

**MAFAC MEETING  
(NWX-DOC CONFERENCING)**

**Moderator: HEIDI LOVETT**

**August 23, 2022**

**1:30 pm CT**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. All parties have been placed in a listen only mode until the remarks part of today's conference. Today's call is also being recorded. If anyone disagrees, you may disconnect at this time. It is now my pleasure to turn the call over to your host, Ms. Jennifer Lukens. Thank you. And you may begin.

Jennifer Lukens: Hi, everyone. Happy to see you all here today. I'm Jennifer Lukens, the Director of the Policy Office at NOAA Fisheries. I am going to keep my remarks very short and sweet, because we've had a few connection issues and we're already a little bit behind schedule, and I want to have as much time as possible for our single agenda item today, which I'm super-excited about. So I will turn it over to Megan Davis, your Chair.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you, Jennifer. And welcome. Good morning to all of you that are out further west - Alaska and Hawaii, maybe. So - and good afternoon to everyone else. So as Jennifer said, this is our MAFAC meeting. We do have one topic today. This is our summer meeting that we're going to have virtually as you can see. And you'll remember that at our last meeting in May in Puerto Rico, that we had a presentation by Sam Rauch, the Assistant Administrative for our Regulatory Program, on the Equity and Environmental Justice Strategy.

And during that presentation, we came together as a MAFAC group and said that we would like to respond to the comments. And the comment period does close August 31st. And that's why we're here today to be able to have this discussion, and have a MAFAC cohesive recommendations brought together. So the working group was formed at the MAFAC meeting. And the group came together. It is Chaired by Jocelyn Runnebaum. And she's had several outstanding members of MAFAC that have

contributed, over the last several months; a very intensive time, working very closely also with Heidi, on putting together the recommendations that you're going to hear today.

And so I know that these conversations that they've been having and just the topic along, is a very hard topic to have conversations around in terms of also, you know, being able to share things openly and honestly. And I know that the committee has done an extraordinary job around that, and we're all quite excited to hear their results of the recommendations. So what we're going to do first is, have a presentation by Jocelyn and the taskforce members.

We will be able to have just more technical type questions during the presentation that I'd be happy to call on you. And then we'll leave the discussion until after the motion and the public period comments. And so we should have plenty of time for both the presentation and also for the comments there. So I don't know if there's anything else we need to discuss before we actually open up the presentation. Jennifer or Heidi? Yes. Go ahead, Heidi.

Heidi Lovett: Yes. So a couple of housekeeping things - first, when you speak have yourself obviously not on mute, but to help with the recording and to hear each other, if you can put yourself on mute when you're not speaking that's helpful. And secondly, I'm going to read down the list of members that I see present as an official roll call. And before I do that, I just want to note for all on the video, participating today, and who may be listening, is that we had a privacy statement on the MAFAC Web site, and I will post that in the chat in just one moment.

So the members that I have present are Roger Berkowitz, Megan Davis, Tom Fote, Natasha Hayden, Donna Kalez, Meredith Moore, Stefanie Moreland, Linda ODierno, Kellie Ralston, Jocelyn Runnebaum, Joe Schumacker, Sarah Schumman, Patrick Sullivan, Clay Tam, Matt Upton, Pat - oh, I said that already, sorry. Brett Veerhusen, and Richard Yamada. Are there any MAFAC members that I - are here that I did not note? Great. Thank you. And then for staff, we have Jennifer Lukens, the DFO; myself,

Heidi Lovett, the Assistant DFO; and Gabriela McMurtry on today, as well as two other NOAA staff, Laura Dietrick, and Heather Blough. Thank you.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Heidi. I appreciate both housekeeping and the roll call. So I think we can go ahead and turn it over to the presentation. Maybe as - yes, there we go. Okay. So we're - I'm just going to kick it off with these meeting agreements. As I mentioned earlier, this is a topic that has (harden) on us conversations around it. And so as a reminder, because we are virtual today it's sometimes easy to get distracted. So to please stay on camera; stay present during the meeting. And that will help us to have a lively conversation.

The next one is to lean in and lean out. Meaning that, you know, that it's time to share evenly; to have everybody have an opportunity. And because we're in a bit of a short time span on this topic, I will work to give everyone a chance to speak, most definitely. And then if we have time, to have the opportunity to have a second opportunity to speak as well. And in terms of the statements it's best if you speak on behalf of yourself and not others.

And then I like this one - just so, you know, practice curiosity; to really listen if there are things that you're maybe not in agreement with, but you want to learn more about other people's viewpoints, I think that's a great way to stay open-minded. And so with those starting meeting agreements, I would like to turn over the presentation to Jocelyn and her task group - her working group. So, thank you very much, Jocelyn.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you, Dr. Chair. So thank you all for joining us today. I am really honored to have been able to help guide. Oh, Gabby, can we go to the next slide? Sorry. We're going to have to coordinate with that. Sorry about that. Yes. So I'm really honored it have been able to help guide the comment writing process, and I'm really looking forward to today's discussion and feedback from the broader MAFAC.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the Equity and Environmental Justice comment drafting team or taskforce. We've been meeting every week since the first week of July, so about two months or so. We've had really a lot of thoughtful and

sometimes challenging discussions about equity and environmental justice in fisheries and marine science and management. I really think we've learned a lot from each other. And what we are presenting today is a combination of commonalities of issues we found across the regions that we felt could be addressed in a high level national strategy.

I really want to explicitly acknowledge that the conversations about equity and environmental justice can be uncomfortable and challenging at times. We experienced this ourselves, and we had two months to reach an understanding with each other and where we were coming from. And today we have a little bit less than two hours to find understanding and common ground amongst this broader group. So I really want to acknowledge that these are robust and thoughtful comments, but there are likely many more things that we could have discussed and included.

So I'm sure that there are things that you feel like might be missing, and we would love to hear that. And then last, I just want to - the other introduction I want to give is that I really think it's important for us as a group, to commit to nonclosure on this conversation, meaning that this isn't really the end all be all stance of MAFAC, on this strategy. I think there are going to be more opportunities for us in the future, to help shape this policy and this work as NOAA Fisheries works to implement this strategy.

So this is really, as Megan pointed out, this is messy and hard work. We will make mistakes along the way. And the work we are presenting here is the point we've reached in our conversation, not a perfect draft of a comment letter of the strategy. So as Megan pointed out, this is the work of a collection of brilliant minds, presented on these photos here today. So we will be presenting together, which I'm sure will also be a little bit messy, so bear with us. And I think that we can have some clarifying questions as Megan pointed out. And then definitely we will have a full discussion following the public comment period. So I think we can go to the next slide, Gabby.

So just at a high level, we really want to thank the agency, or we want to let the agency and our fellow MAFAC members know that we really appreciate this strategy being put

together. It's really ambitious. And we hope that the final version of the strategy remains high level enough to cover each of the regions, prescriptive enough to provide direction and consistency for implementation, but flexible enough for regional differences. We do acknowledge that this is a tall order and will require significant resources.

And we hope that the agency puts significant resources into this endeavor over time, and integrates this strategy into NOAA Fisheries day to day operations, to become ingrained in the science and management processes. There will be a learning and growing curve for that to happen and will also require bringing all supporting entities into the folds of the conversation. So for us, this meant the management councils and commissions with federal authority, and their advisory bodies, in addition to other advisory bodies, including MAFAC. So we're going to get into a little bit more - oh, next slide, please.

We'll get into a little bit more detail for the document that each person's going to present, a section that they're pretty familiar with. But we just wanted to give a high level overview of the seven points that we came up with. So the first is, explicitly acknowledge historical and ongoing harms; incorporate and establish equity framework to address all aspects of inequity; clearly identify the expected benefits of the EEJ strategy to underserved communities; hold regional learning sessions; confront the structural issues and fisheries management councils better leading to inequity and injustice; develop implementation guidance for the regions; and address inequities in research and data use and management.

So I think that Meredith is going to take the item number 1, and I'll mute myself for her.

Meredith Moore: Great, thank you. I'll be brief in this section. The first recommendation that we have is to more explicitly acknowledge the historical and ongoing harms that have happened due to colonization, due to longstanding and recent government policies, and due to fishery management decisions and approaches that have been used. While the intent of the strategy when you read through the agency's, EEJ draft, it's clearly not intended to suggest it starting from a clean slate. But we felt that without more explicitly

acknowledging the harms that have been - have occurred and continue to occur, we can't really start from a place of humility and engaging in the issues.

So we feel that it is really crucial to, in order to ensure thoughtful conversations can proceed and that the engagement that the strategy is very much focused on to supporting underserved communities, in order for that to be successful, there needs to be a much greater acknowledgement of harms that have occurred and are occurring. There are other government documents that we have cited in the letter that do approach that sort of thing more directly, that can serve as a model. And so our key recommendations here are just to clearly acknowledge, in the strategy, that historic and ongoing harms have occurred.

And to also consider that in the context of a barrier to achieving the goals and objectives of the strategy. In particular, without really addressing those issues or starting from a place of shared understanding, that harms have occurred, it may be really difficult to do the type of outreach and engagement that the agency is looking to do under the strategy. Thank you.

Brett Veerhusen: Yes, is it my turn? And yes, thanks, Jocelyn, for all of your leadership and sharing this committee with us. It was a significant amount of work and it was very educational, you know, having members in Hawaii and then the East Coast and Alaska, coming from different sectors. We felt like we all learned a lot, so I just want to acknowledge my appreciation for educating me as well. The second high level recommendation that the committee has, is to incorporate and establish equity framework to address all aspects, or as many aspects of inequity as possible.

And the kind of key component here is to use expertise of equity scholars to ensure that the strategy and the implementation of the EEJ strategy, addresses these aspects of inequity and environmental justice. Frankly, there is not a lot of scholastic research on equity as related to marine resources, even less on equity as related to fishery resources, domestically. There is some scholastic research using other equity scholars that (Nathan Bennett) has provided. We gave some citations of where folks can learn more about

(Nathan Bennett)'s work, but really it's being able to provide a framework so that we have a common language about what it is we're trying to talk about, address, and solve.

And so we as a committee, feel like it would be helpful for the agency to seek out another equity expert to provide guidance and training for both the agency and councils and advisory committees as well. And then to add three main components of equity definitions, three principles that are used in the scholastic research that is available within the strategy. Those three are recognitional, procedural, and distributional equity. I've talked a little bit about this before in Puerto Rico, but in summary, you know, recognitional equity kind of comes down to whose voice matters.

It's the acknowledgement and incorporation of the rights, tenure, cultural identities, practices, values, livelihoods of different stakeholders and actors in conservation, governance, planning, and management. So it's looking at, you know, what is the use of a resource, for example, and what is the importance of that use and resource to various stakeholders? The second piece is to procedural equity. This is one that we're most familiar with. It's who is involved in decision making?

It's defined as the inclusion and effective participation of all relevant actors and groups in rule and decision making transparency and accountability for conservation policies and programs. So that's, you know, who's at the table? And then finally, distributional equity - who wins and loses? It's the level of fairness in the distribution of benefits, rights, costs, responsibilities and risks, between different groups, including current and future generations. These three principles that I've been learning a lot about and within the research, you know, it's really a loop. You can't have one without the other.

You can put maybe the right people or who you think are the right people in the right process, but if those folks are not recognizing the value or the importance of a resource to other stakeholders, then the distribution of that resource will be inequitable or lopsided. So you have to - it's sort of a full kind of continuous feedback loop, and it's - the legitimacy of governance depends on how these principles are implemented throughout the whole decision making. So, this second high level recommendation is

really to put a little bit more depth into the existing research and academic findings of equity. Acknowledging that research on marine resource equity and inequity is less, and even less so on domestic fisheries.

But certainly there's a lot of other scholastic research on equity that we can pull from and learn from. And I think it would serve, you know, our collective industry to be learning from others and making sure that within these processes, within these discussions, that the expertise and the definitions of the three principles really consider all folks that are part of the agencies' management, that includes commercial fishermen, recreational angling, charter for hire, the processing sector, aquaculture participants, communities that rely on marine resources for cultural identity, and individuals who gain food security from access to natural resources.

So really making sure that all of those critical stakeholders are included and considered within the practice of applying these principles.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Great. Thank you. Clay, I think you're up.

Clay Tam: Yes. (Hi - hello), Clay. I'd like to again, acknowledge and thank the committee. They worked really hard to put all of this together. Jocelyn, Heidi, and Gabby, (unintelligible). It was a great team effort I think. And (unintelligible) task at hand with his, you know, higher level recommendations and perspective, I think that when you look and we talk about clearly identifying and expect benefits out of EEJ strategy to underserved communities, you really have to look at the situation and it's an executive order coming from the top down.

Really, in order to get to the constituents and the people that really need it, it's actually a need to understand and public - perhaps include the bottoms of proportion, a lot of this, I think that, you know, we had a long discussion about this. There's, you know, a lot to be included as Brett said, and also as you heard, that we'd rather be inclusive than exclusive in this process. And to, you know, bring the nation and our fisheries together



moving forward. And so in order to do that, these recommendations that we have are trying to represent.

And participating in the governance process is not always an easy task, as you know. And each of our communities is different and respond differently to that. But getting down to that level of management and I think that when we discuss this, prioritizing to preserve historical fishing when we look back, of those who occupied our land, who have had practices and we talked about generational fisheries and knowledge and information as the basis, historic recording that should be documented and acknowledged by NOAA are preserved and eventually perpetuated to continue these practices within these traditional communities, indigenous communities, tribal communities, moving forward.

Hawaii is a little bit different in our area. Not much different than some of your areas of that there has been a huge influx of immigrant population that's, you know, something else to deal with. But if you look at it, a lot of them that immigrate to these areas have really adapted to a lot of the traditional fishing and culture/heritage, and practices that are in these areas. And so I think that's moving forward in that. And also, the bigger task at hand is we discussed funding.

And as a recommendation, we had talked about, you know, the funding we found is a massive task. But, you know, there would possibly be ways of assisting these communities on an as needed basis, and have flexibility like maybe directing more funds toward (SKA)s and trying to help these communities financially and not put the burden entirely on NOAA. But, you know, I think having the ability to embrace the community and let them be a part of the process is important.

And by, you know, having community involvement and in conjunction with oversight from NOAA, will help lead the way forward we believe, in that area. And, then we - and to make sure that, you know, a lot of this is in line with carrying a lot of the technical side of it in terms of NOAA's assistance that'll be important to have. We discussed a little bit about, you know, what benefits will this bring to these underserved

communities? I mean really what does NOAA have in their shopping cart, in their bread basket, to offer communities and to assist us moving forward in looking at EEJ and positive outcomes.

I think that is an issue we can get that moving forward. And these recommendations I think we should hopefully have a better fishing future. So anyway, that's all I have. Thank you.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you, Clay. So as Clay mentioned, we really focused on a bottom up approach of learning really. So the need to learn from what is happening within the communities. So we're recommending holding these regional learning sessions in order to let stakeholders in the region define who the underserved communities are in those particular areas, and what inequities or injustices they face. The document clearly lays out barriers to equity and environmental justice, which I think are well-founded and solid barriers.

But there may be something that has been missed. And we think that there is an important aspect of learning from people in the regions and on the - and in these - in fishing communities and other communities that access marine resources to learn from them. We also think that following the learning sessions that would be really helpful for the agencies to do sort of some internal learning themselves about norms and assumptions, or internal policies that may be marginalizing underserved communities from, you know, wanting to work at NOAA Fisheries, or work at the councils, or in other aspects of fisheries management that touch NOAA.

And then last, this is more - the last key recommendation is really more of a reminder to the agency to just maintain, some self-awareness that this idea of equity and environmental justice framing could easily be shifted by the dominant culture, and that the needs and resources - sorry, resources and policies may shift away from centering those truly underserved communities. So it's really just trying to remind the agency of maintaining self-awareness about what we're trying to accomplish with this Equity and Environmental Justice strategy.

I forget his - Tom and potentially Brett, and backup for this next recommendation, if willing and able. Tom, are you there?

Woman: Tom?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: So I don't know if we've been able to get Tom audio. Is that true? No? Oh, gosh. I'm sorry, Tom. Brett, you were on backup for this. I'm also happy to take it, or pass it to Meredith, too.

Brett Veerhusen: Yes. I'm happy to, but I think I would feel best if folks who have worked the council process more than I have, can speak to this.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you, everybody for your patience in our messiness as we work forward. Hopefully, we'll figure out Tom's audio so he can contribute, but I'm going pass the torch to Meredith.

Meredith Moore: All right. Well, here's my unprepared version of this. But I will do my best to not - to fairly represent the good work that went into this section from folks. So recognizing - and I will say upfront that we recognize that our sort of working group had a lot of fisheries experience, and not a lot of like protected resources or other pieces of the agency, experience. And I think you can see that in some of our comments here.

But we spent quite a bit of time focusing on what I thought was one very interesting piece here, which is that so many of the essentially decisions that get made that affect equity and environmental justice on the water, are made at cooperating partners from - with the agencies, for instance, the fishery management councils.

And we felt that particularly in reviewing, for instance, the barriers and objectives, and even the long term goals of the strategy, without more directly confronting the fact that fishery management councils will be critical partners in considering and changing practice and habit of what they think about and who they listen to and how they operate,

without looking at both those procedural issues that happen at the councils, and also the way that they make their decisions, we felt that it was essentially not possible for the agency to achieve the long term objectives and goals of the strategy without engaging more directly with that fishery management council facet.

So a bit of a wandering sentence, but I got there at the end. So essentially we have a number of recommendations that we made. And we highlight in the letter some of the key pieces that we note are similar barriers or structural issues that occur at the council, that I think that the agency is also interested in solving in their EEJ strategy. And we make a variety of key recommendations. I will say the banner recommendation is essentially, you have to think about like in this strategy, what - how to engage with the councils.

And I will extend that in these comments to entities like the commissions or other key partners that the agency works with. These are the places where frequently the connection to an underserved community or a particular regional issue, exists and addressing that and engaging with that will be incredibly important. One of the things that we really noted as people who engage with a variety of councils, is that there's a lot of, I think, good intent at many of the councils, to think about and engage with EEJ issues, but there is not a shared glossary or set of terms or broad understanding about what that means.

And so while the EEJ strategy has a substantial amount of intent to provide useful training, we felt that noting that council members, council staff, advisory panel, and stakeholders to engage in the councils, but also greatly benefit from that sort of specific training, so that people understand the objectives and the terms and what is trying to be accomplished. So because, as we started this whole thing out with, these are really difficult conversations. And it's going to be very important to figure out how to have those at the councils. And people sharing sort of a geography of what it looks like and a shared language, is going to be really key to making sure that happens.

These slides, sorry, don't have all of the recommendations. I'll send you to the letter for that. But we also noted that the agency as a voting member and representative on many of the councils, have a platform to advance and highlight the impacts on equity and environmental justice that they see for the actions being considered at councils. They also certainly can work with councils to increase the representation of underserved communities, not just in council seats, but also on advisory bodies, or setting up other sorts of structures that can help inform council decisions.

And then there were some very interesting recommendations from folks trying to understand, like what the representation impacts and who is representing at the various councils, and to perhaps then get a better understanding of what that means for the people who engage. And so there are a number of - a couple of recommendations about understanding who's involved and what their demographic information is, and what impacts that may have on decision making. So that's my, apologies, bit of an off the cuff description of this section.

I would open it to the other folks who are also familiar with this, to see if there are any - if I missed something big in my extemporaneous comments.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you for jumping in, Meredith. Yes.

Coordinator: Tom is on the line.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Go ahead. Sorry?

Coordinator: Tom is online. He can speak.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Tom, can you - do you have anything to add?

Heidi Lovett: Tom, this is Heidi. You might check if you have muted yourself on your phone.

Thomas Fote: I muted it and took it off. And I - can you hear me now?

Heidi Lovett: That's good. We can hear you. Yes. We can hear you.

Thomas Fote: Oh. Okay. Well, I called in both ways and it wouldn't let me get in. I had to call in again.

Heidi Lovett: No worries. You're here now.

Thomas Fote: Okay. So I'm supposed be covering about how the councils work. But - and the problems that I've seen over the years. And I think we've addressed a lot of it. The councils aren't structured to be environmental justice. When they were basically set up, they were set up to have, you know, fishermen and women basically participate with recreational anglers and others. That's really the way it was set - that's the way it's been going for years.

In the last 15 years they started to put on more environmentalists. There were professors put on. But that's really - what it's about when you look at the councils, I hate to say this, but a bunch of old white men that can afford to do it because they're retired. And we need to figure out how do we adjust for that, and that's what I've been working on. And I'm about finished with it. I started about a month ago, and I'm still revising it. But yes, that's what I see as the problem.

I don't know how good training sessions would be, because these people are so set in their ways. I mean I've been around a long time so I have a lot of things that I'm set in my ways, and it's hard to change. I think when we do a council initiation, you know, when you have a learning session before you go on a council, we've got to start right then and there and explain to them they don't represent the community they came from, or even the business they came from. They represent the people that are around the fisheries and should be looking out for all of them.

And that's a very hard message for some of them to accept. In the same way we sit around here, we're supposed to be representing all the fishermen in our states that we

basically concern whether it's recreational or commercial drives the poor and everything else. But that's very difficult for everybody to do. And I'll leave it with that right now, because everybody's said a lot and I was not really prepared for this because I've been out all day and just got back here at 3:00, and a load of company. Sorry about that.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you, Tom. I appreciate that. And then I think Meredith is up again, for number 6.

Meredith Moore: Yes, thanks. Me again. So this one - this recommendation really derives from the - in this spirit of okay, so now you have an EEJ strategy and you want to make regional plans; how do you do that, and what kind of guidance can the agency provide to the regions and to engage with folks in the regions, to create what will be, I think, a bit more of a closer to that bottoms up structure that we were talking about, like, how do we focus in on the particular regions and the needs of those regions and make sure that the plans that are derived from this overall strategy are very effective?

They really drive important conversations. They're focused on particular issues. They are customized to the regional needs, but are actually resonating with each other and driving conversation forward at the national level, on how to address the bigger environmental inequity - or equity and environmental justice issues that exist. And so, this is a very workman like section, I think, for our recommendations, which is like you need guidance for how people should figure out how to take your overall strategy and set a standard for what people should consider.

But at the same time, add flexibility for them to supplement if there's a particular thing in their region that needs like more focus in on. You should create structures that support the inclusion of community members and councils and all those other advisory bodies, in creating the regional plans so that it is relevant to the issues that people are seeing. You may need to focus in on or offer, specific trainings if an issue comes up and people just don't feel ready to handle one of those issues, in order to create these effective regional plans.

And there is a lot of work that can be done to ensure that like the implementing bodies are all working together and the advisory bodies are working together, and they're all doing that in the direction of like some clear metrics to make sure progress is legitimately being made. A slight aside, which is that this is the same sort of structure that we see with the climate science strategy, where there's a national plan and their regional action plans.

And there's been a number of looks at, and this is a common strategy for the agency as well, to have a national plan and regional plans. And there have been a lot of looks at this lately, and even just the GAO study that just came out on the progress on climate. And one of the big challenges has been a deep lack of communication between regions, once it gets down into these regional plans. Because they're not learning from each other, and there's nothing really driving cooperation across things.

And so it's that sort of narrowed in thing that we're - that a lot of these comments are looking at, which is like if you're going to go the regional action plan route or strategy route, which is good and makes a lot of sense, there - it can't just be handed off, this version of the document with no guidance and no structure, and no cross collaboration, if it's going to truly achieve the long term goals that the agency's looking to do. So it's about establishing that working structure. So there are some specific recommendations in there, but that's the spirit of this section. Thank you.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you, Meredith. And last but certainly not least, Natasha?

Natasha Hayden: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, depending on where you are. So the seventh one is - recommendation is intended to address the inequities and research in data use and management. And right at the very beginning it talks about how in the strategy, it identifies the inequity and research that happens, but then it goes on and kind of morphs into the becoming - the objective becoming research and monitoring for equity, which is what we interpreted as the strategy for monitoring, or researching if and how equity is incorporated or being addressed, or included in management versus what our recommendation here is trying to get at, is to make the recommendations about



equity and research that we all know that, you know, research is conducted by individuals and, you know, funded through different entities.

And usually it's funneled through different various institutions, all of which have got their own inherent biases based on their own experiences and demographics. And so these recommendations include adding actions to evaluate how research funding is prioritized and framed to identify those systemic basis. Already discussed pretty thoroughly are the three dimensions of equity and building those in, and how the different data is evaluated and how information is then weighted and incorporated into fisheries management.

One of the ways that this can be - that the information can be collected, is to conduct a census of the individuals who have comprised the different councils, you know, the regional management councils, the advisory panels, the advisory committees, and science committees and whatnot, to better understand what the composition is of the individuals that actually have been involved in making those decisions.

And along with that, to create a map, you know, it's called a map, but you can identify within each region, the indigenous people and the tribal people who have been - who have been and are still within those - each of those individual regions and are dependent on that. Access to principles permits and proofs with participation - this is all very long.

Anyway, the, you know, a lot of what this is getting at is when you've got funding mechanisms that are coming from industry or coming from, you know, stakeholders like - and Tom was referring to the people who are, you know, able to - they're in a position where they can afford to attend, they can afford to contribute, they can afford to, you know, provide funding for, and then direct the funds to institutions that are doing the - that are conducting the research, that are educating the managers as they're coming through, you know, the university system and their - how the data is collected, how it's generated, how it's analyzed, and then therefore is implemented.

And so all of that is influenced by the systems that are in place. I want to make sure I got all of that. I just also would like to send a shout out to Jocelyn for all of the hard work and heavy lift that she's done, and Meredith and Tom and everybody who's been working on this since the beginning, and all the way through. I think it's a pretty incredible document that you were able to pull together.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thank you. So thank you to all of the working group members. Gabby, I think we can go to the last slide. I really want to thank Heidi and Gabby for keeping us on track and scheduled, and working as a cohesive unit. And we're looking forward to hearing back from the broader MAFAC. And we're happy to answer any questions. I think we're a little bit over, or running behind, on public comments. So Dr. Chair, I'll turn it back over to you.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you, Jocelyn. Thank you, working group team. Before I say much more, I believe that we open up for public comments, but I'm not sure if there's anybody available. But I'll do that, and then we'll follow on from there.

Heidi Lovett: Hello, Operator? This is Heidi. Can you please provide the instruction for public comments if we have any other members - any participants or attendees? Thank you.

Coordinator: Okay. Thank you. If you'd like to make a comment over the phone, please press star 1. Please ensure your phone is unmuted and record your name. Again, that is star 1 to make a comment. One moment while we wait for any to come in. There are no public comments or questions.

Heidi Lovett: Thank you, Operator. Megan, I turn it back over to you.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Heidi. So, Jocelyn and working group team, thank you for that overview. And you really got into depth onto the recommendations. It was really amazing. When we think of MAFAC as a body of expertise and experiences, I could really see that shining within the documents and the recommendations that you

brought forward. It's very clear that it was a very thoughtfully put together document with recommendations.

And that the - responding to the strategy is directly reflected in the comments that you put together, along with - I was pleased to see also how you had touched on the implementation guidelines, because that will be a big part of moving forward. And it will be a continuation for MAFAC to also continue as the document becomes live and then the next steps of implementation. So our work can continue as well there.

So the real world examples that you provided were really also very important to have in this document. So I just want to thank you all, and thank you for the support staff, with Heidi and Gabriela, to do that. So I am ready to open the floor up to questions. I see that - I believe (Joe) has his hand up.

Joe Schumacker: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you hear me?

Megan Davis: We can.

Joe Schumacker: Fabulous. Well, first of all, great job. Just really well done. These are sorely needed and kudos both to NOAA Fisheries for, you know, making this effort to put out an EEJ strategy, and to the working group for these fantastic comments on them, that hold NOAA's feet to the fire on such a strategy. We have the, you know, a lot of these documents get made and dissolve into the past. And something like these comments here are absolutely necessary for follow through on these types of efforts. So, thank you.

Specifically, I've got a couple of things here I wanted to see if these suggestions were helpful at all to the working group. Though I think the work you've done is extremely comprehensive, I'd like to talk about two potential things - the council process is dear to my heart out here on the West Coast, because we work as tribal representatives, really well within the Pacific Fisheries Management Council, because the tribes in this area have treaties, and that's a hammer that was used - a legal hammer that brought us into

the decision making processes with NOAA, at the table, and with our co-managers and the fellow states out here in the West.

However, that shouldn't be the singular place where tribes are represented as voting members on councils. So I greatly appreciate your comments about the underrepresentation of underserved communities, tribal communities, communities of color on the councils around this nation. And I believe that the council, the Secretary, should prioritize those communities for both at large seats and for state obligatory seats. That these seats should be recruited appropriately amongst those underserved communities.

So I really think that if you're going to follow through on this EEJ at NOAA, that you press forward, you know, with council nominations and really make sure that you have better representation, and that you show metrics that apply to some of the things I think are in number 3, that show the benefits of this to indigenous communities, for the success of these recruitments to councils. Because that's where it is. You know, that's where these - so many of these decisions are made.

And I couldn't agree more with Tom and Clay and others, and Brett and others, and Jocelyn and (Melinda) and everybody else that's on this thing, that - and Natasha, forgive me, that we, you know, there's - it's a good old boy network out there that needs to be fixed. And I'm glad people are understanding that. And the other thing is that the FMPs themselves, that are created through the process, for fisheries management, those FMPs cover multiple species, obviously. And one thing they - a big thing they lack in my mind in any of these FMPs is a historical and cultural use section.

So we have a lot in there about, you know, optimum yield and blah, blah, blah, and allocations and all of these things. Where is the section that should be in there on the historic and cultural uses of these species within the FMPs that's been vetted by and written by social scientists and historians? And I think that that should be a section within those FMPs, and they should be updated, you know, with the normal updating process of those fishery management plans.

Those are just a couple right now. I just want to thank you all again. Wonderful job. I really appreciate all the work you guys have done. Thank you.

Megan Davis: (Joe), thank you for those comments. I realize in order to follow format that if - right now we should probably take any clarifying comments, which, it doesn't seem like throughout the presentation that that was necessary. But we should really turn to motion, and then we'll take the more discussions after that. But (Joe), thank you for your noted comments. And we can respond to that.

So, what I'd like to do now is put - have Brett I believe, is going to give the motion. Is that right, Heidi? And then - and then there'll be a second, and then we'll open up to discussion. And we have a full hour to be able to do that. And we'll continue to note everybody's comments and continue to have discussion. So, go ahead, Brett.

Brett Veerhusen: Yes. Thanks, Madam Chair. And before I make the motion, I think one of the key elements that the committee talked over and over again, is around capacity to do this; to do this well. And also acknowledging that sometimes this is new territory, whether it's academic research or to educate ourselves and each other. And we were explicit in that we - of our commitment within the committee and speaking for myself personally, to help the agency as best as we can, and offer our own resources so that we can provide the maximum value and impact.

So I just want to express that was a topic that was discussed time and time again. You know, and so with that, I'd like to make a motion to move to endorse and support the comment recommendations of MAFAC's Equity and Environmental Justice Committee to NOAA Fisheries on the agency's draft EEJ strategy.

Megan Davis: Thank you for that, Brett. And the second?

Meredith Moore: This is Meredith. I can second the motion.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Meredith. And so now as a committee, we can open up to discussion on the topic. So feel free to talk about the document. Now is the time. If you see anything that you'd like to see added or further elaborated on, this is the right time to do that. Because once we vote it will really become more editorial or grammar after that. So let's see, do we have any other hands up? I don't see any hands up. I'm happy to call on everybody to get everybody's input. Brett? Oh, I see. And then we'll have Donna - excuse me, we'll have Stefanie after that.

Brett Veerhusen: Just a quick clarifying comment to what was discussed before, you know, from Joe, around, you know, having the right representation. You know, that is of course really critical. But the best that we can do, you know, also having the inputs of the value and the importance culturally, to families or otherwise, of a resource, you know, on a recreational standpoint, we can go down lots of different chains of the value and the importance of a fishery. And that's the recognitional kind of equity principle component too.

And making sure that we can have that broad understanding, hopefully, this is my opinion, will hopefully create a system that is more understanding and more educated, rather than myopic in a view. And be able to, you know, take into consideration through learning and an anecdotal experience and own experiential knowledge of those importances of a resource, so that you have the proper procedural representation say on the council. But my hope on a personal level, would be that we, you know, through a common language and a framework, can also take into consideration the recognitional value of those species, across the board.

That would be - I know that's a little ideal and "woo woo." But frankly, you know, I think that we all have a lot more in common across stakeholders and finding a way to be solution-oriented helps us strengthen the overall productive use of our oceans.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Brett. And Stefanie?

Stefanie Moreland: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the work that has gone into this document. It's well written, very accessible, and clearly has been - taken a tremendous amount of time and thought to put together. So it's difficult at this point, to really constructively engage and understand some of the intent of all of it. But with that said, I feel like there are a couple of high level points that I'd like feedback on, or perhaps, to be addressed through amendment.

In particular, I think many of the concerns and remedies that need to be considered, with respect to EEJ, are due to unintended consequences of past decisions and management action. I feel that the tone of this is quite heavy on allocative issues and outcomes. And that's usually not what initiates the National Marine Fisheries Service or NOAA Fisheries' actions.

Typically, it's a conservation and management objective that drives the actions that end up having unintended consequences on underserved communities with historic dependence on resource, whether it be conservation or other more complex management objectives. And so I feel that from the introductory remarks, towards the bottom of the page, there's discussion of tradeoffs and ensuring that there's representation and inclusion in addressing tradeoffs. I think equally important is that inclusion and setting a management objective to begin with. And so, having suggested an addition there.

And then to pick up this other theme that I'm speaking of, I feel that it would be helpful if within the focus on acknowledging and explicitly acknowledging harm, that it would equally be helpful to provide some input for there to be examples added of mitigation strategies that have been effective at minimizing, preventing, or reversing harmful, unintended consequences of fishery management actions on underserved communities, with respect EEJ issues.

So those are the two primary additions is to include objectives as an important piece of considering action. And then to also consider some of the successes and the explicit attempts to mitigate or reverse unintended consequences with respect to EEJ outcome.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Stefanie. Jocelyn, go ahead.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes. Thanks, Stefanie, for that. I think that having explicit language about setting management objectives from the get go, and really providing clarity of what an FMG is working towards, or sorry, any action is working towards, would be really helpful. And I think that would be a great addition to this document. I really appreciate your comments about mitigation strategies for unintended consequences. And I'm struggling to find clarity and thought of what - well, one, I'm struggling to find an example on the fly, of what that looks like, in order to include.

But I'm also wondering if sort of thinking about it from the mitigation hierarchy, if that's in terms of like avoid - anyway, I guess maybe a little bit more clarity about the direction you're thinking for that second comment, as I stumble over myself here.

Stefanie Moreland: Yes.

Megan Davis: Would you like to comment on that Stefanie? Thank you.

Stefanie Moreland: It's okay. There are some key recommendations on - under item 1. The first key recommendation is to add clear acknowledgment of historic and ongoing harms, in the opening context of the strategy. And so, my suggestion would be to also add examples of mitigation strategies that have been effective. And as I described it in minimizing prevention in reversing harmful unintended consequences.

And an example would be for one that I'm familiar with, and was heavily involved in, a need for limited access of a specific kind of population in the Gulf of Alaska, due to changes in effort and recognizing that limited access permits are typically awarded per National Center of Guidance recognizing direct stakeholders and historic dependents. Those permits can move. They can be transferred. People can migrate out.



And so an acknowledgment and authority was provided for permits to be issued in more of a community-based approach that can be governed by an entity that would be eligible for holding a permit, and tie to community priorities under community representation and governance. And then anchored in communities that would be considered underserved and not be issued, initially, much access to resource. That's an example of a mitigation strategy anticipating limited access program development would have negative impacts otherwise, on access to resource that was in proximity to these entities.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Stefanie. And we have Tom then Roger, then Linda.

Thomas Fote: Yes. I was thinking about how long ago we really started the problem. And the problem started when we first - and I only can talk from the East Coast side. I only can talk from really the mid-Atlantic, which I've been involved with so many years. But it started when NOAA started getting the data for the council and the commission to work off, because - on the joint management plans. Because the data they had was so flawed and basically the longstanding, as we've gone through the years.

They only looked at what the commercial landings were, and with the best estimates they could have a recreational. But they looked at no other entity when they set up those quotas. And you say the mediation, and I think of, I just went through a framework process for over I think 3-1/2, 4 years, while they basically redo the quotas. And it was not successful. I mean just because of the makeup of the council, the votes went as I expected they would go. They didn't reallocate much. And when they did they only reallocated, even when we proved that they set up the quotas originally wrong, back in the '90s.

So it started off on a - it's very hard to basically change, because once somebody's got something it's difficult to take it away and share it with other people. And it's been a longstanding problem. And we also rewarded back then, the quotas to people that we collapsed the fishery because of what they were doing in a short period of time. And all of a sudden we decided we had a manage (unintelligible) flounder. We've got to do

something, yet we gave the quota to the people that basically found (unintelligible) and basically overharvested and collapsed the fishery.

So that always - and you refuse to use the earlier data that we had from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries that shows that the quota was different, 70/30. So yes, I mean I've been hoping that we would find adjustments when we did the quota reviews, but it just didn't seem to work.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you, Tom. I'm just going to jump over to Heidi for a minute.

Heidi Lovett: So I just sent actually a message to Stefanie to ask if she had any - if she had specific draft language. And I didn't know if folks were looking at the document on their own screen, the shared document, or if we needed to share it here, on this screen, which makes it a little more hard to see all the hand raising. But whatever works best for you all. And if there was some draft and/or Stefanie wants to give me a little bit of time and share something with me, then I can insert it as the - with track changes, so you can see potential changes from the existing document with new language.

Megan Davis: Thanks for that, Heidi. Because we're trying to finish the document so that we can vote on it. And so really any substantial changes that we want to make, we need to make during this working session. So, thanks for that, Heidi. And, Roger?

Roger Berkowitz: Yes. I'm impressed with the thought processes that went into the document. And I think that, you know, certainly it could be a good catalyst for change. I'm wondering if there could be, I don't know, something added that there could be some kind of mechanism for assessing the progress of this EEJ policy. You know, oftentimes when, you know, there's an accountability that absolutely accelerates change, and falling back a little bit on what, you know, Tom said, what is - how can we get it to change?

And if it was some kind of mechanism, you know, for assessing how these councils were doing in terms of what we've laid out here. I think that's helpful.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Roger. And yes, there will be an opportunity during the implementation stage that we can also talk about those types of metrics and seeing how the progress is. So, that's a great point. Just a comment in the comment box from Brett, regarding Stefanie's comment. He says, I'd like to point out that the committee talked extensively about whether to include examples or case studies. We decided that unless there was a legal court case using examples felt prickly to wade into, as they could be left open to certain interpretations.

So that's a very important comment to think about in terms of specific examples. So okay, Linda, you're next, for your comments, please.

Linda ODierno: Thank you. I think this is an incredible document. Kudos to everyone on the working group. I had a few suggestions for consideration. One, on the top of page 2 where you talk about strategy into the current science and management practices. Would it be useful there to also include communication and outreach? Because I think that that's one of the issues that a lot of underserved communities have had. They haven't had that opportunity to understand the system. So that's one suggestion.

I also thought, on the recommendations it might be good to move recommendation number 4 up to position number 1, because that's going to inform a lot of the other topics. And it might also be useful to have something just about the historical perspective of underserved communities, just to inform a lot of these decisions that are being made. So those are a few of my thoughts. I don't know how anyone else feels about them. But I think they might have some consideration like on the historical perspective, that 80% of oyster industry in the 1800s was Black folks, free men.

And it was a big important economic driver. And now there are very few Black oystermen in our area. So it gives you some perspective on some of these topics. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you, Linda. I'm thinking that likely that Heidi is keeping track of these suggestions and that we'll be able to come back to them. Or should we be discussing the addition or the changes as we go along, Heidi?

Heidi Lovett: I suggest - I'm trying to take notes right now, and I think Gabriela is as well. And maybe, list them all out and then go back and look at the document and try to insert them. Or, as we're taking notes, if individuals would like to, using suggested edits themselves, go into the document and insert them and then we can go through and look at it as - from top to bottom.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: And Brett, I would suggest raising your hand. It's a little more difficult to ensure we keep track of comments in the chat.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you for that, Heidi. I did read Brett's comment for the record.

Heidi Lovett: Right. But there's more...

Megan Davis: So it's good - we're good there for this one, Brett. Next, I see Natasha's on the list. And Joe, I'm going to come back to you, but then there'll be Meredith and Matt. And then I'll come back to you, for sure, Joe, after that. Okay? So Natasha and then Meredith.

Natasha Hayden: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm appreciative of Linda's comments. I think those are good suggestions. I just want to talk a little bit more about what, you know, Stefanie's suggestions. And I understand and I appreciate Stefanie, that you're wanting to incorporate a different perspective, and some other language that might incorporate the, you know, what you're hoping that we would achieve with this.

And, you know, but in my mind environmental justice and equity is the - what is included in here is about explicitly acknowledging the historical ongoing harms. And then what you were talking about, about, you know, identifying, you know,

management tools that have been incorporated in fisheries management to mitigate unintended consequences, and then you used an example about (unintelligible) permits in the Gulf of Alaska. And then you referenced that it is, you know, potentially allocative.

Those - that perception to me, is diverting away from the intention of environmental justice and equity. I mean it is, you know, in itself, is - and I hope I'm not putting my ignorance on display, but what I think you're talking about is the (cod) permits that are - the CQE community entities quota fees, are able to possess, and then in turn, have their community members utilize, which is indeed a good in theory, practice. But the CQE program in itself, has failed. You know, there's - it's been in existence for 20 years, and there have only been a couple of the CQEs that have actually been able to utilize that program to benefit its community residents.

And so, I think that there have been plenty of successes that are not drawing attention to and really drilling down into the importance of the environmental equity strategy, and the environmental justice - or these recommendations. And, you know, really I'm just bringing that up because I just - I genuinely appreciate your perspective about that, but I don't know if this is the - if it is necessary to bring that into these recommendations.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Natasha. We'll have Meredith, Matt, Joe, and then Jocelyn.

Meredith Moore: Thanks. I just want to speak to one challenging thing I think about our review of this document today, which is that our comments are in response to the EEJ strategy. And so there are portions of what people are bringing up today, which I very much agree with, that are inherently already included in the EEJ strategy in some ways. Which means that they're not in - our letter looks very comprehensive, but is not comprehensive, because there was lots of stuff in the EEJ strategy that we didn't speak to, directly.

And so I just want to highlight that as a challenge of the process of feeding into our comment letter, is that there pieces of it that we didn't include. One thing that I want to highlight and no one's trying to pick on you Stefanie, I'm sorry, to your point of

clarifying the intent, which I think is really important that it is very possible that the EEJ strategy is not clear enough in and of itself, of acknowledging not only the historical and ongoing harms that have occurred, which we noted in the first section here, but also the agency's intent to understand, avoid, mitigate, and minimize those harms.

It's possible that the sections within the strategy that talk about equitably distributing benefits and that sort of thing, is not clear enough in its language there. So I would be like - certainly I think you've narrowed in on something interesting here about whether professing the clear intent that the goal of the equity and environmental justice strategy is to address those harms and that there are many ways to go about doing that. I think that's a really powerful message that maybe we didn't get clear enough in here.

So yes, I think that's a really effective point. And I could see some ways to either add that into Section 1, but the intent needs to be more clear that this is about not only acknowledging those harms but addressing them, as well as perhaps we didn't take close enough a look at the three long term goals of the strategy, and perhaps, it's not clear enough in there either. But apologies, if that's me misinterpreting your comments. But I was intrigued by them. Thank you.

Megan Davis: Thanks for that, Meredith. And Matt?

Matthew Upton: Thanks. We appreciate the work that folks put in this. I guess I had a question and a comment. So I'm looking at under 5, the council aspect of it. And then on page 9 there's the six bullet points. Is that something that we kind of come up with here, or is that drawn from the EEJ strategy? I'm looking at it and I thought it was just something that we kind of - the group had come up with. But I wasn't sure if it was more in that category that Meredith, I think, pointed out of things that were kind of already part of the strategy. And I guess depending on that answer, then I have a comment.

Woman: I believe those were our examples that we discussed and things that we brought forward that were outside of the EEJ strategy. But your comment is welcome.

Matthew Upton: Thanks. So then I guess I would just hope folks would consider kind of potentially a caveat that these may be concerns. Because I think it really can be specific to each council. And I'm just speaking from my perspective from the North Pacific. And I wouldn't necessarily agree with the different points here. I understand others may have a different perspective, but sometimes I think within Alaska, the largest holders of the quota and some of the largest kind of voting blocks, are in two groups.

And I think the council has been doing a lot of sort of work on this, some of these issues. Obviously, there's more work to be done, but I would just kind of throw that out for close consideration. And then scrolling down to the key recommendations, one of the concerns I have is kind of census of previous staff, you know, the revolving door between industry (NJR)s, and tribal groups.

It seems to be that that may, to me, it's almost like you're saying that it's not okay for people to - who have industry experience to either work in public service, or people have done public service and work in the industry. And I'm not sure that that is necessarily aligned with kind of other general kinds of employment rights that people have and that NOAA's already set up from this.

But I also get the sense from some of these comments that it's almost like there's a kind of distrust towards the - what the agency and the council process. And so I struggle with on the one hand, you know, how to encourage people to view that as something that was at the same time, not targeting specific people, which is what I think sometimes come out of these different kinds of rosters of who's left to go work in industry.

But in general, I mean the biggest thing I'm concerned about is just a lot of those six point are inclusions that I think are - may not be widely shared and maybe there'd be different perspectives on those, and are obviously going to vary from council to council. So those are my thoughts. Thanks.

Megan Davis: Great. Thank you, Matt. I know Jocelyn would like to jump in for a minute. So go ahead, Jocelyn.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I guess I have a few points to respond to. So maybe I'll let Joe go ahead and finish up his, and then I'll maybe respond to a few thoughts of potential suggestions for some of these recommendations, if that's okay.

Megan Davis: That sounds great. Okay Joe, we're back to you. Thanks.

Joe Schumacker: Oh, there we go. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Jocelyn. Yes. Well, actually, I'm going to be right there in that same chunk of recommendations. As for my out of order comments made previously, I just thought maybe I'd ask first of all the working group, at the top of page 10, the key recommendation - this is under number 5 overarching recommendation; key recommendation that NOAA should create joint efforts with the councils to increase the number of representatives from underserved communities on advisory bodies or in other meaningful capacities to inform council decision making?

I'd like to ask the working group first of all, if - did you pull up short on that on purpose, or was there - do you see the potential for including voting members of the councils in that bullet? And then I have a follow up.

Woman: I almost want to - oh, Meredith, you want to respond to that. Go ahead.

Meredith Moore: Yes. I was just going to note, I don't know how - I think that we pulled up short because of the governor's list process for the council seats. And just recognizing that that's where the names come up. And I think that that's a dismissable concern if there's consensus to add council seats to the intent of this. But I believe that is what left that off the list.

Woman: If I may also add, that I think there was a conversation about the council representation and council seats that came up under point 3 for benefits of a strategy and letting



communities define what the benefit would be. And if one of the benefits of this strategy is increased representation in these processes, then I think that it should be - well, I think we discussed that being noted at the region is where I remember those conversations happening. And I think Meredith is also making a valid point of the conversation that we had. But my memory doesn't serve me all that well sometimes. So that's what I recall too.

Joe Schumacker: Okay. Well, I greatly appreciate it. Maybe there's more. I really would recommend that you do, since I think in your statement above, you do say that the Secretary has ultimate decision - ultimate authority over councils and council members. So I would recommend that you go ahead, especially for recommending at large seats and, you know, the state obligatory seats. Because that's how we got a tribal member in our council, out here, before we got the voting member.

The states and Washington, put a tribal and an obligatory seat. So just a suggestion. I think it's a way to go forward and to get more inclusion into that actual voting decision making process. The other one was I mentioned earlier, the fishery management plans, the FMPs. And somewhere on these two bullets and there are a couple of other places these could go, but I think it fits here.

And the idea that I brought up earlier that these FMPs do not have any historic or cultural use sections within them, that indicate how these different stocks within the FMPs have been used historically, or are being used currently by underrepresented groups. And I really think that that's a needed socioeconomic section within these FMPs. Just another recommendation for a bullet there. Thank you.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you for that, Joe. Then Kellie. And then I'm wondering, after Kellie speaks, we have about 20 minutes left, so we may need to jump into additions, so that we can come to a vote today. Just a thought, after Kellie. Please provide your comments, thanks.

Kellie Ralston: Thanks, Megan. First of all, I want to say thank you to everybody who was on this working group. I think it's a really great document. I think that it is way outside of my scale of expertise, and so I really appreciate all of the thoughtful conversation and hard work that went into this. I wanted to jump in on the council appointment issue. And perhaps the way to include it in this document is for the agency to investigate avenues to increase travel representation on councils.

My understanding of (Magnusson) is that it is up to the governors to submit their list of three names for each of the seats. However, you know, council can make those decisions to have, you know, specific representation. For example, on the Gulf Council there's no requirement for specific members of recreational, commercial, or other categories. Although there used to be, statutorily. But then, you know, that the agency prioritizes trying to have, you know, balance on the council in all of those areas between the states. So I think there is some mechanism there.

I don't - I think there would need to be kind of a legal review of that by the agency, to kind of see how they could do it. And then if there are necessary statutory changes, that's something that, you know, could potentially move forward on a (Magnusson) write off. So I just wanted to throw that out there. Thank you.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Kellie. And Jocelyn, did you have some other comments?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I did. I first want to apologize to Stefanie and the group for asking for specific examples. We have steered clear of those, but it helps solidify the comment in my mind. So, I'm sorry that it might have brought up unnecessary tensions. I would say that my interpretation of Stefanie, your comment about providing mitigation strategies, to me how I interpret that is an opportunity for the regions to learn from each other, of how they are addressing inequities in fisheries management and in their processes.

And I think that almost would come under Point 2 I think is where - maybe not Point 2. But I think that - oh, I think it's actually implementation is probably where it might make a lot of sense to put that. It might make - I think it makes sense to put it in a

couple of different places. One is Point 6 where we're working on implementation strategies. And the key recommendations there, really focusing on learning from the other regions about how they're handling these issues, and trying to overcome them or address them, and how it's been done in the past.

And I think a historical look back is also a helpful comment in addition to moving forward, learning from each other. And then I also would almost add it to number 7 as well, in terms of - these are examples that we can learn from. And I think Natasha's point of the overarching structure might not be working quite as well. But some mitigations - some of the strategies implemented moving forward, have worked well, but to separate what works and what doesn't work, in some instances.

So I appreciate the spirit of the comment in terms of learning from the different regions. And I think that is in line with the spirit of a lot of the recommendations that we are making in this document. I think Matt's point about caveats to our bulleted lists, are also in the spirit of regional differences, and should be included. I think it's a valid point that we all have different experiences at different councils, and that this is not the end all/be all experience. And I think we do say that this is not an exhaustive list. But I think it's also worth noting that people, different experiences that the councils may be different.

I think to - I think it was Rogers point about metrics, we actually do have that in the document. And I looked it up when you were talking. And I promptly lost it. But I did see one of our key recommendations somewhere in the document. On page 11, the last bullet point another number 6, is, establish clear metrics on implementation. So I would encourage you to take a look at that to make sure it's in line with your comment.

And then Linda, we did talk about communication and outreach, at least verbally. And if it didn't make it into the document, I'm so sorry. And I think it's a valid point and that we should be sure to figure out where that makes sense. So I think those were - and then to Joe's point about historical and cultural uses, I feel like that came up maybe under the research section. And I'm curious what your thoughts are here in terms of under, on

page 12, under the key recommendations, we have conducted demographic and economic census of marine fisheries participants.

And then a map that includes tribal occupation, but that doesn't actually get at what you're - I'm wondering if under number 7, that's where maybe starting there, to help inform the FMPs, to provide that necessary research to go into that recommendation. And then I think I'm done, Madam Chair.

Megan Davis: No. That's great, Jocelyn. Actually, I'm thinking with your review of everybody's comments that we could decide as a group, that we, you know, accept the way that Jocelyn has been able to address it, and that those comments will get included in the right places in the document, that we may need to wordsmith right now, or put those content. If everybody's in agreement. I really like the approach that you just took Jocelyn. Is that something we could move forward? I see also, Natasha and Meredith with their hands up. So, go ahead, Meredith - excuse me, Natasha.

Natasha Hayden: Thank you. I just wanted to quickly touch on the - how - so when - in the FMP my understanding is that the councils are required to address and investigate, and then excuse me if I'm not - haven't the precise terminology on what the requirements are. But the councils are - the councils are able to I think, I'm not positive about this, to define what a historical dependence needs.

And so it's - that's one of the topics that having the - developing the census of participation and - on the councils and the advisory panels, and, you know, can inform because of, you know, much of the fisheries management has already been, you know, created. And so the "historical dependence" at least, you know, in my region and I know I'm very inexperienced, you know, from a national standpoint, but it is, you know, it's based on a certain number of years.

You know, some historical dependence criteria is as defined by the management body, which is not the same as identifying the historical dependence. And so I think that if it hasn't been explicitly written in here, it's just, you know, it's sort of - there's a theme

throughout these comments about how important that is. And if it is necessary for us to make it explicit, that historical dependence and utilization of the resources going back to, you know, the prehistoric records, you know, then we'll have to find a - not help us - but Jocelyn, I think that's something that we could try to, you know, work into making an explicit statement if it would be more effective.

Megan Davis: Thank you, Natasha. Meredith?

Meredith Moore: Hi. Just briefly, I will note I'm generally supportive of the language that Joe has dropped in on the FMPs. I wanted to highlight, I think one of the things we struggled with as a group, was how much we were going to drag this into the fishery management sphere, given that it's a much broader document and they kind of don't even mention the councils at all, is - was kind of our starting point.

And so I think our lack of digging into like FMP considerations is somewhat from the agency's starting point and onwards. And so that's a piece of why you don't see that sort of thing I think dug into as far as like how - I think if they'd asked us like how would you do it in fisheries management, we'd have a different document than we've provided to you all. We'd have a large number of things to comment on there.

I wanted to emphasize for you, that into the - in the actual NOAA strategy under their research and monitoring for equity section, there are a number of specific recommendations they make that I think are laying the groundwork for what it is that you're asking for, to be included in FMPs. And so if you've not had a chance to look at some of those it certainly talks about analyzing the social, cultural and economic impacts, in NOAA Fisheries Services and management decisions, e.g. fisheries, etc., on underserved communities, including traditional local ecological knowledge, co-producing certain things.

So I think they are getting asked that. It is certainly not what you are trying to include. But I just wanted to note that they get pieces of it, and I think that's why the disconnect for our comments. Thank you.

Megan Davis: Thank you for that. I'd like to turn to Heidi and Jennifer for a minute. Can we accept the idea of - that I believe that Jocelyn and the committee and the recordings, and also the chat box, has a lot of the information, if it can be incorporated as sort of a modification to the motion that this will be updated with the various pieces? Is that something that we can work towards, Heidi?

Heidi Lovett: So I have - Stefanie provided some draft text, as did Joe. And I have inserted it into the document and I tried to highlight it in yellow, so it's really clear...

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: ...for people to see. And I personally prefer that we do walk through the document...

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: ...and look at those sections. And then if there are other things - obviously, there were a few other things that people mentioned, that we take the time to walk through and add that kind of text. Because it's - it is more substantive.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: And the only thing I haven't added because I didn't quite wrap my head around it yet, was Stefanie had a comment in one section. But I've added the draft text that she sent me. I believe I've added all of it.

Megan Davis: That sounds great. So then Gabriela...

((Crosstalk))

Heidi Lovett: Yes. I was going to say, I guess I can share and walk through. And then if people would like to stop me and let me know where other language might need to go, I can do that.

Megan Davis: That sounds great.

Jennifer Lukens: Heidi, I - Megan, can I just add something here, just for those who might be new to the committee? That the intention here if we do get to that today, is - on a vote, is to get to consensus, which is that you can live with what the general comments are here, all from the vast variety of perspectives, and that you all agree on what's on the paper there and that you can live with it.

So we may not get to perfection, but that is at least what we're striving to do with this conversation here today. So I just wanted to say that before you jump in. Thanks, Heidi.

Megan Davis: Yes. Thanks, Jennifer.

Heidi Lovett: Stefanie, did you have a comment, before I try to share my screen?

Stefanie Moreland: Yes. I appreciate you doing that, Heidi. Madam Chair, if you don't mind, I just want to comment in a manner that I think will make this a little more efficient with respect to my comments. I do suggest looking at the addition of objectives, since that seems of interest to the group. And that's at the bottom of page 1, the last sentence of the last large paragraph.

With respect to the other insertion that's been discussed a lot and find in spirit with what Jocelyn suggested for proceeding with that. So I just we not review that. Thanks.

Heidi Lovett: Okay. Thank you, Stefanie. I'm sorry. I'm at a loss to the thread there. But when you say not review, well I'll let you guys direct me. Sorry. I'm juggling between your comments, looking, and listening. So let me share my screen.

Stefanie Moreland: My suggestion was to look at the page 1 edit in...

Heidi Lovett: Okay. Can everybody see?

Stefanie Moreland: ...the bottom left full paragraph.

Man: Yes. We can see.

Heidi Lovett: Okay. Let me just throw this over here. Okay. So, excuse me, (unintelligible). So this was your first comment, Stefanie, or the first addition that I saw.

Stefanie Moreland: Please go to the first page, last large paragraph.

Heidi Lovett: First page, last large paragraph. Got it. Okay. I must have missed something there. Sorry.

Stefanie Moreland: Yes. In the - I apologize, second page last full paragraph, then.

Heidi Lovett: Okay.

Stefanie Moreland: Or maybe (unintelligible). Right before the signature from MAFAC. There you go.

Heidi Lovett: Here. Management objectives...

((Crosstalk))

Stefanie Moreland: Yes. That was the recommendation that I had regarding objective placement.

Heidi Lovett: Megan, I'm happy for you to continue to lead the conversation if there's - I can't see everybody or hands very well.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: So...



Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: ...you know, if people agree or disagree with this or (unintelligible).

Megan Davis: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Heidi. So there are two additions. One and not only - if you go back up to the top part of the page.

Stefanie Moreland: Madam Chair, that issue of the - the other issue is one that Jocelyn suggested handling in a different manner, and I support the suggestion from Jocelyn, if that's preferred by the group.

Megan Davis: Okay. Let's take a look at that then.

Heidi Lovett: Jocelyn, can you reiterate how to handle it that is different than this addition?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes. So I think that if we take this text and we can make it a key recommendation - sorry, I'm just now finding the edits coming in. I think it can become a key recommendation under - I think I said 6, in terms of implementation. So...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) see if you can mute that line. There you go.

((Crosstalk))

(Darius): Okay. This is (Darius) on the line. Is everyone able to hear me?

((Crosstalk))

(Darius): All right, excellent.

((Crosstalk))

(Darius): Yes. I was working with the operator. I don't know if they'll be able to conclude if it were someone's specific line that was giving that garbled noise. But you should be able to speak freely as you previously were.

Heidi Lovett: Thank you, (Darius).

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I wish I could have used that time to think a little more clearly. So I think that text that's highlighted there of examples of successful mitigation strategies, I think can go under key recommendation under Point 6. And if I could add a friendly amendment to that of in terms of maybe adding that it's sharing learning across the region. So collecting and sharing examples of...

Heidi Lovett: Jocelyn, if I may, can we suggest that you take a moment and draft with that language where you recommend? I'm on page 6 in another view, but I think I know what you mean, but if you just take a moment and do that and we can look at the other comments that were added.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Okay. And then I'll text...

Heidi Lovett: And I'll go back and remove it from here.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Okay. Thanks.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thanks for that. And then the addition of the management towards the end of that letter, if everybody's in agreement with that, or if there's anybody that doesn't agree I should add. Okay. So without any disagreements on that, Heidi, we can keep scrolling down. Okay. And this is what Jocelyn's working on right now. Or no, this is something - no, okay. So this was an addition as well.

Woman: I think it's the same addition in two different places...

Megan Davis: Oh, okay.

Woman: ...that Jocelyn is working on.

Megan Davis: Okay. Very good.

Woman: That's my guess. Stefanie, or Jocelyn, should weigh in.

Heidi Lovett: I haven't added that yet. Is that from...

Megan Davis: Okay. So now I think I'm understanding the comment center, and Stefanie, please correct me if I'm wrong. But maybe, this particular piece - the add examples of mitigation strategies that have been effective, that this language is related to the - during implementation, add examples of mitigation strategies that have been effective, and that you - and that Jocelyn was recommending that get moved to section - as one of the items under section 6, I believe. Is that accurate? I'm not hearing Stefanie. Is she still with us?

Man: I don't see her on, so...

Woman: Yes. I don't see her either.

Megan Davis: Oh. Maybe she had trouble. Okay. Well, Jocelyn, I would recommend that you work with this language and consider where you thought it fit in best. That was the language that came from Stefanie. So I'm going to move on. Then we should see that pop up at the bottom later. Sorry. It's a little hard scrolling through Google Docs sometimes. Okay. So this relates to a comment that came from Joe, to be a little more explicit. And just include voting membership on councils as part of this particular recommendation that NOAA should create joint efforts with councils.

Maybe it should say and states, to increase the number of representatives of underserved communities. Since as Meredith noted, governors - it's their prerogative as to who they

put forth as nominees for a council appointment. So I don't know if that meets what Meredith was discussing - if we add the term. Let me just make sure I'm in - adjust it.

Patrick Sullivan: Can I ask a clarifying question on that? This is Pat.

Megan Davis: Yes.

Patrick Sullivan: So Joe would - would it weaken it too much to say for underserved communities, for example, as voting members? Because obviously we want to include them in other capacities too. But I don't want a leak in your statement.

Joe Schumacker: So Pat, this is Joe. Thank you. To increase the number of representatives from underserved communities, for example, as voting members? Is that what you just said?

Patrick Sullivan: Yes. That was my suggestion. Yes. But if you feel it weakens it too much, but I just want to leave open the opportunity for putting it in other places. But if the for example keeps them from being voting members that's a problem. Right?

Joe Schumacker: I don't disagree with that. You know, the idea of being - just getting voting per person.

Patrick Sullivan: Okay. Thanks.

Megan Davis: Okay. Any other comments around these additions?

Patrick Sullivan: So I think we have - I don't know who's doing the editing. I don't have access to it. So underserved communities, for example, as voting members.

Megan Davis: There you go. Thank you, Pat.

Patrick Sullivan: Thank you.

Megan Davis: Okay. Very good. Okay. The section there. Okay. That's what you just added in, is that right, Jocelyn?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes. I just moved - yes. I moved that down and add - sorry, that should be developed - yes, develop examples. And then I added for shared learning across regions, to try and make that explicit.

Megan Davis: Okay. Yes. I see that.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes.

Megan Davis: Meredith, I see your hand's up. Would you like to comment on that?

Meredith Moore: Oh, sorry. I was trying to find a home for Joe's other comment that was left in chat. I'm not sure if it made it to the document yet. So you can come back to me.

Megan Davis: Okay. Very good. And can you remind us what the overarching recommendation is in number 6, that this ended up being added to, just at the top? Oh, okay. Okay, good.

Woman: It's linking it - it's in, specifically, the implementation guidance for regions.

Megan Davis: Yes. Yes. I think that's a great spot for it. If anybody has any other comments, I see Matt has his hand up.

Matthew Upton: Thanks. I just wanted to see if kind of the - how my suggestions around the section 5 got incorporated. If not, I have some language that might work for folks.

Megan Davis: Okay. Could you remind us on that, Matt?

Matthew Upton: It's just - if you scroll up - I wasn't sure - if you scrolled under - it's on page 9 in the middle. It's just - it's six bold ones. There is some talk of talking about how it can vary

across different regions. And I'll just put up - okay, let me - okay, there is the language that I would propose. If you scroll up a little bit.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Matthew Upton: Yes.

Heidi Lovett: So I quickly - I think this is what you were talking about. But you can modify it.

Matthew Upton: That's great. That works. I just wanted to see that language. Thanks, Heidi.

Heidi Lovett: Yes. I didn't get back to that yet. But I think that's what you were talking about.

Matthew Upton: Yes, that works. That works as well.

Megan Davis: Okay. Any other comments around that? Okay. Thanks. And Heidi, is there more after recommendation 6?

Heidi Lovett: I think - let me scroll real fast here and see if that...

Woman: If you - can we stick on number 5? I think Matt had another comment about the - under key points, that conduct the census of previous NOAA Fisheries staff. As I'm reading that recommendation a little bit more closely, I was wondering if we could get some clarity from the working group, about what was meant by this comment. I am finding myself in agreement with Matt, that I don't know what - if this is applying to labor issues. Anyway, it would be helpful to get some clarity here on this comment, if anybody remembers.

Matthew Upton: And I can speak to the concern. I mean so if someone wants to leave the agency or the council to go work somewhere, there's a process for what that involves, what you can and can't work on, and others conflicts of interest. And so I don't know if the folks who brought this concern want to change up those policies and make them different. Or

if they don't think that people should be able to work in industry or having - if they've worked on a council or for National Fisheries Service.

But I just feel it's beyond the scope of what we're trying to get at. But I'm also open to hearing why people may have felt strongly to improve that as one of the recommendations.

Meredith Moore: Jocelyn, this is Meredith. I don't recall who drafted this. So not it first.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Lukens: Megan, Brett has his hand up.

Megan Davis: Okay. Thank you, Jennifer. Brett?

Brett Veerhusen: Yes. I think I'd be in favor of nixing this recommendation. I can't remember exactly how it came about. I remember some of the conversation was around, you know, one, I think who can - because of the complexity of council process, who might also be able to serve like as a resource for folks, who are trying to get up to speed.

And so I think that was kind of like, you know, one piece. And then the other piece was around to elevate how you - how complex the system is, and how oftentimes you need to have that institutional knowledge to kind of participate, rather than just kind of everyday stakeholder. But I agree that I think it's beyond the scope, and I would be in favor of removing it.

Megan Davis: Okay. Any other comments around this topic? Thank you, Brett.

Heidi Lovett: So I believe Jocelyn just added this. It's saved...

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes, I...

Heidi Lovett: I'm sorry?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I - sorry, Heidi. I - it's pretty similar to what was under number 6, but recognizing that there may be a research component to it as well that might be worth the agency exploring. And this reminds me of the comments made by Joe and Natasha, that historical dependence on marine resources should be added to the research section.

And I would like to encourage us to think about historical dependence on marine resources to include more than just fish, but also marine mammals and seaweed and other aspects of resources that NOAA manages. So, yes, I think that's another aspect that Joe raised, that I don't want to get overlooked and that Natasha brought up as well, that I think is important to capture historical dependence.

And I think that it would be helpful to - sorry Heidi, I could probably add some language. But I think it would be helpful for us to make sure that we are explicit in that historical dependence - like research on historical dependence to be considered in management processes.

Megan Davis: That's great. While Heidi's putting that together, does anybody else have any comments on Jocelyn's suggestion? I think it's a great one to add? Joe?

Joe Schumacker: Yes. That works for me. The - with the addition of historical dependence and uses. It's not just necessarily dependence on, but uses. I just want to broaden it a little bit. Thank you.

Woman: I'm channeling Clay here. And we could also put cultural. Historical and cultural.

Clay Tam: Yes. Thank you.

Megan Davis: There you go.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: And then I think Linda's comment - I'm sorry. I should probably raise my hand.



Megan Davis: It's okay, Jocelyn. Go ahead.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I also want to give Heidi - I want to give Heidi a break in terms of what she's trying to edit. Linda, your comment about communication and outreach, I - and I think there was also - yes, communication and outreach I think maybe could go in the introduction. I think that's where you - I'm just recognizing that the comments that you made aren't being captured. So your help - help - phone a friend. Help, please.

Megan Davis: Linda, did you have a specific area to add that?

Linda ODierno: I thought in the introduction where you talk about - I think it's on top of page 2.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: So before we move to that, so does this cover show what you were - in all, what you were getting at?

Linda ODierno: So on page 2 where you talk about the current science and management practices, if you inserted in there communication and outreach, because that is a potential change in NOAA's approach.

Heidi Lovett: On top of page 2?

Linda ODierno: The current science, management, and communication outreach practices.

Heidi Lovett: Got it.

Megan Davis: That's a great addition. Heidi, were there more comments after where we left off? And Jocelyn, keep thinking about - are we sort of kicking off the list there?

Heidi Lovett: I don't think so. I just wanted to make sure I captured Joe's comment correctly. Or completely. Got to love Google Docs. So encouraging - it's - so this has two aspects - encouraging the research on historical and cultural dependence and uses of fishery resources, as well as unprotected resources. And include explicit sections in new and revised fishery management plan. I should say include explicit sections described in these, I think. Does that meet what you were noting, Joe? I don't know if you're on mute, Joe. We haven't heard your responses yet. Or others.

Megan Davis: We can't hear you, Joe. But we see that you wrote well written. So thumbs up on that. All right. Any other thoughts around this? This was a good addition as well. Are there any other comments that we haven't captured during - from the discussion that we had, during the course of the - our meeting? And Jocelyn, go ahead.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I think that Kellie made a recommendation about these comments about tribal representation on council seats, or for councils. And I'm wondering if the current additions that we've made capture that, or if the recommendation that Kellie made of investigating avenues to increase tribal representation, that might include a legal review, needs to be added.

Megan Davis: It may be up in the area where Joe and Pat were commenting. Would that be the area?

Jocelyn Runnebaum: I have to think about it. I just saw it on my list.

Megan Davis: Yes. I was just thinking - and we put as example, as voting members.

Heidi Lovett: This is Heidi. So that was section 5, which is constructing - directly confronting the structural issue of fishery management councils in the strategy. So it's - section 5 does seem to be the appropriate section.

Megan Davis: So maybe...

Heidi Lovett: And it's just a matter of - it does note that - let's see. I was just looking at the other recommendations in that section. So let me scroll up to it now. The first two on the previous page, talk about just addressing the significant role the councils play in ensuring equity and environment justice goals are achievable. That there should be significant and meaningful training for all council members on diversity, inclusion, and equity, etc.

Work with states. Create joint efforts with councils and states. And so I guess this is the issue of as Jocelyn noted, what Kellie noted, what Kellie said, was about the whole process is driven by the MSA. And should there be some legal review and potential recommendation for modifications in the MSA, to help support this point. That's how I interpreted what Kellie said. So I don't know if you want to - if that should be added; if people feel that needs to be added here.

Man: If you want to put it under that point that's highlighted in yellow there, as an additional comment, I think it would go there, if you want to do that. I certainly think it would make the statement stronger by saying examine the law.

Heidi Lovett: I agree. And Matt, do you have a comment on...

Matthew Upton: So by saying them that sounds like (unintelligible) would be advocating to change the law. I mean people may personally feel strongly about these things. So I just think that sometimes we have to be careful about it. Even though it seems like some of these obvious recommendations might not comport with the current, you know, status of the MSA. I just think we should be aware of that kind of restriction on our activities.

Woman: Good point.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Although I've been arguing that we should be changing the law quite often, or at least the national standard guidelines.

Matthew Upton: And I totally think that you should be doing that as individuals. But one of the things I think that we are charged with within MAFAC is we have set national standards, and we kind of have to work within them. And if people have their personal disagreements about them then there are ways that you can do those - that advocacy. But that's just where I am with that.

Heidi Lovett: So as a - so this is Heidi. As a group, you can make recommendations that there should be changes. And MAFAC has in the past, definitely looked at proposed - when they've been public, proposed changes to (Magnusson) Act, and other acts and have made comment on policy that's driven by those acts and laws as they are currently written. So as a group you may do that and make a recommendation to the agency, to consider, you know, as I think this was aimed at. But it's up to you to decide whether you wish to do that. It's not prohibited for you to comment on the law, if that makes sense.

Matthew Upton: Oh, I - okay. I thought that we couldn't comment that change laws and that would be outside the purview. But that's - maybe I was mistaken in that. Because that's what you - us doing when we are walking down towards that.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Heidi, I would offer the language that Kellie provided, in terms of investigating avenues to increase tribal representation.

Heidi Lovett: Okay.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: That's the note that I have. And I recognize that this is a particularly touchy and challenging issue and it's going to look different for each of the regions. So I don't know if Kellie had written down the words that she used, because they were coming out at me very - I was receiving them very well. I actually didn't capture all of them. But that was sort of the spirit of what I remember from them.

Megan Davis: So to say more than just representation, representation on the council, or...

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes.

Megan Davis: So I think that does capture what Kellie had spoken about, Jocelyn.

Patrick Sullivan: I thought there was some legal direction in her statement as well. Did you happen to capture that? Because the statement as it's - we just added is not really too different from what we had up above. And so...

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Yes.

Patrick Sullivan: ...I was responding to the sort of legal wording that she had on that investigation of blah, blah, blah, and the law.

Jocelyn Runnebaum: Thanks for that, Pat. The - I think I remember that might include legal review. Is Kellie still here? I'm sad that I'm speaking for her.

Megan Davis: She's not. But I think that's - yes, you could put that in there. I'm just thinking that I don't want to lose a quorum for a vote. So I think we're really close to having put everything in. There might be a little bit of minor editorial or grammar that might come with it. But if everybody's in agreement, if there are no other comments, I would like to put this into a vote. But just let me know if there are any further comments that are needed, because we're so close to having this document approved and ready to go. Well, I hope approved. We're going to go for vote.

So - but are there any last minute comment of anything we've looked at or any wording that people are - I see both Joe's and Matt's hands up. Do you have some quick comments, Joe, and then Matt?

Joe Schumacker: Can you hear me?

Megan Davis: We can.

Joe Schumacker: Oh, you can? Wow. Okay. Good. I'm unmuted. I just put through something in the chat there that I think the legal process that we're talking about or at least one of them, is the - during the reauthorization of the (Magnusson-Stevens) Fisheries Management Conservation Act.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Heidi Lovett: I can't see. This is Heidi. Madam Chair, if I can read the text that I drafted to insert, to capture what Kellie had. And I went looking at my notes and it - she did say just may need to be legal review of NOAA on that. That's how I captured her comment after she said investigate adding to increase tribal and indigent people's representation on the council. So it says NOAA should investigate avenues for increasing tribal and indigent community representation on councils and other advisory bodies, including legal review of options. I don't know if that captures...

Megan Davis: Yes. That leaves it kind of open. Are you good with that, Joe, rather than...

Joe Schumacker: Yes.

Megan Davis: ...giving...

Joe Schumacker: Yes. The specificity is that, you know, that's where we - that's where the rubber hit the road is during that reauthorization process. But yes, I think we're fine.

Megan Davis: Okay. Yes. Thanks for that. All right. I think - I don't see any other hands up. I think we're made incredible progress. And I'm happy we were able to get these comments into the already amazing document. So we have the motion on the floor and we have a second on the floor. We've had our discussion; we've made our changes to the document. So really at this point Brett, could I just ask you to read the motion one more time, and then we'll go to vote?

Brett Veerhusen: Yes. Let me pull it up real quick. So the motion that was made was a move to endorse and support the comment recommendations of MAFAC's Equity and Environmental Justice Committee to NOAA Fisheries on the agency's draft EEJ strategy.

Megan Davis: Okay.

Brett Veerhusen: That is the motion.

Megan Davis: Thank you for that. And Heidi, thanks for making all those changes. Maybe if it's okay with everybody, if you could close the document so that we could see everybody and I get to see the hands raised for the vote. Thanks for that. So motion on the floor, second was on the floor. Great discussion and great additions to an already very robust document. I think it's something we should be really proud about, for the committee's work and then for the additional MAFAC input.

So I'd like to go to vote. You can raise your hand for all those in favor. Okay. I need to vote. We have a unanimous vote accepting the document. The recommendations that are going to NOAA. And I just want to give a huge congratulations that I see little hands, a huge congratulations to the working group - Jocelyn for carrying the support staff of NOAA - of Heidi and Gabriela and all the comments and discussions today. So good job everyone. And really a great way to end a Tuesday.

So I think we have some concluding remarks by - oh, I like that little thing, trumpet thing Jennifer. We have some concluding remarks from Jennifer and possibly Heidi as well.

Jennifer Lukens: I couldn't find my phone. Wow guys, thank you so much for all of your efforts to the working group. Sometimes it's tough to get through these. It made it even a little more challenging doing this virtually and being able to juggle many things. And you guys got through it. So kudos to all of you. I really appreciate you all staying on a little extra longer, so we could get this over the line and not have to hold a whole other MAFAC

meeting again, to get to consensus. So I really appreciate it all. And again, for you leading us through the discussion here today.

So with that, I don't think I have anything else. Heidi, am I missing anything?

Heidi Lovett: Yes. So just I believe it's on your calendars, we - I think we put a hold on your calendars for the fall meeting, which is being planned to be in the Greater DC area. We don't have a location specified just yet, but it's the week after Thanksgiving, November 29, 30, and December 1. So we'll - once we - working with our meeting manager, once we identify a hotel and venue, etc., you will get information about that to start planning. But you can at least block off the time now on your own calendars, if you would, if you don't see it already.

Megan Davis: That's great. That's great. Looking forward to seeing everyone in the fall. And also, I know that we have committees that are still working on projects in terms of the workforce development and also protective resources. And have we - have I left anything off there, Heidi? I know those two are very active right now.

Heidi Lovett: And the Recreational Fishery Subcommittee has been - has started to work with (Ruston) and his staff, on looking at the National Saltwater Recreational Fisheries policy. I might have gotten the title of that wrong. But anyway, that is being considered internally for review and for additions and updating. And the Recreational Fishery Subcommittee is embarking on that work.

Megan Davis: Wow. Very good. And Brett?

Brett Veerhusen: Just as a reminder, what is NOAA's timeline again, for review of comments and posting a - what I would imagine would be a final draft or a final strategy? I should know this because I think it's outlined in the document.

Heidi Lovett: So the comment period was extended to the end of August. And I believe that the working group will be reviewing all the comments received through September. And I



don't have - I can find out for you the specifics of their target date for their revised draft. But I'm presuming now that it would be some time into the mid to late fall.

Brett Veerhusen: Thank you. And when the final strategy is created, how will that strategy be communicated and presented across, you know, the agency, councils, advisory committees, other decision makers?

Heidi Lovett: So I think that's a great topic to have presented to you at the November meeting.

Megan Davis: Yes. Yes. That sounds good. And we have both Sara and Meredith have their hands up. Sara?

Sara McDonald: Thanks. Do you have any updates on when the other groups and subcommittees might be convened? So the Ecosystem subcommittee, and then there were working group for a bunch of resilience related stuff that's not covered by the working - workforce development group.

Heidi Lovett: So I think I know what you're referring to, and we have - that group has not been convened as yet. I think it was a bandwidth issue both on your members' parts, as well as staff - our part. So I will go back to that particular - there is - I think you're referring to sort of one more overarching task that was linked to the workforce development related work, but has not really been kicked off as yet, correct. Is that it, Sara?

Sara McDonald: There's - you sent us a spreadsheet in May, and the title of that working group is Building Resilience in Fisheries and Seafood. I'll paste the link to the spreadsheet in here.

Heidi Lovett: Yes, and that. Yes, thank you. And that particular effort, I think I did draft something to one or two people, but I hadn't - I need to sort of tag back up with some folks that were interested in that topic. And a lot of those individuals overlapped with the EEJ group. So I think that because of the timing of this, the fast track of sort of getting this work done caused that other work to be paused. And also because the other folks were

working on those other efforts. So I will touch base with you Sara, about that, because I know you expressed interest in that.

Megan Davis: That's great. Thank you for bringing...

((Crosstalk))

Megan Davis: Yes. Thanks for that. And Meredith? Oh, no?

Meredith Moore: No, sorry. I just voted for a really long time. I didn't actually have another comment.

Megan Davis: Okay. All right. Very good. Well, for those on the Eastern side, have a great evening. For those further West, have a great afternoon. And great work. That was really a wonderful meeting. And thank you all, for your efforts. Okay. Bye for now.

Heidi Lovett: Have a good evening, everyone.

Woman: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Coordinator: That concludes today's call. You may disconnect at this time.

END