UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATIONAL MEASURES OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC RIGHT WHALE SHIP STRIKE REDUCTION STRATEGY

+ + + + + MONDAY,

AUGUST 14, 2006

+ + + + +

The public hearing came to order at 1:18 p.m. in the Auditorium of the O'Neill Federal Building, 10 Causeway Street, Boston, Massachusetts. Laurent Cartayrade, moderator, presiding.

PRESENT:

Laurent Cartayrade, Earth Tech
Jessica Gribbon, Earth Tech
Richard Blankfeld, Nathan Associates
Greg Silber, Office of Protected Resources
Shannon Bettridge, Office of Protected Resources

I-N-D-E-X

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Laurent Cartayrade
Greg Silber!
Jessica Gribbon 19
Richard Blankfeld 25
Public Comment 46
Adjourn

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

2

1

(1:18 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CARTAYRADE: Good afternoon and welcome to the public hearing for the draft EIS for the Operational Measure of the North Atlantic White Whale Ship Strike Reduction Strategy. My name is Laurent Cartayrade, I am with Earth Tech. Earth Tech is the firm that is preparing the EIS,

that has prepared the draft EIS.

And I would like to introduce some of the people we have with us here today to listen to your comments and, later on, if we have any time left, to talk with you and answer questions you From Earth Tech, as well, we have may have. Jessica Gribbon who is the project manager for the EIS and who has been the main person responsible Working with Jessica, we have for the document. Richard Blankfeld from Nathan Associates Richard was in charge of the economic analysis of the EIS which, as I'm sure you know, is a big part of the document. Finally, most important, we have Office representatives of **NMFS** of Protected

Resources who have been working on the strategy.

We have Greg Silber and Shannon Bettridge who are
here from headquarters in Silver Spring, Maryland.

What's going to happen today is we are first going to have a brief presentation to summarize the issues and refresh your memory with regard to the approach of the proposed measures and the EIS. Following the presentation, we will have a period to take comments. Many of you have signed up for comments, so what we'll do is we will call your name in the order of when you signed in and we will ask you to step up here and make your comment.

This is a comment meeting, that is we will be taking them, there will be no response from the agency. The response to the comments that will be made today will be provided in the final EIS, which will be a revision of the draft EIS based precisely on the comments received.

Finally, today is one opportunity to make comments on the EIS, it's not the only one, it's part of an entire review period for the draft

NEAL R. GROSS

EIS. There are other ways for which comments can be submitted, either in writing or by e-mail, or even by fax. Those of you who picked up the fact sheets at the door, most of the fact sheets, that is those that are 8 1/2 x 11, all of them have the contact information with the mailing address, fax number and e-mail address that you can send written comments to, if you do not speak today or also for people who may not have the opportunity to be here.

I think that covers my introduction so, without further ado, I would like to introduce again Mr. Greg Silber who is going to start with the presentation for today.

Greg?

MR. SILBER: Thank you, Laurent.

I also want to mention that Kristin Koyama is here, she is also with our agency, she works in the Northeast Regional Office. As Laurent said, my name is Dr. Greg Silber, I work with the Office of Protected Resources in Silver Spring, Maryland, and I want to thank you all for

NEAL R. GROSS

turning out today, it's nice to see the size of the turnout. I see a number of familiar faces in the audience and that's because I think we have been working together on this for a number of years, it's an issue we are all trying to grapple with.

Laurent said, one of the main purposes today is to hear your public comments on the draft environmental impact statement and you also have the opportunity to do so in writing by e-mail, hard copy, fax, whatever, but we are here today to hear what you have to say. To the extent possible, we ask for specific comments. If there is something about what we are doing that you have data that might have direct bearing on it, we need those desperately, whether it's economics, biological or whatever, those are the kinds of information that we need.

I think you probably wouldn't be here if you didn't realize the situation we are grappling with and that is a highly depleted population of North Atlantic Right Whales. There

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are about 300 individuals in the population, we could perhaps quibble about the exact number. I hope we don't put a lot of time and energy into the actual number, whether the population is dramatically increasing, decreasing or static, the fact of the matter is there are not enough of them. One of the main known threats to Right Whales is that of collisions with ships.

If you look at the last decade and a half or so, the average number of known ship strike deaths is on the order of one to two per year, 19 known ship strikes since 1986, three since 2004, three additional that are probable, and I say that only because the actual cause of death could not be determined definitively, a number of them have been pregnant females. Quite frankly, ladies and gentlemen, we are between a rock and a hard place, again a highly depleted population, one in which we are facing the main known threat and that is ship strikes.

As you probably know, the agency is under litigation as we speak, we were petitioned

NEAL R. GROSS

to issue these regulations by emergency regulation, the petition was denied and a lawsuit I'm here to tell you that it's not only, ensued. at the moment, it's an East Coast, U.S. issue, but it's becoming an international issue. I've been to a number of meetings and conferences in which large whale ship strikes, globally, is becoming one of greater visibility. The International Whaling Commission has formed a working group to address it specifically and, as recently as June of this year, the IWC sent its recommendations and its progress report to the International Maritime Organization.

As you know, especially in this region, the fishing industry has been regulated to reduce the probability of entanglement in fishing gear and that particular industry is quite vocal about our addressing ship strikes. There is congressional interest. For example, we had the opportunity to address a letter to the president from six senators asking us why we have not issued these regulations. The point of this slide is to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

indicate to you that it is a range-wide issue, actually the demarcations there are a little bit outdated but my point is that it occurs throughout the range of this population.

Often times Ι questions get regionally, tell me exactly how many ship strikes in my waters, but these animals migrate and often times can drift in death, so we can't often pinpoint exactly where a ship strike occurred, but the threat exists throughout their range. different kinds of injuries, blunt trauma, hemorrhaging, propeller marks, etcetera, all segments of the population are affected.

This is, in a nutshell, what we set out to do and what we have ultimately done, to this point. In the center there is our overall Right Whale ship strike reduction strategy. We sat down a number of years ago and decided to approach this comprehensively, wanted we to do our homework, we gathered all of the data information we could, both on whales as well as We held, in the course of an advanced vessels.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

notice of proposed rule making, I think either eight or nine East Coast meetings up and down the East Coast at various ports, we held five public hearings, we had six or so face to face meetings with industry, we've met with stakeholders at various times, comment periods on the ANPR, comment periods on the notice of intent to prepare and EIS and what you are seeing today is a result of those kinds of discussions.

short, we have five basic What we are here to talk about today, elements. the subject of the rule making and the EIS are what we call operational measures for the vessels and to make a distinction that one of them, mostly speed restrictions are contained in the proposed rule making, but there are other kinds of routing measures that would affect vessels that we are pursuing through other avenues. The importance of this is we didn't want to forsake the things we have already going, this includes mandatory ship reporting systems, the aircraft surveys, getting information out to mariners, etcetera.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mentioned here also that people say, often people say to me why don't you just tell us where the animals are and we'll take proper steps? The fact of the matter is we have been doing aircraft surveys for more than decade, that information is routinely passed to mariners. We are embarking on enhancing, improving and implementing comprehensive а education and outreach program for mariners, we are working on a bilateral agreement with Canada. These are animals that are transboundary in their range and we are attempting, to the extent that we there is cooperation can, ensure that collaboration across the border.

We plan to, or have already, conducted what we call consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. These are for other federal agencies, ones that operate, contract, or permit vessels.

Just by way of broad overview, there is two basic kinds of tools that we are using, one are seasonal management areas, the second,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

dynamically managed areas, these occur in specific locations and at specific times. We have attempted to limit these as concisely as we can, both geographically and temporally.

And one of the main reasons, one of sat down to do when the things we we were developing this was to look at each measure with respect its conservation value, its to effectiveness in protecting the animals, but also respect to known or potential impacts to the industry. We were very well aware of that when we set out and, again, it was the effectiveness of the measure, the economic impact and the feasibility in terms of how we could get them implemented.

Most of the measures, not all, certainly a little further offshore in New England waters, but a lot of them, the majority, occur within about 30 nautical miles of the shore, they would apply to all vessels 65 feet and greater, with the exception of federal vessels. The reason for this exemption is because we didn't presume

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nor want to affect the operations of the vital missions, the national security, search and rescue, other vital missions that are carried out by various federal agencies but, again, the nexus, the hook for us it to bring those agencies to the table to provide consultation and provide conservation measures that those agencies can undertake.

This is a snapshot of the types of measures that we are looking at. If you look at the Mid Atlantic, these are bubbles or 30 nautical mile radii around key ports. The reason that we did this was we calculated that these are the areas in which the whales or the density of the whales and the density of ships would coincide. The alternative of course was sweeping broadly seasonal or defined areas, but would include the entire range of the animals. Instead, to reduce economic impact, we tried to focus these areas. In the Southeast, again, about 30 nautical miles from the shore, at certain times of the year, and New England, a little more complicated, various

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

times and various locations, but tightly defined seasonally.

With respect to speed restrictions, a quick overview on the types of information we considered, we have on the order of about 300 records of known ship strikes of all large whale species, not just Right Whales. In about 50 to 60 of these, the fate of the animal was known as well as the speed of the ship. If you look at those data grossly, the average speed was about knots, and in around 80 percent or so, the speed was 13 knots or greater. Two known, definitive ship strikes of Right Whales were at 22 and 15 knots. Some time ago, in the mid and late `90s, computer simulations that suggest that speed is a fact in that the bow wake would repel an object in the water, whereas it would be drawn toward the ship amidships.

Two fairly recent papers, one presented late, actually both of them presented late `05 at a conference, and now in press, in the scientific literature, which suggest that if you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

look at speed on this axis, probably of looking only at death or serious injury to the large whale, once you get above about 20, I can't see it exactly from here, 20 to 25 knots, the probability of a death or serious injury is at 100 percent. As you come down in speed, once you get down to around 15, 14-15 knots, the probability is about 75 percent. When you get down around 10 knots, it's still about a 40 percent probability that death will occur or serious injury.

One question I often get is if you look at the distribution of these speeds, known fate of the animal, how does that compare to what most ships are doing? This paper also looked at data from the mandatory ship reporting system in which speeds are reported to us. If you look distribution of at the these, they differ significantly from these, that is these occurred at higher speeds than what most of the ship population is doing.

What I just discussed is mostly having, is contained in the proposed rule making,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

but there are a couple of other measures that we are taking, have mostly to do with routing, that are not part of the proposed rules but we are addressing in different ways. These are recommended routes, one set in Cape Cod Bay and a series of recommended routes off of, in the waters off of this Southeast U.S., Georgia-Florida border.

I wouldn't look too closely at where these actually lie because they are being modified in some ways, but these will, hopefully we will have these charted some time in the coming months, they will be recommended. They are based on reducing, analysis to reduce the risk of ship strikes.

This is an activity that's pretty far along, it has to do with the traffic separation scheme entering and exiting Boston. Analysis, both internal and external, from my agency suggests that if you move the traffic separation scheme three to four miles north and you narrow it, you reduce the probability, the risk of a ship

NEAL R. GROSS

strike to Right Whales by nearly 60 percent, you reduce it over 80 percent for other large baleen whales that are occurring in those waters.

This has been prepared and submitted to the International Maritime Organization, it was submitted by the U.S. Government in April, We learned not long ago it cleared the first subcommittee and has been passed to the committee or will be submitted to the full committee in Fall, `06. We'll learn by around the end of the year, December, `06, whether it was approved and we should be able to implement it by mid `07.

Another thing that we are considering, actually more than considering, we are in the process of developing a proposal, is an area to be avoided in Great South Channel. This is sort of a term of art that means a lot more to the International Maritime Organization than it does to me, but, nonetheless, it will be in the waters of Great South Channel at certain times of the year, affecting only ships 300 gross tons and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

greater. We are developing the proposal now, we plan to submit it to the IMO in April, `07.

Back to this diagram of the strategy itself and its various components, again we are focusing mostly today, and in this rule making process and the EIS on operational measures, ship speed, as well as the routing measures I just mentioned. The rule making is following this Here is the draft environmental impact path. statement, obviously it has a bearing on this side, but here is the process, routing measures. It's doing the analysis and ultimately this path is headed towards a final rule. Once we get your comments, the comment period ends, we'll synthesize, analyze those and, as need be, make modifications to the final rule.

I think this will come up also in the subsequent talks, but the comment period on the proposed rule has been extended as of today, perhaps yesterday, to the 5th of October, so we've aligned the culmination of the comment periods so that, for the draft environmental impact

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

statement, it too will end on the 5th of October, as will the comment period for the rule making, and then the final box of course is an implementation.

And now I have the pleasure of passing the mic on to Jessica, who is going to tell you a little bit more about the DEIS itself and the process.

MS. GRIBBON: Hi. My name is Jessica and I've been working with NOAA over the last year and a half, almost two years on this environmental impact statement.

I'm going to start this portion of the presentation with giving you a little bit of background on the National Environmental Policy Act, which we also refer to as NEPA. All agencies of the federal government must consider the potential impacts of their actions on both the human and the natural environment. Because NOAA's rule making is a major federal action, an EIS was prepared.

This is a summary of a typical EIS

NEAL R. GROSS

process that we summarized in seven steps, the first step was the notice of intent that was published in the Federal Register in June of last year. Following this publication, we had a 30 day comment period where we received comments on the alternatives first mentioned and the notice of intent. After about a year of research and revising the document to reflect these comments, NOAA issued a notice of availability for the environmental impact statement on July 7th of 2006.

Right now, we are in the fourth stage of this process which are the public hearings and the comment period and, as Greg mentioned, this was also extended for the EIS. After NOAA receives all the comments, the document will be revised to reflect some of these comments and then we move on to the final EIS. The final EIS will also be available for at least a 30 day public review and, after this period, the agency can then go ahead with their record of decision. This is the final preferred alternative and the final rule

NEAL R. GROSS

that the agency will go on the record with choosing at this stage.

One of the requirements of NEPA is that the agency clearly states what the purpose and need of the proposed action is. In this case, it's to reduce the number and severity of vessel collisions with the North Atlantic Right Whale, thereby contributing to the recovery and sustainability of the species while minimizing the effects on the shipping industry and maritime commerce.

Another requirement of NEPA is that the agency consider and evaluate reasonable alternatives to meet the purpose and need. In this case, NMFS has considered six alternatives and each alternative is a set of the operational measures.

Alternative one is the no action alternative. Although this is not a viable alternative, NEPA dictates that it is measured as a baseline to assess the impacts of the other alternatives. Under this alternative, no new

NEAL R. GROSS

operational measures would be implemented, it would simply be the continuation of some of the current conservation measures that Greq mentioned.

Alternative two would implement dynamic management areas within the exclusive economic zone or 200 nautical miles of the shore. Certain triggers, certain aggregations of whales would trigger a dynamic management area, in which case the agency would draw a buffer zone with speed restrictions, although this alternative would rely on an increased survey effort in order to site these aggregations that would trigger them.

Alternative three is a little bit different and includes year round speed restrictions in the Northeastern U.S. region. Speed restrictions in the Mid Atlantic would take place from October 1st to April 30th in all waters 25 nautical miles out from Providence, Rhode Island to Savannah, Georgia. In the Southeastern U.S., speed restrictions would include all waters

in the mandatory ship reporting system south area, in addition to the southeast Right Whale critical habitat waters, and these restrictions would be in place from December 1 to March 31st, corresponding with the Right Whale calving season.

Alternative four includes routing measures only, there would be no speed restrictions associated with this alternative and this alternative includes the recommended routes, as Greg mentioned, the Boston traffic separation scheme realignment and also an area to be avoided in the Great South Channel.

Alternative five combines all these previous alternatives, one through four.

And finally, alternative six is the agency's preferred alternative which includes speed restrictions in the three regions, as Greg mentioned, who you can also see on the board to my right, and also the recommended shipping routes in both the Northeastern U.S. and Southeastern U.S. regions.

An EIS includes a description of the

NEAL R. GROSS

affected environment, and in this EIS, considered the following resources: The Right Whale and other marine species such as marine mammals and sea turtles, the physical environment, which includes air quality, water quality and also ocean noise levels. And then the vessel operations considered approximately 12 types. And in addition to that, different types of shipping such as multiport string vessels and also coastwise shipping. We looked at 26 port areas from Eastport, Maine all the way to Cape Canaveral, Florida, and then other areas that we considered cultural were resources and environmental justice communities.

After describing the affected environment, an EIS analyzes the impacts on these resources. I'm not going to go into the detail today on the impacts of these resources because, if you read the EIS, you know I would be up here all afternoon but, if you would like to know more, feel free to grab a CD of the EIS, it's also available on-line, or we have several reference

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

copies. However, I will emphasize a couple of key points on how we evaluated some of the more significant impact areas.

With regard to the Right Whale, we couldn't quantify the impacts but, based on what we know, and Greg gave you an idea of the available data on the associated, the ship speed associated with ship strikes, we fully expect ship strikes to be reduced and the population to have a positive impact on their recovery.

The other point I would like to make is how we evaluated the economic impacts. And to present this, I give you our economist, to talk about his approach to analyzing the economic impacts. Richard Blankfeld from Nathan Associates.

MR. BLANKFELD: Thank you, Jessica.

As she mentioned, my name is Richard Blankfeld, I'm with Nathan Associates. We are a subcontractor to Earth Tech that was retained actually back in October of 2004 to start looking at the economic impact of the, at that time,

NEAL R. GROSS

advanced notice of proposed rule making and we have been engaged ever since, having various drafts looking at the economic impact of these proposed measures.

I would like to say that where we are today, we have available on the website a two volume set which has the main report of economic impacts, that's part of the draft EIS, and also an appendix volume that provides some more sensitivity analysis and supporting documentation, and the website where these are fact available the sheets that are on available I guess at the front table and also there will be another slide that comes up here towards the end of this presentation where you can copy down the e-mail again.

I also have a handout, which I think we have enough for everyone in the room today, if I could ask my colleagues here to just help distribute these. While those are being handed out, I would also like to add that I see a number of familiar faces in the room this afternoon,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that's primarily from those who participated in some of the stakeholder meetings that we conducted last fall on a draft economic impact report that was available. And indeed, there was a series of actually five stakeholder meetings that we held, one of which was here in Boston, another one in Jacksonville, Savannah, Charleston and Hampton Roads, and also there were a series of meetings in Washington with some of the industry association members.

I would like to take a few minutes here to quickly go through the approach to the economic analysis and I realize that my comments here are the only thing between that and our receiving your comments here today, which indeed the primary purpose for us to be here. So I'll indeed try to keep these brief, and further information all of this methodology on contained in the reports that I have already mentioned. When we were asked to say, well, how this affect will the proposed operational measures, how will it affect the shipping industry

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and other affected sectors of the economy, the first thing we tried to do was to say what are the number, what are the vessels that really will be impacted by this?

And what we tried to do, as Jessica mentioned, the rules are affecting 26 port areas along the U.S. East Coast and we searched for what is the best data source, the most comprehensive data source on vessels coming into the U.S. East Coast? It was quickly apparent from the reviews that we conducted that the U.S. Coast Guard Vessel Arrival Data Set, which they maintain on keeping track of every single vessel that's 150 gross registered tons or greater, calling into all ports, but we have the part of the data set that dealt with the U.S. East Coast ports that are affected by this and we obtained this information for a three year period from 2002 through 2004.

Just to give you an idea, during that period, the data set included vessel arrivals of over 83,000 arrivals of vessels at U.S. East Coast ports and those 83,000 arrivals were conducted by

NEAL R. GROSS

over 7,300 individual vessels. What that means, as many of you in the industry know, many of these vessels called repeatedly throughout the year and indeed that's why the number of vessels, even though it's a huge number at 7,300, is still much less than the total number of arrivals themselves. And we looked at this data by vessel type, these that were in the report, it's types of vessels that are commonly used in the industry, such as container ships, dry bulk carriers, passenger ferries, tankers, etcetera.

for all of also, those vessel types, we identified vessel size ranges that are relevant to those vessel types and, all together, we had 18 vessel dead weight size ranges analyzed, and we also looked at these vessel arrivals by the time, by the date which they occurred. Because as Greg mentioned, under some of the alternatives, actually all of the alternatives, there seasonal measures in which the speed restrictions would be put in place for certain months of the And we looked at the seasonality and the year.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

period when the vessel arrivals historically have occurred to understand indeed which vessels would be affected in which port areas at specific points of the year.

Once we identified the number of vessels to be affected, we then said, well, what will be the impact on these vessels in physical terms? And, by that, we mean, if you are talking about a speed restriction, the primary physical impact is to take more time for the vessel to slow down and for it to require additional time to come in and out of the U.S. East Coast. And we looked at these, the range of 10 knots to 14 knots, which is in the proposed, which was in the proposed rule at that time.

In looking at the speed, the impact of the speed restriction, we took into account specific characteristics of each port area. For example, the location of the pilot buoys at different port entrances. You say, well, gee, how does that affect this analysis? Well it's been pointed out in prior studies, and by the industry

NEAL R. GROSS

and some of the environmental groups as well, actually they have all chimed in on this, that the vessels, when they approach a U.S. East Coast port, in most cases, have to pick up a pilot at the pilot buoy. Well, in order to do that, they generally slow down between, to around 8 to 10 knots anyway. So, depending on where the location of the pilot buoy is at the access to each port, hence, since they are already slowing down to pick up a pilot, the effective distance of the proposed regulation is less than what's just nominally stated in the proposed rule.

For example, if it was proposed to be a semicircle of 25 nautical miles offshore and the pilot buoy is located four miles off shore, then we were saying the effective distance was only 21 nautical miles. In addition to this, we also looked at other factors such as vessels having to slow down or speed up. A good example of this, we were just in Baltimore last week at a public hearing and I mentioned how the rule would apply only to what we call the deep water, the area

NEAL R. GROSS

outside of a COLREGS line, for those who are marine oriented.

Basically that means it's offshore, deep water, and in the area, say, of Hampton Roads and the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay. What that means is, well I'll just point, this map isn't going to do it. It basically means the regulation is in effect on the area, if you connect it from one point of land to the nearest other point at Chesapeake Bay, the rule is only in effect on the outside of that, not inside Chesapeake Bay itself.

Why is that important? Okay, well, vessels would have to slow down prior to hitting the speed restriction, say, 25 nautical miles offshore, and it takes, and in order to be at 10 or 14 knots when they hit that area, it's been pointed out by the industry, and we have adopted this, that vessels can take up to 30 minutes to an hour in advance in order to slow down from their normal sailing speed to when they will be able to be going somewhere between 10 and 14 knots in the

restricted area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Once they leave the restricted area and start sailing up, I'm very excited by this analysis. I would say leave the restricted area, start sailing up the Chesapeake Bay, they then need to take time to resume back to normal operating speed, so these are included. trying to just give you a flavor of the detail that we've run into. In each of the port areas, we've looked at when they would need to slow down, how long that would be in order to reach the restricted speed, and then how much time it would also take to speed up afterwards. I'll mention it does not affect, that particular impact doesn't apply to all port areas, it really depends on where the restrictions are relative to the shoreline.

Another example of the detail that was used in the analysis, under one of the alternatives that Jessica highlighted, alternative three, rather than having speed restrictions be defined as a semicircle offshore of each port

area, under alternative three, that had blanket speed restrictions for 25 miles off the entire U.S. Mid Atlantic East Coast, and that extends from Providence all the way to Brunswick or through Savannah.

What that means for me, as an economist, well, when you look at vessel traffic coming in and out of a U.S. East Coast port, the vessels don't sail southbound, and then make a right turn and go in perpendicular to the shore to enter the port, what they do is they take the shortest, safest distance that they can travel.

So, if they are coming down the U.S. East Coast, they would actually enter most of these port areas at a diagonal, and hence, when you look at the effective distance of how long they have to sail through a blanket restriction that's parallel to the coast, they would be coming in at an angle, instead of coming in just the width of that effective distance. So, for those reasons, we've increased, we have in the report shown how taking into account the actual sailing

NEAL R. GROSS

routes, what is the effective distance that the speed restriction would be in place under that type of an alternative.

Another type of impact that we looked which out of the comments in came stakeholder meetings was the cumulative effect of impacts at multi ports. For instance, especially in the Mid Atlantic region, many of the speed restrictions would be in place at the same time of the year and container ships and railroad ships calling at New York, Hampton Roads, Savannah, then there are other ports, multiport strings that we have identified, the industry would say that indeed the impact on us of those three vessels calls, all during the restriction period, is greater than just summing up the impact And we looked into that and indeed have of each. concluded in the current version of the economic analysis a factor in an amount relative to that cumulative impact.

Moving on. Once we talk about the time and the physical impact of the operational

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

measures, how do we put that into economic terms? How do we value that? And what we've used for this analysis is vessel operating costs that are prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. of know of them, Perhaps some you they referred to as the vessel operating costs for Deep Draft vessels and the data that we were provided from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was through Again, based on our own observations and inputs from the industry, we realized that those operating costs reflect bunker fuel prices from 2004 and now here we are in 2006 and the world has changed quite dramatically, in terms of where fuel prices are.

We have been able to update our analysis and to update their formula on how they include fuel prices as part of the total operating cost to include, at the moment, we have bunker prices as of October, 2005 in the current analysis that's available and we'll be able to update that to more recent 2006 data when we go to the final version of the economic impact for the EIS itself.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So what do we do? We take the hourly operating cost of vessels, apply that to the delays that have been estimated by each type of vessel in terms of hours of delay and we calculate the total direct economic impact on the shipping industry.

The numbers that we have come up with are in some of the handouts and people say, well, gee, what does this mean, 30 million, 50 million, 100 million? It's hard to place that number, for many lay people, in an economic context. What we've done in the analysis is shown that number vis-à-vis two other economic indicators, if you will, one is the comparison of the economic, the value of the economic impact with the total value of imports and exports that enter the U.S. East Coast.

As an economist, I wanted to see, well, gee, are we looking at an economic impact that would be so significant that it could even change the demand for U.S. traded goods and the demand for shipping industry services? And when we looked at the numbers, you know, what we found

NEAL R. GROSS

was that the proposed, the estimated economic impact of the proposed strategy constituted 1/100 of one percent of the value of the traded goods. So, in terms of, if you are saying, gee, as a consumer here, if the industry passed along the cost of this economic impact to society through economic prices, one could say it might have an impact of 1/100 of one percent of the value of goods that are either produced or consumed along the U.S. East Coast. Another measure of the impact is how does it affect the shipping industry itself?

And as an indicator of the magnitude of the shipping industry on the U.S. East Coast, we took a look at the maritime freight charges that are estimated as part of the total imported value of the goods. This is data that's the Department of maintained by Commerce imports and, generally, the freight charges, while it varies by commodity, when you take an overall average, and it varies by port area too, based on the commodities that are handled, but generally,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they are somewhere between five to eight percent of the value of the goods.

When you look at that number and the economic impact relative to the value of maritime freight charges, it represents somewhere on the order of magnitude of 2/10 of one percent of ocean freight charges. That could be said that the ocean freight charges are a proxy for the revenues of the shipping industry associated with the transportation of these goods so, hence, it would be 2/10 of one percent of the revenues of the industry. We also, I've been focusing, up to now, most of the discussion on the impact on the commercial shipping industry because, frankly, it's the industry that has the largest dollar impact due to its significance along the U.S. East Coast, but we also took a look at other industries as well.

Passenger ferries, who I know are represented by a number of operators here in the room today, in general, these regs do not apply to the vast majority of passenger ferries that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

operate on the U.S. East Coast. The reason for that, again, is because these apply offshore. Most of the passenger ferries inside New York Harbor, inside, the Cape May Ferry, others, they all, those operate inside what's called the COLREGS lines, and hence, would not be affected at all by these proposed regulations.

There are though some passenger ferry operations, such as those up here in the Cape Cod Bay, some of which also to Block Island that would be affected by these regulations and we've included an estimate of the economic impact on those types of operations in this analysis.

Another sector that would be affected is the whale watching industry and many people find that a bit ironic, but indeed, in order for the whale watching industry to serve its clients, it needs to get the people out to the whale watching areas quickly and to bring them back quickly, so they can maximize the amount of time that they are in areas where whale watching would be most interesting.

NEAL R. GROSS

at speeds well in excess of the proposed speed restrictions and, in some of the alternatives, the speed restrictions are also proposed for what is considered high season for whale watching. So we have estimated the impact of those high speed whale watching vessels that have to either slow down during those periods or switch to vessels of a shorter length that would not be affected. I don't think that was really mentioned in the earlier presentations, so let me just highlight that a bit.

All of the regulations that have been proposed here today affect only vessels 65 feet or greater so, indeed, some of the whale watching vessels and some of the charter fishing vessels, which I'll get to in a minute, those are already under 65 foot in length and would not be affected at all by these regulations. But what we are really looking at, in terms of the economic impact, are the larger vessels in categories, especially those that are high speed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

vessels.

I mentioned charter fishing, it's actually a similar concept to the whale watching, they want to get their clients quickly out to the fishing areas. You don't want to make a half day fishing trip into a whole day fishing trip only because of the increased time of getting in and getting out to the areas where you can do the fishing. And indeed, we have looked at the impact on those industries as well of having to make some of the larger charter fishing head boats have to slow down.

The other sector that's listed there is the commercial fishing industry, obviously that's an important industry up here in New England. By and large, the majority of those vessels are not affected at speed restrictions of 12 knots or 14 knots, it's only if the speed restrictions is at 10 knots do some of those vessels start to get affected and we've included an estimate in the economic analysis of indeed a speed restriction of 10 knots and how that might

NEAL R. GROSS

affect the time that commercial fishing vessels take to go out on their fishing trips.

I think that summarizes the overall approach to the economic analysis and, indeed, I would like to refer you to the reports that are available on the Web for more information on any elements of that.

At this point, I would like to turn it back to Laurent, who will have some concluding remarks and I think some logistics to mention as well.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you, Richard. Yes, mostly logistics.

Just a reminder that we are, and as has been stated during the presentation, that we are dealing here with really two processes that are shown here and what we are dealing with today is the EIS, the big blue arrow there, and comments on the EIS. There was also parallel to that a rule making process, which also has its own channel for comments, and one of the differences is that there are two different e-mail addresses.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now we have the same deadline for both processes, since the deadlines have been extended, which is October 5th, but the processes themselves remain different.

I think this will conclude our presentation and a reminder that the URL is there for the website that may contain more information than what you had so far and, with that, I would like to move on to the next phase of our meeting today which is the comments.

A couple of housekeeping issues, one thing I would like to remind everybody is that we are recording this meeting, we have a court reporter there, and that everything that is being said today is and will be on the public record, so it is just a statement I wanted to, something I wanted to remind you of.

The other thing, in terms of the format of the comments, we are going to be calling your names in the order that you signed in. We'll ask you to step up here and make your comment. We ask that, as much as possible, you stay within

NEAL R. GROSS

five minutes, which I found by experience, actually plenty of time, but under five minutes There will be no, as I stated would be great. earlier, there will be no response to comments directly, the response will be the final EIS which will be prepared following the conclusion of the comment period.

And I would like to apologize in advance for the way I'm going to be saying your names because, first, I have to read them off the sign-in sheets and then, even assuming I got those right, I have to pronounce them right. So hopefully you will recognize yourselves when I call you and, in advance, I apologize for, some of them actually are going to be easy for me this time, but not all of them. If you will be patient with us for a couple of minutes, we are just going to reorganize our little set up here and it's going to take a couple of minutes, and then we will start with the comments.

(Whereupon, at 2:10 p.m., there was a brief pause until 2:12 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 MR. CARTAYRADE: We'll be ready to start in a minute, perhaps less than a minute. 2 The first speaker today will be Mr. 3 4 Ed Welch. 5 WELCH: Good afternoon, ladies MR. and gentlemen. I'm Ed Welch, I'm Legislative 6 7 Director for the Passenger Vessel Association of Alexandria, Virginia. We are a national trade 8 9 association that represents U.S. flag passenger 10 vessels of all types with roughly about members representing several thousand vessels. 11 With respect to the rule making here 12 13 today, we are talking primarily about ferries and whale watching vessels. All of our members that 14 15 are affected by this are small businesses under 16 the U.S. Small Business Administration guidelines. would like to commend 17 And Т National Marine Fisheries Service, to begin with, 18 19 by responding positively to some of our comments and our meetings and previous activities where we 20 pointed out that, up until basically last year, 21 the agency was assuming this rule making dealt 22

with deep sea, commercial cargo vessels and didn't have much of an impact on the types of vessels that my association represents. And after several insistent arguments on our part that you needed to expand your scope, you did and we appreciate it.

I want to commend particularly Mr. Blankfeld and his work because it does, he did look carefully at how it affects whale watching vessels and ferries and has some analysis, and we appreciate that because this rule making, in your own words, has a disproportionate impact on our segment of the industry compared to other segments of the industry.

I don't think it's a stretch to say that rule, proposed, the as threatens the existence of ferry service in the Northeast to Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket Provincetown, Block Island as the New England community has accustomed to under the grown current circumstances. I'll explain why I reached that conclusion in just a second.

So the question is how can the rule

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

making be adjusted so that all the whales can be protected but the ferries and also the whale watching vessels can operate economically and serve their customers? We, the PVA, believe and we agree with the EIS that probably, with the exception of the interest of Delaware Bay, proposed seasonal speed limit zones are not going to have unreasonable impacts on ferries and whale watching vessels. Fortunately for and us fortunately for the whales, our prime seasons of operations in Cape Cod Bay, and off Race Point and in some of the other places do not overlap with the prime seasons the whales are there, so that's good for everybody all around.

The real problem is with the dynamic management zones as in the proposed rule. The way we understand it, the zones will be automatically of a duration of more than two weeks, 15 days, unless NMFS affirmatively removes them. They will be, at a minimum, 36 or more miles in diameter and so a significant area of ocean will be affected. Basically what we are concerned about is that the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DMA is overlaid to one of our ferry's typical routes, say, across Cape Cod Bay or out to Nantucket, in the prime of our season, your own analysis suggests that the rational response of the operator would be to cease operating for those two weeks and we agree with that, most of these operators can not economically carry passengers at 10 knots on these routes.

Where we do take some issue with your economic analysis in that the impact is not just those two weeks. If our people have to shut down for two weeks in the prime of the season, and then the DMA goes off after 15 days, things just don't resort to where they were pre DMA. The customers won't come back, the revenues of those two weeks may be the crucial revenues for whether company makes a profit that year or not. Remember, we are talking about operating seasons that are not 365 days long, we are talking about operating seasons that might be 90 days or perhaps 120, so you take days out of that and that's a meaningful reduction of revenue capacity.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So what can we do? How can we come up with something that effects, protects dealing with whales without economically an crippling blow to the ferry operators and the whale watching operators? Although I will have to say that NMFS' own data, as I analyze it, shows no instance of either a confirmed or a suspected strike of a Right Whale in either Canadian or U.S. East Coast waters by a ferry or whale watching So it's a little bit hard for our people why they are being understand asked what they consider to be undertake responses when they have not been implicated even by suspicion in any of the whale strikes.

If you look at the strikes that were known, they weren't our people. If you look at the strikes that are unknown derivation, most of those are in geographic areas where our people weren't operating or weren't even close. But we are not going to sit here and say our people pose no threat to the whales. That's foolish, we understand that. Potentially, they could pose a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

threat to the whales. We would like to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service and see if there is some alternative to the DMAs as you have proposed them. For example, and we don't have the exact magic answer, our vessels are much smaller than the deep sea vessels. They are more maneuverable, they don't weigh anywhere close to the same amount.

it necessary to have the regulatory regime for these relatively smaller vessels as it is for the large cruise ships and container ships? We think perhaps there might be a way where you could come up with a two-tiered that would lessen approach to the DMAs the economic impact on us and still deal with the potential threat to the whales. We would like to work with you and see if you would consider that. What might that constitute? We don't have an Out in San Francisco Bay, some of the answer. ferries out there are looking at some special forward looking radar to avoid whale collisions, that might be something to look at.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Our vessels operate only in the day so the question about visibility of whales at night is not a problem, so maybe if we had a dedicated spotter on board, that would help during these DMAs. Do the DMAs have to be as large as you proposed? Do the speed limits have to be down to 10 knots? After all, most of your documents, up until this most recent permeation, we are talking about 12 or 14 and most of your data indicates that most of the problem is at 12, or 14 or higher, so we don't have a specific proposal today as to how to address this DMA for ferries and whale problem but, watching vessels, what you've got now is potentially a business killer.

And while we don't want to be perceived as uncooperative in the rule making, when our folks come to us and come to you and say, look, we don't see, if a DMA, if the whales behaved in an out of character situation where they showed up out of season in an area that doesn't have a seasonal speed limit, we realize

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that's an irregular situation, it's an unpredictable situation but, if a DMA is imposed on us, our routes, it could be potentially a business killer. We have got a couple of members that will explain that a little bit more in their testimony today.

Two other points I would like to make. The documents and the statements here today have indicated that your seasonal speed limits apply outside the COLREGS line, I think that needs clarifying in your final regulations. It's not clear to me that the regulations themselves say that, they talk about a radius from a certain point. I think if you used the phrase seaward of the COLREGS lines, that would help clarify that.

The second question I have is what about the DMAs, are they only to be imposed outside the COLREGS lines because, if they aren't, Richard Blankfeld's comments that ferries, like the Cape May Louis Ferry, aren't affected at all by these regulations would have to be revised because the Cape May Louis Ferry, for example,

NEAL R. GROSS

across the mouth of Delaware Bay, if all these rules apply outside COLREGS, is not affected but, if the DMAs can go inside the COLREGS lines, they potentially could be affected.

So we appreciate the work that the agency and contractors have done to begin addressing the potential impacts on ferries, and whale watching vessels and other U.S. passenger They acknowledge that, under vessels. estimates, that, for example, high speed ferries that are affected could lose 9.8 percent of their We might take issue and say that annual revenue. the impact would be greater, but at least you are addressing it, we appreciate that, we would like to work with you further as you refine your rule making.

Thanks very much.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Before we move to the next speaker, a reminder also that, if you have written comments with you today, we have a box in which you can place them before leaving.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Our second speaker is Mr. Joe McKenly or Kechnie. I'm not sure I got the name, so--2 MR. MCKECHNIE: Close enough where I 3 4 was able to recognize it, anyway. MR. CARTAYRADE: Well that's all that 5 matters. 6 7 MR. MCKECHNIE: Thank you. I'll be reading my statements for the record. 8 I'm Joseph McKechnie, Vice President, 9 afternoon. 10 Shipping for Suez LNG North America. I thank you for the opportunity to 11 present these comments in a public forum as well 12 13 as the opportunity to reply with more in depth written comments at a later date. Suez LNG North 14 15 America transports liquefied natural gas or LNG to 16 ports on the East Coast of the United States, 17 including Elba Island, Georgia, Cove Maryland and of course Boston, Massachusetts, all 18 19 of which will be affected by the proposed 20 regulations. We supply LNG for heating homes and 21 businesses and the generation of power throughout 22

the East Coast. Suez LNG supplies approximately 20 percent of the natural gas consumed in the New England market, Suez LNG has nearly 100 vessel arrivals per year on the East Coast with approximately 65 arrivals per year in the Port of Boston alone.

We strongly support NOAA in its efforts to protect the North Atlantic Right Whale from extinction and actively support these efforts on an ongoing basis. We consistently provide our vessels with Right Whale alerts and remind our vessel masters of their responsibilities under the Mandatory Ship Reporting System.

We do, however, have serious concerns with the proposed rule in its present form. Of great concern to us is the speed restriction of 10 knots. Most large deep draft vessels require the ability to travel at speeds in excess of 10 knots in order to main full steerage when not being escorted by assist tugs, such as while inbound and outbound in harbor transits. The proposed 10 knot speed restrictions could result in unintended

NEAL R. GROSS

consequences for vessels by taking away the master's ability to safely maneuver his vessel.

In addition, the Port Access Route Study or PARS, as we know it here in Boston, which will the traffic separation narrow scheme approaching Boston by approximately 1/2 nautical mile, further restricts these vessels' ability to maneuver. A speed restriction of 14 knots would be far more acceptable to the marine industry, it still significantly contribute protection of the North Atlantic Right Whale.

Another point. The proposed regulation currently exempts federal vessels, including foreign sovereign vessels when they are engaged in joint exercises with the U.S. Navy. urge NOAA to reevaluate this exemption as there are several documented cases of federal vessels being involved in whale strikes. So long as it does not compromise the mission at hand, they too should comply with the final version of these regulations.

The proposed speed restrictions will

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

also result in significant economic impacts to the marine industry. While the draft EIS does address economic impacts, we feel that it fails to go deeply enough and does not fully detail the results of these regulations and requires additional evaluation. We will comment further on this matter in our written comment letter.

believe that the proposed rule ignores the results of many partnerships, outreach programs and direct participation by industry representatives in protecting the North Atlantic Right Whale while maintaining safety within the marine industry. We have requested a 60 day extension to the comment period as the proposed regulations may have potential safety concerns and serious economic impacts that must be addressed in This morning, we learned that greater detail. this request has been partially honored and we appreciate the extra time. However, we still look forward to the full 60 days.

We will put our detailed comments in writing and ask that NOAA fulfill its requirements

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to consider them. We in the marine industry hope that these comments will be given serious consideration. The PARS, as mentioned previously, which was fast tracked to the IMO before the released for public proposed rule was even comment, does not appear to have followed that normal process and procedure for rule making.

Thank you again for the opportunity to make these comments.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mr. John Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

My name is John Phillips, I'm the New Regional Director for England the Ocean Conservancy and my offices are based in Portland, On behalf of our over 10,000 members here Maine. England 180,000 in New and about members nationally, we urge you to protect the 300 remaining Right Whales. We've received, I think you have received, rather, many e-mails, perhaps several thousand, from our members and activists

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who asked that you adopt this 10 knot speed limit in areas and at times that they are needed most.

Throughout most of the 1990s, I was the Massachusetts Commissioner of Fisheries and Wildlife and I worked on Right Whale protection, along with members of my department, including some who served on the Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and we were focusing almost exclusively on entanglement but, at the time, ship strikes were talked about, but we really weren't focusing on it because it was considered a fairly intractable, difficult political issue, so I'm very pleased that NMFS has gotten into the issues and is doing something about it at this point.

endangered and the situation has not improved since the `90s, for instance, and it remains at the brink of extinction. It is also clear that we can't wait any longer to implement measures to prevent ship strikes and note that NMFS' analysis concludes that the economic effects will be fairly modest. We have such critical feeding grounds

NEAL R. GROSS

here, and an aggregation of whales and a high level of reported ship strikes and, here in Massachusetts, we also have a migratory corridor for females headed to the Southeast to give birth. In the last two years, we have lost six adult females.

Alternative five of the DEIS would provide the highest level of protection, while six, alternative six, provides the bare minimum needed. We urge NMFS to use the best available science to ensure that the speed limits are applicable in the times and places that the whales need it most.

Two final points. There must be adequate enforcement to ensure that the rules are adhered to and we urge you also to move forward now and to not delay. We were disappointed to learn, actually, I learned it this morning, that NMFS has extended the comment period until October 5. We would like the speed limits in place by November of this year to protect the mothers and calves in the Southeastern calving grounds.

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to comment on this vital issue.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Next up is Mr. Michael Glasfeld.

MR. GLASFELD: Good afternoon. My name is Mike Glasfeld, I'm owner of Bay State Cruise Company, we are one of the ferry operators from Boston to Provincetown, Ed Welch mentioned our business.

The 35 years that our company has operated that ferry route is the longest of many operators that have plied that route for the 160 year history of the ferry, it's one of the longest operating ferry routes in the United States. We too are facing extinction, should this regulation take hold. We are specifically concerned with the DMA.

While we sincerely appreciate the economic study that's been performed, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you, I don't think the economic study has gone far enough and I will do something very unbusinesslike and

NEAL R. GROSS

share with you the nitty gritty economic picture of our business and how this would impact us. More than the 9.8 percent reduction of revenues that we read about in this study, the two weeks that would be imposed by the DMA would in fact make us extinct, it would put us out of business.

We operate for 18 to 20 weeks a year, the two ferry operators carry in excess of 100,000 people from Boston to Provincetown. Depending on when that two weeks falls in our operating cycle, \$150,000 of we will lose either revenue \$380,000 of revenue. That is more profit than we have made in any of the 35 years that we have operated from Boston to Provincetown. It is not something we can make up, it is not something that would allow us to come back the next year. In fact, over the 35 years that we have conducted this service, we have made money, the north of break even, for 18 of those years, such is the delicate balance. If it's 19 years that we don't make money, I think then that's it.

It's more than just the impact of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

putting our ferry operation out of business, it is also the roll down economic effect. We do, as I said, bring probably in excess of 100,000. Ι don't exactly know because the other operator won't share his numbers with me won't with him, that's part of what we do businessmen, but I can tell you the Town of Provincetown would be keenly sensitive to losing what is calculated to be about \$350 spent by each visitor to Provincetown that comes in on our The effect, I assume, would be somewhere ferries. around \$15 to \$20 million of lost retail revenues in Provincetown.

There are of course the diminished expenditures we will make in the market place, whether fuel, employment, it be goods and services. We will no longer be spending \$3.2 million, we will no longer be taking thousands and thousands of automobiles off the road, reducing greenhouse emissions by hundreds and hundreds of This is a known negative environmental tons. impact of us no longer being sailing on this route

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

so, please, take into keen consideration these numbers, and I will go into a little more detail because I ran across this while I made these points earlier in this process.

People say, now, how can slowing down to 10 knots, in what could be a 36 mile diameter, put you out of business? And we have quantifiable evidence of that being the case. Most recently, when the tunnel closures in and around the Boston area hindered our passengers' traffic by as much as 20-25 minutes, we saw a precipitous drop in ridership. People do not want to be slowed down by 20-25 minutes, let alone expanding our ferry route run from 1.5 hours to 5 hours. That's what would happen if the Right Whales, one Right Whale was sighted in an 18 mile radius а DMA was impacted, that's a 36 mile We have a 48 mile route and with the diameter. slow downs in and out of the harbors, that's a five hour route.

Further evidence of this is we had been, prior to operating the high speed ferry,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

operating a slow speed ferry, a 16 knot ferry. 1 Once we introduced the high speed ferry, we went 2 from carrying about 40,000 passengers a year, 3 4 average, to 6,000 passengers a year. It goes 5 without saying perhaps that we no longer operate that ferry seven days a week, it's just not 6 7 economically viable, so we have quantifiable evidence that people will not give up what could 8 be a two and a half mile ride to Provincetown or 9 10 frankly a two and a half mile ride to the White Mountains, perhaps, maybe that's the alternative, 11 in order to hop on a boat for five hours. 12 13 Thank you for your time. 14 MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you. Our next speaker, Mr. Tom Valleau. 15 16 MR. VALLEAU: My name is Tom Valleau, I'm the Executive Director of the North Atlantic 17 Ports Association, and I'll spell my name for the 18 19 record, it is V, as in Victor, A-L-L-E-A-U. 20 And I would like to use my time to

NEAL R. GROSS

and my overall comment is that we

address the economic impact elements of the study,

21

22

think the

economic impacts have been understated by the work of Nathan Associates. We see this not just as a question of slowing down ships, calculating the hourly operating cost of the ships and multiplying by the number of hours of delay, and calling that the economic impact, and I really question Nathan Associates believes that either, it's far too simple, and I'll give you some examples as to why I think that's the case.

It's not like reducing the highway speed on I-295 during a snow storm and everything slows down to 45 miles an hour for a day. In that system, there is redundancy and resiliency, and then things come back to normal and the economic impacts are easily absorbed. The ocean commerce system doesn't have that global resiliency, it doesn't have that redundancy. I'm going to give you three examples to try to illustrate the point, first would be a New England manufacturer of food and pharmaceutical products, and they import their materials from Indonesia, manufacture them here in New England, ship them back out worldwide.

NEAL R. GROSS

Ιf that company can't get dependable supply of the Indonesian products that it needs, they'll have to build a warehouse in order to smooth out the highs and the lows of inventory supply in order to keep that production line running, or they may relocate the facility to Indonesia where the product is. are shipping it to customers worldwide, in any event, and if you did that, their product cost might be lower than what it is manufacturing it in New England, not higher and, according to the methodology that Nathan Associates uses, would be a benefit of slowing the ships down. This is economics turned upside down.

My second example would be a passenger vessel that operates from New England into Canada with a 24 hour round trip cycle, a 200 mile voyage, ship traveling at 30 knots, hour and a half, two hour turn around time in the port and back. Well if you had to slow that ship down by three hours on some of its voyages when the whales are there and they need to be protected, it's not

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just a matter of multiplying the hourly operating cost of the ship times the number of hours of delay and calling that the economic impact. If that trip were to leave, say, at noon on Monday, it would leave at 3:00 on Tuesday, and it would leave at 6:00 on Wednesday and it would leave at 9:00 on Thursday, and it would leave at midnight on Friday and you wouldn't get a 24 hour daily rotating service, the entire business plan is compromised.

This is a better way to look at the economic impacts of disrupting ocean operations. The method that Nathan Associates used is certainly simple. Once you have the formula, your high school son or daughter could determine the so-called impacts. It's much more nuanced, much more layered, much more sophisticated than that, and I think the people in this room know that.

My last example goes to commercial fishing, the vessels are leaving their port, headed for the fishing ground, they have to slow down to 10 knots instead of 14 or 15 in their

NEAL R. GROSS

transit and, again, Nathan Associates takes the operating cost times the hours and says that's the additional cost. Instead of codfish costing \$5.95 a pound in the supermarket, it's going to cost \$6.01 in the supermarket.

The National Marine Fisheries Service knows there is a regulation called days at sea, these boats are limited to 50 days fishing at sea, generally. Their steaming time counts and if it's going to take them extra hours to get from their fishing the port out to grounds, George's Bank, these vessels are going to migrate to the nearer ports, and it's already happening, as the National Marine Fisheries Service is keenly aware because they are pounded on this. simply say, oh, it's just three hours times the operating cost, it's a far, far more complicated calculation than that.

I'm concerned about whether or not these regulations would affect the supply of heating oil and gasoline supplies in New England.

Reading the Nathan report does not give me

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comfort and my suggestion to NMFS is, before you embark on this public policy, reassure yourself that this isn't going to be an unforeseen factor, as these events unfold.

I think the work on cruise ships is woefully lacking in this report. The report talks about ships on a string of ports. Well, cruise ships are surely on a string of ports, they go to a different one each day on a very strict schedule and if, when you take your vacation, you expect to sail at noontime on Sunday, you don't want to come to find out that you are going to sail at 9:00 the following Monday morning, this won't work. final think before you do a report, rethink, and rewrite and expand the section on cruise ships.

I looked at the ship counts. Is it Mr. Blankfeld? Have I got your name right? And I was looking, for example, in table 4-27 and in that neighborhood and, from my every day knowledge of these port operations, these figures look wrong to me and not just nitpick wrong but grossly

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

wrong, wrong by factors of 100, so either I don't understand how to read this report or very wrong data has been used. There is a tidal calculation in this report that shows if you miss your tide, how long will the ship be delayed. There is an error in that because the report says tides cycle every 8 hours and of course they cycle every 12 hours, so there is an error of 50 percent in the This is from consultants who claim four report. decades of maritime transportation planning and high academic experience credentials, terrible mistake, if I'm right. I may be wrong, but that is what I read.

Economic models are used that are outdated and unreliable and in particular, I'm thinking of the MARAD model, which is used in the report, it is a creaky, dopey model that I wouldn't rely on as a business planner at all, but Nathan Associates found it, liked it, used it. Rethink that, if you want to have the quality of report that I know you are hoping to achieve.

I looked at the section on high speed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ferries and I may have missed it but I didn't see a reference to the ferry service called the Cat, which operates out of Maine into Canada, carries 150 automobiles, 1,000 passengers, daily service and travels at 50 knots. I hope that's accounted for in the study. I may have missed it, but it's a huge, huge factor, and if this report is going to be complete, that's got to be in there.

In general, my comment on figures and conclusions, they are unexplained. in Charleston, economic impact \$7 million, economic in New York, \$12 million. there is working papers that would explain where those numbers came from and I would recommend you hang onto those working papers in case you are challenged at some future point to defend those announcements of what these economic impacts will they are though I think even woefully understated.

So, in conclusion, I would say fact check this report and make corrections so that when Nathan Associates and the National Marine

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Fisheries Service put their imprimatur on this work, it's the kind of quality that it should be, 2 3 save those working papers. 4 And my last comment would be please 5 don't overestimate the resilience of seaports and 6 the global supply chain to cope with this kind of 7 disruption. Thank you. MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you. 8 9 The next speaker is Ms. Patricia 10 Sullivan. Well it's not Patricia Sullivan, you are Mister? 11 MR. DIGANGI: Paul DiGangi. 12 13 MR. CARTAYRADE: Paul DiGangi. 14 MR. DIGANGI: Good afternoon, 15 My name is Paul DiGangi, I'm of East everyone. 16 Hartford, Connecticut and I'm here to speak on behalf of the Cetacean Society International for 17 which I serve on the board of directors. 18 19 am grateful to NMFS for holding 20 this meeting regarding the proposed rule implement speed restrictions to reduce the threat 21 ship collisions with North Atlantic Right 22

Whales. CSI will submit written comments in addition to my verbal comments today.

involved with CSI has been Right Whales issues since 1979, members have supported and participated in direct research by the Center for Coastal Studies, including photo IDs and behavioral assessments. Massive direct research on the Right Whale ever since has demonstrated that this remnant population of whales require habitats and resources in direct conflict with human uses along the East Coast and if humans cannot adapt, the whale will be lost.

The extraordinary significance of Cape Cod Bay, the Great South Channel and the Bay of Fundy to the species' survival has amplified everyone's concerns and extreme and welcome measures have been implemented by a remarkable spectrum of society. However, it is clear that more must be done or this generation of our society will be responsible for the preventable extermination of the species.

The evidence is undeniable, the Right

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Whales continue to suffer unsustainable losses from ship strikes. Two of the four known fatalities so far this year are from confirmed ship strikes with one in the Southeast critical habitat. There is an unequivocal relationship between potential fatal impacts and vessel speed, the evidence supporting the 10 knot speed limit in specific waters and times is also undeniable and CSI supports them all with one modification.

The proposed data is designed protect whales' seasonal leaving Cape Cod Bay by not entering. Therefore, CSI specifically urges that the rule define a January start date for the area off seasonal management Race Point and through the Great South Channel, as Right Whales are in Cape Cod Bay in January and transit these areas to get there. Dynamic management is extraordinary promise as a tool to protect Right Whales, but the recent average ten day implementation time between sightings and vessel notification is inconceivable. While disgusted with some of the current obstacles interfering

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with timely responses, CSI supports dynamic management with mandatory zones established around known whales. CSI recommends whatever changes are required to implement a truly dynamic management risk zone around known whales without delay.

Under the current voluntary speed reduction scheme, about 95 percent of the vessels in one study refuse to slow or use an alternative route after being notified of whale aggregations. CSI recommends that the rule establish mandatory responses by notifying vessels and enforcement of required reductions with a system of fines that would help defray administrative costs. CSI does not believe it serves anyone or whales to force vessels to slow or change routes irresponsible based on outdated delayed ornotifications. How can mariners and operators have faith in the system when they find that the whales actually have moved on and their effort is They certainly will resist further speed reductions or route changes.

Therefore, CSI believes that if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mariners can establish that the whales they slowed avoid, turned from to based notifications, actually in the not were implemented core zone upon which the alert was based because of the bureaucratic delays between sightings and notifications. Those who are responsible should be sued for the mariners' expense of fulfilling the required slowing or CSI respects and understands that time rerouting. is money, CSI acknowledges that this rule may impose added cost on the industry.

this is However, like any justifiable of doing business cost and the industry already accepts а wide spectrum restrictions, it will be passed on to consumers and there will be no competitive disadvantages because all operators will be under similar restrictions.

Ultimately, if a shipping company vessel operator or mariner is unwilling to help the society save the Right Whale and instead acts to help cause its extinction, the society has the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 right and obligation to impose more order and 2 penalties. in conclusion, my statement is 3 So, 4 proposing that we use alternative five or six, 5 would be acceptable. Number two is to use the 10 6 knot limit. Number three, apply to all non-7 sovereign vessels. Four, and most importantly, ensuring speed limits are in place by November of 8 this year to protect mothers and calves in their 9 10 southeast calving grounds. And are disappointed to hear the NMFS extended the comment 11 There is only 300 of them left, folks. 12 13 MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you. The next speaker is Ms. Deb Hadden. 14 15 MS. HADDEN: Good afternoon, 16 appreciate this opportunity to comment. I speak behalf 17 today on of the Massachusetts Port. Authority. My name is Debra Hadden and I'm the 18 19 Deputy Port Director for Properties and 20 Transportation. MassPort has been an active member of 21 Northeast Right Reduction 22 the Whale Take

Implementation Team and the related ship strike subcommittee since their inception, we strongly support NOAA Fisheries' goal of protection the North Atlantic Right Whale from extinction. However, we have significant concerns with some of the proposed recommendations and in particular, the speed restrictions, as well as the process through which NOAA Fisheries has put forth the draft EIS and the related regulations.

Nearly a decade ago, NOAA Fisheries reached out to the maritime industry in Boston, work together to develop us to implement a plan to minimize ship strikes of the North Atlantic Right Whale. MassPort and others from the industry came to the table with NOAA and other stakeholders to jointly explore solutions, educate NOAA Fisheries about the maritime industry and to recommend and help implement solutions that would protect the whale. Industry representatives supported and helped to implement many of the recommendations developed by NOAA, including playing a major role in developing and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

distributing educational materials that have been very effective in educating mariners regarding identification and avoidance of Right Whales.

MassPort is extremely disappointed that the years of collaboration and support have resulted in the draft EIS and the related regulations and process that we are here today to We believe that NOAA's recommendations discuss. and process are seriously flawed and that NOAA has continuously ignored comments from MassPort and industry representatives. other Our greatest concern is the proposed speed restriction of 10 knots or less and the potential in the future that NOAA will further lower the speed limit and expand the extent and duration of the seasonal management areas, if the speed restrictions prove effective.

The proposed 10 knot speed restriction is simply not supported by the available scientific evidence. All of the studies referenced in the report clearly acknowledge significant shortcomings in the data set on which the recommendation is based and we are dismayed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that much of the supporting documentation is based on terrestrial studies, which are irrelevant, and a study that is still in peer review. Well, we now see it's in press but, as far as I can tell, unavailable to the public for review, which makes it very difficult to be commenting on the proposed speed restrictions.

The proposed speed restrictions will in significant economic impacts to result maritime industry, as well as the nation, and Mr. Valleau said that as well Ι could have. as Although the draft EIS does address impacts, it fails to quantify the full range of will economic impacts that result from the We have repeatedly commented, proposed action. both verbally and in writing, on this point to NOAA and will continue to elaborate in our comment Industry representatives also continue to raise safety concerns about the proposed speed restrictions which we also feel continue to not be adequately addressed by NOAA.

Finally, the proposed strategy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

continues to dismiss technological solutions on the basis that no proven technology is currently available. Industry representatives have repeatedly indicated that they can avoid a whale if they know its location, its real time location, not where it was seen by an aerial flight at some point in the recent past but its real time location, but neither the recommended strategy nor NOAA's and other available resources focus research and development of potential technological solutions. The foundations of a technological solution are available and perhaps if funding and research over the past decade had focused on developing technology, we would have drastically reduced ship strikes and we would not be here today.

From a process standpoint, we also have serious concerns. The proposed speed restrictions regulations were issued prior to the availability of the draft environmental impact statement, which includes many of the supporting documentation, and at least one key document that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

supports the proposed speed regulations is still not available to the public for review. A 60 day comment period between July 5th and Labor Day is not adequate in light of the enormous volume of documentation that must be reviewed to thoughtfully comment on the proposed regulations.

MassPort and others many requested 60 day extensions. We do appreciate hearing and we saw in the Federal Register this morning that a 30 day extension has been granted. But in light of the volume of information and the amount of analysis that we need to go through, and that we still do not have one of the studies that we can use in our review, we think that's still insufficient and we respectfully request the full 60 day extension, and we urge NOAA to immediately make the Vanderlaan and Taggart study available for public review. I have no idea what in press means, in terms of when we'll be able to acquire it, but we ask that it be posted on the website so those of us reviewing it can have the remainder of the review time to look over that study.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Another thing I need to comment on is MassPort and others from the industry were stunned to learn that the port access route study had been submitted to the IMO five weeks before it was released for public comment. NOAA and the Coast Guard, we believe, directly misled the maritime industry in believing our comments on the port access route study would be considered before they submitted a proposal to the IMO.

On May 24th of 2006, the Coast Guard stated in the Federal Register the changes in the traffic separation scheme would be implemented through submission of a proposal from the United States to the IMO and the PARS itself states that the Coast Guard will seek the first available opportunity to present this option to the maritime industry for additional input. But in fact, the government had already submitted federal proposal to the IMO in April, so it was ready to go to the IMO five weeks before the public could it review for comment. We iust find unacceptable and it has seriously damaged the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

relationship that we though was a collaborative working relationship for all these years between NOAA and the maritime industry, and no explanation of this duplicity has been provided.

To summarize, we do not believe that NOAA is fulfilling its obligation to base whale protection methods on the best available scientific information, to fully consider impacts on the industry or to provide the public with all available studies on which the recommendations are based and adequate time to review them. We will put our detailed comments in a letter and hope that NOAA will thoroughly consider and directly address our comments.

Thank you.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

The next speaker then will be Ms. Patricia Sullivan.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Patricia Sullivan, I'm from East Hartford, Connecticut and I represent Cetacean Society International also.

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you for allowing us to speak am here basically to summarize and clarify comments that were made previously by Paul DiGangi of CSI. In addition to the comments that were made, I want to call attention to several issues, one being of sighting, one being reporting and the final one and most critical one being the critical nature of the consideration of all aspects of what we do to protect critically endangered North Atlantic Right Whale.

first points, One of my reviewing all the information that has presented previously, is that are we sightings on aircraft and aerial surveys, I just want to point out that they somewhat are ineffective. As we all know, Right Whales are known to migrate and travel subsurface and feed opportunistically when migrating. I think we need to come up with an alternative to augment aerial sightings and surveys, I don't see that addressed We request that dynamic management anywhere. system will quickly trigger an emergency speed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

restriction if whales are found to be present when seasonal management measures are not in effect.

We request to ensure speed limits be in place by November of this year to protect the northeast calves, I'm sorry, to protect the mothers and calves in southeast calving grounds. To delay this process for another year or even several months would probably mean the loss of another Right Whale, we cannot afford to do this. CSI urges that the rule define a January start date for the seasonal management area off Race Point and through the Great South Channel, as Right Whales are in that area and in transit. Presently, the plan proposes March 1st.

CSI regards the day ten implementation time between sightings and vessel notification to be totally unacceptable and my colleague Mr. DiGangi addressed that previously. Therefore, dynamic management, with mandatory zones, should be established around known whales and these changes should be done without delay. CSI recommends the rule establish mandatory

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

responses by notified vessels, enforcement of required reductions and a system of fines that would help defray administrative costs. Thorough environmental and economic analyses have been completed. To repeat, time is critical.

We appreciate all considerations that have been made, and comments and the economic impact but, at the present rate of decline, the North Atlantic Right Whale will be extinct around 2019, we can not afford to lose one more whale. We have the grave responsibility to take even more measures than reduction in ship speeds. to this process is the enforcement of whatever it is that we decide. Communication is critical. to enforce and the resources implement anything that is decided after this environmental study and economic study and we recommend that severe fines be implemented to match the severity of the violation of protective measures.

Thank you.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

The next speaker, Mr. George

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Blanchard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BLANCHARD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. George Blanchard, Hyannis Whale Watcher Cruises in Barnstable, Massachusetts. Sitting here this afternoon, it interesting watching the was very screen, everything refers to ships, whale watching vessels do not belong in this category. A DMA in the prime season of the New England tourism industry in the months of July or August would put me out of business, I would have to close the doors. Case in point, I am not only the owner, captain and I'm out there every day.

Two weeks ago, we've been watching Humpback Whales near the separation zone. A ship leaving Boston, the captain spotted three whales. Doing the proper thing, he called Coast Guard Boston and stated that he had seen three Right Whales. To the untrained eye, is it a Right Whale or is it a Humpback Whale? To the trained eye, sometimes it's tough at the first glance, is it a Humpback Whale or is it a Right Whale? If that

had triggered, under these proposed rules, a DMA for no reason, that would put me out of business. I don't know where the 65 foot or larger vessel threshold comes in, I have 130 foot vessel so, if there was a DMA in place, I would have to be traveling at 10 knots. The 45 foot lobster boat can pass me at 20 knots, the 58 foot recreational boater can pass me at 25 knots, the 70 foot sport fishing boat can pass me at over 30 knots.

I am going out there whale watching, I have two people in the wheel house and upwards four looking for whales. Ι have passengers or witnesses on board every day and they view, on a daily basis, the reprehensible behavior of recreational boaters and there is no enforcement in place out there. They keep on referring to high speed. I don't know if, to my knowledge, there is no whale watch boat that operates in New England at a speed of 10 knots, I would say it would be much fairer to say that the average whale watch boat travels at an 18 to 25-26 knot speed with a few vessels that travel in the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

30 knot speed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As some of my other colleagues have spoken, that would take my three and a half to four hour trip time and extend it out to five-six hours, and people just, they won't go, they will not go, just like the Provincetown to Boston ferry, people will not ride on something that takes longer. We work closely, the whale watching industry works closely with NOAA and we pass information back and forth all the time.

You don't have the resources out there on a daily basis. Just like the previous speaker said, aerial photographs is not the only solution, we give constant reports on whale locations, we do it because it's our livelihood. If we don't have any whales, we don't have any business. And if you have ever been on a whale watch with people, the most educational, no matter what the naturalists tell people about the total experience, the information that's passed on to them, but hundreds of thousands of people that go whale watching come away from that with just such

a sense of these beautiful creatures. It's free education. If you put us out of business, it's gone.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Mr. Jim Hain.

MR. HAIN: Ι am Jim Hain, Associated Scientists at Woods Hole and I also spoke probably to many of these same people, also this building, in July of 2004 the preliminary leading on this topic, so some of the things that I'll have to say are things that I repeated or that I said initially at that time.

And the thing about all this is that if you have the facts right, you don't have to argue about it and one of the, some of the facts that we know are ships hit whales, ships hit each other, ships hit sailboats. These are facts, no one has to argue about that. The other fact is no one really wants to be involved in a collision, whether it's with vessels, or whales or anything

of that sort.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now the other thing that most will probably agree on is that we probably maybe not completely but at least at a majority subscribe to the idea of science-based management using best available science, and this brings me to my point which is the same point that I raised in 2004, and that is that the science that underlies the draft environmental impact statement is soft. And when I the list of references in the draft environmental impact statement to look at the documents that are cited, what I find is a great of references that number are in the In other words, they are unrefereed literature. and unreviewed.

There is a reference in there that was submitted as an abstract to a meeting, to a poster session, and all these would not meet what are regarded as the standards of credible science and science that is uncovering the truth and uncovering the facts. There is an accepted standard for how that is done and, once that is

done, then most everyone will agree to the findings. Okay, this is what was discovered and this is what the results indicated. I mention, without putting too fine a point on this, I'll give you one example and that is figure 4-1 from the draft environmental impact statement and this is a graph that's entitled Vessel Speed Versus Whale Injury Type and at first glance, this graph appears to show you something.

In fact, what it shows you mostly is that there is a tremendous sampling bias and that any interpretation of this figure should be taken with a great grain of salt, and looking at this graph is like saying that most vehicle accidents occur on highways, and this falls into that same ballpark. To reach whatever the facts in the case and whatever the scientific truth happens to be, there is ways that this is done and, in the case of contentious issues like Navy sonar or various environmental issues, one of the methods that's used is to have a review panel by the National Academy of Science, the National Research Council,

NEAL R. GROSS

and this is a method that's employed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One thing that's available to this group and this topic are the implementation teams and those teams, the Northeast team and mentioned in the draft Southeast team, are environmental impact statement. Now the truth of the matter is, even though the DEIS mentions these teams, the truth of the matter is that the teams currently are in a very compromised position. Northeast team is essentially disbanded non-functioning, whatever word we prefer to use, and the Southeast team, at least in the last, I'm going to say the last year or so, has had its role very limited to education and outreach. And in many respects, that team, even though there are resources and expertise present, really hasn't been charged with reviewing this kind of document and this kind of topic. So I just mention that of the that available, the resources are implementation teams might be one and they aren't the only one, there is other avenues.

So, in conclusion, very briefly, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 expect fully that no one wants to be involved in collisions with Right Whales, I would guess that some kind of actions, some suite of actions will emerge and that it's my view that good science and good analysis can help identify those actions.

Thank you.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mr. Rob Moir.

I'm not sure I got the name right.

MR. MOIR: Hello. My name is Rob
Moir and I would like to speak to you as a former
school teacher, and as a nonprofit director and as
a guy who lives in Sommerville, up the street
here.

I would like to tell you a bit about why I care about Right Whales and then how I would like the NOAA to adopt strong protections for such precious leviathans. Back in April of 1975, a group of Massachusetts public and private school science teachers, many of them were members of the Mass Science Supervisors Association, all of them were instrumental in establishing the Mass Green

Educators Association, they convinced a Provincetown tuna boat captain, Al Avalar, to get his boat in the water early that year and take him out.

And into the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, on that bright, clear spring day, 8 to 12 North Atlantic Right Whales were seen, they were observed feeding in the placid, calm waters of Cape Cod Bay. And later that spring, Bill Watkins brought his family to the beaches of Provincetown, and he has a keen eye and a keen ear and, sitting on the beach, he could hear the clack of the Right Whale baleen plates knocking against one another as the whale, open mouthed, skimmed the water for plankton.

The next spring, Al Avalar changed his focus away from tuna fishing and set out with tuna fisherman Charlie Mayo's son Stormy Mayo, and Stormy had just completed a Ph.D. in plankton studies at the University of Miami, had Massachusetts school and college teachers return with students, their family, and friends and the

NEAL R. GROSS

whole whale watch industry began.

Now Humpback Whales soon took center stage but, nonetheless, the industry, from Provincetown to Newburyport, began with educators witnessing the annual migration of Right Whales, and for many of us here in Massachusetts, spring becomes synonymous with Right Whales feeding in Cape Cod Bay and by summer, the whales were gone.

And I'll leave on the record here some further stuff that happened in the early `80s but, to cut to the chase, North Atlantic Right Whales are cetaceans that belong to the suborder of baleen whales called mysticeti.

Now you know this, but they are literally are mysterious whales and little is known of how many years whales reproduce, how long they may live, Right Whales may live 50 years 75 years, 150 years, maybe more. Supported by water, whales live in a suspended, gravity free world eating plankton that, by definition, can't swim away from them. Think about it, life is pretty easy and reproduction for these whales is very

slow. It takes, it does not take the loss of very many whales to threaten the survival of the North Atlantic Right Whales.

Therefore, and because there are fewer North Atlantic Right Whales today than when I first observed them, or so it seems to us in Massachusetts, and because they magnificent animals, the state mammal Massachusetts, I stand before you to urge adoption of strong protections of Right Whales and to slow ships to prevent strikes. We need NOAA immediately adopt a comprehensive and suite of management measures that include both vessel speed limit and routing. By adaptive, I regulations expectant of mean must be responsive to ongoing unforeseen elements of ocean ship traffic in whales. Nature and weather surprise, particularly continues to in Northwest Atlantic Ocean.

A dynamic management system is needed that can be deployed rapidly, should the unexpected happen. For example, implementing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

speed restrictions when the whales appear out of season and perhaps lifting speed restrictions during periods when whales are observed lingering longer in feeding areas that are separate from the ship traffic. So, you know, you need a dynamic, this is a very complex problem and I applaud NOAA for getting into the complexity of it because it's got to be dynamic and responsive in order to meet all of these different criteria that people are bringing to us today.

So thank you for traveling to Boston and holding this public hearing. Now I hope you have an opportunity to get out on the water and I would recommend the MBTA boat from Boston to Charleston and back again, it's a few bucks, but you really should take the ferry to Provincetown and back again, and that would be walking the talk to get a sense of what all this is involved with regulating and seeing the whale watch boats coming out of Newburyport, Cape Ann, Gloucester, Salem, Boston, Plymouth, Barnstable, Provincetown, and just the ship traffic out there and stuff, but the

NEAL R. GROSS

MBTA boat from Charleston and back, Paul Revere would have used it, if he could. And while we have come a ways since communicating by lanterns and steeples, I hope this hearing will further eliminate, will further illuminate the dire necessity for responsible North Atlantic Right Whale ship strike reduction strategies regulations.

Thank you.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Ms. Sharon Young.

MS. YOUNG: Good afternoon. I'm Sharon Young and I'm the Marine Issues Field Director for the Humane Society of the United States.

We will be submitting more detailed written comments on the DEIS. But I want to highlight some of the areas of our major agreement and disagreement and address some issues that came up today. First of all, I would like to thank you for issuing the very long overdue strategy. As I'm sure you all know, we are plaintiffs against

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Coast Guard for your failure to adequately protect endangered whales, so I'm sure it's no surprise that we urge expeditious action to protect this critically endangered and declining species.

We agree with most of the elements of the strategy outlined in the DEIS. However, I want to raise a few points. Adequate risk reduction will require a combination of reduction, routing measures and dynamic response. In general, we support alternative five as the protective. With regard to restrictions, we are supporting a limit of knots. While studies may not be entirely complete, the best available science indicates that speed limits at this level correlate with dramatically lower risk.

I would like to diverge from my playing comment at this point and just mention that folks have brought up the notion of the impact of speed, particularly in regard to dynamic management but, in general, on industry, and I am

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a veteran of multiple take reduction teams and things that arose out of the changes in the MMPA in the 1990s. And I know that it's pretty common any industry that's being restricted complain that whatever restrictions are going into place will put it out of business. I've heard the fisherman complain at every single take reduction team meeting how every new whale protection measure will put them out of business, and what is impacting them is not the restrictions that are protecting marine mammals but rather the restrictions in place for fisheries conservation issues.

I am constantly barraged by e-mails of late talking about what a great country this is and American enterprise, and I fully believe in American enterprise and I believe that this industry and all the industries that are affected can rise above the challenges that are proposed. Yes, there may be the need for some changes in economic analysis and, yes, there will be some economic pain, but that is balanced against the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

survival of the species and the ESA states quite clearly that it is relatively blind when it comes to economic impact when it comes to the survival of the species and, make no mistake about it, that is what is at stake here.

Back topic, adequate on risk reduction requires a combination of all of these measures that NMFS has outlined. We generally agree with the routing and seasonal management in the Southeast U.S. We noted that the DEIS asserts that routes and seasonal management measures are selected in all areas because they capture the vast majority of whales sightings and, thus, risk, but the DEIS provided no sighting maps nor data, except regarding the shift in the TSS lane into Boston, we would like to see that remedied. The DEIS also did not adequately consider the time period for seasonal measures in the Northeast nor consider the risk of alternatives that could have been offered in its stead.

In particular, it assumes that Right Whales require protection while feeding in Cape

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Cod Bay critical habitats starting in January, yet for provides protection those no entering or leaving prior to April, though they must traverse the off Race Point area to both enter and leave. Data from surveys conducted by the Center for Coastal Studies have indicated that whales, on average, remain in the bay for only a period of а few weeks, thus they require protection when entering and exiting the heavily trafficked area, not simply during the time that The area off Race Point and the they are here. Great South Channel require protection during the same time period as Cape Cod Bay. This deficit in and the need to consider additional the DEIS alternatives should be remedied.

We support dynamic area management, but it can only be effective with timely implementation and with increased aerial surveys in times and areas not currently or adequately surveyed, this is of some concern to us in a time when decreasing budgets are happening in the areas of conservation. NMFS must also work with the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Coast Guard to ensure that the measure is enforced. Also, with regard to the issue of dynamic management, I want to say that I am one of the people who started working on whale watch boats back in the early `80s when the industry was old and slow, and it grew to a very healthy industry without the speeds that boats currently use.

I myself have witnessed whale watch boats hit whales and injure them severely, I have been involved in the prosecution of a whale watch boat for that very thing. Having an observer on the boat is not in and of itself any indication that the vessel is at less risk, whale watch by their very nature, have board. Speed, however, observers on significant factors and the incidents of whales being hit by boats, from whale watch rather, has increased as the speeds of those vessels have increased.

The industry survived at lower speeds in the old, dark days when folks like me came of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

age and I believe that it can do so again. This is, after all, an industry that is there to teach people about whales, to teach people about caring, to teach people about the need to change our lives just a little bit to respect the other creatures that share this planet, and one of the best ways to do that is for the boat itself to behave responsibly. Right Whales can ill afford to wait for protection, we are concerned that some of the protective measures in the DEIS are delayed.

For example, the area to be avoided is not, for the Great South Channel is not going to even be proposed to the IMO until 2007 and will not be implemented for almost two more years, this is not acceptable. The DEIS also has not stated how ship routing measures will be implemented, it states that they are not regulatory measures but it does not indicate how they will be implemented, although they are an integral part of alternatives three through six.

Right Whales can ill afford to wait.

This year alone two Right Whales have been found

NEAL R. GROSS

1 dead from collisions, one a calf in the Southeast, another calf in the Southeast was injured. 2 3 al, have found Kraus, et and 4 published studies that the three pregnant Right 5 Whales have died in the past two years represent a loss, in fact, of as many as 21 animals to the 6 7 population, they also stated in this published study that eight Right Whales, found in their 18 8 month study period, underrepresent the 9 10 mortality, which may be as high as 47 animals, yet most bodies are not recovered. 11 This death toll has to stop. 12 By your 13 actions, you can save a species. Your conscience impels it, the ESA demands that you take timely 14 and significant action to achieve the survival of 15 16 this species. 17 Thank you. MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you. 18 19 The next speaker is Mr. Rick Nolan. 20 MR. NOLAN: My name is Rick Nolan, I operate Boston Harbor Cruises out of Long Wharf, 21 we operate a fast ferry to Provincetown and some 22

whale watching vessels here in Mass Bay. I wanted to speak primarily to the science, I don't think the science that's been used to develop the 10 knot speed restriction is adequate. I do believe that in fact the science that I've seen suggests that 10 to 12 knots is really where most of the ship strikes have occurred, at least in the data that I saw in the committee that we sat on. I'm curious as to where the data that supports a speed restriction of 10 knots could conflicting with at least the information, scientific information that we saw, so that's my point number one and I would like to get some information on that.

think do too that dynamic difficult, are as thev management areas proposed, because of what Mike said with regard to their sheer size. I think if you go to 26 miles in diameter, then that effectively would put us out of business, both in the ferry to Provincetown and in our whale watch operation, if it were to happen in July and August. I support what Mike

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and George said with regard to that and what Ed Welch said with regard to it.

When I was on the advisory council two or three years back, what I thought was a of real time better proposal was some sort reporting, 24/7, 365 days of the year, we had a network of people in the whale watch industry, people flying over the sites where NMFS indeed and NOAA would indeed be required to do some of their own work and record information being reported back to them by vessel operators, by tankermen, by transiting across Stellwagon Bank regard to real time reporting as to what they were seeing.

If that, for instance, were to go back to a clearing house, let's say, in Scituate, at the headquarters in Scituate and from Scituate, that real time information went out to the maritime community through a number of mediums, including AIS and perhaps radio, then mariners would have the ability to make decisions for themselves and, particularly, masters would have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the ability to make decisions for themselves as to what avoidance actions they should take with regard to real time information as to where animals really are. Part of the problems with the data that we are looking at, I think, is that they are too broad based and too generally to be really detailed.

We know that the animals are dynamic, we know that the water is dynamic. As a master on one of our vessels, I would be concerned, quite frankly, to be restricted to 10 knots, if I deemed that it was prudent and safe for my passengers to be traveling at 15 or 20 knots because of sea conditions on any particular day. So I'm curious, with regard to the regulations, as how they mesh with or how they could conflict with a master trying to operate under the rules of the road, the existing rules of the road. I'm curious as to how they are applied in international waters and I'm sure that the regulatory ability exists to do that, otherwise it wouldn't be proposed in the draft.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But in any event, my thought is that there is a problem, there is no question about that, there is a solution to the problem. I don't think that speed has been identified as the problem and, in fact, I think that's it's going to identify that 10 to 12 knots is where the highest elevation of strikes has occurred, so I'm very curious as to why 10 knots has been deemed to be the right speed limit.

But in any event, with regard to the dynamic management areas, I think that they are just too broad. For instance, if a Right Whale were to show up within Cape Code Bay some time in July or August, or June, for that matter, and a report of that sighting was made and that location could be clearly identified, I think perhaps a mile or two, or five miles, perhaps, at the most, would be adequate, as long as the real time reporting was done on a frequent enough basis that mariners could indeed understand exactly where the animals are and try to avoid them.

So I think what I'm asking for here,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

quite frankly, is that the federal government not scapegoat an industry or a number of industries, including the shipping industry, with regard to a problem and try to come up with an easy public solution. I think you've got NOAA in place and NMFS in place here with a strong presence in New England, you've got the headquarters in Scituate. I think you have the opportunity in a number of locations up and down the East Coast of the United for receiving and reporting real regarding information the presence of these animals and, if you were to do that, I think you would be taking progressive and proper steps in the right direction to protect them.

MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mr. Charles Mayo.

MR. MAYO: Thanks for this opportunity to address this important issue. To qualify myself, some of my data actually has been referred to, I am one of the co-authors on the Science article that estimated as many as 47 fatalities mortalities through human causes. I am

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the senior scientist at the Center for Coastal Studies, have been studying Right Whales in Massachusetts water now for, gee, I guess it's been since 1975, and focused on them recently, in particular, trying to find new ways of identifying their areas of aggregation, the areas that the dynamic plan perhaps would address.

And as many of you know, we have now a non-sighting, non-oceanographic way of doing a reasonable job in Cape Cod Bay of predicting, on very small scales, where whales are likely to be over matters of days. That's, however, still a process that we are working on and it is one though that I think shows some hope. I mention that because I've had to deal, I'm on the federal panel, the take reduction team also, and I've had to deal with this question of soft science and it occurred to me, though I can't remember what the quote is, it does lie at the base of a lot of the comments that we have heard today.

Funkawitz and Ravitts, some of you may know, wrote an extraordinary, several tone

NEAL R. GROSS

work called "Ecological Economics", and really the bible of a lot of conservation study. And they observed that, in the normal world, science is hard, the facts are hard and the decisions, conservation decisions and ecological decisions, are soft. But they also observed that in the post normal world that we are presently dealing with where politics have considerably, that the opposite is now true, and we can see it in many of the major issues, Global warming is a classic, where now the facts from scientists are clearly soft, but the decisions need to be very hard.

And I mention that in some depth, and I don't know if it will make it into the record, but I think it is central to the questions that have been brought up, particularly by some of the industrial groups, and my colleague, Jim Hain, because the present set of circumstances are indeed difficult to pin down, but there is no question by any of us who have worked in Right Whales for now several decades that the story with

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the Right Whale is a depressing one. The hardest facts that we can come up with, and they seem very well tested, are that the Right Whale, in all of its vital measures, is going negative.

That can't be said for a lot endangered species, in fact, but in the case of the Right Whale, nothing looks good and, as you know, not only our Science article but earlier ones of considerable value have demonstrated that the situation is a critical one, and the question do you do? We could continue is what bureaucratic chase or we could make a decision, and so it leads me to, first of all, state that, from my perspective, we need to consider, I would prefer, alternative five because it is the most conservation oriented of the choices, and six, if not five, but I would suggest just one way of addressing the problem of not many good facts.

We all know that we have to have better technology, there is no question. Some of our work with plankton fields is attempting at that and there is some great work being done here

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and there regarding fisheries and ship strikes, and that I hope would continue. So what I would suggest is that perhaps, if the situation is critical and the facts are soft, as the facts begin to harden and we can all come to a closer agreement that Jim has mentioned, that the process that is being proposed have enough built in flexibility, something that's not easy for government, I understand, but enough flexibility so that as facts harden, decisions perhaps can soften and evolve.

The present set of circumstances, just to reflect on the difficulties that we've heard from a number of people, first of all, I have to say that everything that I know about Right Whales suggests that speed kills. I can't see that there is any other way around it and it's for that reason that I support five or six, if necessary, but I would like to reflect, just in closing, on the fact that we don't know where the Right Whales are.

I have heard a mention of the exit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

area around Race Point, as you know, that's the area that we work, whales are actually coming in and going out of Cape Cod Bay, as best our data can tell, the data from our survey team, they are coming out of the bay or going into it, even at the peak of the season, as often as every day or two, so there is a constant stream of animals, as best we can see.

The problem that I have is we don't know where they go. It's all very easy for us to say that they go to the Great South Channel and I think, with soft facts, that's what we decide they do, but information is going to lead us in a different direction. So I would hope that the agency would acknowledge the problems, and I know they do, of knowing what's going on, the difficulty of trying to manage important industries which may suffer. Maybe the facts in economics are as soft as the facts in science in fact, and that we could all realize that we must take action quickly.

The present PBR is zero, we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	already surpassed it this year and, believe me, we
2	are not seeing all the vessel strike animals,
3	everyone knows there are a lot more that are hit.
4	Let us somehow or another make a move, rather than
5	allow the situation to get any worse and, at the
6	same time, build some sort of flexibility within
7	the plan so that industry and conservationists,
8	neither of which are very satisfied with this, can
9	come together more and more as facts improve. I
10	realize that's not easy for bureaucracy, but it
11	has to match the complexity of biology, if we are
12	going to get these animals out of the hole.
13	There is, as you know, some
14	substantial question as to whether they can be
15	saved, it's this group that's going to make the
16	difference.
17	Thank you.
18	MR. CARTAYRADE: Thank you.
19	This was the last person on the list.
20	If someone in the meantime has decided they want
21	to speak, please come up here. No one else? I

didn't forget anyone who had signed up to speak

either? If I have nobody, I guess we will be
closing the meeting now. It is 3:45, it looks
like everybody took their five minutes, and a
little more in some cases, but we are good. We
still have a few minutes for people to stick
around and ask questions from NOAA's
representatives or the EIS team. If I have
nothing else, thank you very much for coming and
we'll be closing the meeting now. Thank you.
(Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m., the meeting
was adjourned.)

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19