

Chair Davis: Thanks for that clarification. I also want to mention that, you know, when we look at climate-ready marine resource management and community resilience, that topic could also fold in to this very nicely.

(Off-microphone comments.)

Chair Davis: Right. Right. And so that's, you know - - we don't want to lose that. And so it could easily be, you know, a section of this discussion for fisheries resilience and communities and businesses and things like that. So, thanks for that.

Pat?

Dr. Sullivan: Just a comment. When Janet was speaking yesterday in our introduction, I thought I

heard something along the lines of, like, needing more input on wind. And I wasn't sure whether it was clear that we had already put a white paper together on wind. Presumably, you did get that. But if there's more that's needed beyond that, it would be good to hear now.

Ms. Coit: Yeah. I don't recall saying that. I recall saying I'm spending an inordinate amount of time on wind and that we have a lot of needs associated with it, etcetera, etcetera. But I don't remember asking for anything specifically more from MAFAC on that. Thanks.

Ms. Schumann: Well, my comment was actually the same as Meredith's. I'm not sure exactly where we wound up on that.

But I just wanted to point out that the original draft work plan did include something about access to fishing opportunities and what Meredith was mentioning yesterday was sort of building capacity for people to engage in fisheries decision-making.

Both of those seem really important to me and I think they should both be reflected as choices. They're very -- they're different tasks. They're not exactly something you could blend together.

So I don't know. Among the menu of choices, maybe we could have both of those things up there clearly to choose from.

Chair Davis: Thanks for that added information, Sarah. Gabriela?

Ms. McMurtry: Tom has his hand up.

Chair Davis: Thank you, Gabriela. Tom, go ahead, please.

Mr. Fote: Yeah. I was thinking the same thing on the barriers to participation to folks. We want to look at them in two ways. One, basically, get them to the meetings and how we better reach out to the

communities when we're doing rules and regulations.

And the other part is how do we open it up, and that goes into catches and the whole bit. So there's two, actually, ways of looking at the other barriers to participation and do we want to list both of them.

Chair Davis: Tom, it was a little difficult to hear you. But I think you were in agreement with the discussion that was going on around barriers to participation.

Mr. Fote: Yeah, I was -- that's what I was saying. I, basically, said that, you know, lowering the barriers to participation, basically, includes both of those.

Do we want to separate them maybe into two different categories or just keep it in one, knowing that that's what we want to, basically, be looking at?

Chair Davis: Right, I think -- yeah, I think we can roll that into one. Is that --

Ms. Schumann: Well, we suggest separating them into --

Chair Davis: Separating them.

Ms. Schumann: I think Tom was also suggesting that we --

Chair Davis: Okay. Very good. And Gabriela, you're keeping notes on this or --

Ms. McMurtry: Yeah.

Chair Davis: Okay. Heidi is, too.

Ms. McMurtry: And we have a transcript.

Chair Davis: Okay. Very good. That sounds good. Brett?

Mr. Veerhusen: Yeah. I've been thinking about the communications piece and I think I'm going to go

along with the theme that all of these fit into all of these. So, thanks a lot, Meredith.

Ms. Moore: I tried.

Mr. Veerhusen: Yeah. I know. So, I'm open to suggestions on where communications can kind of fit in. I'm maybe thinking about it in terms of, like, a framework on ways in which communication plans can be incorporated into each of these or some way in which it can be replicable or follow some guidelines.

So I'm open to suggestions on where communications can be useful but having an -- I would fear having to participate in all of Meredith's five work plans to get a good communications kind of strategy for each and I'm wondering if -- okay, I'm done. I just know you're in a good mood today.

So, anyway, I'm open to suggestions there but I'm thinking maybe pulling it back into, like, a framework and best practices can help.

Chair Davis: Yeah. Thanks for that, Brett. We're trying to actually advance the slide because --

Ms. Lovett: Can you please advance the slide, AV?

Chair Davis: There we go. Because if you look at --

Ms. Lovett: And one more, please. Somehow this is not working. There was more detail.

Chair Davis: Yeah, these have more detail. Thank you, Heidi. The other thing about communications there was also how to work on complex topics, which is all of these, and then --

Mr. Veerhusen: I was going to say --

Chair Davis: -- you know, and also definitions. That was, you know, explaining and being able to define and so I also agree with you, Brett, in terms of that.

(Off-microphone comments.)



Mr. Fote: Can you please use the microphone when you, basically, cross-talk across the table? Because Joe and I can't hear you.

Ms. Lovett: This isn't -- yeah, I'm just flagging Janet to give her a little time. I know she has to leave us early and I think we would love to hear a little bit of input from Janet about her views on where you all landed and what is valuable to the agency.

Ms. Coit: I have to leave for a call at 1:30 but expect to be back, and you're going until 2:20, correct?

Participant: A little after 2:00.

Ms. Coit: Okay.

So I don't have the benefit of having heard all the discussions, and I think Cisco and I probably both agree that number one, formerly number five, is the most foremost on our minds and probably needs the most definition and support big picture, not to reduce the importance and I know you're not -- you're not going to work just on one thing.

My feeling is communications and engagement is totally embedded and, like, so whatever -- whichever one of these you do I think it's part of it.

I don't disagree with you, Pat, that we need to do a better job of communications in particular. I liked your story.

Cisco missed it but our -- you know, talking about our science in a way where people can understand why it matters and why it's relevant and talking about how our science informs management sustainability in a way that is accessible in plain English and exciting and -- so but I think that sort of -- like, I see that as belonging to all of these.

When we have the draft Seafood Strategy out -- now I'm looking at current number five -- you know, I heard Brett at least talk about the trades and the

tariffs and I've talked to Stefanie before about how we have a role to play there.

But it's not -- it's not in our portfolio the way it is in USTR or some other entities' portfolios and, yet, there's a lot of discussions going on right now and we want to be more forceful.

So I think I'd like to hear more -- talk more about how -- on, generally, the seafood resilience strategy how MAFAC could participate.

And I don't know if you guys are aiming at one big project, one small project, but even, Jocelyn, when we were talking about climate-ready fisheries a couple of weeks ago at our leadership meeting somebody pulled out the TNC definition because it's one of those things that when you talk to people on the Hill or when you talk to the councils you just don't know that everyone has the same thing in mind.

So my thought on that had been really fleshing out a definition that makes sense but is high level enough and clear enough to fit many different scenarios because we most likely will be putting a lot of resources and staff into that and having it not feel like it's some jargon, I think, is going to be really important for our success on that.

But, you know, you would want a project bigger than the definition. You would want to, I think, be looking at pushing us really hard on where we need to go and what are the resources needed to do that.

Anyway, I also -- so that's my -- that'd be my number -- oh, yeah, thank you. So it's much bigger than that.

I like, though, as a follow-on to the equity and EJ comments that you made, thinking about how this group could help with the increasing participation in management and I'm interested in the other aspects, too, and Sam mentioned that National Academy of Science study on catch shares, and I

don't know the timing of that.

I'd like to circulate to you guys -- maybe someone in the room knows more about -- those usually take a while. But I think that's going to be an important input in terms of the impact of catch shares and the winners and losers and benefits and detriments.

So, anyway, I think define -- so if I had my druthers, I would say let's define further MAFAC's role in this arena without wanting to close off the others.

But as several of you said, equity, access, supporting seafood, they can all nest within this. So that's my 10 cents, and I'm going to pop out for that call and be back.

Chair Davis: Okay. Thank you.

Stefanie, and then Jocelyn. Or did you -- just that -- I was just going in order.

Ms. Coit: Do you -- I have two minutes.

Dr. Runnebaum: I guess just to Pat's question and to your comment about spending a lot of time on offshore wind and recognizing that there's a National Academy of Science subcommittee on offshore wind and fisheries, I think I have a two-part question.

One is how can we request to engage or talk across agencies or groups to the National Academy of Science Working Group, and then I'll give you time to think about the second part is if there is some role that this group can play.

I also spend an inordinate amount of time thinking about offshore wind. So if there is a role that we can play it'd be great to be helpful. I would love to talk a little bit more about offshore wind when I come back.

On the first one, I guess, I learned that they normally don't include the agency experts on such

groups, to my dismay, because it felt like we should be on that National Academy of Science look at fisheries impacts from offshore wind.

But I really feel like we need to be plugged in and it would be helpful if we thought more about how MAFAC could participate in that.

Dr. Werner: Let me jump in. Yeah, it wasn't a firm no but they would -- normally they would not include the agency folks.

But one way to do this is that, you know, these panels or these National Academy studies as they're moving along they actually then invite outside comment and panels and such, and maybe the way to do it would be to contact Sue Roberts, who is the person who is leading this from the National Academies, and try to understand what their schedule might be and see where, perhaps, a meeting with the MAFAC or the appropriate groups from MAFAC might fit in as they collect data because they're trying to collect information in their -- in their process.

So I think we could just go directly to Sue and ask her if there's an appropriate way to do this.

Chair Davis: Thanks for bringing that up. Jocelyn?

Dr. Runnebaum: So I know Sue, but if you want to contact as chair of this committee that might be a good --

Chair Davis: More formal. Okay.

Dr. Runnebaum: She's very open to those kind of things.

Chair Davis: Okay. Great. I'll talk with Heidi and Jennifer about that.

Stefanie, go ahead and have your comments and questions, and then I'm also thinking that Cisco, it might -- it'd be great to hear from you, too, because some of the things in here we heard in your

presentation and we'd love to hear your feedback as well.

So, Stefanie, do you want to go or you want Cisco to --

Ms. Moreland: I'm back on communications and I think it's relevant. I feel that we should consider something on communications in each of our project areas around how to ensure that there's focus and prioritization on strategic development of whatever the follow-on is of MAFAC work in the areas that we choose.

But I also see a communications project that's distinct from our discussions and that is regarding the budget and the value proposition to the public of the services that the agency provides, and so I do you think that's a discrete project that I would support us continuing to advance.

In the comments that Janet just made, I left feeling that we need to understand if it's NOAA Fisheries' intent to be the lead agency on seafood trade or not.

That is very unclear to me and I don't want to waste our time anymore if there's no will for NOAA Fisheries to be an interagency coordinator on seafood trade policy. We must move on and go to USTR or to USDA if that is the will.

Chair Davis: Thanks, Stefanie.

In terms of the communication, Heidi or Stefanie, can you read what was different? Because you added -- you added something different as a stand-alone for communication.

Ms. Moreland: Just the budget. It's --

Chair Davis: The budget. Okay.

Ms. Moreland: -- expanding the risk of not funding needs, essentially. Yeah.

Chair Davis: Yes. Very good. And I think Brian also was going to talk with us about the -- was it the NAPP, the --

Ms. Moreland: SNAPP report.

Chair Davis: Yeah, the report on how communication is done. I think that was something that he wanted to also provide some more information. So when Janet comes back you can raise your question again, Stefanie.

Cisco, do you have a few thoughts?

Dr. Werner: Well, first, on the communications part that you brought up, was this in some ways also related to what Dr. Spinrad said yesterday between thresholds and objectives and communicating -- communicating this is my threshold, this is what I'm doing now, this is my objective?

And the way he said it is that if you're okay -- if you're talking to Congress, if you're okay with this delta and not having -- not meeting this objective that's fine.

But is that what you were thinking about in terms of saying what we could do, what we would need to do, and then whether we can live with a delta or not?

Ms. Moreland: I think it's deeper than that. There seemed to be mixed messages to and heard by congressional offices regarding core functions and how sufficiently they're resourced.

Dr. Werner: Mm-hmm. Okay. You know, the other thing was I -- Janet's comments were spot on also in terms of how communications really is the common thread through each one of these topics, which are really good.

So you're saying it's also a stand-alone -- there's a stand-alone component of communications as well. So no, that's fine. Thanks.

Chair Davis: Jocelyn?

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah. I guess just to that point, we have the committee -- subcommittee on budgets, and maybe that piece would fall there, right, with our -- I guess I should pull up our list of what we actually have.

Chair Davis: The Subcommittee on Strategic Planning and Budgeting, and I believe Erika Feller was the chair of that at the time.

I don't think we have a -- we don't have a chair on that subcommittee, but that would be -- that would be a great task for that subcommittee to take on.

I see -- I see fingers pointing towards Stefanie. Let's keep passing it down the table. So --

Ms. Moreland: I'd be interested.

Chair Davis: You are interested?

Okay, that's fantastic, and I do think that that's a perfect topic to be worked on. I know that when Erika worked in that role she worked very closely with the -- with Paul and with -- you know, with areas. So that would be great to be able to have some more discussions with Jim and also with Brian.

Okay. Brett?

Mr. Veerhusen: Yeah. So I think I'm hearing that, you know, maybe on the communication side we could use the strategic planning and budgeting as an immediate opportunity to build a framework as well as the EEJ next steps -- if there's other ones I'm missing please let me know -- and we can use the -- those working groups as a way to build sort of a communications framework that should be applied to other working groups and work of MAFAC.

But does that sound -- because I'm hearing kind of different levels of priority and urgency and I agree, and I just -- I think this one would be hefty and

good around budget.

Ms. Moreland: I believe we could take that on. I still feel the level of input on content and approach in this category is unique because of the limitations on how the agency can and has traditionally talked about their budget.

And so I feel there's more direction that may be needed in this and, perhaps, echoing some of the NAPA -- new acronym to me -- recommendations whereas in other areas it may be just leveraging the communications expertise that's internally and prioritizing it appropriately.

Mr. Veerhusen: That makes total sense and I think having two different tracks will be necessary because there's a track of which the agency has kind of allowed within the confines of itself and then there's a track for the agency or MAFAC to run with something that are different than budgetary requests.

Chair Davis: That sounds good. And so now that Stefanie has stepped up to be the chair of that subcommittee, which is fantastic, you all want to be thinking about who wants to sign into that -- being a member in that subcommittee.

You don't have to decide that right now but you can, certainly, express yourself now or at a later date. I'm sure there'll be a follow-up on that as well.

Just to move us along a little bit, I want to let you know that yesterday both Jocelyn and Meredith had come to me over the last couple of days and said they're really interested in working together on the climate-ready, and I just want to check in with both of them and see if they would like to be co-leads. And they can also have sub-chairs as well, you know, on different topics.

But just wanted to get a feel for that because I am really, really happy that they both have stepped up and wanted to put some effort into this.



Dr. Runnebaum: Rock paper scissors? I'm just kidding. Yeah. Yes.

Ms. Moore: Yes. Although I want to say, like, I felt like some of that was done a little bit, like, side conversations and I don't know if we have fairly assessed whether there are other people who were wanting to be engaged and so I don't want to --

Chair Davis: That's fair. That's fair, Meredith.

Ms. Moore: But yes, so --

Chair Davis: Yeah. Yeah. So the floor is open to --

Dr. Sullivan: I hope to be involved with that.

Chair Davis: Well, we want you to be involved, Pat.

Dr. Sullivan: That's different. That's different than being chair of the committee.

Chair Davis: That's right. So you've got -- you've got one person signed on, Meredith and Jocelyn.

But now I'd like to hear from MAFAC if you support - - if you support Jocelyn and Meredith stepping up or if you have others that are interested as well.

Participant: This is something different.

Chair Davis: Okay. I don't see anybody -- I don't see anybody objecting to that.

Ms. Moore: I actually thought it would be hilarious if I, after all of this, was, like, I don't really think I'm going to work on this thing because --

Chair Davis: Yeah, we wouldn't be very happy either.

Ms. Moore: -- if that's cool with you. So I'm over it. Just kidding.

Chair Davis: Well, thank you both for stepping up. I think you have full support of MAFAC members, your colleagues.

Dr. Runnebaum: I'm also going to say that Matt agreed to join the group. Sorry, Matt.

Mr. Upton: Are you looking at large members? A big personality and community involvement.

Chair Davis: Yeah. So let's turn to Sarah, then I have another question for you all.

Ms. Schumann: So this is a comment on lowering barriers to participation, which, again, I think there are two things in there and I'm referring to building capacity of external, you know, stakeholders and folks to engage in NOAA processes.

I was talking with Meredith as a side conversation yesterday and I think that we both felt this would be a fairly easy task that wouldn't require a ton of time, that it was something that would just be sort of internal, more like a letter rather than, you know, a big research effort with a report.

So I was -- I would be happy to, you know, work with someone like Meredith or somebody else to lead that effort and I'll also add that I do think that it shouldn't completely fall off the table, that there's an important need to look at access to participation in fisheries. But that is a much bigger research project that would require a lot more work.

Chair Davis: Sarah, that's wonderful. Yes, and I think your idea of working it as a letter and working it as -- I mean, I'm not going to say that it's a minimal project because it's still going to take quite an effort to put that together.

But as a recommendation it could be something that could be put together in a relatively short time that could be voted on by MAFAC. So thank you for stepping up for that, Sarah and Meredith.

And just trying to think about my thought here. The climate-ready marine -- I know in terms of barriers, because that's a separate one in terms of access into the -- access into the fisheries because we do

have in here includes people, communities, businesses, social and economic considerations.

And so be thinking also about how that could roll into this climate-resilient fisheries as one of the main topics or subtopics in this bigger topic. So --

Ms. Schumann: I think it could and, like I said yesterday, the topic of access is one that comes up both in sort of supporting the next generation and in the climate conversation. So if it goes here in the climate conversation then that's a great place to put it.

Chair Davis: That's great. Thanks for that. Any hands up in the virtual world? Gabriela?

Ms. McMurtry: No.

Chair Davis: Okay. Thanks for that.

Participant: Somebody just raised their hand.

Ms. McMurtry: Yeah. Just kidding, Tom.

Chair Davis: Somebody -- who did?

Mr. Fote: Well, I didn't put my hand up and down because I figured out what we're actually doing. I volunteer to serve on it because, I mean, I've been doing climate for the last 20 years so I guess I would have to put my two cents in, and the same thing with the access.

So I will serve on those committees and maybe by next year -- I'm supposed to be -- begin another job in about -- my other volunteer job is in about three months. So we'll see if that time would open up on me.

Chair Davis: Okay. We're having a little trouble hearing you. But I think you just volunteered to be on the committee. So we're good with that. Thanks, Tom.

And I'm going to turn to Donna and -- oh, Brett, let

me -- let me go to Donna because, Donna, there is a bullet point on recreation. So is that something that you'd like to address as well?

Ms. Kalez: So there is a bullet point on it and, I mean, it hits in a lot of the different areas. So I would just say that recreational fisheries -- we have to create and improve the angler access and the lowering the barriers.

So when I saw that in three I was thinking that's a great way to lower the barrier to enter recreational fisheries but I realized that it went across both ways. So they were thinking more of management and I was thinking more of the activity.

So I just think that those kind of mesh together, and then just that we so much need improved data to manage the recreational fisheries.

So I don't know where -- if I need, like, something to work on specifically, but I just think that three was kind of where I was going with the recreational fishing access.

Chair Davis: Thank you for that, Donna. I think that's great and you all have been really busy. I mean, you've been doing a lot of work in the recreational.

So if you decide that you'd like to join in to maybe this bigger effort that I think all of MAFAC is going to have a bit of a role in --

Ms. Kalez: Right.

Chair Davis: -- that that would be great as well and, you know, I think that, you know, working with the co-chairs and seeing how you sort of, you know, break up the subtasks that recreational fisheries would fall in really nicely with three and four coming together. So thank you for -- thank you for that. That's great.

We haven't heard from Linda. Any thoughts, Linda,

that you'd like to share?

Ms. Odierno: Thank you.

In looking over the draft strategy, both aquaculture and international trade are major bullet points and the way that the initial language reads is to provide input to ITA and to USDA on trade issues.

So I still think it's relevant for us to look at that even though it's not directly in the NMFS wheelhouse.

But, of course, aquaculture development is and I think those are really complex issues and we ought to start looking at them in anticipation of a new strategy coming out in January so that we have at least started to think about the pathways, how we collect the appropriate information, and how we try to move forward on those issues -- what kind of recommendations we can craft.

Chair Davis: Thank you for that, Linda.

I know we have -- Dr. Michael Rubino is with us today. We haven't had an update on the National Seafood Strategy since Paul presented it to us in May.

So I don't know if you wanted to say a few words around that, Michael, or you want to wait on that. But we welcome you to the table.

Dr. Rubino: Thank you, and hello.

At the staff level we're diligently working on sort of polishing, refining, trying to think a little bit -- taking a step back to think a little bit about sort of what can be realistically achieved, what's different from climate-ready fisheries here, and to make sure that -- you know, a draft strategy that goes out for public comment will be relatively general.

But behind that there needs to be an implementation that's informed by comments that we have received but also the realities of budget

and staffing and what can be done in two to five years.

So those are some of the things we're trying to grapple with sort of before we go out with a strategy for public comment. So that's where we are.

Chair Davis: Thanks for that update. And Heidi just corrected me that Jim Landon did bring up National Seafood Strategies just so you don't think that we didn't hear it come up in our discussions earlier in the week. But thanks for that update.

Do you have any questions and anybody have any questions for Michael? So I think we have got a very interested party to be able to provide comments.

When the document is available for that we will definitely come together as a group and it sounds like Linda is very interested in beginning that thought process now and so we welcome that input, Linda, on that. That's great. Thank you so much.

So let's see now. We have actually touched on all of these topics, which is great. I have -- Pat, go ahead.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah. So I was wanting to get back to communication. I appreciate Stefanie sort of splitting the elements.

I still feel strongly that there's an element of just general communication that needs to be dealt with. I don't know, Brett, if you're interested in getting involved with that or not. I don't have enough of a vision -- well, I do.

I have very personal sorts of beliefs about how communication should go. I'm not sure I know of a way to put that forward in a sort of structured sense except, you know, having dialogue and listening even with the discussion with Laura today.

As much as I appreciate everything that's being

done there -- I think it's really terrific -- it's all, from my perspective, NOAA Fisheries going out with their information and not creating an access point for bringing anything back.

So as much as I appreciate what Janet's doing, traveling the world, I know she's -- that's taxing, right, and Cisco is doing that too and so is Russ. I'm appreciating that. It's really, really important.

But there's a -- it's got to -- it's got to work into it in a kind of structural way, I think, so that once the personnel who are actually willing to do this are gone somehow it keeps going.

So if we can think about that a little bit. I'm not sure I want to chair it, though I could co-chair it. I would, certainly, like to participate. I think it's something we should be addressing and I'll just leave it at that.

Ms. Schumann: So if we're talking about communications from the outside in as opposed to from the inside out, I think that that could fit in with the building capacity or lowering barriers to participation focus and sort of acknowledging that there's work that we need to do to help stakeholders do things differently so that they're more effective and get more out of the process.

But there's also things that NOAA can do internally to make sure that we are -- that they are absorbing what's coming in from the outside and making the agency more responsive. Could those two things be coupled together?

Dr. Sullivan: If I can respond to that. That's a great suggestion.

I see it more as a dialogue. So the National Fishery Service needs to be able to communicate what they're thinking but they also need to be listening, too.

And I think you're right. One of the ways to do that

structurally would be to bring more people to the table somehow, right, if that's how you're kind of thinking of it.

I mean, it's more -- it's more than creating access to fishing, let's say, or -- and you were -- but that was one side of the -- that's -- yeah, that was one side of the barrier.

The other barrier was bringing folks sort of to the table in terms of, like, access to councils and leadership. Am I not correct?

Ms. Schumann: We're really getting muddled because of the way that the lowering barriers to participation is coupled on the screen with building capacity.

Those really need to be two separate things and I don't know if it's possible to do that on the screen. But we need a new terminology.

So I think -- and, Meredith, please weigh in here and others -- maybe we could call this category, like, strengthening partnerships between NOAA and stakeholders and that would include both, you know, services or even funding that NOAA can be offering, as we heard from Carrie yesterday.

I mean, to me, it really struck me that some of those infrastructure law funding streams will be used to enhance the capacity of tribes and underserved communities to take advantage of those funds, and that kind of approach, which, I think, is also pretty common in the Inflation Reduction Act is something we could think about applying more broadly.

So that's one example of just ways we can strengthen the capacity of people who need to be more affected by what NOAA does to also be participating in informing what NOAA does.

But the other side of it, as you're alluding to, Pat, is to make sure that NOAA -- that structurally and in



terms of organization of culture and whatever else we need to think about is also, you know, adequately responding to those things and so I think they go together.

So whatever phrase -- I just used strengthening. What did I say?

Participant: Strengthening partnership.

Ms. Schumann: Okay. Does that sound like it captures both of those things and could be good?

Participant: Yes.

Ms. Schumann: Okay.

Dr. Sullivan: I'd like to hear what Brett has to say, but this -- I really connect with this, yes.

Mr. Veerhusen: I'm thinking on the fly here so it's a little -- you know, I think I agree with what Janet was saying that communications is embedded into all of these, and so pulling it out as a separate group and then trying to fit it in to what each group is working on, I think, will be tough.

And so part of the thinking earlier from what I -- I'm just -- I'm repeating that I thought I heard was there's going to be a couple different tracks in which we can think about communications, whether it's external or internal, and one track that is pertinent right now is the way in which the agency itself can communicate its value through budgetary needs.

Another way is sort of external ways that NOAA can be receiving information and providing it to strengthen partnerships but also to have better climate resiliency and to be executing parts of the Seafood Strategy so and I'm having a hard time keeping all the threads together.

And so my recommendation is that we work in all of these components to include the communications category. But because each of these components will be moving at a different pace we kind of create

a framework to build off of on the ones that are moving immediately and then see if then we can insert those into the work being done, going forward.

So that's the way I'm hearing it. Having a separate -- yeah.

Dr. Sullivan: I'm appreciating this discussion, Brett. So what -- where I was kind of going was I recognize that the piece that Stefanie is doing is separate. It's logistically separate. It's less separate in a lot of different levels.

The -- bridging the communication gap between NOAA Fisheries and the rest of the community, I think, in my opinion, needs to be dealt with at a higher level.

But we could take what we learn there to the other ones that you're describing. I think it would be a lot of work to try to go through and build that at each individual one that we're looking at.

And, frankly, I don't even know how to communicate the -- how to restructure the communication part. But, like, just this thing that Sarah just said about creating this sort of infrastructure for the -- whatever we're calling it -- is -- creates a sort of structural entity that creates a pathway that begins building the bridge from the community out to NOAA Fisheries with the additional hope or desire or suggestion that NOAA Fisheries builds from the other side to bridge back to create this sort of communication link.

And I don't really have a really solid idea of how to do all of that except that it's needed and I do feel like it's at a higher level than going through and doing one -- the others. But I'm open to other suggestions on that.

Mr. Veerhusen: Just when we're talking about communications, I think that it's really important to first define what our goal is and then who our

audience is, and then we can start to develop strategies and tactics in order to execute that.

Without being really clear about those initial components then I think that we will run the risk of not using time effectively or, in fact, actually doing harm and communicating ineffectively.

So my thought process is to have some of those steps built out into some thinking so that we can then -- you know, again, that's what I kind of am picturing, and maybe I'm totally wrong here but what I'm thinking is a framework to think about so that each group can start to answer these communication questions and build out a plan.

So you're defining what your main goals are, then in order to achieve those goals who are the different audiences that you need to reach and which audiences do you need to hear from and then -- you know, and then how are you going to do it and then for what purpose.

So, to me, that's kind of a communications 101 roadmap that I think might be helpful to start with so that it can be applied and used and replicated with other working groups. Is that helpful or am I --

Dr. Sullivan: I noticed that Heidi has her hand up. But, like, for me, I mean, if I started giving examples, like we were talking about the whole catch there thing, I think that was a communication problem more than anything else in terms of how that was implemented on the East Coast.

I think it was sort of, like, we're going to do this, whereas on the West Coast when it happened it started with the fishermen and built up from there.

I don't know that there's any way to repair that now. The other is the clear things that we've heard about throughout the week in terms of the animosity that a lot of fishermen have relative to the National Fisheries Service and the National Fisheries Service wanting to connect to that, and

part of that is really just communication science. Part of it is communicating complex things.

But part of -- you know, MRIP -- the Marine Recreational Information Program -- is another one where communication is just in the toilet. And maybe the whole program is wrong, but I have a feeling it's communication more than anything else.

Mr. Veerhusen: And I think that taking a step back to understand what do we want to communicate versus what do people want to hear are two very different questions and, again, having those kind of framework questions built out initially.

So for the subgroup to ask themselves and begin to answer, I think, will help create a really informed plan and strategy.

Dr. Sullivan: But do we have to do that with each individual thing that we're working at or --

Dr. Runnebaum: Hold that question.

Dr. Sullivan: Okay.

Dr. Runnebaum: Okay. That's great. There's a lot here to respond to and I think a lot of the issues right now are NOAA's -- are based on relationships and not communication, which is part of it.

But there's a huge trust issue that I don't think that an effective communication plan will fix at this point in some regions and I think that we're losing sight of the point that Sarah made, that strengthening partnerships in the management process or in the science process are really important and the point that she made really resonated with me.

And I think that, to Brett's point, having a strong communications plan for these different elements and being clear on that from the get-go is also really important.

So I feel like we're talking about, like, three different things right now with some similar

language that is getting confusing and I want -- I would like to go back to Sarah's point of trying to think about the strengthening partnerships with NOAA and industry.

And the points resonated with me and I hope somebody got them recorded really well because they were good. So I'm now just rambling. So I'm just going to stare at you. See if they'll respond.

Chair Davis: Heidi, and then --

Ms. Lovett: Yeah. So I just wanted to -- it has been very interesting listening to all, I will say, and because I'm hearing, like, what Jocelyn just described is, like, was already coming into my head from what I'm hearing people say.

So you are, I think, bouncing around a couple of different ideas and I just wanted to process wise note that you don't have to resolve it right now but that if there's a group that would like to come together to discuss it a little bit more because sometimes as conversation moves on your ideas solidify or get a little more concrete about where you want to focus and what you can -- where you can add value and I think on both things it's important.

And I also just wanted to note that it kind of links, I think, to -- particularly because of strengthening partnerships and trust, links to EEJ work, I feel, that I think you all want to kind of stay abreast of and stay involved in as things progress.

So, anyway, I just wanted to suggest that. I just wanted to remind you you don't have to resolve it right now and we have captured these comments, and it would be a great thing for a group of you to come together and think about and allow the time for it to gel a little bit more.

Dr. Werner: I just wanted to build on this communication, and I think that there's an opportunity to actually build a lot of relationships

right now that is offered, in some ways, by the uncertainties -- the common uncertainties that we have with climate, for example, right.

I mean, we're both going into this thing not really knowing what's going to happen, and I bring this up because I was out on the West Coast to Southwest Center when that -- the warm blob hit and all of that and it was -- it was something that brought us all together.

It was, like, we were all trying to figure out what is this, you know, and, you know, it went from a science conversation to a truly joint discovery aspect of what's happening and how do we deal with it.

It was an honest -- neither side knew what was going on and, I think in some ways we have that opportunity a little bit bigger now with the climate question and how we're going to evolve how we think about climate, the points that Stefanie made yesterday about the long-term plans about how we do this and how we all need to be at the table together at the same time.

So I think that there is a really good chance to bring that conversation or have that conversation with this new fresh look, albeit uncertain look, and maybe go that way.

So it's just a thought of how we could take advantage of this common starting point and not say we're going to do this and then we're going to tell you what we find out. That shouldn't be the way to do it. So anyway --

Chair Davis: Great suggestion. Thank you, Cisco.

Linda?

Ms. Odierno: Thank you. I'm going to have to leave. But if we'd like to revisit objective number five again and people would like to talk about that topic more and try to firm out a framework to provide a

recommendation on that I'd be happy to work on that.

Chair Davis: Thank you very much, Linda.

I was thinking -- it's just a little bit after 2:00 now -- I was thinking about trying to do a summary.

Now that Janet is back also, she can sort of hear -- we can make sure that it's -- it represents where we stand right now and, as Heidi said, it's just the beginning.

But I think we have done some amazing work over the last three days when I think about where we started and the discussions that we're having now.

So I really feel like we're zeroing in on some really great work plans and I think -- I think having the presentations that we have along the way from NOAA leadership and the science and the budgets and the outlooks and -- really help us to formulate.

So and there is a lot of value in having these three-day meetings because you kind of get to this point, and I'm feeling really good. I don't know about you all but I'm feeling really good that we were able to bring some ideas together.

So I was going to try to provide a summary based on what I heard, and please feel free to add to that.

So we made a decision that climate-ready marine resource management and community resilience is definitely the larger working project, and Jocelyn and Meredith have agreed to co-chair this project -- this work plan.

And we also talked about -- let me just forward this one -- we also talked about the bullet point of lowering barriers to participation and that it had two threads in it.

One was the access and we decided that we would also look at it from a fisheries standpoint but also from the recreational standpoint and that those two

could be blended together.

But then we also -- Sarah brought up the idea of building capacity and that bullet point being a stand-alone bullet point and having some short-term work that could be done on that aspect of it, and Sarah and Meredith agreed to lead that and it might be, like, a letter of some sort with some recommendations.

But, Sarah, if I did not -- go ahead. I can see your look. Go ahead and explain it a little more.

Ms. Schumann: I think things may have evolved a little bit since that point, though. So I'm not quite sure we want to lock in that --

Chair Davis: Okay.

Ms. Schumann: -- you know, due to the conversation we had with Pat, etcetera, after that.

Chair Davis: About the strengthening partnerships?

Ms. Schumann: Yeah. Yeah.

Chair Davis: Okay. Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Moore: I would say -- I would also agree that evolved into sort of the strengthening partnerships idea.

Chair Davis: Okay. Very good.

Ms. Moore: I think that was the direction -- I think that's what we were planning on putting in a short letter. But if it's a bigger conversation now then we should give it some space.

Ms. Schumann: Yeah. And it might need a different leadership structure since you already have a lot on your plate.

Chair Davis: Okay. Okay.

Ms. Moore: I don't know what you're talking about.



(Laughter.)

Chair Davis: Okay. So, very good. So I have this written down here as well. Yeah, okay. Building -- yes, building capacity and strengthening partnerships.

And so we had a very robust discussion about communication and how communication could break down into possibly three different areas and we're still -- we're still working on this. This is a work in progress.

But Stefanie has agreed to step up to being the chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Subcommittee, and we haven't had a chair since Erika left so I'm really excited that Stefanie's taking on a chair position there and that we can work with that subcommittee the way it was formed, and this would be a subcommittee to really look at the NOAA budget and the communication of the NOAA budget.

And, Stefanie, did I define that well enough?

Okay. Then let's just go back to the communication. So that was one part of it.

The other part is exactly what we were just talking about, the idea of strengthening partnerships between NOAA and partners and helping that to bridge communication gaps and also to, potentially, build a framework and -- with that that can possibly be used in other aspects of our discussions.

Cisco also talked about the fact that sometimes when there's a lot of uncertainty it's actually a time for many to come to the table to talk because we don't -- it's not like we all have answers on, really, anything we do.

But it's a time when there's a lot of uncertainty that actually brings people together because we're all in a similar situation coming into an unknown.

And so it was a really great point that Cisco brought

up that communication -- that's a good starting communication point when we're talking about things such as climate-resilient fisheries -- what does that really mean, what does it really mean to have climate, how do we work with the management side of it, how do we work with the science side of it. And so that was a really nice addition into that as well.

And then we had a short just update from Michael Rubino about the National Seafood Strategy and when that's going to come out -- I think he just left -- and so he just gave us an update on that and said that will be open for comments, and MAFAC stands ready to provide comments in that area as well.

And Linda's -- Linda just left but she said that she'd like to lead also some of the information around the bullet points that we have in the seafood area.

Did I capture everything that we have talked about? Because that really does go through our list of five.

And, typically, what I've seen after our MAFAC meetings like this when we're working towards a new work plan with new charges that Heidi will help -- will work with Gabby and Jennifer and they'll come up with a way to summarize this and also to start to open up the invitation for members to be involved and then we begin to further explore, as Heidi mentioned earlier.

So I want to make sure that I captured our discussion well enough and if anybody has any further comments -- if Janet and Cisco have any further comments also based on where they -- where you can see us starting to focus on our work plans.

Mr. Fote: Clay's hand is up.

Chair Davis: Let Tom know that we'll get back to him in a minute.

Ms. McMurtry: Clay. Tom was letting us know that Clay's hand was up. So --

Chair Davis: Ah, Clay's hand is up.

Ms. McMurtry: -- he took my job from me.

Chair Davis: Okay. Well, Clay, we can go ahead and take your comment. Please share that with us.

Mr. Tam: Thank you, Madam Chair.

It goes back to, I think, what -- my comment was that I fully support what Pat said and I think that the communication is key and it is very important in moving forward.

And I think that if we can define it and, like Brett said, develop the matrix. And it's -- you know, when you're in communications it's been -- at least from our side of the region it's been a pretty systemic problem within all agencies, unfortunately.

They do a really good job, I think, horizontally within organizations, but not so good job in terms of vertical or movement between communities and sometimes even between agencies. But I think that, you know, like Pat said, it is a two-way street and I think that some of the bullet points that are -- that were listed can be used in terms of conduits or tools to apply communications, and I think if we are able to define it then we can always reference it in any of our plans and I think that'll be an important thing.

And, like you said, there's a lot of things floating in the communications world but I think that, at least from our experience especially out here, communications is so important.

I mean, a lot of the stuff that we deal with and especially with some of the indigenous groups it really comes down to face time.

It comes down to talking to them personally. It makes a huge difference because, you know, working in territories and working with some of

these other people, if you cannot speak their language, so to speak, it's hard to communicate with them and having resources there to be able to reach that is very important.

We have good messages and good intentions but unless, like Pat said, we have open ears and listen - - and I come from a retail background -- so, you know, listening to your customers is so important.

It comes down to customer service, understanding what is needed and, I think, together you can provide, you know, a better outcome for everybody. It would be a win-win situation.

So, anyway, that's just my comment. But I'd be interested in the communication side and also with Linda on the seafood side. Thank you.

Chair Davis: Thanks a lot, Clay, for your comments and also for stepping up for the communication discussion and work team.

Brett, I see you have your card up. Do you have a comment?

Mr. Veerhusen: I'm back to sort of the functionality of communications, which seems to be a lump term for lots of different things, and I'm just going to kind of revert back to some advice maybe I would give clients is that a communications plan is not your plan.

A communications plan fits into a larger plan, and so we need to -- I need some clarity -- and we can do that another time -- on what we're talking about here.

To me, I keep reverting back to communications needs to fit within a larger recommendation -- a strategy -- for building partnerships, for advocating for budget, for increasing climate resiliency.

But the -- a communications plan is not the strategy to actually do the work. We need to -- just like the -

- like we did today with quite a bit of great detail, and I think in the future we can do that more behind the scenes before, is first define what we're talking about and who.

We spent an hour defining workforce. So let's do that prior. Let's define what the problem statement is and then the goals of the group, and then what it is we're providing input on, given the problem statement under the confines of the definitions.

And then communications, to me, fits within there of what we want to accomplish based on those definitions, those goals. So I don't want communications to be a catch-all for all the work that needs to be done or that isn't being done.

Chair Davis: Thank you, Brett. I think you should raise your hand to be the committee chair.

Mr. Veerhusen: Happy to. No invoice.

Chair Davis: Did he say absolutely?

Mr. Veerhusen: I said no invoice.

Yeah. No, I mean, I'm happy to.

Chair Davis: I think -- I think with Brett and Pat, you and Sarah, I mean, I think you and Meredith -- well, I mean, there's a few but you can't have too many chairs.

Mr. Veerhusen: Meredith, you're in that one, too.

Chair Davis: You can't have too many chairs. But anyway, Brett, please consider that.

Ms. Moore: Can I send invoices?

Mr. Veerhusen: We are under the legal confines of FACA and we are -- lawyers will always have a place at the table.

Ms. Moore: I know. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Participant: Are you both lawyers?

Mr. Veerhusen: No. It was based on earlier conversation.

Yeah. No, but I'm just saying this so that -- to set some expectations and the way I kind of see it. Talking to community members in Hawaii is going to be very different than, you know, communicating the ways in which NOAA is helping with climate resiliency and in building partnerships with new entrants.

So I just want to, like --

Chair Davis: That's great. That's great, Brett, and thanks for stepping up. No pressure there.

(Laughter.)

Chair Davis: Okay. So we need to start wrapping up. But I see Pat has his card up as well.

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah. My comment's not about communication.

Chair Davis: Is not about communication?

Dr. Sullivan: No, it's not.

Mr. Veerhusen: Is it about catch share, Pat? Because I can't do it either.

Dr. Sullivan: No, it's not about catch shares.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Veerhusen: Are you sure? Is it about whales? Because we can't go there either and you can't ask Janet a question because she hasn't finished her sandwich in two hours.

Dr. Sullivan: I'm really learning -- this is why I said we shouldn't be doing communication at the start of our discussion. But, anyway, I'm excited about where it's going.

My comment is even though there's a lot of money going into the wind area we haven't set up anything that we're going to do. We have already written a white paper that may be even dated now.

I was just going to open the door should NOAA Fisheries, Janet, in particular Cisco, have any questions or need input from us in the wind area.

I think the door should be open to that because there's a lot of people on this committee that are very worried and interested in that and can provide comment if needed.

Ms. Coit: Maybe I forgot we were supposed to get back to that. Let me comment and then, Cisco, I would be interested in your thoughts.

The areas most on my mind where MAFAC could be engaged, but I'm not asking for it and I think we should think about it some more, one is what types of policies do we need in statute and moving forward to create a platform from which to responsibly develop offshore wind so it doesn't have a negative impact on marine life, fisheries.

So that's something that we're thinking about and talking about because I don't think the current laws are set up well for us to protect fisheries, for example. So that's one as just kind of a policy.

Another area is the compensation. BOEM has put out guidance and had a comment period, which has now closed. But the law doesn't require compensation for fisheries impacts.

But there's a willingness by BOEM to consider them and put them in the contracts, and there's a requirement at the state level in some states through their CZMA programs that has been useful but uneven across states.

Anyway, so that's another area, kind of looking at what that guidance is and we put -- gave a lot of comments and many of which were not reflected in

the guidance and we don't think it's adequate to address impacts on fisheries, which are -- talk about unknowns.

A third area that we're learning more about is floating wind. Most everything we have done so far is about these single monopile wind farms and, yet, the ambitions of the Administration in the Gulf of Maine, off the coast of California, elsewhere, requires floating wind and that's something that I think we're still trying to very much get our arms around in what are the impact of floating wind vis-a-vis monopile farms.

And then the last one on my mind, but I don't know if MAFAC is the right place, is we have talked a lot -- it's in our North Atlantic Right Whale Strategy -- about the unknowns in particular in regard to oceanographic impacts, really large-scale impacts on productivity, on --I don't think anyone knows that if wind is developed at scale in which it's being considered what the bigger impacts will be and how that will affect prey-predator relationships and how that will affect, you know, a whole bunch of things I can't really define. Yeah.

So I don't know on any of those if they're the right place for MAFAC to engage, and I would invite Cisco to comment further.

Dr. Werner: I was trying to think of how to summarize what I was thinking and building on what's been said and, you know, we talked about a number of things, one, the uncertainty that I talked about that we share, but also another thing that we talked about was how, as we go out and measure, like Janet just said, about, you know, how the new ocean is shaping and all of that. We're not going to be able to do it alone.

It's, again, something that we're going to have to do cooperative research and collaborative research and so on. And I started thinking about the white ships being sort of a microcosm of how we're not going to do it anymore.



It used to be the way that we did it we're going to build a ship and we're going to go out there -- we, the NOAA scientists or whatever -- and we're going to measure and then we're going to tell you what to do.

And the world of the future is going to be different. It's not going to be a white ship that's going to do something, you know, set aside from everything else.

I mean, we're going to be needing to work together with the fishing industry. We're going to need to work together with citizen science. We're going to need to work together, you know, with other groups.

And so we're evolving, I think, in a way that, getting to the point of communication, and I'm going to quote something I heard somebody -- Bonnie McCay over at the SAB next door made this statement and I really liked it and she said it's not just about communication but about institution building.

And I'm not sure if that actually applies here, but if you find another way for institution, it's -- we're not creating a new institution but we're creating a new way to work together.

And it's not just communication but how are we going to work together in this -- in this new uncertain world that we're all going to go out there and discover and find solutions to jointly.

And so it's just a thought that is just sitting there and percolating. Maybe it'll disappear. But I thought it was relevant to the kind of things that were being -- that are being said here, that we're at that point where it's no longer us, them, you, them, anything. It's really all of us jointly, moving forward.

And so communication and institution building we need to rethink those -- what exactly do we mean by that.

Chair Davis: Thank you, Janet and Cisco, for your input and for stimulating the discussion.

Pat?

Dr. Sullivan: Can I just make one more comment? I mean, if we haven't seen the white paper that we did on wind it might be good to share that. Again, it's just a starting point. It may be dated and so on, but --

Ms. Coit: She -- they have staffed -- yeah.

Dr. Sullivan: Well --

Ms. Coit: I'd like to take another -- I think it probably is dated but I would like to take another look at it. So maybe we should -- and I don't know if some of the new members of MAFAC would have had access. So can we circulate that to everyone, Heidi?

Ms. Lovett: Sure.

Dr. Sullivan: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Schumacker: Thanks, Pat.

Chair Davis: Jocelyn?

Dr. Runnebaum: Yeah. Thanks for that, Janet. That was really helpful.

Just to the oceanographic and floating offshore wind in the Gulf of Maine as thinking about this right now and pretty deeply, so the University of Maine and partners pulled together a proposed NSF grant for EPSCoR that didn't get selected by the state and in it we sort of worked through the idea of almost like a management strategy evaluation or decision support tool to pull together the pieces of the oceanographic modeling that exists and some of the engineering modeling that exists to actually plop down a turbine and a -- digital twin is what we were calling it -- to model what some of the predator-prey dynamics and oceanographic changes or

hydrodynamic changes could be.

And I think that that idea is still extremely relevant and extremely complicated to pull together a huge team and enough funding to be able to get that done, and I don't think that MAFAC is the place for that to happen.

But I think that I'm saying this because there are people thinking about those issues and it might be nice for us to learn a little bit more.

Ms. Coit: Yeah, I agree. I think maybe a follow-on -- I know when we talked to the new president -- newish president of URI he was talking about a consortium of universities taking a look at these things.

I mean, it needs to -- we should talk further about how that happens. I mean, part of our conflict right now around some of the wind farm permitting just south of Nantucket Shoals is that we want a precautionary approach.

In fact, we are required to take that under the law when it comes to endangered species because of not knowing the answer to these questions and we want to be really clear on what are the questions that need to be answered and can we get all the best minds we possibly can working together on that.

And that's, I think, far bigger than MAFAC but I'd love to have conversations about what's going on in the respective, you know, academic institutions and institutes.

Dr. Sullivan: So, just as a tangent, we do have some expertise. So I'm estimating that mortality in wind turbines on land, for example.

So, I mean, there's a lot of places that we can connect. Even if we're not doing the research, per se, we might be able to provide input in terms of, like, you know, how to think about these things.

Ms. Coit: Yeah, or what exactly -- and I mean, I think our staff has some of this already in various places and I would invite you to look at the draft North Atlantic Right Whale Strategy because part of what that talks about is the unknowns and what are the right questions that we're asking -- what are the questions that need to be answered. That could be something that you help define.

#### Close Out

Chair Davis: Okay. Thank you all for that discussion.

And we're going to now turn to wrapping up our time together -- our MAFAC meeting -- and I'd like to congratulate all of us on the fact that we passed two action items during this time. We passed the recreational -- let me make sure I have the right wording on this.

Participant: Recommendations on the national policy.

Chair Davis: Recommendations on the national policy, and we also had the long -- year-long effort of Joe and also Roger and the team and the great work of the NOAA staff, Gabriela and Heidi, on the workforce development document with many recommendations.

So that's going to have a drafting letter that goes to NOAA leadership -- to Janet. So very proud of the work -- those two items of work that were completed during this time.

We also put together a letter this morning that Sara helped to put together based on a comment that Janet provided us on the first day about remote telework and remote work. And so we have a letter that will be coming to you and to the Department of Commerce on our thoughts on that.

We have the beginning of a really nice work plan that's starting to really shape up and many of you have stepped up to that, and so that will be the

beginning of work for the future.

And I would like -- I know that Heidi has some words that she'd like to say and I'd also like to turn to Jennifer to also have her contribute to the closing of our session together.

Ms. Lukens: Can you hear me?

Dr. Sullivan: Yes. Yes.

Ms. Lukens: Okay. Great.

Well, thank you all so much. This has been painful for me not to be in the room with you all. I was all geared up for this meeting but decided it was best not to get you sick.

But I really have enjoyed the great level of engagement, listening to you all here and completing those two tasks. Also, your letter that you're going to be putting together on the fly, so to say, that really -- some nice achievements for this meeting.

I want to say thank you to you, Megan, for chairing a great meeting and keeping us on time as best you could and on task, and then I also want to say thank you to Gabriela and Heidi, who do all of the legwork to make this happen in between the meetings and support the working groups and try to support you all in the work that you do.

So I am so grateful to have them on the team and they're really the ones who help make these meetings happen.

So I want to say thank you to them and then also to Janet and Cisco and Sam and Jim, who participated in the meeting.

So, hopefully, I will not be sick at our next in-person meeting and I will be able to sit there in the room with you all. Thanks.

Chair Davis: Thank you, Jennifer. We appreciate

your support and we do look forward to seeing you at the next meeting.

And I'll turn it over to Heidi.

Ms. Lovett: So I'm going to share quickly one slide that has some potential dates. So we will send these out to you also in an email but I thought, in case anybody knows right away if they have a conflict you can let us know.

But, essentially, these dates -- Gabriela and I scoured the calendar and found dates that we believe do not conflict with any councils or commissions or the CCC, which is sort of those -- you know, take up about 40 weeks of time in the year -- and also we need to look for our own internal leadership meeting dates.

But these are dates that we're proposing, either a March date or -- I think that's our first choice or our first recommendation -- and June is the second option. And then in the fall there's sort of this same week or the week -- a week or two ahead of Thanksgiving as potential dates. So --

Dr. Sullivan: So I have a conflict already.

Ms. Lovett: Which one?

Dr. Sullivan: The March 27th. The acoustics meeting is happening in Portland, Maine, that week, and I also have a Ph.D. defense that I'm supposed to be attending that week.

Ms. Lovett: Okay. So Pat no go on March. Anyone else?

Ms. Schumann: I can't do the June one, and the November dates, the 13th, the 17th, sounds likely to conflict with Pacific Marine Expo. They don't announce the dates until closer to November but that's usually around the time it is. I'm trying to check if I can do March.

Ms. Lovett: Well, that's a good 10 days ahead of

Thanksgiving. That November 13, 17 is -- okay. But I thought it was the week before Thanksgiving but maybe I'm wrong. Okay.

Ms. Schumann: Okay.

Ms. Lovett: Okay. Well, anyway, it's not a -- I'm sorry?

(Off-microphone comments.)

Ms. Lovett: Yeah. I bet fishermen and rec fish folks are busy in June.

(Off-microphone comments.)

Ms. Lovett: Yeah. June. Okay, not good. Okay.

Mr. Veerhusen: I really thought this -- I mean, you know, pending travel before Thanksgiving, I thought this week worked quite well just, you know, for this time next year, personally. That's just a personal thought, like --

Ms. Lovett: Great. Well, I just wanted to share that quickly. There will be, obviously, a lot of follow-up after this meeting. You'll see emails from Gabriela and I or from Katie, who herself had a conflict for two -- these two days, but we'll be doing a lot more engagement with you all.

Meredith?

Ms. Moore: Do we know where yet you're thinking?

Ms. Lovett: We don't. We're open to suggestions and we have been -- we have been noodling around a few suggestions internally but haven't shared those yet with anybody.

(Off-microphone comments.)

Mr. Fote: Hawaii is also nice in March.

Ms. Lovett: Well, I will say that generally we do try to be -- obviously, Puerto Rico is warm. We do try to have one meeting each year somewhere outside

of Silver Spring and one in Silver Spring.

We did -- we have had a couple meetings during my tenure in California. It's just that the -- prior to COVID those -- there was a couple of meetings we did back to back in the Portland, Maine -- I mean, Portland, Oregon, area to kind of accommodate engagement with the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force folks.

So we kind of hovered up there a little bit, if you will, but normally we do go -- we try to do different coasts. And you're right, California would be great.

Okay. That was really all I wanted to share. I know we have dwindled in number but thank you for -- also thank you for Tom and Joe and Clay, who have been stalwarts on the line the entire meeting.

I know Richard was interested as well but had a conflict with the International Pacific Halibut Commission meeting because he's a commissioner there.

So we really appreciate your engagement and hope that this has been -- we hope we have -- it's worked pretty well for you. I know it's not ideal.

But we really appreciate that you've -- particularly those of you on the West or Hawaii Coast, that it's been so early in the morning for you to get up and join us.

Mr. Schumacker: Minor frustrations. Thank you kindly for facilitating it, and you were glad I wasn't in the room.

Ms. Lovett: So that's all I have.

Ms. Coit: Yes, Megan has allowed me to say my thanks, too. So I wanted to also thank Gabby and Heidi and Jen, and Megan, you are always setting a high bar as the chair. Really well done. And thank everyone.

It's hard -- when it's here it's harder to stay present



in the room. So apologies for being in and out. I think that your work plan involves some weighty topics where we probably need some subsequent smaller meetings to talk about what's most useful.

So I'm offering up my staff for that and great to see everyone. Thanks. I'm really grateful.

Mr. Fote: Hope everybody has a great holiday and, basically, a safe holiday. And I finally figured out why my mic was so low. I had it on the wrong setting.

Chair Davis: Okay. Well, thanks for that, Tom. And I don't know if we need a motion to adjourn but we're officially closing the meeting.

Mr. Fote: So moved.

Chair Davis: So thank you, all, and safe travels home.

### Adjourn

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter concluded at 2:37 p.m.)