NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

Tuesday, December 18, 2007

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee met in the North Terrace Room in the Don CeSar Beach Resort, 3400 Gulf Boulevard, Saint Pete Beach, Florida, at 9:00 a.m., Anthony DiLernia, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

ANTHONY D. DILERNIA, MAFAC Liaison TOM J. BILLY, International Food Safety Consulting

RANDY CATES, Cates International
JOHN P. CONNELLY, National Fisheries Institute
BILL DEWEY, Taylor Shellfish
CHRIS DORSETT, The Ocean Conservancy
JOHN FORSTER, Forster Consulting
ROBERT FLETCHER, Sportfishing Association of
California

JIM L. GILMORE, At-Sea Processors Association CATHERINE L. FOY, Aleutians East Borough STEVE JONER, Makah Fisheries Management DOROTHY M. LOWMAN, Natural Resource Consultant HEATHER D. MCCARTY, Heather McCarty and Associates

MARY BETH NICKELL-TOOLEY, Small Pelagics Group of New England

RALPH RAYBURN, Texas Sea-Grant College Program TOM RAFTICAN, United Anglers of Southern California

DR. KENNETH J. ROBERTS, Louisiana State University AgCenter

OTHERS:

NEAL R. GROSS

JIM BALSIGER, NMFS Alaska Region
CAROL BALLEW, NMFS Retired
HEATHER BLOUGH, NMFS Southeast Region
LAUREL BRYANT, Sanctuaries Foundation
GORDON COLVIN, NMFS Office of Science and
Technology

ELIZABETH FETHERSTON, Ocean Conservancy TIM HANSEN, NMFS Seafood Inspection Program MARK HOLLIDAY, NMFS Policy Office MARY HOPE KATSOUROS, Fish for the Future

Foundation
BRIAN KELLER, NOAA National Marine Sanctuary

JOHN V. O'SHEA, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

JOHN OLIVER, NOAA Fisheries

Program

TYWANNA OTTS, NOAA Fisheries

PRESTON PATE, NMFS Office of Science and Technology

ALAN RISENHOOVER, NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Office

MICHAEL RUBINO, NOAA Aquaculture Program
MICHELE SHEA, Fish for the Future Foundation
LARRY SIMPSON, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
Commission

TOM WHEATLEY, Marine Fish Conservation Network

NEAL R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	ĺ	3
		NEAL R. GROSS

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Introductions4
MAFAC Administration 32
Charter
Financial Matters
Briefing - Magnuson-Stevens Act 79
Briefing - Seafood Inspection Program 144 Saltwater Angler Registry Program 192 Registry Team
Operations Team
Briefing - Aquaculture Program 243
Wran-IIn Issues 275

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

9:03 a.m.

CHAIR DILERNIA: On the record. I hope everyone got in last night well or yesterday. As well, I know when I got in yesterday there was a committee meeting or subcommittee meeting going on in the lobby that went on to about 1:00 a.m. I'm sure very lofty issues had been discussed and settled between now and then. Perhaps we could have a committee report.

Where is Randy? Is he here?

I have just a couple of housekeeping items. First of all, our court reporter in the center here, Chad, it would be helpful if when you spoke if you just announced your name especially with you folks that he has his back to. Excuse that, but there's no way he can keep his eye on everyone here. So if you have an opportunity to speak or you ask to speak and I call on you, please try to -- There we go. He has us all now.

Just for the record, my name is Tony
DiLernia. I'm the Committee Liaison. We have a
couple of housekeeping, I guess, Health and
Welfare items that have to be taken care of.

NEAL R. GROSS

You've all seen email exchanges. There have been some email exchanges regarding the Committee's, I guess we'll say, gift to the Hogarth family and also we have -- You all know about the sad situation with Steve Murawski. The Committee sent flowers to the Murawski family in sympathy for the loss of their daughter and the Committee is, we're picking up the cost of the suite for the Hogarths for a couple of nights here at the hotel.

And so between the two, it would be around \$40 per person. I see a number of members who have already made a contribution. Ralph Rayburn is coordinating that. So when you get an opportunity if you can just see Ralph if you wish to make a contribution, just give him \$40 and they'll let Ralph check out at the end of the couple of days. They won't hold his luggage.

And with that, I'll turn it over to our Executive Director, Mark Holliday. Dr. Holliday.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you, Tony. For those of who don't know me, my name is Mark Holliday. I'm the Director of Policy for National Marine Fisheries Service and I would like to welcome you to the second meeting of 2007 to the

Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When Laurel Bryant, the past Executive Director, was assigned to my office last year and MAFAC was given to my office for responsibility little did I know that in the course of just a few short months that I would be sitting at this table. Laurel took a wonderful opportunity with the Sanctuaries Foundation and she has certainly left a wonderful organization intact and prepared to take on a lot of exciting responsibilities and I'm very pleased to be here and to help the Committee continue to do good things for NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

I wanted to acknowledge your effort to be here. This is a very busy week for everybody. Travel is long and hard to get here. I hope that we do have a good agenda set for up everybody. But the business that we had conduct can't wait for any other time. So we're very excited about having you all here and looking forward to working together with you.

For the record and the benefit of our recorder, I would like to have a round of self introductions to go around the table. If you

1	would not mind, please identify yourself and your
2	affiliation and just go around the table for the
3	membership. Start with Ken please.
4	MR. ROBERTS: Ken Roberts, Emeritus
5	Professor, Retired, LSU.
6	MR. O'SHEA: Vince O'Shea, Atlantic
7	States Marine Fisheries Commission. Good morning.
8	MR. BILLY: Tom Billy, President of the
9	International Food Safety Consulting.
10	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Mary Beth Nickell-
11	Tooley, Small Pelagics Group of New England.
12	MS. LOWMAN: Dorothy Lowman, Fisheries
13	consultant, Portland, Oregon.
14	MR. GILMORE: Jim Gilmore with the At-
15	Sea Processors Association.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Larry Simpson, Gulf
17	States Marine Fisheries Commission.
18	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tony DiLernia. I
19	guess we'll say Kingsboro Community College,
20	Committee Liaison.
21	MR. DEWEY: Bill Dewey, Taylor
22	Shellfish Company, Washington State.
23	MR. JONER: Steve Joner with the Makah
24	Tribe from Washington.

	MS. MCCARIY: Heather McCarty. I'm
2	from Juneau, Alaska. I'm a fisheries consultant.
3	MR. FORSTER: John Forster from
4	Washington, Forster Consulting.
5	MR. CATES: Randy Cates with Cates
6	International.
7	MR. RAFTICAN: Tom Raftican, United
8	Anglers of Southern California.
9	MR. FLETCHER: Bob Fletcher, President
10	of the Sportfishing Association of California.
11	MS. FOY: Catherine Foy, Aleutians East
12	Borough biologist.
13	MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn with the
14	Texas Sea-Grant Program.
15	MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett, The Ocean
16	Conservancy.
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: And I should note that
18	John Connelly from NFI will be joining us this
19	afternoon, Eric Schwabb from the Maryland
20	Department of Natural Resources will be with us
21	tomorrow and, of course, regrets from Bill Hogarth
22	for not being with us this morning but he'll join
23	the meeting tomorrow and Thursday in its entirety.
24	I also have heard from Randy Fisher,

Rob Kramer and Pete Leipzig. They've sent their regrets. They're not able to attend the meeting.

I think that takes care of where people are.

Before we get into some further business, I would want to go around the room and acknowledge staff past and present. Laurel Bryant joined us in the audience this time instead of at the table.

(Applause.)

Laurel DR. HOLLIDAY: has been exceedingly helpful in the transition and has been a great joy to work with and I really appreciate the opportunity to follow in her footsteps. would also like to acknowledge Tywanna Otts in the back who has helped prepare the meeting and all of the logistics the mechanics, the and travel importantly, arrangements and, most the reimbursements after we're done here.

(Applause.)

DR. HOLLIDAY: I'd also at this time people who are ask other quests invited or the outside to speakers on just do а introduction for themselves. Ιf you're here attending as a quest, we have a sign-in sheet on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	the side board. I would appreciate you signing in
2	for the record if you haven't done so already.
3	We'll start on the left side please.
4	MR. KELLER: Good morning. I'm Brian
5	Keller. I'm the Science Coordinator of the
6	Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.
7	MR. COLVIN: Gordon Colvin, NMFS, Office
8	of Science and Technology.
9	MR. HANSEN: Tim Hansen, Director of
10	Seafood Inspection Program, NOAA Fisheries.
11	MS. SHEA: Michelle Shea, Fish for the
12	Future Foundation.
13	MS. KATSOUROS: Mary Hope Katsouros,
14	Fish for the Future.
15	MR. OLIVER: John Oliver, NOAA
16	Fisheries.
17	MS. BLOUGH: Heather Blough, Fisheries
18	of the Southeastern region.
19	MR. BALSIGER: Jim Balsiger, NOAA
20	Fisheries, Alaska region.
21	MS. BALLEW: Carol Ballew, retired NOAA
22	Fisheries.
23	MR. RISENHOOVER: Alan Risenhoover,
24	Office of the Sustainable Fisheries.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks, everybody. 1 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Actually, Ken 2 has something to say. 3 4 DR. HOLLIDAY: Ken, did you have --5 MR. ROBERTS: I just wanted to ask if I could have a moment to thank the Committee. Ι 6 7 always like to do things in person as opposed to sending things in. It probably had something to 8 do with the expression of support when my mother 9 passed away the day of the last meeting. 10 11 on our way to the airport and got the call from the hospice people and she did pass away that day. 12 So we were not able to attend. 13 But you sent a lovely window box of 14 15 plants and my mother was a real plant person. they're out on my deck and every time I go out to 16 Ι think 17 qet wine about you guys and 18 generosity. I just wanted to thank the Committee before we got onto other business. Thank you all. 19 Appreciate it. 20 You're welcome, sir. 21 CHAIR DiLERNIA: 22 A member of our family was not feeling well and a member of our family was down and we tried to do 23

what we could for our family. That's what family

members do.

MR. ROBERTS: Appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you, sir.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Tony, Carol introduced herself this morning. But I'd just like to say that she's a long-time civil servant and a colleague of ours, a long-time friend of NOAA and she asked this morning and offered to give us a little bit of information about the local area. She's a local resident now and she wants to share some of your knowledge and some information with her about things to do, places to eat and other wonderful things about our venue for this meeting. Carol.

MS. BALLEW: Thank you. I guess I'm the local representative to say welcome to St. Pete Beach. I've been here for 16 years now, moved here from Washington and I just wanted to let you know that there is plenty to see and do here and give you an advantage of my knowledge of my having lived here.

The thing I handed out is the map and when you get that if you'll open it up, I want to

give you a little orientation about where you are.

Basically, you're on Barrier Island as you know.

You walk out the front of the hotel to the right is south and to the left this way is north.

You're on Corey Beach.

The part of the island that is south of the Don CeSar is called Pass-A-Grille. It was formerly a separate city, but we've annexed. We've just had our 50th anniversary. South is Pass-A-Grille and that's main road south is called Pass-A-Grille Way. If you see where the red dot is here, that's the Don CeSar. Everything south of there, that main road is called Pass-A-Grille Way.

(Off the record comment.)

MS. BALLEW: North that way the main road is called Gulf Boulevard and that's where most of the restaurants and the shopping and so forth. But there's a small area of Pass-A-Grille around 8th Avenue that has some shops and some restaurants and it's right on the beach. It's just a block wide. The Gulf is over here and the Bay is on the other side.

I have a list of restaurants that we're

going to get some additional copies for you on the table back there. And there is a trolley that runs all the way from the south end of this beach all the way up to Clearwater Beach and you'll recognize the trolley stop signs. They're a big sun kind of thing. There's one right here at -- on the Gulf side and then one across the street on the Bay side also.

There is a brochure back here called Historic Corey Avenue. It lists the shops on our main street which is all of about two blocks long. But it's a nice little area. There is a shop there that I wanted to tell you about called Blue Water Outfitters and Gallery. It's a new shop -with coupons for discounts. But the reason I thought you might be interested is they carry all the Guy Harvey things, the T-shirts, artwork and a lot of nautical-themed things that you might be interested in for yourself or for Christmas gifts There is also a wonderful shoe shop or whatever. across the street there.

And there are restaurants there.

There's an old historic beach theater that carries independent films most of the time. So I think

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you would just be enjoy being in that area and seeing what it's like.

Let's see. I wanted to tell you also. This building to your left here that's separate from Don CeSar is called the Don Vista. It's like an art gallery. It belongs to the city. It's recreational, art classes, etc. That used to be a science center lab of the fishery southeast region. It hasn't been for many, many years, not since I, you know, 20 years ago. But Ι thought that was an interesting fact about local area.

Across the street and down a little bit south you'll see a big gray building that's on It is Pinellas Marine Institute. It's is alternative --Τ an know some of you Particularly, I know in other southern states, I'm not sure about the rest of the country, but there are marine institutes in other states. They deal with kids who have, most teenagers who have gone through the court system and have been adjudicated to go to school here rather than go to jail and they can't go back to the public schools. So they give them instead educational counseling. They

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

work with families, etc. I'm on the board of trustees. So if anybody's really interested in seeing that or knowing more about it, I would be more than happy to arrange some time for you to go over and see or talk with the executive director or whatever.

And let's see. That's pretty much it. This is the list of restaurants and shops and I've told you like where they are. Breakfast, lunch, dinner, places, where they're located. A few things about several shops and if you don't even get up the beach, I really would recommend that you take the time to go down to the 8th Avenue area. There is plenty of breakfast, lunch, dinner and good shopping down there.

I've been asked to say that Little Room for Art which is listed here is a really tiny art gallery. It's pink in color. But they have some works by a local artist there that some of you in here have some of these pieces. Tommy Guccione works on tiles, but he asked me not to mention that and I wasn't going to say anything.

(Laughter.)

MS. BALLEW: I hope you'll have a good

NEAL R. GROSS

time here. I know you will. Sorry about the weather, but yesterday was probably the coldest day we'll have all year. Enjoy yourselves and I think I'll see some of you on the --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you, Carol.

Before we get to the agenda, I spent a good bit of time putting together some opening remarks for Bill. He's not here to use them this morning. I'm going to give them in his stead because I hate wasting some good words. So if you'll just indulge me for a few moments, I'd like to -- I know I can't do a Bill Hogarth impression, but I'll do my best to convey the message that he wanted you to hear.

This coming February MAFAC will celebrate its 37th birthday and for more than three it's been in the public interest decades, the charter of the Marine continue and renew Fisheries Advisory Committee. And while the next 12 to 18 months will be a period of significant change and transition, MAFAC as an institution will remain steadfast in its role as an advisory group to the Secretary on issues of policy and priority stewardship of for the the nation's

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

living renewing resources. But in order to provide this advice and direction, MAFAC must address and discuss among itself what are the most relevant and pressing issues facing NOAA and the country.

Within just the last year, MAFAC has allocated its precious and limited time to advancing the state of U.S. aquaculture and supporting the repair and revitalization of marine recreational data collection and has taken a look forward at the hot issues of tomorrow through its Vision 2020 effort. Yet there is much more work still to be done as all the issues raised in the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy report continue to unfold before us, issues of science, management and governance and a multi-sectoral... can you imagine Bill saying this, no, I can't.

(Laughter.)

DR. HOLLIDAY: He would have cut to the chase, but I liked it and these issues certainly need attention.

New and reauthorized statutory drivers are being looked at for their economic and conflicting sometimes objectives in an integrated,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ecological, economic and environmental setting.

There several hundred federal are agencies even more legislative authorities and governing our oceans and their resources. challenge for NOAA, the department, and therefore MAFAC, is how to be strategic. MAFAC is comprised of a wonderful mosaic of expertise and talent that is unmatched by any federal advisory group. connections to people who care about and depend upon our stewardship, of the public's resources, this is a vital link with reality. Your training and education is unparalleled and your experience hard earned over many years is what helps earn you a place at this table and made you a success.

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries is coming, a new president and cabinet are on the horizon and even a number of you will complete your final year with MAFAC in 2008, the Marine Fisheries Advisory group will continue. Its important contributions to the sustainability of our living marine resources will also continue and it's my challenge and that of the Office of Policy to ensure your success and to facilitate and support meaningful

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	and satisfying contributions by you to help
2	fulfill the mission of NOAA.
3	I look forward to working with you all
4	and together we will make a difference and I
5	appreciate your help and forbearance in this
6	opening remark. Thanks.
7	So, Tony, at this point, I would like
8	to look over the agenda and have a briefing. We
9	have prepared briefing books for everybody thanks
LO	to Tywanna and the rest of the staff. There are a
L1	couple of changes on the agenda that I'd like to
L2	make note of. So if you can open to your tab, the
L3	agenda.
L4	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tab 2.
L5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Tab 2 is the agenda.
L6	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Actually, the front.
L7	DR. HOLLIDAY: The front is a table of
L8	contents for the book itself.
L9	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Right. Tab 2 is your
20	agenda.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: Anyway, I'd
22	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Go ahead, Mark.
23	DR. HOLLIDAY: I would just like to
24	highlight the first changes. This morning because

of John Connelly's travel arrangements, switched the briefing that Tim Hansen is going to seafood quality and safety do on until the afternoon when John will be here. And Alan Office Risenhoover from the of Sustainable Fisheries has graciously agreed to give his presentation on Magnuson Stevens Act this morning. those two things will be switched between 10:45 a.m and the 1:30 briefing.

Tony, did you want me to walk through it or would you like to just walk through the different items and see if there are any questions?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: You can go right ahead. I didn't know if you wanted to. Go right ahead.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. The first day of the meeting we've organized into a series briefings on topics that you raised as wanting status reports on or wanted more information on when we were preparing the agenda. So we'll be looking at both Magnuson Stevens Act implementation, marine recreational fisheries data improvements and a briefing on aquaculture. So

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

these are principally information transfer, status reports, updates, an opportunity for you to see where things stand, ask questions and get a report on where things are going next in these three areas that MAFAC have been working on. It's a status report on current business and what's next with these areas of interest to the Committee itself.

We've organized Wednesday into a series of discussions. We've tried to allocate large blocks so that we have ample time for interaction among the Committee members in three principal In the morning, we're going to tackle 2020 and Mary Hope is going to walk us through the response by the public to the draft of Vision 2020 document that was completed earlier in We posted it out on the web for public the fall. We'll spend the bulk of information and review. the time going through those comments, evaluating the relevant ones, what we want to do or not do in response to those comments with the goal and the objective to complete the Vision 2020 document by the end of this meeting and we'll go into the mechanics of that a little later.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the

why

After lunch tomorrow, we have set aside two blocks of time for a full Committee discussion of what I think are sort of forward looking areas potential areas for MAFAC contributions The first is a discussion of involvement. development of a national ocean policy statement or perhaps a series of policy statements. are a number of briefing documents that are in the But as I said in the email, I sent out what book. I call two annotated agendas. They're just one pagers that Ι hope you can read before discussion that gives you some context for we're discussing it, what we hope to get out of the discussion and again this is all driven by changes in legislation, different activities that NOAA is faced with in integrating these different statutory requirements and the short version we're looking to see what the pros and cons are on developing statements of policy on the ocean for NOAA to help create this integrated vision from the National Marine Fisheries Service, NOS other partners in moving forward over the next We have a couple of hours several years. aside for that discussion and Jim Gilmore

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

has

agreed to help facilitate and lead that discussion today.

And then in the afternoon, we're going to have a discussion on we're calling it Seafood Certification Standards. We spoke briefly at the June MAFAC meeting about MSC certification and we've gotten some experience after the launch of the FishWatch website from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The point here again is there's a annotated agenda, this one pager, that I think you might focus on if you could before the discussion to see again is there a need or are there net benefits for the Federal Government to involved in of certification qet some sort standard for seafood in the U.S. and, if so, what form might that take.

Those are the three items that we're going to cover on Wednesday. I should point out invited guests members and on Wednesday there's a reception and you'll hear more about It's hosted by Fish for the Future Foundation to help celebrate Mary and Bill Hogarth's contributions to MAFAC and the change in their lifestyles if not their -- coming over 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

22

23

next, actually it's only a couple weeks away. So that will be our Wednesday evening entertainment.

Then on Thursday morning, we're going to break out into small groups again as we did at the June meeting based on feedback from a number of you and the notion of breaking into committees and small groups, I have two other rooms reserved in the hotel for work by the Commerce Committee or the Strategic Planning Committee or the -- Working Group, the Vision 2020 group. We'll have this room reserved as well. So we're going to dedicate the morning to follow up on committee work based on Wednesday's discussion and what we talk about this morning and this afternoon.

If you have ideas, recommendations, you want to develop motions, do the work of the Committee in small groups and then after lunch come back to the plenary session in this room on Thursday afternoon to report out from those committees with the findings, recommendations, action items and help close out any remaining business before we adjourn for the day.

The times and locations, we'll develop which committees go to which rooms as we see what

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the interest is on the part of the members to
2	convene those groups on Thursday morning.
3	Questions? Suggestions? Comments? Any agenda
4	related issues that you would like to bring up at
5	this time?
6	Great.
7	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Great.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, that's a sign of
9	endorsement as I've ever heard one. Right, Tony?
10	I got it perfect. No complaints.
11	(Laughter.)
12	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Do you want to go
13	right into MAFAC administration?
14	DR. HOLLIDAY: We can go right into the
15	first discussion on MAFAC Administration. Again,
16	some of these are mechanical, but I'd like to make
17	sure we get through.
18	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Hold on. Steve Joner.
19	Steve.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, Steve.
21	MR. JONER: Mark, do we have any
22	arrangements for internet access? It's \$11.00 to
23	be in the room.

Right.

DR. HOLLIDAY:

1	MR. JONER: Do we have it in here?
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: No, we did not schedule
3	internet access for this room.
4	MR. JONER: Okay.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: If we want to do that as
6	a regular part of the meetings, then we can do
7	that in the future. I had sort of mixed signals
8	about whether, no pun intended, we wanted to do
9	that because some people feel it's distracting.
10	Other people don't use it. So you're on your own
11	for this meeting at the hotel rate of \$11 a day.
12	MR. JONER: Okay. If you can't answer
13	emails, you can't get them. Right?
14	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Right.
15	(Off the record comments.)
16	MR. JONER: That's reimbursable. It's
17	like a telephone call, isn't it?
18	CHAIR DiLERNIA: It should be.
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, it's not going to -
20	- It's a reimbursable cost, but it's not going to
21	break anybody's bank. It's a significant cost if
22	we got it for the room. It's a different rate
23	structure they do with audio-visual. So it's
24	usually much more expensive in that regard.

put

But I don't want to digress, but we did 1 prepare hard copy briefing books for people. 2 is a tradition of the Committee to generate paper 3 4 and send them home. So I've had 5 experience with doing paperless where we materials out on the internet. You print out or 6 7 take your laptop with you and read the contents I have all of the briefing materials on 8 a jump drive for those who do have laptops and 9 10 want a copy of all the materials that are in the 11 briefing book. I would be happy to share them with you and if over the next couple of days you 12 have opinions one way or the other of going more 13 towards paperless and less towards briefing books, 14 15 please talk to me or to Tywanna about what your I can stay with the paper 16 preference would be. books if that's your preference or we 17 towards a more electronic version for those of you 18 who are into that or continue as a hybrid as we 19 have now which everything that's in the briefing 20 book is on the website. Everything that's on the 21 22 website is on the jump drive, your preference. think about it and let me know how you want to do 23 the business of the Committee best and I'll do our 24

best to make sure that we can work with that. 1 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Any other questions? 2 Why don't we just get into our administration. 3 4 We're a little bit ahead of schedule. 5 DR. HOLLIDAY: Nothing wrong with that. CHAIR DILERNIA: Nothing wrong with 6 7 that at all. Mark, you're back up. Financial Disclosure Statements. Nomination process. 8 must be missing tab -- Okay. That's where I am. 9 10 I'm backwards. Okay. Materials are 11 DR. HOLLIDAY: Tabs. after the tabs. 12 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. So Tab 2. 13 DR. HOLLIDAY: We're on Tab 2 and the 14 15 first thing under Tab 2 is the Charter for the Committee, not necessarily listed in the order on 16 the agenda. But the first item on there is the 17 It's renewed every couple of years. 18 Charter. It's a requirement by law that the Charter can 19 only be extended on a two year interval. 20 Because of the timing of the Charter's 21 22 expiration for this year which was February of 2008, submit the Charter 23 we had to to the 24 Department and the Secretary for approval.

pretty much mostly submitted as it was previously.

Because we did not have a full meeting to discuss it and suggest any changes to the Charter, I was assured that you could change the Charter at any point in time. We can submit changes midyear or mid cycle if need be.

So in order to ensure the continuity of the Committee, we submitted the Charter as is for the next couple of years. But during the next 12 if the Committee months, the next 18 months, chooses to look at. the Charter and make suggestions for changes, there's absolutely nothing stopping us from proposing that and going through the approval cycle in midstream should you determine that changes are necessary.

copy of the Charter This is submitted to the Secretary. Hopefully, it will be approved and in place to ensure continuity by the deadline of early part of February is. Ouestions the Charter? Comments? Oron suggestions?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I know I have a couple of comments that I'll let members -- Do members have any comments or questions regarding our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

current Charter? Mr. Rayburn.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn. This goes to the administrator, I guess, and he continues to want to be chair of this committee even though he doesn't ever show up. Is that right?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Well, that's actually -- the point that you're trying to make was also a point that I was hoping to make. Currently, the --

MR. RAYBURN: I'm sure you could do it much more eloquently.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: -- chairman on the Charter is listed as the NOAA Administrator and the Vice Chairman of the Committee is listed as the AA for Fisheries. You may recall that with the last Charter revision and coincidental with my election as Committee Liaison, the term "chairman" was changed from Chairman to Committee Liaison so as not to conflict with the Charter.

But the term "Committee Liaison" fact made recognition of the in that our leadership according to our Charter is the NOAA Administrator and AAfor Fisheries which interesting because we're supposed to be -- Well,

I guess we're giving advice directly to the Secretary according to that table. So there are appointed members.

MR. BILLY: Not directly.

CHAIR DILERNIA: Not directly. Tell me, Tom.

MR. BILLY: It says "through the assistant administrator and administrator."

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Well, that's a good If -- The question has been raised how can point. the Committee give advice through the AA Fisheries and NOAA administrator if they themselves are in a sense part of the Committee. So the discussion there's been discussion there. amongst some members that the position that I currently held right now should be and I won't be here to fill it, you'll have to let someone else fill it in the future, that position be changed to Chairman of Appointed Members just for points of clarification.

There would be the appointed members. all Those would be members other than the executive directors of the fisheries state commissions, the Fisheries the NOAA AAand

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

administrator. We all would elect our own chairman again and he would interact with AA Fisheries and NOAA administrator.

Some folks have been saying we should be talking directly to the Secretary. Other folks have been saying that we should be talking to the Secretary through NOAA. We're advisory committee to NOAA. So I would think that should be talking But to NOAA. Ι was just wondering if any other Committee members had any comments or advice or any views on this position.

I'm going to hopefully ask that we have an opportunity to amend the Charter. The Charter is at the Secretary's office right now. So there's nothing that we can do right now. But I would change my position, that term that describes my position, from Liaison to Chairman of Appointed Members again for the future person who sits here because the term "Committee Liaison" is a bit misleading and it doesn't, I would say, lend the person the authority that it may need to lead the Committee. Ralph.

MR. RAYBURN: Yes. Ralph Rayburn. Since this is 35 years old I guess it predates 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

22

23

1	FACA. Does it predate FACA, the Federal Advisory
2	Committee Act? I mean, I think this doesn't. It
3	does not?
4	DR. HOLLIDAY: No. It is a FACA
5	Committee and it is FACA compliant.
6	MR. RAYBURN: It is a FACA. But I
7	thought it was maybe set up preFACA. It was an
8	advisory group but it is a FACA now. But I just
9	wasn't sure whether it conforms. Are there other
10	FACA groups?
11	DR. HOLLIDAY: It was determined for
12	states. It was initially chartered under the FACA
13	on February 17, 1971.
14	MR. RAYBURN: Okay.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: So it was originally a
16	FACA committee by design.
17	MR. RAYBURN: And do other committees
18	or do we know if other FACA committees operate
19	where the senior executive of the agency for which
20	they provide advice is a chairman or a leadership
21	role of that advisory committee? Is that
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: Within NOAA, we're all
23	over the map.
24	MR. RAYBURN: Yes.

DR. HOLLIDAY: It's not consistent. This is the only one where the vice Admiral does that. And so there are three total committees but they differ. So there's no standard.

MR. RAYBURN: General.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So you can recommend and have it organized according to whatever standard you see fit and, as Tony pointed out, the current charter is being renewed. But there's nothing to prevent us from going forward and recommending a position for modifying that charter and seeking approval for that change. We didn't have the time or the opportunity to have a full discussion by the Committee for such a change before we sent this one forward.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Vince.

MR. O'SHEA: Vince O'Shea. I think the linkage to the states of this body through the strategy of having the commissions here is a good one. But I notice it's not mentioned in the Charter. Do you know why?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Very good point. I'm looking around the room, Vince. I don't see anyone raising their hand.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. O'SHEA: So maybe on the next go-
2	around, that might be worth a sentence. Since
3	that's what you're doing, I think it would be good
4	to get credit for it. Thanks.
5	MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I know it's
6	been that way. We have been advisors to MAFAC
7	since at least the early `80s from my first
8	meeting. Now that's all likely go back to, but
9	we've been advisors in a capacity sense since the
10	early `80s.
11	I have another question if I might, Mr.
12	Chairman. Mark, you mentioned there are three
13	other FACA established which is different than
14	FACA exempt and one of them is SEAGRANT, I know,
15	and MAFAC and could you enumerate the other two?
16	(Off the record comment.)
17	MR. SIMPSON: Does anybody know what
18	the other FACA?
19	MR. O'SHEA: Sure. MPA (Marine
20	Protected Area) Advisory Committee is another.
21	MR. BILLY: The MPA and the NOAA
22	Science Advisory Board.
23	MR. SIMPSON: And the Science Board.
24	DR. HOLLIDAY: The NOAA Science Board.

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. And there are 1 some committees like the Council which are FACA 2 3 exempt. 4 DR. HOLLIDAY: Exempt. And I think it was done 5 MR. SIMPSON: before -- I think it may actually have been part 6 7 the reasoning or the need for a final actual advisory committee act. So I think MAFAC 8 9 predates that. 10 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tom Billy. 11 MR. BILLY: Yes. I'd like to put on the table a question regarding the value of having 12 the administrator of NOAA in terms of, I'm a short 13 timer in terms of being on this Committee. 14 15 haven't seen the administrator around or showing any interest in particular about us. I know he's 16 spoken to us once maybe at my first meeting. 17 So I think it would be valuable to reconsider 18 who should chair the meeting and vice chair 19 liaison and that particular set of issues as it 20 relates to the future work of the Committee. 21 22 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tom Raftican and Ralph

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tom Raftican and Ralph Rayburn.

MR. RAFTICAN: Mr. Chairman, what's the

23

timeline on this? I'm wondering. Does it make sense to appoint a subcommittee? There are a lot of different facets going on here and I hate to take a snap judgment on this. Do you have -- Is there time available or does it make sense to have somebody bring back recommendations?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I think that's an excellent suggestion. I would hope that -- I'd like to see some more just general discussion. Because if a subcommittee does develop, I think Committee members should -- the full Committee should hear perhaps some of the items that would be discussed in the subcommittee, I think, if we did it as, say, part of Thursday's breakout session.

like Τ would to see some more But, yes, I agree with you that a discussion. subcommittee or a work group should be established to make recommendations regarding the Charter rather than just I would be uncomfortable with recommendations that just originated from this table today having just initiated the conversation 10 or 15 minutes ago. I know you all are going to make me pick up the phone and call the Admiral and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

tell him he's off the committee. I know that's what's happening today.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ralph.

I agree with what Tom RAYBURN: There ought to be -- Maybe your executive says. It seems to me that if the FACA group could meet. group is limited by number and two of numbers are the administrator and the assistant administrator count against the total, then you're reducing the opportunity to bring in constituents. I mean, it's like -- I'm not saying one way or the other but if you're going to limit it number I wouldn't think you would want those two people to count against the overall number of the committee and I would think, too -- I was thinking about it, too. It seems like having advisory people here whether MAFAC covers their expenses or under "Other," whether they come the three commissions and I was thinking the other day maybe since this regional councils have their entity now established in Magnuson maybe the representative from that group could be considered an advisor and one thing I wanted to do since I've been here is

1	have a role for SEAGRANT to be an advisor, non-
2	voting member, where they can sit in, hear what
3	the constituents are saying and maybe that would
4	help us all get to. So I would think looking at
5	how the advisors are in a formal sense so they can
6	justify coming to this meeting not necessarily
7	with federal payment for that, something like
8	that, I think it could try to make it more
9	effective.
10	DR. HOLLIDAY: Just a point of
11	information.
12	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mark.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: Just a clarification.
14	Twenty-one person membership does not include the
15	vice admiral and the assistant administrator. So
16	there are 21 appointed members. So the Committee
17	at least in practice has 21 appointed members.
18	The three commissions are advisors and then a
19	chair and a vice chair.
20	CHAIR DiLERNIA: We currently have 20
21	sitting members, one vacancy, I believe.
22	MR. RAYBURN: I'm sorry. I read that -
23	
24	DR. HOLLIDAY: It's awkwardly

constructed and our practice may not follow. But, in fact, there are 21 appointed members.

MR. RAYBURN: But everything else I said was okay. Right?

(Laughter.)

DR. HOLLIDAY: Friendly point of information.

CHAIR DILERNIA: Let me tell you what I think I'm hearing here and quite frankly it does my heart good to hear what I think I'm hearing or maybe I'm just interpreting it that way. The Committee is trying to -- As we begin to discuss who should be on the Committee, who we should be reporting to, the Committee discussion I hear, the subtext that I hear, is how does the Committee redefine itself. How does the Committee redefine itself regarding the work that it does and the advice that it gives.

I, for one, was extremely pleased when the Committee was assigned to the Office of Strategic Planning because -- And I'm sure you all will aware of my opinion that that's what the Committee should be. We should be forward looking. We shouldn't be down in the weeds.

That's where the councils are and then that's what the councils should be doing way down there in the weeds.

But keep in mind that some feel that the councils were modeled after MAFAC. MAFAC existed before the councils did. But MAFAC should be right up there above and doing policy advice, long-term strategic planning and policy advice. So if we're doing that, where do our The the Committee membership of is little bit different perhaps than what we are currently composed of.

I would like to put together a working examine the Charter group to to make some full recommendations to the Committee for consideration. Mr. Raftican, you first brought it I was wondering if asked to serve as the chairman of that subcommittee would you serve as it.

MR. RAFTICAN: Yes.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you, sir. And what I would like to do is perhaps have some more discussion. But I would like for some folks whoever wants to volunteer to work with Tom

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Raftican regarding making recommendations for our 1 2 revisions. MR. BILLY: A point of order. 3 4 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes, sir. 5 MR. BILLY: I'd like to suggest as an alternative for consideration of the Committee 6 calling on the executive subcommittee to take that 7 responsibility and then any other member of the 8 Committee be involved as well. 9 10 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Why don't we -would like to -- The executive committee could be 11 part of Mr. Raftican's committee. But I would 12 like Mr. Raftican to serve as chairman of that 13 Objection? Our executive committee 14 committee. can serve and all the members of our executive 15 committee can serve on this committee, but if you 16 17 could take the ball and run with it a little bit and try to organize it for us. Mr. Billy. 18 19 you, sir. I apologize for my naivete. 20 MR. BILLY: But could you remind me who is on the executive 21 committee? 22 CHATR DiLERNIA: The executive 23

committee is the members of the work group.

MR. RAYBURN: The chairs of the
subcommittees and the liaison chaired by the
liaison.
MR. BILLY: Thank you.
CHAIR DiLERNIA: So we have Mr.
Fletcher, Mr. Gilmore, Mr. Billy, Mr. Dorsett,
myself and Mr. Raftican will chair.
MR. RAFTICAN: Is there anyone else
that would be interested?
CHAIR DiLERNIA: I would ask anyone who
is interested in serving on that group to speak to
you.
MR. RAFTICAN: Okay.
CHAIR DiLERNIA: And if you could take
that group and run with it, I would appreciate it.
We'll take a look at the I'll take a look at
our schedule and perhaps make some recommendations
as to when you could meet.
MR. RAFTICAN: Okay.
CHAIR DiLERNIA: And perhaps you can
give a report back to us.
Are there Mr. Dewey.
MR. DEWEY: Additional comments here as

1	we've done it already by having some
2	representation on the Committee that the Charter
3	doesn't reflect them. That might be something
4	that you It seemed like it would be possible
5	there in that Section 1 under "Members and
6	Chairperson" to add aquaculture to it and then A,
7	"Experiences and Harvesting, Culturing,
8	Processing" is to reflect all the hard work that
9	the Committee has done to recognize the important
10	in the country.
11	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Could you give me a
12	line, sir?
13	MR. DEWEY: On the first page under
14	"Members and Chairperson," third line down at the
15	end of that after "recreational fishermen" you
16	could potentially insert aquaculture and then in
17	A, "or that experience in harvesting," add
18	"culturing" in that list of people processing.
19	CHAIR DiLERNIA: That's a
20	recommendation that will help the work group or
21	committee would be coming forward with.
22	MR. RAFTICAN: Bill, would you help us
23	with that?

MR. DEWEY: Absolutely yes.

MR. RAFTICAN: All right. 1 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. 2 MR. CATES: 3 Tony. 4 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes, sir. 5 MR. CATES: Can I ask a question? For the new members and some of the ones that 6 are 7 about ready to leave, under the "Objectives Duties," the first sentence talks about --8 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Could you speak up a 9 little bit please, sir? 10 The first sentence talks 11 MR. CATES: advise 12 duty to the Secretary of about our Commerce. Has that happened? Are we able to? Ιf 13 we're going to make this working group, what's 14 been the past experience? Is our message getting 15 Do we have access? to them? 16 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Since I have served as 17 Committee Liaison, in the two years I have served 18 as Committee Liaison, I've never had a meeting 19 with the The recommendations 20 Secretary. 21 previously, my predecessor met with the Admiral. He would meet with the Admiral after each meeting 22 and present the recommendations of the Committee 23

and it was presumed then that the Admiral then

transmitted those recommendations to the Secretary. But there was no -- We didn't know if that occurred or not.

You make a very good point, Randy, as to what should be the future operating procedure of the Committee. I've been comfortable in accepting the recommendations of the AA Fisheries. It's no secret that I have tremendous confidence in Dr. Hogarth and we're friends for a very long time and I have been very happy to follow his lead and accept this guidance regarding making our recommendations.

But you make a good point. For future for what we leave regarding members that will be following us and myself my term in about a little less than a year and you will be here to accept -- and so your recommendation is a very good one. I've heard it from more than one person on more than one occasion and I think that's something that should be seriously considered in the committee that I've asked Mr. Raftican to convene.

MR. CATES: I've sat on other organizations where it's similar and when you accept an appointment to something and it puts in

writing your job is to advise either the State of Hawaii or whatever, you have to have access and if you don't, then as an appointee you're not doing your duty. And it shouldn't be written in there unless we're allowed to do that. As an organization, we have to. Otherwise, a future Secretary of Commerce can look back and say you didn't do your duty.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mark. Okay. Dorothy and then Tom.

MS. LOWMAN: Well, I think that point is important and how do we give advice, you know, up the chain and then particularly how relevant that we're talking about it now because we are going into this time of transition and we will probably have a new secretary and an opportunity maybe to have some influence from the beginning of a transition time. So I just wanted to say I think this is really important that we're doing this now.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: MR. BILLY.

MR. BILLY: I would like to make a slight correction to what you said a little while ago. On aquaculture, this committee within the

NEAL R. GROSS

last year chose to go beyond simply reflecting the resolution that we passed in the minutes of the meeting and also drafted a letter that was sent by me as the chairman of the Commerce subcommittee and Tony as the Liaison jointly to Bill Hogarth advising him of both our findings and our recommendations in the area of aquaculture. As a result of that, Bill asked for a briefing. Tony wasn't able to make it, but I was there along with -- I think it was Eric Schwab.

And we did a briefing on the actions of Committee. Hogarth liked the Dr. that and further and recommended that brief we qo the administrator of NOAA which we did and Bill also thought that we should further brief the Secretary That became not necessary because of Commerce. the Secretary's, I think, chief of staff and a couple of his other people were at the briefing for the admiral and it was as a result of that briefing that the Aquaculture Summit was accepted and carried out under the sponsorship of Department. So there are ways in which this Committee if it chooses to do so can go further than just reflecting things in the minutes of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	meeting depending on the subject of how we feel
2	about it.
3	CHAIR DiLERNIA: It's an excellent
4	model that perhaps we should be considering and
5	it's a good sign or example of how the Committee
6	can work. I thank you. MR. BILLY, you
7	spearheaded most of that and you took the lead in
8	that. I thank you for that. But perhaps we
9	should be doing more of that. It should be the
10	routine rather than the exception.
11	MR. BILLY: One thing I would add is
12	relevant to my earlier comments it was important
13	that we brief the admiral because he as the
14	chairman wasn't present at all at the meeting
15	where we had all those discussions on aquaculture.
16	So he missed that.
17	CHAIR DiLERNIA: When we probably come
18	back from lunch, we'll try to find some time to
19	make recommendations to when the working group
20	committee can come together. Okay?
21	Further administration items or any
22	other questions on this before we move on? Now
23	we're on schedule.

DR. HOLLIDAY:

24

Tony, just since you've

been talking about makeup and membership, maybe we 1 just skip to the one tab. 2 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes. 3 4 DR. HOLLIDAY: A couple tabs down that 5 has the spreadsheet on MAFAC Membership Appointment Expiration. 6 CHAIR DiLERNIA: It's behind --7 DR. HOLLIDAY: Just keep going a couple 8 9 more. 10 CHAIR DiLERNIA: -- Tab 2 on the pink. 11 Right? Tony has asked me to put 12 DR. HOLLIDAY: together a small table of current members and the 13 first and second term and whether or not when that 14 15 term expires. So we get a sense of the turnover in the membership of the Committee and it's pretty 16 straightforward. 17 CHAIR DiLERNIA: 18 May I? DR. HOLLIDAY: Go ahead. 19 This is a result of --CHAIR DiLERNIA: 20 Those that were appointed with me, I guess you'll 21 say the year Class of, what were we, 2002. 22 there were originally something like 12 members or 23 24 appointed in Well, there members --

supposed to be 14 members expiring in 2002 and Dr. Hogarth reviewed it with then Chairman Rod Moore and invited some members to continue on for another year or so to try to break up the renewal so that if we have 21 appointed members we should never have any more than seven new members coming on at any one time. And we're getting there.

If you look at the matrix that's behind Tab 2, you'll see that there are ten members whose terms expire in 2008 and we should really try to see if perhaps -- I haven't had this discussion with Bill, with Dr. Hogarth, for it's been a few months the last time we discussed this. So his opinions may have changed, but do we want to have only seven members expire in 2008 and have three members serve another year of service. So we would try to get everyone back at the sequence and that would mean that whoever is interested in saying whose term is scheduled to expire would they be interested in serving another year.

I know the last time this was done, that was six years ago, there were approximately six or seven members that were interested in serving for an additional year and basically what

NEAL R. GROSS

they did was they put those names in a hat and they pulled the names out to determine who was going to serve the extra year.

You all can see your names there on the list, myself, Mr. Dorsett, ${\tt Mr.}$ Fletcher, Forster, Mr. Gilmore, Mr. Kramer, Ms. Leipzig, Mr. Rayburn, Mr. Roberts. We will give it thought and we'll refer it back to Hogarth to give us some more quidance. But I think we may want to consider extending individuals for at least, some individuals, for another year to serve additional year as to try to bring an some continuity to the Committee and particularly at a time when we have a transition once again and I'm sure our new members will do a stellar job of continuing good work for the Committee. some of the more experienced members wish to stick around for another year and help the newer members go forward, then let's hear from them.

Questions on that? Mr. Rayburn.

MR. RAYBURN: Is there any indication we'll be going to Hawaii in the next year?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Randy, it's fine 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

22

23

me. You all can come to New York in July.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RAYBURN: Do it in the winter.

(Off the record comments.)

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Laurel.

consideration MS. BRYANT: More needed also as you're doing Charter and as you're doing the membership to also address because I don't think it's ever been done specifically and Mr. that when you have a member such as Donnabrio that for one reason or another is pulled out for one reason or another. Do you have a vacancy that then when is appointed does it fill a full three year term or is the person appointed to complete that term and then is that -- And I think that's something that's really never been addressed and as you guys are having the discussion and considering it, you might want to think about defining that role.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I know the trends on the Fishery Advisory Councils are you're limited to three complete terms. So if you're appointed to complete someone's, say, half term or whatever that doesn't count in your three term limit and perhaps that something that the Committee may want

to make a recommendation on also.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Thank you, Laurel. Thank you for bringing That's that up. an important point regarding the continuity. Any additional questions or comments on that topic before. have additional administrative matters. Right, Mark?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Good. Back to you.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Back to the more mundane issues. As part of your Committee membership responsibilities, you're required every year to complete a confidential disclosure report. We sent out the materials requesting you do this back in the fall, ask you to supply them to our office, I think, it's the first week of January. If you haven't already done so, this is just a friendly reminder to do that.

If you didn't keep a copy of your disclosure form from last year and would like us to send you a copy of it, please just contact me and we'll do so. The form itself has changed. So you have to transcribe materials onto a new form. That's why we just can't xerox the old form,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	white out your signature and have you resign it.
2	There's a new form which is consistent with
3	reducing the paperwork in government. No, that's
4	not true.
5	We do ask your cooperation in doing
6	that and in addition, the last page in the tab has
7	a certification statement that you're also asked
8	to complete. That's a one pager and that you can
9	complete here. You can sign it and date it and
10	give it to me or to Tywanna during the meeting.
11	It's talking about you're not a foreign agent,
12	etc. If you haven't done so, you can just take
13	this out of the notebook and complete that. That
14	would be great so that it would take care of those
15	two housekeeping things as soon as practicable.
16	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. What else do
17	you have? Anything else on that, Mark?
18	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, we have the last
19	item under MAFAC Administration is to talk about
20	one of the more recent activities of MAFAC
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes.
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: it's the
23	Sustainability Awards and we have our first

presentation this morning. I'd like to introduce

to you Michele Shea from the Fish for the Future Foundation who is going to show a little bit about the process that we're going to be using this year and this is under Tab 2 as well as shortly up on the screen.

MS. SHEA: Good morning. As Mark said, I'm Michelle Shea for Fish for the Future Foundation and I'm just going to talk briefly with you this morning about the Sustainable Fisheries Leadership Award, talk a few seconds about the background, a little bit about your role and then go through the evaluation process with you that hopefully you're all very familiar with.

This award's program was launched in the fall of 2005 and this nomination process, it just opened up about a month ago. It will be our third annual. And as you all know, the awards were designed to recognize outstanding performance, achievements and leadership that promote stewardship practices for the sustained use of our nation's living marine resources.

Our award categories, there are six of them. We have the Special Recognition, Stewardship and Sustainability, Conservation

Partnership, Science, Research and Technology,
Coastal Habitat Restoration and Public Education,
Community Service and Media.

One great thing to note is that the interest has been growing and picking up every year. We went from 48 nominations in `06 to 60 in `07. We had one sponsor for the awards ceremony in `06 and we went up to 16 in `07. And we went from 100 to 150 attendees, participants, in the awards ceremony.

Your role, at the request of the Under Secretary, who you helped to establish this awards program and to pick the six categories, is to agree to serve as the review panel for all of the nominations we receive.

This timeline I believe is also in your briefing book just to give you a quick overview of the process. As I said, we opened up the nominations on November 13th, just about a month ago, and the nomination process will close in early February and then in those couple weeks between February 11th and 25th, we'll be getting our website ready for you all and setting up the evaluation process. And then in late February,

you will officially begin your review process and you'll have three weeks to complete your evaluation forms of the nominations. Then once we receive all of your evaluations, what we do is we put that altogether with all of the nominations we receive, all of the supporting materials, and we give this to NMFS Leadership to review and make their selection. And then from there, they will notify winners, announce winners and in June of 2008, something you all should hopefully keep in mind to attend will be the awards ceremony.

A little more about the review and evaluation process that you all will be participating in. It's the same form as 2006 and 2007 for those of you who are familiar with it. Nothing has changed on the evaluation form.

They'll be posted. All the nominations will be posted online as they were last year and you'll be able to review and evaluate them at your leisure during those three weeks and complete the evaluation form and send it to us and you'll get all of this and more specific information in emails and correspondence closer to the start of your review and evaluation process.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Hopefully, you've all seen this. But this is what our website looks like that you will be reviewing from. And, yes, this is what our website looks like.

Once you log in, at the bottom of the page, there will be a log in prompt and you'll get all the information and you log in and you'll see all the award categories. This is just a little page of that, not the full, because we couldn't fit it on one slide. And you'll have the choice of either viewing the nominations individually or you can download them altogether as a zip file. We're really trying to make this as easy and convenient for you all as possible.

Why is your involvement important? There are several reasons, but obviously, this awards program and the way it was designed was with strong input from you all to make sure that we're getting the most meritorious nominees to be selected for our award. And really your full involvement is crucial to the process. Last year, we had 17 members submit evaluations which we were very pleased with. But for 2008, we'd really like to have everyone complete an evaluation form.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And at this point, if you have any suggestions or ideas that you would like to submit to us, you can feel free to bring them up now or you can email me.

In summary, you can expect to receive correspondence in February according to our timeline with more specific instruction on the review process, your log-in, your password, all of that and, if you have ideas that come up later, I hope most of you all have seen the evaluation form in the past. It's a very short form. You can add additional comments if you want. But if you would just like to rank your top three it can be as simple as that.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you. Ouestions First of all, before questions, for Ms. Shea? Michele, I'd like to personally thank you for you and the Fish for The Future Foundation for all the hard work that you've done in really running this for the Service and for MAFAC. The receptions have been fabulous. You make it very easy for us to do this work. It's time-consuming. It takes a few hours, I know, and I go through all nominations and I read every one and I review them

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and I try to make up my mind to rank order folks. 1 2 It does take time. But it is one of our responsibilities. 3 I think the folks that are recognized it's a 4 5 small reward that we can give them for the amount of work that they do. When you read these 6 nominations and you realize the folks that we're 7 reviewing, you want to give an award to each 8 person that's been nominated. 9 But we can't. So we have to make selections. But you make it very 10 11 easy for us and on behalf of the Committee, I really want to thank you for all the hard work for 12 the entire Foundation. 13 (Applause.) 14 15 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Questions for Ms. Shea? 16 Larry. Michele, I echo Tony's 17 MR. SIMPSON: I thought particularly for myself a 18 comments. good thorough review and so forth, can you backup 19 to the interface on the recommendations? That's 20 different this year than it was -- Right there. 21 22 Back up. Forward. This one? 23 MS. SHEA: 24 Isn't that MR. SIMPSON: Yes.

1	different than it was?
2	MS. SHEA: The reason it might look
3	different is that we blocked out the nominees who
4	were not selected to protect their identity.
5	MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Right.
6	MS. SHEA: Hopefully, that's the only
7	reason it looks different.
8	MR. SIMPSON: I remember when I did, I
9	had to do a lot of innovative cutting and pasting
LO	to get my point across and I don't If you could
L1	make a little more user-friendly as far as I I
L2	use a lot of email on computers, but I'm not that
L3	swift at figuring out how to make my comments and
L4	all the kind of stuff. I found it a little
L5	cumbersome last year, but it wasn't undaunting.
L6	MS. SHEA: Okay.
L7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, I think you're
L8	referring to the evaluation itself. Right?
L9	MR. SIMPSON: Yes. Right.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. That's a comment
21	that we can work on and provide appropriate space
22	and make that more efficient.
23	MR. SIMPSON: Yes. Okay.

Definitely

MS. SHEA:

DR. HOLLIDAY: Michele, do you happen 1 to have a sample with you? 2 MS. SHEA: Of the evaluation form, I 3 4 have it on a jump drive. On the break, we 5 DR. HOLLIDAY: take a look at it and talk some more about it 6 offline. 7 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Questions? Additional 8 9 questions? Ralph. MR. RAYBURN: This is Ralph Rayburn. 10 February 25th and March 5th is only two weeks, 11 isn't it? 12 MS. SHEA: I followed last year's form. 13 I apologize if I misspoke when I said three 14 15 weeks. Last year, do you remember if it was two or three? 16 MR. RAYBURN: I don't but two weeks, at 17 the rate these things are going, that's quite an 18 effort especially for this group. So I think -- I 19 quess my question is why does it seem like we rush 20 to an April 7th deadline and then it's not until 21 22 June that we give the awards. Is that because I know it takes time for the awards in setting 23 24 everything up. But I just wasn't sure if there is

a mandate to do the two week review. We can have 1 2 100 to do. That's a lot of effort. I'm just curious about it. 3 4 MS. SHEA: Sure. There's a couple 5 things. One, I think it would be within reason to extend the evaluation period for another week to 6 make it three weeks. Like I said, I tried to 7 follow last year's format. But I think three 8 weeks is reasonable. 9 10 Also part of the reason for the early choosing and notification of the winners is that 11 the video that's put together for the awards 12 ceremony for those of you who have attended does 13 take a great deal of time to put together and they 14 15 obviously can't get started working on that addition to other aspects of the awards ceremony 16 that need the winners' for. 17 we names So unfortunately, that's sort of does need to stay 18 19 pretty early. MR. RAYBURN: But, say, if you did give 20 us another week to the 17th, whatever day of the 21 22 week that is.

MS. SHEA:

MR. RAYBURN: That would still be

NEAL R. GROSS

Sure.

23

enough time for the administrator to review them 1 and notify and not mess that schedule up too much. 2 I'll talk with Mary Hope and 3 MS. SHEA: 4 Mark about that, but I would think yes. 5 MR. RAYBURN: I would appreciate it. Thank you. 6 7 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Do you have а question? 8 9 DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. Just a question. Mark and then Jim. CHAIR DiLERNIA: 10 11 DR. HOLLIDAY: You mentioned some of the or you emphasized the review role of MAFAC and 12 looking at the nominations. I think there's 13 another perhaps unofficial role for MAFAC as well 14 15 and that's soliciting to submit nominations. is kind of an awkward time of year in just the way 16 the calendar falls for people who publish 17 Federal Register notice. Not many people look at 18 that for their source of ready information. 19 with the 20 But have contacts you 21 organizations, constituents, other your 22 stakeholders. So any effort that you could make to help promote the nomination, submission of 23

nominations, in these different categories would

1	be exceedingly helpful. You may know yourself of
2	people who are deserving or organizations that
3	would be great to nominate. So I would just
4	encourage MAFAC to keep that in mind as well, not
5	just the important role you have on reviewing, but
6	helping to get the right people nominated in these
7	categories and so the deserving folks have their
8	shot.
9	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Let me just ask you.
10	Wait a second. I have a question to this point.
11	Michele, perhaps you could refresh my memory.
12	We've had some members in the past nominated,
13	members of our own committee nominated, and is
14	there a policy or how did we work that? Could you
15	remind me please?
16	MS. SHEA: From my memory and just
17	maybe could step in here, what we have done is
18	just ask that members on their honor not evaluate
19	someone that they may have a conflict of interest
20	with or themselves.
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. But it is still
22	appropriate to nominate members of the Committee.
23	MS. SHEA: It is.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Very good.

(Off the record comments.) 1 MR. RAYBURN: Tom McKant 2 wasn't sitting member. 3 4 CHAIR DiLERNIA: He was not a sitting 5 member. Okay. (Off the record comments.) 6 7 CHAIR DiLERNIA: We had, I think, sitting member nominated also. 8 MS. SHEA: Yes. 9 CHAIR DiLERNIA: A sitting member. Jim 10 11 and then Ralph and then Bob. MR. GILMORE: Actually, I'll go to your 12 point, although I didn't intend to. Our Pollock 13 Conservation Cooperative won in the first year and 14 15 what we did was we found somebody. We didn't self nominate and I recused myself from judging in that 16 category, just to give you that. 17 The two points that I wanted to raise, 18 I'm not quite sure how you handle it, but one 19 thing I found a little cumbersome in doing the 20 21 evaluations that people would nominate was 22 themselves under several categories. So you just Obviously, you only needed to 23 read the

submission once. But it led to a lot of bulk when

you were down loading because you have the same submission coming up time and time again. I don't know if there's a way fairly for, and I don't want to put the burden on Michele necessarily or someone at NMFS just to sort of, Laurel's going to correct me that I'm wrong, but we don't do that.

MS. BRYANT: No, but I think it's something that when we were first developing this there was in the rules and actually in the instructions is that there will only be a nomination for one category and only considered for one category.

So when it's come that there is a nominee that's been an award in one category, there's kind of been this question do we exclude them. Does that kind of eliminate them from the - and I don't think the Committee has ever really looked at follow-up on that. We've never really done a follow-up.

MR. GILMORE: I'd like to have somebody make the judgment before it's submitted to us that this is the category that it's most appropriate to put this nominee in so that you -- Personally, I don't think it's fair to the other nominees to be

NEAL R. GROSS

in one category and somebody else is competing in three or four different ones.

MS. BRYANT: But other ones have also been where you get different entities that nominate the same one and so it is a different nomination and that's happened.

MR. GILMORE: I guess the other point and goes entirely to NOAA is that the purpose, one of the purposes, behind doing this originally was all we ever heard was the gloom and the doom, the oceans are empty, nothing is going right in the oceans and the world is coming to an end and we were trying to create some deservedly positive press for what's out there and one thing that I with know struggled when our pollock we the that. the cooperative won award was made in April but announcement the was wasn't until June and it was tough to do a media thing because you have an event two months after the news and I don't know if there's a way for NOAA to package this in a way in which we can get -- I mean to me it's news in April. In June, it's a wonderful ceremony and it was a terrific dinner that was put together last year and it's a great

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	event. But it's not a media event at that point.
2	And if there's some way to get a little bit more
3	bounce out of it in April and to be able to work
4	with the nominees on or the award winners in
5	marketing that, I just think that would go back to
6	one of the original purposes of putting this
7	together.
8	MS. KATSOUROS: We had the idea of
9	announcing the top three and then actually at the
10	awards ceremony number one. You know they're all
11	winners and that way it would be a little suspense
12	and obviously they were all deserving and it was
13	just according to ranking and it would be like the
14	Academy Awards. You don't know until that day.
15	MR. GILMORE: But then there's the
16	awkward moment where you don't win and you're just
17	
18	MS. KATSOUROS: Right.
19	MR. GILMORE: And the fisherman gets
20	you.
21	MS. KATSOUROS: But you actually do
22	win. So that was the thing that we were dealing
23	with about how do you add that suspense and as

we've said make the press interested at that time.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The point is well taken. I mean, I understand it's sort of the first runner-up is not as excited as the award winner. But trying to do something that would emphasize the event and coincide with the announcement, we'll see what we can come up with. If you have some suggestions, that would be helpful, too.

MS. BRYANT: Mark.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Laurel.

MS. BRYANT: Since I'm not doing this anymore, it doesn't matter. But one thing, Jim, that we did learn, you were the first year, by last year what we ended up doing with the last winners is we did do target media rollouts in each of the areas where the winners occurred and we also did trade magazine target rollout. So that did work better.

But you're right. The first year it was kind of what are we doing and how are we doing it. So it was learning curves. I don't know what the Foundation is going to do with it, but that is something to consider.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have some more hands along this side here.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. FLETCHER: I'm just supporting what
2	Jim had to say. I think it's pretty easy for the
3	members here even if they get nominated just to
4	recuse themselves from evaluating their own and I
5	just made kind of a funny comment. The one year
6	when Ted Stevens was nominated for that particular
7	award we all knew who was going to win. So anyone
8	else that was nominated was going to come in
9	second or below. In those cases, it's a lot
10	easier to put that candidate up for more than one
11	award because you know he's not going to get that
12	one or he or she or the group, etc.
13	(Off the record comments.)
14	MS. KATSOUROS: suggest that we do
15	not do We try and stay away from nominating in
16	several groups.
17	MR. GILMORE: I think that was my
18	suggestion. I think Dr. Hogarth said
19	(Laughter.)
20	MR. GILMORE: I think I lost
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ralph.
22	MR. RAYBURN: I seem to remember that
23	MAFAC members weren't allowed to nominate. Is
24	that really in the rules or was that just it makes

1	it too complicated when you go to scoring and
2	stuff? Are we allowed to nominate? I've been
3	telling folks I can't nominate.
4	MS. KATSOUROS: You can nominate. Then
5	you should recuse yourself for that.
6	MR. RAYBURN: But it would certainly
7	bias your other scores in that category. But I
8	don't know. But that's not part of it. I got
9	that from somewhere I guess.
LO	CHAIR DiLERNIA: You can nominate all
11	the folks you want.
L2	MS. KATSOUROS: Yes, but you just go
L3	to vote.
L4	MR. RAYBURN: Sure.
L5	(Off the record comments.)
L6	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Any other questions
L7	for Yes. Mr. Roberts. Ken.
L8	DR. ROBERTS: Did I get in front of
L9	Bob? Are you finished, Bob?
20	MR. FLETCHER: Yes.
21	MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Refresh my memory.
22	I have fun doing this.
23	(Off the record comments.)
24	MR. ROBERTS: I actually do it twice.

1	I do it once and put my results aside. Wait a week
2	later and then I do it again and then I'll see.
3	It's high level math to average two numbers. But
4	I can't recall much emphasis on groups or teams.
5	Is it primarily individuals? Do you have to be an
6	individual to be nominated?
7	MS. SHEA: That are nominated? We saw
8	
9	MR. ROBERTS: I just can't recall many
10	teams.
11	MS. SHEA: a wide variety last year.
12	MR. ROBERTS: You did?
13	MS. SHEA: We did.
14	(Off the record discussion.)
15	MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there's was
16	California habitat group that was interested.
17	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Actually, I think the
18	groups had more nominations than individuals.
19	MR. ROBERTS: I couldn't remember
20	distinctly whether it was one person who was
21	chairman of the group or the whole group was up,
22	how you would handle it a task force in some
23	community that was 30 people. Is it one person

that's nominated or is the group nominated?

MS. SHEA: We've seen both and when it's the group they will select one sort of maybe the couple people that are front-running the task force.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: The leadership.

MS. SHEA: Or the leadership and they'll notify them and then they will get in touch with the rest of the organization and we sort of base how many people they can bring to the awards dinner based on how big the organization is, how many people were involved and what they need and want.

(Off the record discussions.)

MS. KATSOUROS: The other thing is the sponsors. So if you would like to be a sponsor or you know somebody who would like to be a sponsor please let us know. We will sponsor a fundraising in January. These are outside funds. They're not federal funds for this event and one year it was one person who donated which was a lot easier for us. But we are trying to have a diversity to show that this is important to the whole range of stakeholders.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Is there a

1	solicitation letter or package for sponsorship?
2	MS. KATSOUROS: Yes.
3	CHAIR DiLERNIA: If you could share
4	that with me. I mean, someone comes to mind right
5	away, my own mind, that I would go to for
6	sponsorship.
7	MS. KATSOUROS: We have a very nice
8	package.
9	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you. Mr. Cates.
10	MR. CATES: What's the sponsorship
11	level? What are you looking for?
12	MS. KATSOUROS: We accept all money.
13	We haven't turned down any money yet. So whatever
14	amount people we haven't set a minimum because
15	that would leave some people out.
16	MR. ROBERTS: How much do you need?
17	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Good question.
18	MS. KATSOUROS: It ranges between
19	and this does not cover any of our expenses. I
20	should make this clear. The staff and those
21	expenses are not covered. What we are covering is
22	the actual event, getting out the invitations,
23	things like that and printing up the books and
24	it's between \$40,000 and \$50,000 when everything

1	is said and done.
2	CHAIR DiLERNIA: And that's for how
3	many people about?
4	MS. KATSOUROS: One hundred and fifty.
5	CHAIR DiLERNIA: One hundred and fifty.
6	Are there any plans to grow that number?
7	MS. KATSOUROS: Only if we have the
8	money.
9	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay.
10	MS. KATSOUROS: Well, you know you have
11	two options. You could not go a very nice event
12	and have more people for the same amount. Or if
13	you have more people and you want to keep the flow
14	of the event, then you have to raise more money.
15	And we have not paid for the certificate. That's
16	NOAA. They've borne a lot of the expenses, too.
17	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. Any other
18	questions? Again, thank you, Michele. Thanks
19	again to everybody.
20	(Applause.)
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: We're right on
22	schedule. We have a break scheduled. We'll take
23	a 15 minute break and when we come back, Alan, I
24	think you're up. You're going to sub in for Tim

Hansen. So 15 minutes, everyone, and we'll be back here and Alan will take over. Thank you. Off the record.

(Whereupon, at 10:31 a.m., the above-entitled matter recessed and reconvened at 10:49 a.m.)

CHAIR DiLERNIA: On the record. Folks, could we come to order? I don't have a blind spot on my left, but I have a tendency to go to my right and so if some of these folks here on the left, if they've been raising their hands, maybe I'll hand out flare guns for the left side of the table.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Hand out a couple rubber bands.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: There you go. But if I have missed your hand, I apologize. Actually, coming from a large Italian family and from Brooklyn, we always sort of found a way to express ourselves and let folks know "Hey, me." And not everyone sitting around the table is Italian, but that's what I respond to, I guess. After a while, it becomes a little -- What can I say? It's just what I'm used to. But again, if I missed your

hand in the morning's discussion, I apologize and I will do my best to make sure I scan the whole room and we get the entire discussion.

Mr. Risenhoover, you're next. Alan.

MR. RISENHOOVER: We're going to do today is we're going to go back through the -- give you an update on where we are. It seems like I've given 100 presentations on this over the last month or so. So I've tried to change it a little bit for the MAFAC folks. I did a briefing on the Hill last week to brief user groups and a lot of them don't have the basis you do. So some of the first slides here are going to be kind of a review of some things.

I'm going to go through those quickly and I'm going to remind you of what the provisions are in the Act, the major ones, and then at the end and this isn't going to be in your briefing book because I just put it together this morning is a quick summary of where we are kind of, the statistics of where we are in implementing the Act, how many things are done, how many things have to go, what are some of the problems. And that's still going to be draft.

NEAL R. GROSS

What I'm trying to do is work on a report to my leadership, to Dr. Hogarth perhaps before he leaves, but definitely to whoever is there afterwards kind of as a year anniversary progress. MAFAC will get a copy of that as well and you'll see the beginnings of that here at the end.

Stop me if you have questions.

Otherwise, I'm just going to run through this.

So we all know what the Magnuson Act, it happened in `76, how it's kind of evolved. So if you have questions on that, let me know. But I don't think for this group that's really as relevant as it for some of the other groups recently.

goals of `96 Amendment, Again, the optimum yield includes ending overfishing. That's the theme that's really carried through in the 2007 Act as well. So we're going to be talking a lot about overfishing. I use this slide mainly as a set up for the goals. So let's remember the goals for the 2007 Act, the main one being prevent and end overfishing. It included just about six eight lines on preventing and ending

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

overfishing. But that's what we're spending the majority of our time on trying to get implemented. But it also had improving science and decision-making. I'll talk about a little bit about that. We have a briefing on the rec registry program as well. So I won't spend a lot of time on that and market-based management, presidential goals associated with that, and I'll go through the international things fairly quickly as well.

What I want to do is since the Act focused on ending overfishing is just remind people, broader audiences, the difference between overfishing and overfished which are two terms we use when we're talking to the lawyer side of the House very specifically. But when we're at the Bar we're a little broader on how we use. But one is the rate and one is the population side.

But here is the important slide that I want to spend just a minute on. This is the 43 stocks as of the end of the third quarter that are still subject to overfishing. We have got 43 around the country. You can see it's mainly on East Coast and highly migratory species, the secretarial managed stocks, but a few out on the

West Coast and elsewhere. So as we get into talking about the annual catch limit requirements of the new Act, these are the important ones to remember. This is the 43 that are going to be the first major tests of this new Act.

Now those 43 changed. Our annual report to Congress last year, I believe, had 46. So what we've done is we've started reporting on these quarterly. We've post them on our website. So you can see as stocks go on and up, the number doesn't change that much, but the individual stocks do.

If you go back to 2001 just as a point stocks taken 16 off of interest, we've overfishing list. That's the good news. The bad news is 17 new ones have come on. Now why is it that 17 new ones come on? There is a variety of reasons. Maybe there was а failure in But what we've looked at and management systems. notice more is as we get new and better science, we discover new stocks are subject to overfishing. It's a lot like diagnosing a disease. You have to find out there's a problem before you can solve We're at 43 right now. That's going to be the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

major test. I'll talk about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BILLY: Before you move on, what's the denominator? How many total are there?

MR. RISENHOOVER: We track about 530 So it's about 20 percent are subject to overfishing. You'll also notice we're talking about these FSSI stocks. That's the Fishery Stock Sustainability Index. That's our Government Performance and Results Act performance measure. So we've narrowed that stock. There's 530 major stocks and stock complexes. We've narrowed that down to 230 that we're trying to track over time. Those 230 are any stocks that have ever to overfishing and kind subject are of important stocks. It represents approximately about 90 percent of the landings in that 230. 300 other stocks that 10 you have represent trying percent We're through our so. performance measure to focus on which ones important and track those subject to overfishing.

The other measure then is subject to overfished. It's hard to get the verbs with these two words. We were hoping they would have fixed that. So these are the overfished stocks. The

ones that are bold are both experiencing overfishing as well as overfished. You can see there's a lot of duplication there that both stocks have both things.

The historical perspective on this is,

I have to think a minute, we have taken 29 stocks

off the overfished list since 2001. Twenty-nine

have come off and I believe it's 19 have come on.

Management failures in some case, yes, but in

other cases, better science, better data, results

in the overfished determination. So this is the

other half of it. You have to work on ending

overfishing up front, but then you also want to

keep our eye on rebuilding.

MR. FLETCHER: Alan, I'd like to see you put some kind of an asterisk next to yellow fin and big eye because that's really misleading when you lump that altogether when the impact of U.S. Fisheries on those stocks is so minor. Bob Fletcher, by the way.

MR. RISENHOOVER: That's a good point. We do have international stocks as he mentioned. Where did they go?

MR. FLETCHER: They're on the back.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. We do have that on the overfished and there are some stocks where the international harvest is primarily where the problem is and I'll talk about when we do the ACL rules how we're going to try and handle those stocks. It's kind of the tail wagging the dog. You can cut the tail off and it doesn't matter. The dog keeps going.

So on those, we have to look at that. Some other ones are things like Red Drum. It's closed in the EEZ. What else can you do as a federal government? You close the fishery.

Where we have state problems or state challenges, disuse or let's use the word "challenges," I guess, you have state challenges, you have international challenges. Those things we're looking at moving forward with under But we do recognize that and what we're the Act. doing now as we're moving along is we're trying to start categorizing where can we make a difference. If we have limited resources, where can we make the biggest difference? You know, closing down the big fishery domestically, does that make a difference? We're looking at trying to categorize

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

even further than what we've done here in the future.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'll let you complete your presentation and then we'll take additional questions from there on.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Okay. So those are the overfished. I'll run quickly through the domestic provisions and again kind of give you an overview of where we're at. The first is ending and preventing overfishing. As I mentioned, this is the major one. A lot of you have been involved in this.

We went early this year in February, took a couple months of public comment. We got over 2500 public comments in an initial what's out there, what are people's concerns. We held nine public hearings on it and took comments to the public hearing as well. What we're doing now and I think the last meeting I briefed you all in June I thought we were getting closer to a proposed rule. We're still getting closer to a proposed rule and I'll explain what some of the issues are that are slowing us down.

But anyway, just to remind you, annual

NEAL R. GROSS

catch limits need to be set such that overfishing exceed does not Ιt not the occur. can recommendations in the council's science and statistical committees. You have got to have some sort of accountability. So if you have a measure in place, an annual catch limit, and it doesn't work for some reason, what are you going to do and that what are you going to do needs to take care of the overfishing issue. As I mentioned, it's going to be required for those 43 stocks on that first map by 2010. So that's coming quickly.

We took the public comments. We've been going through those. We've been working with our regions drafting a proposed rule and, as many of you have heard me say before, hopefully we're getting close to that in kind of context where we are with that.

But there are a number of issues we're looking at. The first one is how do you make sure this new rule is going to be flexible going on up to represent what's going around the regions. So if you have something that's working, you notice there isn't a lot of overfishing in Alaska. Right? Whatever rule we put in place, we don't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

want to harm how they're managing in Alaska. We have to be flexible enough that this rule applies to all the regions, but it also has to be strong enough to meet the mandates of the Act and that's kind of the big challenge is how do we make sure such that overfishing does not occur but not mess things up or it's not occurring or institute a new regulation that requires people to do something that maybe doesn't have an effect. So we want to target where the effect is but be flexible enough to make sure we're not messing things up.

Another issue is which stocks need the ACLs? If you read the Act, it says all fisheries. Well, a fishery is a combination of stocks. So we're looking at that. Tom mentioned how many stocks do you have in total. We have about 530 that are managed in some way. But there's about 1700 others that are included in that 530 because of these stock assemblages and complexes.

Does it make sense to have an ACL for all of those? If so, how do you do it? Again, we want to concentrate on those 43. That's the first major test where we know there's a problem and we need to solve it. So how do we put an ACL on all

NEAL R. GROSS

stocks or fisheries? How do we combine those?

The state waters issue and the international waters issue is another one. If you have a stock such as red drum where you have closed it in the Federal Waters, in the EEZ you still need an ACL, an annual catch limit. And if you do, is that zero? How do you work with the states then on things like red drum especially in In the Atlantic, we're going to be the Gulf? transferring authority of red drum to the Atlantic States sometime in Vince's and mУ lifetime. Right? So how do you work with the states to do that?

You have the states' waters issues as well. Then you have the international. Now the did provisions in Act. have some there international. We'll probably have some exemptions for those based on what's in the Act you do have if an international fishery that's managed, we need to go work with the RFMO, the Regional Fisheries Management Organization, and try to end overfishing on the international just on the domestic level; level instead on whereas, as Bob has pointed out, you can't solve

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

some of these problems by shutting down U.S domestic fisheries. So that's another issue.

We have the issue of limits and targets. Some regions have very strict limits and targets under those and they manage to those. Other areas don't. So how do we have an ACL where they don't have a strict limit on catch? So we need to look at that.

Probability of success. Do we mandate what your probability of success needs to be? we do that? Many places we don't have the data to say these management measures have a 70, 80, 90, 10, 50 percent change of succeeding. What we're looking at is what -- You try to measure that, but that's where your accountability measure comes in. So if your management measure may not work, you need a stronger accountability measure. You have a very strongly managed fishery such as an IFQ perhaps. Maybe your accountability measure doesn't ever kick in because you're so structured at the beginning on what folks delay at.

We have the new terminology problem.

The Act mandates "allowable biological catches"

but doesn't define it. We need to think about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

defining that in such a way it makes sense to all our regions and our fisheries. It includes this new term "annual catch limits," ACLs. What does that mean? Is it a limit? Is it a target? How does it relate to overfishing? So we're trying to sort those out across our six regions and eight councils.

And then finally I mentioned the accountability measures. What does that mean exactly? And we're kind of come up with three broad areas for accountability measures. You can be very accountable up front. That is set quota is very conservative or set your hardest very conservative.

Another accountability measure might be if you have the data in-season monitoring. As the fishery progresses through the year, you're able to monitor it. You're getting towards your limit or your target. You might be able to shut it down.

And then finally you have kind of a retrospective accountability measure that you look back at what happened the previous year, adjust your harvests for the following year accordingly

NEAL R. GROSS

or change seasons or have area closures. So we're also looking at what are all the possible accountability measures that are out there that are being used now and how do we weave those into this new rule.

I spent a little extra time on this because I think this is the main one folks are interested in and as I said before, hopefully the proposed rule is going to be out soon for public comment. We need to get that done because the councils have to have these in place for those 43 stocks by 2010.

A second area was to promote marketbased approaches. As you know, this priority under the President's Ocean Action Plan. The Administration also set a goal of doubling the number of these by 2010. So it is a priority. It was a priority in our `08 budget request which until when I got on the plane yesterday it was looking pretty good. When I got off the plane, it wasn't looking so good anymore. So I don't know where we are with that. We had \$6 million new money for implementation of these programs. Ι don't know what happened to that. We'll have to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

find out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But anyway, the Act included some goals that they would have to rebuild overfish fisheries, needs to promote safety, reduce overcapacity, economic benefits. But there's a lot of issues with this as well and we went out this summer and fall and asked people for comments on what do you think needs clarified under the Act. Then we got about another 2500 comments. We're currently going through those, looking at those comments, talking to our regional folks, getting organized internally to figure out what do we do Our initial idea is to go forward with some proposed guidance, but that's going to be off into the future a little bit.

Some of the issues here are some are listed up there. Others are what's the eligibility to acquire the privileges, how do you charge fees, how do you set the transferability of these privileges, how long should those privileges last, a word I can't read, and other things. So this is one that we're working on a proposed rule, but again, it's off in the future a little bit.

Improving science, the main thing is

the new Recreational Data Collection Program and I think Gordon and Pres will be here this afternoon to talk about that. So I won't spend much time on that. The main thing is get this registry in place. That will be a regulatory action. We're working with them on that.

Some other things to improve science, a role for the SSCs. There are stronger have to file financial requirements that they disclosure information. We're collecting that. We owe Congress a report the beginning of next year on recusals and financial disclosure. not what that was about, but anyway so there is this stronger role for the SSCs in addition and that is they set the ABCs that the council uses. So the science and statistical committees will give the councils an allowable biological catch that those councils cannot exceed.

What we're doing to implement this is I've asked all the councils to give me a plan on how they're going to implement this. Some councils don't really use their SSC right now. Some use them in different ways. So we need to make sure that everybody's implementing the Act

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and implementing it somewhat consistently.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This is really going to kick in when we do those ACLs in 2010 because that's where the thread works. The council supplies the ABC. Oh, I'm sorry. The SSC provides the ABC. The council takes that, develops its ACLs based on that. Sorry for the alphabet soup there.

A couple other things. I'm going to spend a little time on something that was just released last week, but it authorizes some research programs. I'm going to talk a little bit more about the Deep Sea Coral and the by-catch, but it also authorized our Cooperative Research Program and we all know we've had a Cooperative Research Program for a number of years. Congressional authorization for have that. Hopefully, that will help us in the out-years in budget but also the structure of that report and we already have a few folks calling us on how they can participate in that.

I want to spend just a second on deep sea corals. The Act did provide some new authorities for the councils on deep sea corals, especially that we can designate areas to protect

NEAL R. GROSS

these corals from fishing gear. Before you had to relate it as essential fish habitat. But the corals were important to Fishery. Now we can protect them without that relationship being established. That was a big deal.

The other thing it did is it required a series of reports that (1) we released in January to Congress on how we're setting this up, but we just last week released the state of deep So that's available on corals ecosystems. the NMFS's website or you can order a copy of it. that's one of the recent things we did just last week in implementing that Act. So that's another for check Alan's sponsors. But that's an important one.

DR. HOLLIDAY: All the MAFAC members will be getting a letter from the Office of Habitat Conservation about how it's important.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Moving right along. And then it authorized a new by-catch reduction engineering program. That I think is going to be established either this week or next week. I don't know if I need to sign the final policy directive for it or not, Mark, if I did. But it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

going to happen. So we now have We have terms of reference where we'll together. have regional involvement in this national program look at reducing by-catch and developing engineering programs to work on that. We'll have annual report on that program next year. We're getting it established on time and we'll meet the annual report on time.

And this is the exciting slide for me here because here is one of the programs and this is from Hawaii that was funded out of this. have a little funding for this program. Hopefully in `08, we were going to get about \$400,000 more. Again, I don't know what happened during my plane ride, if it's still there or not. But what this is showing is looking at reducing the by-catch of sharks and on the one that's moving there, that's a regular lead weight, regular hook and bait and you can see the shark pretty excited about eating But what they've been working with are these it. e-metals that have some sort of electronic charge and if you watch this, the shark goes up to eat it and then doesn't want anything to do with it. is something we're thinking about maybe in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the Atlantic. Sharks really are in trouble in the Atlantic and we're coming out with a final rule on reducing the harvest for sharks. But we also need to reduce the by-catch. So with these e-metal technologies, they'll allow us to repel sharks but still harvest target species. That's a big deal. So a little bit of money here goes a long way for this and we now have a program that's going to institutionalize in the agency to do just that.

Another big provision in the Act was the requirement to integrate and streamline our procedures relative to NEPA and the Magnuson-Stevens Act. If you look at NEPA, kind of the minimum time NEPA requires is the maximum time Magnuson allows in our process. So we put a work group together to look at how do we better mesh these two programs. There's been a lot of talk about this being a NEPA exemption. It is not. NEPA is still something we're required to do. The Act didn't exempt us from that.

The councils put out a strawman in February. We took public comment on that as well as some broad statements or concerns we had. We had about 3,000 comments on that. We've combed

NEAL R. GROSS

through those. We've been working closely with the Council on Environmental Quality. We're hoping to meet with the councils again this week to kind of go over where we are on this and come out fairly soon with this.

This is one of the ones you're going to see that we're late on. We were by the Act mandated to have a rule out in July for public comment. We missed that deadline. But hopefully we're getting close again. But there will be another 90 day public comment on what we come out with NEPA. So this is ongoing and I think we're getting fairly close on it.

Just some other provisions, I mentioned the conflict of interest. Ι kind of qot sidestepped on that, the SSCs there. The conflict of interest rules especially the financial SSC, also disclosure for the this report Congress on recusals of council members because they're substantively involved with the decision.

It authorizes another program we already have in place, our joint enforcement agreements. And there were several parts that addressed the hurricanes and disaster provisions.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We're looking at doing guidance on those as well.

And when I get to the end here, I'll kind of summarize how we're going to try and step all these -- level rules out.

I'm going to run through the international ones fairly quickly. But we have to take action to address international overfishing. So Congress recognized it wasn't enough to do it it domestically. We need to look at internationally as well. And the main thing that the Act focused on was the illegal unreported and unregulated fishing. So that's a theme through here.

We're required to submit to Congress a bi-annual report next year. The main provisions of it are there that we need to look at what fishing and then the nations have IUU what regional fishery management organizations are that. After identify these doing about we we need to notify them. nations, We need to conduct consultations with seek them, international agreements with them on by-catch and otherwise to try and end those problems.

That's something we're working on. We

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

published a definition of what IUU is. We're working on regulations in this bi-annual report on IUU fishing as well.

The certification process is we have to certify whether corrective action is being taken by the nation, notify -- they'll get a positive or a negative certification. And basically if they get a negative certification, we can block some imports.

President will take that The under consideration if we do make those negative certifications. again, International But our Affairs Office is working on a rule-making to implement that.

But what we have been doing is trying to build capacity internationally as we go on. So we've held a number of workshops already on marine mammals, sea turtles, sea birds, other resources. We have a stranding response and our enforcement folks have gotten a little extra money in the last years to look at international overfishing problems and IUUs as well.

That's the quick summary. I'm not going to spend any time. Again, the domestic

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

provisions, we're focused on overfishing. International, we're looking at how do we multilaterally fisheries, better manage these especially when it comes to IUU and then hopefully, here's the kind of statistics on where we were. When we went through the Act, developed an implementation plan and any of you that have been to our website have seen implementation plan and we've been trying to track it as we go.

In the Act, there were 30 tasks or groups of tasks that had hard deadlines. Congress said the Secretary shall do this by this date. We made those our priority tasks. I'll talk about some other things in a minute, but there were 30 of those in total that had dates ranging from 30 days to six months to a year to two years and one, I believe, was even three years. Of those 30 tasks, we've completed 10 of them. We're one-third of the way done with those.

Some of these weren't too difficult.

Others were a little harder. But I've listed those on what we have gotten done. The bottom one here, process for monitoring and certifying

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

contracted performance was actually something the Tsunami Center and the Weather Service was required to do. So we're tracking the Weather Service here, too, to make sure they keep up, nine Fisheries and one Weather Service one. I think many of you are familiar with some of these from around the country that have already been done.

Of those 30 tasks, we had 12 others that are on track. I need to kind of explain what "on track" means and what we're tracking. We've established internal deadlines and milestones for all of the parts of the Act. The "on track" means we're still meeting our deadlines. The first one, the Marine Recreational Fisheries Information Program, needs to be in place by January of `09 and Gordon and Pres will talk to you about that. So that's still on track now. They're meeting their internal deadlines.

The Annual Catch Limit Guidance, we're still meeting our internal deadlines, but that's starting to slip. The main thing this is tracking is the 2010. So we're still on track to meet the 2010 provision that says get ACLs in place for all stocks experiencing overfishing. So that's kind

of a two part one.

The By-catch Reduction Engineering

Program will be done this week. That will move
onto the "Done."

A conflict of interest report to the Congress is working its way through clearance. Hopefully, in January that comes out. That will go to "Done."

The Deep Sea Coral Report to Congress will be out in January `08. That's different than the one that was released last week. This is another requirement.

The International Fisheries Report to Congress is an `09 requirement and on down the list. And then the bottom two again are Weather Service requirements. They need to report to Congress on tsunami technology. Those are the 22 that are looking pretty good.

Of course, there are eight that we need to talk a little bit about. We have two tasks that are pending that we haven't really done anything on or establish milestones. The first one is a secretarial appointment for international agreements involving fisheries. It's a 2009

NEAL R. GROSS

requirement. We haven't done anything. It's not really on track, but it's not due. So it's pending. I don't know what that means.

A tsunami forecast system, the report to Congress, they're working on that. I'm not sure if The Weather Service is going to meet that.

The six tasks that probably we could be criticized for are up there. There were three tasks due at six months after the Act enactment and that was the Ecosystem Research Study to Congress. We contracted for that report. We've gotten a draft report back from the contractor and our Science and Technology Office is looking at that.

A process for national experimental fishing permits process, that's going to be a rule. It's in final clearance now. So we missed the July 12th, but hopefully it will be coming out very soon.

There was a requirement for us to look at the number and types of fishery science degrees coming out of college right now. We were to coordinate with the Department of Education. We contracted for that report. We've gotten back a

draft from the contractor. They were trying to finish it up. These three tasks were important and I think we're pretty close to getting those done.

There are three tasks that are due next month and since I came here, they're not going to be done. Right? But this environmental review process for NEPA, we were supposed to have a final rule in place in January. We don't have a proposed rule out yet. So we're working on that. We hope to get one out. Again, it doesn't cause anything not to happen. We're still implementing NEPA as we always have. What we need to do is get this proposed rule out on how NEPA would be better integrated with Magnuson in the future.

quidelines, IFO referendum I think we're getting close on that. A proposed rule fairly soon should come out on IFOs in the Northeast and the Southeast. They're required to have a referendum of the participants in fishery and we need to get some guidance out on how those referenda should be run.

And then finally an over capacity report to Congress is due in January. I have a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

draft of that. We have some internal concerns with it. I don't know that we meet January, the deadline for that. But hopefully soon after that we can get it out. I'm just trying to get everything lined up.

So those are the 30. Like I said, we have one-third of them done. We have another third that we're in pretty good shape on. Then we have these eight that are a little behind that I think we're getting close on.

Then we have some Priority 2 and Priority 3 tasks. These were originally over 100 tasks. We've tried to combine them. Priority 1 tasks, remember, were things with a hard deadline. Priority 2 tasks were things Congress said do it but didn't give us a deadline. Priority 3 tasks said these are things you could do in the Act.

I just pulled out a couple examples here. Ten of those 50 we're done with. A lot of them were self-implementing. We may need to change our regs a little bit just to reflect the new statute. But those are done.

We have another 12 that are complete that we did have to take some action on. We

NEAL R. GROSS

established the Council's Coordination Committee.

All the councils passed a motion establishing that committee.

A hurricane disaster assistance program, the money has already gone out to the states here in the Gulf. Joint enforcement agreements and there are some others there.

So we have about 20, 25 of those 50 that were done. On the others, we have 18 that are currently in progress. I'm going to do a technical revision to all the fisheries regulations just to update them. What we're doing right now is going to hold that as the last thing we do. As we go through all these other actions, we have a parking lot. We're just putting them in there and we may need to change a few things.

The LAP guidance again, we weren't required by statute to do that, but we'll probably come out with some guidance on it.

Peer review guidance, we're probably come out with. Fish and Capacity Reduction guidelines. So we have some other things we're working on but at a slower pace.

I think that's it. I'll finish with

NEAL R. GROSS

just to stay informed. That website is where I'm trying to get everything posted. That's kind of the first portal of information for folks to go to and hopefully we can keep that updated. What we try to do is any time there's an opportunity for public comment or review, we post a link to it there. It's kind of a one-stop shop for staying informed.

And then just to close, just because it makes me feel better to say things like this, I was thinking this morning. There's a lot of things going on and folks are wondering what are you going to LAP guidelines, when are you going to have the SOC revisions. For these national rules, we're trying to step those out.

So we're working on ACLs and the NEPA rules now. We have about eight of these going on and the Rec Registry. That's kind of the first salvo of rules that will come out. The IFQ referendum rates will be part of that, too.

The next layer of those are the exempted fishing permit draft regs, draft regs on the standard operating procedures for the councils and the LAP guidelines for the new Act and also

some disasters, guidelines on how disasters are declared and kind of the New England experience there.

That's where we are. We have about eight national regs in play right now in addition to the multitude of regional and other headquarters regs we do just a normal course of That's the wrap-up summary. business. If people aren't too hungry, I'd take a question or two, especially easy ones.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Let's start taking some questions. There's a lot there. I want to thank you very much. You covered a lot and I know you and your office having to confront all those tasks, it's a lot of work and it's going to take tremendous amount of work and organization. Council members, Mr. O'Shea?

MR. O'SHEA: Thanks, Alan.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Roberts.

MR. O'SHEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Alan, you mentioned a couple times that as an example in red drum you said what more can be done. The fishery's closed in the EEZ. But it seems to me that there is this issue of state

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

fisheries that have by-catch of federallyregulated species and on the flip side there are federal fisheries that have by-catch of state fisheries.

What I didn't pick up in your brief was a focus on going to the next step and saying to stressed and depleted stocks whether agency is going to be required to go further than simply close the directed fisheries. What's your prediction about or your feelings about dealing the by-catch issue on some of those Or the other way is are you limited fisheries? only in your action only required to close the directed fishery and then you check the box and you're off the hook?

MR. RISENHOOVER: I'm not going to predict because again I'll be wrong. But what we're focusing this guidance on is the ACLs. How do we set an annual catch limit for the federally-managed stocks? Part of that annual catch limit should be by-catch. We'll have to look at the by-catch in state waters. We'll have to determine things like red drum. Do we want to have an ACL for them and is it zero or is a higher number that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	includes that by-catch in state waters and those
2	are some of the things that we're really going to
3	need some public comment on on how we guide the
4	councils on doing those or the Secretary for some
5	of the highly migratory stocks.
6	We don't have a clear answer on that,
7	but that's one of those issues of how does the ACL
8	requirement relate to states and other countries.
9	MR. O'SHEA: Right. Thanks.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: I don't think that
11	was an answer, but it's as good as it's going to
12	get.
13	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Roberts.
14	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	Intriguing presentation, Alan.
16	Focusing on one thing, having served on
17	SSCs in two different council regions, I know
18	they're treated differently. But I'd like to know
19	some more detail about if, in fact, the council
20	cannot override an ACL recommendation of an SSC,
21	if I'm interpreting things correctly.
22	MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes, it's actually
23	allowable biological catch. So the SSC

MR. ROBERTS: Just the ABCs.

MR. ROBERTS: An ABC. Okay. 2 MR. RISENHOOVER: And then the annual 3 4 catch limit established by the council can't 5 exceed that. MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Cannot exceed the 6 ABC. 7 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. 8 9 MR. ROBERTS: And there is great 10 disparity as you pointed out. How do you intend 11 to bring the councils to a uniformity in the way they're dealing with their SSCs? A lot of people 12 on those SSCs pass them on recommendations to the 13 council and the council may or may not pick them 14 15 But if you indirectly are giving the SSCs a responsibility now to establish not to exceed 16 baseline for a policy decision, it's going to put 17 entirely different 18 them in an light and specifically may not treat their SSCs the same as 19 the Gulf. But they're going to have to be a lot 20 more uniform if, in fact, SSC is now setting some 21 sort of a baseline that can't be exceeded. 22 I'll tell you. A lot of people -- I 23 24 know at LSU, let's say, particularly in the Gulf,

MR. RISENHOOVER: Provides the ABCs.

you would have to get permission from the President's Office to serve on a committee of such and if, in fact, the President's Office thinks you're in a position of creating policy, you're going to be denied the ability to serve on that committee. I think this is a area that you're going to have to spend quite a bit of attention on and you probably already know that.

MR. RISENHOOVER: And we're going to have to address it under this Annual Catch Limit Rule. We'll probably have to address it under some sort of peer review guidance under National Standard 2. We also need to look as I mentioned how the councils are doing it now.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Could you speak up a little bit please?

MR. RISENHOOVER: I'm sorry. I don't know if we can ever get to any kind of uniformity around the country. But what want understand is how each council does it. each council will be interested in that because it's a fairly obvious lawsuit to say you didn't follow your SSC's ABC. So we want to map that out how the councils are and see doing that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

beforehand and maybe we'll get to some sort of conformity around the country, probably not and probably not soon if we do.

But working with them, the Act didn't give a deadline or an implementation date that. That's in effect now. But where it really can be measured is when they start setting these annual catch limits and various of you around the councils really table know some don't get information from the SSCs right now. So we've asked them what's your current state, what's your plan to conform with the law so I can run that by lawyers, by the first quarter of next year because that's when the ACL setting process is really going to start.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'm sorry. Repeat that last statement. The deadline for the SSC requirement or use?

MR. RISENHOOVER: It's in place now. The Act doesn't say it's effective at some future date. It was effective upon enactment. But where it's really going to become critical is when they start setting their ABCs and their ACLs based on that. So I've asked the councils to submit a plan

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to me about how they're meeting the Act now and if they're not, how are they going to meet the SSC provides the ABC requirement by the end of this first quarter, March $31^{\rm st}$.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Cates and I haven't seen any other hands yet. Mr. Dewey next.

MR. CATES: Prior to a fishery being determined overfished, does the public get warning signs or the councils?

MR. RISENHOOVER: It's probably a mix, but usually it's based on a stock assessment. that stock assessment typically has two or three parts to it, some public, some not. But there isn't a public decision on or a public comment on whether it's overfished. There would be public thev establish their stock comment when determination criteria.

So the council in its Fishery Management Plan says this stock is overfished when these conditions are met or it's not overfished if these conditions aren't met and that's a public process for setting those stock determination criteria. Then science center our does science, the stock assessment, peer reviews it and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

presents a result then of whether it is 1 overfished or not overfished. 2 There is more public input into the 3 4 setting how you determine whether it's overfished is in 5 than there the science involved determining whether it is and that varies a little 6 from science center to science center. 7 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Dewey. 8 MR. DEWEY: Alan, on one of your slides 9 there, you mentioned the report to Congress on the 10 11 fishery science degrees. MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes. 12 MR. DEWEY: And I was just wondering if 13 that included anything 14 you knew related to 15 aquaculture, an aquaculture program. MR. RISENHOOVER: I don't. But I can 16 check with our Science and Technology folks and 17 see if that was part of the statement of work. 18 But it's mainly how many fishery biologists, what 19 are their degrees, population dynamics, what are 20 coming out and whether there's a need to try and 21 22 grow more fishery biologists. But not necessarily what MR. DEWEY: 23

schools are for what degrees and so on?

MR. RISENHOOVER: Correct. But I think that would be part of the basis for it. They probably canvassed a lot of schools so we would get that kind of information as well. But it's are there enough new people in the pipeline so as old folks leave we can fill in behind them.

MR. DEWEY: Thank you.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Gilmore,
Ms. Tooley and Mr. Dorsett. Mr. Gilmore.

MR. GILMORE: Thank you. Alan, is the emphasis on the Act on IUU fishing is really the certification process or it's various nations and the unilateral approach? The U.S. is already a party to a number of multi-lateral organizations and they have vessel black lists and one thing we found out the hard way is that we haven't enforce any type of port measures against blacklisted vessels in agreements or a party to. Will you tie that aspect into the rulemaking that you're doing under Magnuson to bar those blacklisted vessels from calling at U.S. ports?

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. What we need is an information sharing kind of network in there and we posted on our website a warning that you

can go and look at the lists we know of. But, yes, these procedures will wrap that into how you determine whether a boat doesn't have port privileges as well as how do we start certifying nations for IUU fishing. So I think it's going to be part of a larger rulemaking for procedures.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ms. Tooley.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Alan, you said that you may or may not have \$6 million to implement market-based approaches. If you do get the \$6 million, have you any indication how you would use those funds?

MR. RISENHOOVER: We've done a Yes. breakout of how those funds would be regional expended based on need and we've collected information from all the regions. So we've looked at the President's goal of doubling the number of We have a list of which programs are in these. development and what stage of development they're in and we've tried to allocate the funding based on that.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: So in our region in particular we seem to be lacking human resources more than anything. That's the type of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

funding that could used for that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes. That request \$6 million and was ten new FTEs, full-time equivalent employees. So we have an internal draft allocation of those and the problem is ten Okay. employees across six regions. But it will So we've looked at where there are not only LAPs but any dedicated access privilege. For your sectors, sectors may or may not be LAPs depending on how they're made and try to factor that into our draft allocation scheme. Hopefully, Congress will approve something and there will be a good chunk of that in there and we can get that money out to the field.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Because I think there are some short-term needs and then there are some long-terms needs in monitoring in New England in particular and they're going to have new additional staff that aren't going to go away in a few years and then some that you just need in the short term.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, and we have two parts to our allocation. We're trying to build a base capability in all regions for

1	dedicated access privilege programs and then
2	another part of that would be kind of rolling
3	funding. So as a program, say, develops in New
4	England, we fund that. But as it's implemented
5	and we started collecting fees from it or whatever
6	it implements the net funding shifted to a
7	different region.
8	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: And, Mr. Chairman,
9	just one more?
10	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Please. Go ahead.
11	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Alan, you
12	mentioned the new by-catch reduction engineering
13	program and some of that
14	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Can I ask you to speak
15	up a little bit?
16	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Yes. You said
17	that's coming together at this point. Could you
18	just describe the program a little bit?
19	MR. RISENHOOVER: Okay. We've had a
20	series of smaller programs in each of our regions
21	or science centers. So what we're trying to do
22	under this, it was basically putting together a
23	terms of reference for how all these little

pockets of by-catch engineering interact. We'll

have a national by-catch engineering coordinator in my office that will look at all those programs and then hopefully as we get funding be able to allocate that funding based on some priorities. So it won't be each individual region or center that has the capability that gets some funding and they do it. We'll have а little national coordination. We'll tie it our National By-Catch Report and set out some priorities for the program and then allocate new funding based on that. If people have \$100K that they're using for by-catch engineering programs, I'm not going to take that away. We hope to build on top of it.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thank you.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Dorsett and Mr. Fletcher and Ms. McCarty.

Thank you. MR. DORSETT: You covered the By-catch Reduction Program Report. I was also curious about the Over Capacity Report. You said that one was behind schedule. Is that the report identify the top 20 over capitalization fisheries?

> MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DORSETT: And then suggestions for 1 reducing that capacity? 2 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. That's due in 3 4 January. We have a draft. I don't know that 5 we'll make January. MR. DORSETT: Okay. In developing 6 7 these reports, what's the protocol for It seems that these reports are more 8 input? Then they go to Congress and 9 internal documents. then I'm just curious about it. 10 11 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. We don't have not going to release it for public 12 We're comment beforehand and this one is one of the ones 13 that I know people are looking at and it's going 14 15 to have some implications. So we want to be very careful on the underlying data of how do we define 16 capacity, how do we measure that capacity and then 17 18 how do we report that capacity. also looked 19 And we've just instead of giving capacity numbers per fishery, 20 21 for example, we're also trying to align it with 22 some management issues. So maybe you have a 23 fishery that is over capacity, but it doesn't have

any over harvest problems or management problems

associated with it right now. Maybe you have another one that doesn't have that much over capacity, but it's always over quota and you have an overfished or overfishing condition. We're trying to align those a little bit better to make the report more meaningful.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Fletcher, Ms. McCarty, Mr. Billy and Ms. Lowman. Mr. Fletcher.

MR. FLETCHER: Alan, cooperative research over the past few years was extremely popular and developed some great information and a lot of the industry support and it was a real sad day when it disappeared and now you're indicating that that money may be available again. past, there's been the opportunity through on a West Coast to specific states. They kind of managed some pot of money for cooperative research and had an advisory committee that they formed and we kind of prioritized the various proposals. do you envision that now and then is that similar to how you see this going forward in the future?

MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes. I don't think it's going to have any major changes than how we did cooperative research in the past. I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

they're going to do it as things similar to by-catch reduction of program. Some terms reference on how the small individual programs the country interact, how set national priorities for that, how do set priorities for our funding requests.

Right now, we have a small pot of money for cooperative research that's shared around the I believe it's right around \$2 million. country. The Northeast and the Southeast have some earmarks for some dedicated cooperative research So it's how do we better grow in those areas. that money, coordinate that money, make sure we're hitting the top priorities. But the Congressional end which basically just established the program is pretty much in line with how we have a program now.

MR. FLETCHER: I thought you said there was some money appropriated for that.

MR. RISENHOOVER: There is currently money available in our budget, but it's not a lot. So it's spread fairly thinly around the country. But having a new authorized, Mark may have some more information, vein in the Magnuson Act gives

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	us the ability in budget discussions in the future
2	to go "Look. Congress just authorized a new
3	program for us. Bring money to it."
4	MR. FLETCHER: Okay. But they haven't
5	done that yet is what you're saying.
6	MR. RISENHOOVER: No. That's a future
7	thing. Mark, do you
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: To that point the
9	difference between authorization which the
10	Magnuson Act did, given authorization to this
11	program, but there's not an appropriation which is
12	the actual giving of money to carry that out.
13	There's a big difference between them.
14	MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. And a lot of
15	times where we get hit by appropriation committees
16	that don't want to give anybody any money is
17	they'll say, "You have a cooperative research
18	program. That's nice. Where is your legislative
19	authorization?"
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: So you need both pieces,
21	an authorization and the money.
22	MR. FLETCHER: I understand that. But
23	I was under the impression that recently some
24	money had been made available. That's not the

case I guess.

MR. RISENHOOVER: No. I don't believe the `08 budget included an increase for that. Hopefully, future budgets will. But I can't predict that.

MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of trying -- and money, I think he's talking about getting on the plane and the omnibus and you were saying hopefully there was money. I think that's where he's --

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. In the `08, I don't believe there was an increase for cooperative research. So in the omnibus, it's probably not a plus but could be a minus depending on how they resolve their problems.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ms. McCarty.

MS. McCARTY: Alan, a little bit more about the NEPA money, there's a lot of concern in the North Pacific and probably other places as well that the NEPA streamlining might either go too far or not far enough and lots of folks in the North Pacific want it to go a real long way. Other places are probably more concerned about the other end. Can you describe a little bit about

where you think it might go and what the actual goals of that streamlining are and what the public comment has been and where you're responding to it?

I can do a little bit MR. RISENHOOVER: of that. And as I mentioned, we're hopefully meeting with folks this week on that again. going through it with the Council Environmental Quality. We know the Council positions. We've been working internally to try again and it's how do you fit something new into eight established processes.

looking is But what we're at time lines. Some of the NEPA comment periods are much longer than the Magnuson Act comment periods and they seem to comment at different times. start secretarial review now, we're running a 95day process where we also have to do 45 days of NEPA comments plus the cooling off under NEPA and So we're just trying to almost take two time APA. lines and see how we can best make them fit and then working with CEO to see if some of requirements of the Magnuson Act effectively meet some of the requirements of NEPA. It will still

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

be NEPA but move forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So it's still going to be implementation of both acts. We're not going to exempt anything. But it's mainly time-lining, council decision process-making, when do they make the decision on their DEIS. Also a lot of it is roles, what will the Secretary do, what will the councils do under NEPA and Magnuson, trying to outline those to be a little more standard around Right now, in some regions the country. councils do most of the NEPA work themselves. other regions, they do very little. We're trying to standardize that as well. But that's a real fluid thing right now. So I'm a little hesitant to say it's going to be this, this and this because that will jinx it.

CHAIR DILERNIA: MR. BILLY.

MR. BILLY: Alan, are you going to be here tomorrow afternoon, the session on seafood certification?

MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Good. I have a heads-up for that discussion tomorrow afternoon.

I'm real interested to explore whether the

NEAL R. GROSS

international provisions would in any way contribute to helping the seafood industry take advantage of certification in other countries for species or species groups that are marketed in the U.S. like Atlantic and Pacific whiting or pollock in different countries or those kind of species where in the marketplace they're under one general label and the idea being can certification work in the international context of those. Do any of these provisions contribute to that?

MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes

MR. BILLY: You don't need to talk about it in the detail now.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. I may not be the best for that, but we can at least get into it some. Because if a country is certified for IUU fishing, then there is the potential that that product would be blocked from coming in which in the marketplace would have an effect. There would also be the effect of in the market saying this doesn't come from another country that is known to have IUU or some by-catch problems. So I think you can kind of work it a little bit both ways.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ms. Lowman.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. LOWMAN: Alan, I wondered if you'd talk a little bit more about the process of coming up with the guidelines. You said on it's on your next tier, but as you know the Pacific Council is scheduled to come up with an LAP alternative in June and obviously we hope there wouldn't be some big surprises that would make that complicated. So I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit more about what particular parts of the LAP are you focusing guidelines on and kind of a little more idea on time line.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. I can talk a little bit more on time line. What parts we're focusing on is what I have staff looking at now based on public comments, internal discussions, what is our skeleton of guidelines we need to look at. But we are going to try to pull together a work group that has a representative from every region. The Northwest, for example, and the Northeast would all be on that work group and then with some oversight from a policy level on what we're going to do.

But the timeline is still -- I'm trying to get ACLs and EFPs and NEPA and all of those

1	pushed out. It is going to be well into next year
2	before you see a proposed rule. I don't know that
3	that helps but that's where we are.
4	MS. LOWMAN: The main concern is we
5	don't want to have it going through the process,
6	have a final decision made in council and all of a
7	sudden get the is in violation of some of it or
8	it needs to be adjusted which would the whole
9	time line would be off.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: And hopefully that
11	rulemaking will be informed about what is going on
12	around the country. If there are some flags,
13	hopefully we can throw them early or take the
14	benefit of somebody developing one in helping us
15	with our guidelines.
16	I don't know. Mark, the technical
17	guidance is out and that was a link off one of
18	your emails. So that's out already. That should
19	help.
20	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Roberts.
21	MR. ROBERTS: I thank you, Mr.
22	Chairman. Alan, one question. You said something
23	about law enforcement there. I'm more interested
24	in NOAA general counsel. Is there anything you

1	can tell us about as you get to more market-based
2	approaches to fishing you'll probably be dealing
3	with fewer people but each of them will have
4	potentially a privilege or a share so to speak.
5	Does NOAA general counsel look at that
6	kind of a system to different in terms of
7	penalties? Enforcement is one thing, but if it's
8	a slap on the wrist when you get to council,
9	enforcement doesn't really mean a lot. When you
10	build the stakes up with the market-based fishery,
11	I'm wondering if there's any discussion about what
12	general counsel is going to be doing with that.
13	MR. RISENHOOVER: We did in our
14	administration proposal have increased penalties
15	and fines. Congress didn't take that. So there
16	are it's not a penalty schedule, but the Act
17	does lay out what the penalties are for different
18	sorts of things, civil and criminal. They will
19	still operate within that.
20	MR. ROBERTS: They will not change?
21	MR. RISENHOOVER: They can't because of
	i i

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ROBERTS:

Okay.

MR. RISENHOOVER: At least the range

23

can't change or the thresholds.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Rayburn and Mr. Joner. Ralph.

MR. RAYBURN: Alan, on the response to hurricanes and stuff that's in there, I know it's proactive as well as just reflective. Right? Ι mean, you all did the report. I'm curious because you said something about some guidelines will be coming out in the next month or so and is that going to be -- is that just a report for Congress? forget now. Or is that developing infrastructure in the --

RISENHOOVER: The Act did MR. It modified 312. But then it also added things. 315, catastrophic regional disaster something or another. And so our Management and Budget shop is looking at how do implement those we in It's kind of one of these second tier future. sort of quidance we want to look at. I think they just went out recently with a request for comments on some of the disaster provisions. At least, that's tickling around in the back of my mind. So that's just starting.

But you're right. It's also

NEAL R. GROSS

prospective. We also want to clarify what a commercial fishery failure is and a resource disaster a little bit more, too, since we're seeing more requests for those things all the time.

There is so much of that MR. RAYBURN: activity at least in hurricanes of `05 that has gone through the regional commission that it would be good to really work closely with that group and to stay close in kind of evolving this. So it is a more responsive program -- It's not your all fault, but of groups of wanting do something. But there weren't the resources there and the resources we had were impacted by the --

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. And the Act doesn't -- There's no use prospective for future things could apply. So it's not just for past hurricanes. It could be for future. But it doesn't lay as far as I know any groundwork for how we would deal with a hurricane. Hopefully, what it lays is some groundwork of how we funnel disaster assistance after a hurricane.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Joner.

MR. JONER: Alan, I have a question 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

22

23

I hope it fits under the category of people/system and that is what I'11 call management underfishing. We have a developing problem in North Pacific and Alaska region now with And we've heard from the Halibut arrowtooth. Commission staff a couple weeks ago that that's probably a likely cause for the greatly reduced average size of mature halibut. And in the North Washington coast, for example, we have a growing population and arrowtooth move in and take over an area and they displace just about everything Nothing really eats it including -else there.

So I guess it's one of those old fishery biologists you described a little bit ago. I see that as a really challenging problem in ecosystem management and is there any effort to look at that problem or even to recognize it as a problem to challenges facing something arrowtooth and one is by-catch and I can see where this would be a good project for the by-catch group you described or by-catch engineering program.

Everything that's been done so far on reducing by-catch is done on an ad hoc basis. And part of the problem with arrowtooth is how to by-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We want to help the halibut with it, but we have to deal with halibut by-catch and the other is marketing. We're working with Pacific Seafood on developing a market for that and there were some promising signs, but now the market's really soft. There's no pun intended with arrowtooth, but it's just such a poor quality It's hard to market.

There was a market in Asia for the krill and in Eastern Europe for the harvests. But that's hot and cold. I see it as a national issue and is there anything being done, can it be done, where would it fit in, where do we go from here.

RISENHOOVER: I wish I knew the answer to that. I don't know. Maybe the Alaska regional director could help us on that one. I would just toss that to somebody else, Steve. The Act doesn't talk about how do you develop fisheries, how do you maybe balance a ecosystem by catching arrowtooth flounder. an There are probably other people that would suggest other examples of stocks. But it really didn't have an ecosystem focus. It did authorize some ecosystem research reports and build on the pilot projects,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	but nothing specific to that, how do you harvest
2	something more.
3	MR. JONER: Do you see that as an
4	ecosystem question or would the Act, I guess?
5	Would that fit under the Act?
6	MR. RISENHOOVER: To a degree. But
7	it's also kind of the predator or prey. You said
8	they eat the halibut.
9	MR. JONER: Not necessarily.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: It's just the
11	competition.
12	MR. JONER: It's just not much eats
13	them, like a sea lion, for example, will not. It
14	will eat halibut but not a flounder, not
15	arrowtooth.
16	MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes. So you're going
17	I don't want to go to that either.
18	MR. JONER: Yes.
19	MR. RISENHOOVER: I don't think I'm
20	going to be much help there, Steve.
21	MR. JONER: It all goes to the region
22	then.
23	MR. RISENHOOVER: That's what I think.
24	MR. JONER: authorized regions?

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Are there any other
3	questions? Randy.
4	MR. CATES: One quick one. I haven't
5	heard much discussion on stock enhancement, if
6	that fits into the
7	MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. There wasn't
8	anything specific to that on the reauthorization.
9	But Mike is going to be here this afternoon on
10	aquaculture. That's probably a good place to ask
11	that. That's kind of like Steve's question there.
12	I don't know if it fits under the Act or not. I
13	would have to look at the specifics.
14	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Dr. Holliday.
15	MR. RISENHOOVER: It's not fair that
16	you ask questions.
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: I waited until the end.
18	But, Alan, I first wanted to thank you for the
19	presentation. I heard it lots of times. I learn
20	something new every time. So either my attention
21	span is getting better or you're very polished in
22	your presentation.
23	MR. RISENHOOVER: Or maybe I'm getting
24	better.

DR. HOLLIDAY: But I'm looking things sort of through this MAFAC lens these days and you have all these 30 items that are on the Can you think of one, two or three things that really could engage MAFAC that you would be looking for as a group to be helping out with MSRA implementation? I mean, it's very informative to know what's going on, but are there policy issues or some strategic questions that MAFAC could be helpful to the agency in the next 18 months that we haven't been thinking about considered at this point?

I think a lot of that MR. RISENHOOVER: would depend on folks' interests on what they want to tackle. But a MAFAC position on, say, annual catch limit rule would be helpful. take the feedback I got from you all in June or July, I forget when we met last, of putting that back in at least on an ad hoc basis into what we're doing. lot But, yes, there's а of opportunities of stuff moving through. I think kind of on the policy stuff I'm also interested in the 2020 discussion as well as the NOAA ocean policy discussion because we do have some latitude

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

under Magnuson for how stringent are we going to be on ACLs or not or how hard and long should we push limited access or dedicated access privilege programs. Some of those policy things, yes, I think the individual members on the individual rules will definitely have positions. MAFAC could do that as well, the kind of the how do we take Magnuson on past 2010.

Part of what I've been thinking about is if the Act works and the agency gets it right and the councils get it right after 2010 we're not going to be talking about overfishing anymore. And then a number of years after that we won't be talking about overfished anymore. It will be a rare event. What's the next major issue fisheries are going to face then?

Because we're going to end overfishing That's what it says. in 2010. Right? So four years from now, what are we going to be talking Is it improving the about? Is it allocation? economics of the fishery? it some of the Is import/export quality? How do we market U.S.? What comes after and that's the sort of things you talked about in the 2020 report and I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	II that
2	CHAIR DILERNIA: MR. BILLY.
3	MR. BILLY: On this point, is there a
4	NOAA attorney here? There are some pretty strict
5	rules about who can comment on rulemaking.
6	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Say that again please.
7	MR. BILLY: There are strict rules on
8	who can comment on rulemarking and how you do it.
9	So you would have to lay out some agreed means
10	for the MAFAC committee to participate in a
11	rulemaking process beyond looking at future policy
12	or some of the other or after comments are in
13	participating with the agency in making choices
14	about what the final rule should look like.
15	MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. And I'm
16	always amazed at the attorney's advice regarding
17	FACA and what's yes and no when and why.
18	MR. BILLY: So you would have to be
19	careful.
20	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. I don't know.
21	I'll take it under advisory. I don't know how to
22	respond, what to say. Ralph.
23	MR. RAYBURN: I would just like to say
24	I appreciate Mark's comments on looking

strategically at this thing in the sustainable
fisheries because when our class came in that was
where we wanted to take it. So now having it in
your shop as Tony mentioned earlier, I think
really makes this as I see it very effective and
viable. So when you come in here, Alan, you're
not just holding up progress in D.C., but you're
getting some thoughts on how where you need to
head or suggestions anyway, you know, for five
years out or something like that when you do solve
all our problems. It's like stuff that's really
does advance it. So I think that's a significant
question. I just wanted to comment on that and
thank Mark for taking us that way because I think
it's a strategic area to be in.
CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. Are there any
other questions for Mr. Risenhoover? Mary Beth.
MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Alan, those last slides that you added
to the presentation were very helpful. Can we
somehow get copies of that?
MR. RISENHOOVER: What I hope to do is
pull this into a little glossier of a report.

What I had my staff do after the last week or so

is pull this together and we're still kind of arguing about categories, what's on time, what's not on time, what's on track. Because we do have our internal milestones. So I hope by mid January to have this progress report. But I don't see why I can't have Mark post these on the MAFAC site just with the caveat that I may change them a little bit to make them look better probably.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thanks.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mary Hope.

MS. KATSOUROS: Thank you for giving me the opportunity. Alan, what happens if you don't get in the budget plan additional funds? Have you decided what programs you'll cut out in order to do these?

MR. RISENHOOVER: We've talked about do we cut things or do we just slow everything down and we have a little extra money in `07 to kind of speed some things up around the country. I don't think I got any though. So that helped. But again, if we don't get the, for example, extra dedicated access money, the \$6 million, it's just going to delay, string things out, take longer to get stuff done. The analysis won't be done as

L	auickly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. KATSOUROS: And has Congress aware of this?

MR. RISENHOOVER: I'm hoping that message has been sent to them. We based the `08 request. We got some money right at the end there right before the request went up last February. there are a number of fact sheets. Our Legislative Affairs folks are aware of this. We've prepared all the Q & As you could ever dream support these requests including what So if you do look in the doesn't get done. President's budget, I mentioned the FSSI, Fishery Stock Sustainability Index. It shows what can be done with the money and what can be done without the money and how that metric moves.

MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.

MR. RISENHOOVER: So we do have some performance links. It can always be better. But where we really need the additional resources are in kind of the science programs to support the annual catch limits in particular.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Are there any other additional questions? Okay. We're pretty much on

NEAL R. GROSS

1	schedule. Five minutes over time. That's
2	wonderful. That's great. Thank you, Committee.
3	We will take a break for one hour and
4	when we return we will hear
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: We'll be back at 1:30
6	p.m.
7	CHAIR DiLERNIA: 1:30 p.m. We'll be
8	back at 1:30 p.m. Off the record.
9	(Whereupon, at 12:08 p.m., the above-
10	entitled matter recessed and reconvened at 1:43
11	p.m.)
12	CHAIR DiLERNIA: On the record. Thank
13	you very much for being back on time.
14	MR. FLETCHER: We were.
15	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes, I know. We
16	switched agenda items this morning. Our next
17	presenter is Tim Hansen from Seafood Inspection
18	Program. Mr. Hansen, are you
19	MR. HANSEN: I'm ready. Thank you, Mr.
20	Chairman.
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Tim, take it away.
22	MR. HANSEN: I will take it away.
23	Dr. Hogarth asked me to make this
24	presentation to you. This is a presentation I

made to NMFS management last summer. It's kind of 1 2 what's going on in the seafood world today. (Off the record conversation.) 3 4 MR. HANSEN: This little ridge here is 5 taking a lot of the sound out. CHAIR DiLERNIA: If I may just though, 6 7 you're behind Tab 3, Ι believe, is the presentation also. 8 Okay. You might follow 9 MR. HANSEN: along. 10 Behind Tab 3, folks. 11 CHAIR DiLERNIA: HANSEN: MR. Okay. Just maybe not 12 everyone knows, but in the midst of NOAA fisheries 13 is Seafood Inspection Program. I would like to 14 15 start out if I can make a page turn here that we do have a program that's been around in the Bureau 16 of Commercial Fisheries and later NOAA Fisheries 17 for about 51 years now. 18 Our mission is to assist consumers and 19 improving the industry for the 20 consumers and 21 improving seafood safety, quality and 22 marketability. We assure that all inspected products meet the FDA safety and DOC quality 23 24 quality regulations regulations, and safety regulations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We don't operate on appropriated funds. We are a voluntary fee-for-service organization because we gain all our operating funds, travel, salaries and so forth from user fees which is a charge for our services. We have an Inspection and Certification Service and do this both in this country and we also offer inspections services We have principally approaching about overseas. 60 foreign seafood firms that participate in our program and we presently impact or touch about one-third of the seafood that is consumed in this country which happens to about 1.9 billion pounds We have every reason to believe that in 2006. that figure is going up.

We also offer lab analysis and consultative services to the industry and training. We have an in-depth training program that we offer those who are interested in it.

We ensure the quality and the safety of seafood. We have grade standards. There are 23 of them and we also ensure that company/customer specifications are met for quality and safety and so forth. And we also ensure compliance to the

NEAL R. GROSS

applicable regulations. A preventative system required for CPU countries, processing, I should say. We also ensure proper labeling.

What drives our business is basically the big buyers of seafood, I think, WalMart, Kroger, Safeway, Albertson's and so forth who require their suppliers to have our services and the reason they do that is to get the quality levels and assurances of safety that they desire for their consumers and their customers. We also oversee federal buying of seafood. We do the quality assurance part of that and we also work with big distributors like Sysco, some others, Kraft.

We offer federal marks that people can use for their marketing purposes. It's "Grade A packed under Federal Inspection." We have some other marks that people can use for their point of sale advertising and so forth. And we also go and participate in an important international food safety fora such as Codex Alimentarius and International Association of Fish Inspectors or World Seafood Congresses and American Society for Quality to name a few.

NEAL R. GROSS

to give a little insight, everybody may know how food regulation works in this country. But FDA is the primary agency for food safety in this country except for meat and poultry which is USDA Food Safety Inspection Services has responsibility for that. Underneath that, there are so called Agricultural Marketing Act organizations. We are one of them. them occur in the Agricultural Marketing Service, They have meat grading, milk and dairy, and vegetables, outfits that are very similar to our own that do quality and inspection services voluntary basis. Generally on а speaking, that's how food regulation is kind of laid out in the Federal Government.

Let me just start with our baseline question. How safe is seafood. There has been a lot of questions about that, but it turns out it's pretty safe. If you look at the CDC information, you'll see that about 90 percent of all illnesses, known illnesses, are from three causes: ciguatera, scrombrotoxicity, and molluscan shellfish. Ciguatera, of course, I think we have an event going on in the North Gulf of Mexico right now

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

which is a toxin that comes from a mephitic algae that works it way up in the food chain and reef fish particularly concentrate this and it will make people sick. It doesn't really kill people but it will give you a bad day.

Scrombrotoxicity is a histamine if you will. That's probably the biggest, most important food safety hazard in seafood and it occurs usually through poor handling or poor fishing techniques where the individual fish decomposes and certain microbiological flora take over and produce a toxic result.

Molluscan shellfish, most of this is due to the vibrio that occur in the Southeast United States in the summer time and this is a Vibrio vulnificus, Vibrio cholerae and Vibrio parahaemolyticus. I got this slide from Spencer Garrett and I can't help but notice that the outbreaks actually outnumber the cases which can't be. So we're going to have to talk about that.

MR. O'SHEA: I think they're reversed.

MR. HANSEN: I noticed that you guys were noticing it too. But I imagine that the legend just should be reversed.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. O'SHEA: What does that mean?
2	Percentage of seafood?
3	MR. HANSEN: It means that 90 percent
4	comes from three causes essentially.
5	MR. O'SHEA: Okay. Not 90 percent of
6	the seafood.
7	MR. HANSEN: There are a whole bunch of
8	causes which I'll get into. But these are the big
9	ones and if you control these, you essentially
10	control the safety of seafood to a large extent.
11	Just to go over some of the risks I
12	think we lost a slide here or maybe not.
13	Microbiological risks, we have a broad Yes,
14	John.
15	MR. CONNELLY: Just the last slide. It
16	might be helpful to define what outbreak and case
17	is.
18	MR. HANSEN: Yes. I think outbreak is
19	three or more, two or more. So you have to have
20	confirmed cases. This is CDC and a case, of
21	course, is just an individual getting sick. We're
22	talking multiples here. Those should be switched.
23	We have a wide variety of seafood
24	safety hazards that occur and they can come from a

number of They from the sources. can come environment naturally. They can come induced by They can be induced in the food chain or in man. the supply chain or processing and even storage. Here are some microbiological risks that occur in Clostridium seafood, vibrios, botulinum. The Listeria are all natural pathogens. Anthropogenic ones, Salmonella and are man caused Salmonella is associated with Staphylococcus. storage and Staph is associated with human skin which grows on certain media such as hydrated batter for breaded fish, for instances. If that's abused, you may get a Staph outbreak or a Staph growth and the occurrence of a toxin and it will make people sick.

This slide should have been switched with the other one, but anyway this is generally as I just said five different sources of seafood safety hazards. So it could be natural or mancauses, in-processing and distribution chain or even the consumer may mishandle it to cause some of these problems.

Moving on, here are some chemical contaminants that we have to deal 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

22

23

natural ones are paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP), ciguatoxin as I mentioned before, domoic acid, Man-caused mercury. or anthropogenic, pesticides, PCBs, mercury in that we have coalfired power plants which spew mercury from the coal into the environment for instances, also antibiotics. And in the processing the handling stage, we can get histamine. We have bisulfites which are a food additive which are sometimes abused people that are sometimes allergic to, pesticides and food additives that are used and some others.

Just to go through a couple contaminants that are used quite a bit and I think we're kind of back to a stage where we were about 20 years ago where the press and the newspeople are questioning the safety of seafood, only this time it's in a little different context. But two contaminants that I kind of want to discuss just a little bit are methyl mercury and polychlorinated biphenyls because they've been in the news here in the recent past.

Mercury is basically in about 45 or so species. Sharks, swordfish, tilefish, king

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

mackerel and tuna are particularly noteworthy as being the most economically important ones. It is a neurtoxin. It does have very definite effects on the nervous system and the brain. It's very toxic at certain levels. However, having said that, there's never been a documented case of methyl mercury intoxication into seafood consumption in this country that we know of.

A little bit on the tolerance FDA has established for this is one part per million. A little bit about how the safety assessment and tolerances are established. They would look at a contaminant and then do an epidemiological study to determine is this even something that the human population is subject to. If it is, they'll do a so-called safety assessment. They use what they call a "may render injurious" standard.

What that is is they'll take all the best scientists and science and a bunch of FDA scientists will decide where the toxic levels begin in actually according to science. They have to come to consensus on that. Then they divide it by ten. So that's to ensure there will be no harm done to the human population. Sometimes they

NEAL R. GROSS

divide it by 100, I guess, for highly toxic things.

Basically, we have a single bright line that when it comes right down to trying to do food safety regulation it's not very helpful. have a tolerance of one part per million. fish, say, at 0.9 parts per million perfectly fine, but 1.1 part per million it has to be off the market. It kind of works out for foods that aren't very nutritious, say, crackers something. You might not want to take the risk. But a food like seafood which is highly nutritious and highly beneficial, it probably isn't very What might be better is to consider a helpful. whole range of levels depending on the benefit of the food itself.

I'll just talk a little bit. FDA has a current Consumer Advisory that suggests limiting consumption of fish to 12 ounces per week. Mr. Connelly tells me that the intention was just fish that are high in mercury. But it kind of doesn't read that way. What assured that this is a flawed advisory is limiting the consumption of fish. If you follow it, you would deny yourself a highly

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

nutritious food source and it's designed to protect the human population, but actually might do harm in that people won't eat fish which is actually more beneficial probably than -- has more benefits than risks when it comes right down to it. So we have to consider the benefits.

Just PCBs, there's been a lot of press about PCBs of farm-raised salmon. First of all, it's way below the tolerance level that the FDA has established. They have not found any PCBs in farm-raised salmon, even approach a regulatory limit, first of all, although they have found some in trace amounts. It's detectable.

Another thing to think about, some of the latest science in examining the toxicity of PCBs, is that the toxicity varies by the kind of molecule, of the molecule called the shape congeners and the ones that are shaped like dioxins are pretty toxic but the other ones less It kind of calls into question whether even so. that tolerance level is the right one. jury is still out on this. But I think it's safe to say that farm-raised salmon are quite safe when it comes to PCB levels.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Moving on, just to talk about the benefits of consuming seafood. We know most of these things. It's less fat, more healthy fat, more digestible protein. Of course, the Omega 3s, the EHAs, and the EHAs are absolutely essential for the development of human fetuses, infants and children up until at least adolescence and there studies that suggest even in are some adolescents that humans absolutely have to have this to develop normally. And there's a lot of research these days that suggest that a lot of behavioral problems in children for instance because of a lack of EHAs in the diet.

We all know about the heart benefits and the circulatory system. And there's a lot of research by the psychiatry community on how it mood, anxiety and even affects has positive effects on certain mental illnesses. So this is something that the benefits of getting Omega 3 into the diet are tremendous and important to all of us. When you consider the benefits of seafood over the risks, I think the benefits very much outweigh the risks. It's something we all need to have in our diet.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Just switching over, just a little bit about what NOAA's capability in science, I talked a little bit about my own "brand," the Seafood Inspection Program. But we also have researchers and scientists in a couple of locations, probably all the science centers, but mostly associated with National Seafood Inspection Laboratory in Pascagoula, Mississippi and the Northwest Fishery Science Center in Seattle. We have researchers that are doing research on various aspects of seafood safety.

With the advent of aquaculture, we have folks that are working on animal health issues with the shipment of larva for rollout and across national lines and so forth. There's a lot of need to control diseases and so forth. And we have folks that do that sort of thing.

The National Seafood Inspection Laboratory is also involved in risk assessment. It's kind of like a biological assessment and it's rigorous scientific assessment using statistical techniques and so forth. So Pascagoula lab is doing that.

Contaminant monitoring and ecological

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

monitoring, mostly it's out of the Northwest Fishery Science Center. They looked at harmful algal blooms. They do profiles of what kind of contaminants are in the marine environment and so forth.

For us, for Seafood Inspection Program, we absolutely have to have scientific support to be successful. So we need these folks to advise us, do analytical work and be there to help us form policies and procedures that make sense.

We're also doing quite a bit on risk communication. I'll just show quickly. you Spencer Garrett and the Pascagoula Lab and the National Seafood Inspection Lab and Usha Varanasi the Northwest Fishery Science Center are putting out these frequently asked questions for seafood safety which are rather good because they address a lot of the long-standing questions that people have about safety of seafood and so forth.

The other thing I want to show you is FishWatch. This is our new website and it's absolutely wonderful. It's one of the best, I guess, vehicles I've seen in a long time to convey a whole bunch of information about not only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

seafood safety and quality, but how fish are captured and how fisheries are managed and so forth. I'd like to see a little more seafood safety and maybe just a little bit of information about the Seafood Inspection Program in there. But this is really a site that everybody should visit and use because it's very innovative and very good. We are involving ourselves to some degree in this communication of seafood.

Let me just talk about what's going on in the industry. Some of you guys are industry guys. So you know. I'll just go through this quickly.

Over 80 percent of the seafood consumed in this country is produced overseas. There are approximately 20,000 foreign firms shipping to the When I was an FDA'er, we used to think it U.S. was 13,000 and then The Bioterrorism Act required registration of food firms and we found 7,000 more of them. So there are 20,000 of these guys who are shipping in. We only have about 5,000 firms in country producing seafood. It's а tremendous influx of poundage and so forth.

Some of these, I've been overseas many

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

times, and some of the food safety controls of some of these countries are probably not up to our standards. Sort of unknowns in foreign countries. Sanitation conditions. Prerequisite program, what we call prerequisite programs such as is the building sufficient and is the water supply clean, do the individuals working there have health checks for systemic diseases and so forth. Quite often, we don't find this when we go to foreign countries.

There is a regulation of the Food and Drug Administration, you may or may not be aware of called the Seafood HACCP Regulation and we're not always sure that all of the foreign firms comply with that. In fact, we're pretty sure they don't. They have HACCP plans and they comply in part. But by and large, they don't do as well as domestic processors in this regard, this is a very important preventive system of controls to prevent food safety hazards.

Then there is the supply chain. Quite often, we don't know what happens between here and China or here and Ecuador quite often and we have things that go wrong and product could be abused

and food safety hazards would emanate from that.

So there's a lot of unknowns we talked about for the seafood establishments.

A little bit about aquaculture drugs because they're in the news. We find that control is nonexistent or weak most of the time. There's very little testing. For one thing, they don't know how to do it. There's a tremendous cost to this, probably not as much as holding up their shipments these days, but it is an expensive, time-consuming thing.

Because this is such an important part economies, of countries' there's large in not to regulate, not to look for pressure problems in seafood being imported into the United And for aquaculture drugs, there's simply not very many testing methodologies available. while back when I was at FDA, we got a list of the drugs from Vietnam that Vietnam was using and there was evidence on the order of 40 different kinds of drugs, but only 12 of them we had tests for. So we would have never known that these were being used if drugs they hadn't stopped, things like ciproxin which we would have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ever in our wildest dreams thought that somebody would apply this to a fish product. an antibiotic. It's a big gun antibiotic for humans that have very bad infections. These have the effect of causing antimicrobiological resistance and so forth. So this is something that even though it doesn't have a definite human health risk, in the long run it might. something that the Food and Drug Administration wants to not give and wants to regulate.

FDA, they perform presently about 100 seafood inspections overseas per year. I don't think they're doing that well these days. It's like probably 60 or 70. Ιf the total inventory is 20,000, you get the idea how long going to take them to go through that inventory which will be roughly 200 years. So they're not getting to these things through the traditional means which is an in-plant audit of the conditions of the seafood.

We do have something called affirmative steps which is applied to the importer of record and the idea for affirmative steps is the importer has taken due diligence to ensure that the food

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

safety, the seafood HACCP measures are in place and the firm that produced the food overseas. problem with that is that it's generally weak, easily falsified and FDA doesn't vigorously pursue regulatory action against the importers of record. Moreover, if there is a regulatory action against the importer, generally the producer of the food will just go to another So there's basically no effect and importers. this is how 80 percent of our seafood is regulated right now, those three measures. It's probably not the most effective way to go about things.

And this is the slide that probably you won't want to share, Mark. Just a little insider thought about the current challenges going on at FDA. First of all, they're really not organized to deal with imported food. They haven't had any kind of a reorganization since the 1950s. Most other federal agencies and food agencies around the world have been transformed several times since then and probably will continue to be so. They are organized to deal with domestic food safety problems, not imported ones.

They've had a tremendous amount 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

22

23

staff reduction due to retirement, the general shrinkage. Somebody going to another job or so forth. Over 50 percent of their current people working for them are eligible for retirement. So there's a tremendous loss of institutional knowledge going on of people just going out the door.

Moreover, they're losing critical skills which they're not able to replace. They don't have a filth person anymore. Usually, these are people who enumerate insect legs and that sort of thing. They have no one -- the FDA has no one to examine parasites and figure out if they're harmful and the FDA scrombrotoxin expert is about to retire this month I believe.

All these areas are just critical for seafood safety and they have no one following them in these jobs. These are important because these are the people that get on the stand and do court testimony and without them it's a lot harder to take regulatory action.

The biggie for them is, the most important thing, is they've lost, they've been reduced. Forty percent of the funding has been

taken away from them in a three year period. In any federal agency or any agency in government, that would be devastating and it is for them. They're just not able to get the mission done because they don't have the resources and essentially turning out the people either.

Also kind of turning away from focused research on seafood. The Washington Seafood Lab has been closed up. So important research in scrombrotoxicity and harmful alqal blooms no longer exist and we're seeing the same thing in other labs across the country. And research is absolutely regulatory necessary to make good It's just not happening. decisions.

Also FDA, when there's a problem, a food safety problem or a pharmaceutical problem, everything stops or the field stops and they go and try to get the cans of whatever, beans or whatever it is, off the shelf and there's been some fairly prominent crisis in the recent past in the spinach pharmaceuticals, monkeytox the crisis you never heard of but apparently the research monkey came down with this disease which had a high mortality rate which they were really afraid

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

was going to break into the human population. So the field was running around trying to figure out where all the research monkeys were and not doing seafood safety and that happens all the time. That's just their reality.

All right. Of course, this has elicited a fair amount of interest in the cause up in the Executive branch that several bills Congress are probably not likely to go anywhere this year but we have a coming election. There is one called the Safe Fish Act that would give us There's the Dingell Bill some responsibility. which would, I believe, have a beefier service for sort of arrangement imports and several There have been many hearings as well if others. you've followed any of that where the Congress pretty well people beat FDA senior up on management at these meetings.

Last summer, the Office of Management and Budget put together a food safety crosscutting agency group, the idea of which was to give the next administration some food safety goals that should go forth and that has been accomplished. There is also an Import Safety Task Force which is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

a high level thing which is at the department level which is headed by HHS and deals with the problems with dealing with the import safety, not only toys and food but anything else as well.

Those are kind of some of the things that are going on in Congress. They're basically current. What we have is what I call a perfect storm. We have real food safety problems in the seafood arena out there. We have a regulatory agency that isn't up to par these days in terms of getting their mission accomplished and a lot of interest in the press and so forth.

That kind of presents some opportunities for us. Maybe we should have a partnership with FDA because we sort of travel the same road. We seafood do research. do We inspection and a lot of things along the Maybe they could use some of our capacity to accomplish their mission and maybe vice versa. Inspection work, there's all kinds of things we could do in terms of getting to seafood firms overseas and so forth which I'm moving to in just a minute. Also do some analytical work. We have lab 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

22

23

Research, both National Seafood Inspection Lab and Northwest Fishery Science Center do the same kind of research. In fact, in recent times, FDA used the research for their policy, to develop it, particularly some research from the Northwest Fishery Science Center. We can get involved in risk management policy or at least assist them in that.

for the Seafood For us, Inspection Program, we would hope that they would recognize our inspections domestically. I had hatched a plan and presented it to them about doing a feefor-service on imports because what happens import shipment that when an is tagged inspection, it generally sits around for six to eight weeks and it costs the importer quite a lot of money in terms of demurrage and quality to warehouse it. So it would be a lot cheaper just to pay it out. We have a quaranteed turnaround of seven or days. FDA is time, say, ten considering that. I don't know whether they're going to accept that idea or not.

Overseas HACCP inspection, we have a team in China right now. They certainly could use

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

our results. We could do inspection for them if there was a firm there that they have concerns about. We could again -- we have labs. We could do analytical work that they could accept.

We could -- This is Spencer Garrett's idea which is to develop a way to assist foreign labs to get up to snuff and get whatever approvals they need from FDA or a recognized body that sufficient lab they're а to do the kind of analytical work that they're doing. We can work with FDA on training the technical development not each other, but only with for the competent foreign authorities overseas and they could even compliance work where they their look particular cases for regulatory action share some experts because we have quite scientists and food technologists that are very, very knowledgeable about a lot of these issues.

Just some of the research opportunities that we may have: algal blooms, scrombrotoxin, Clostridium botulinum, aquaculture drugs, parasites, decomp, Listeria and then pathogens of retail. These are just some of the things I think we could be pursuing which would kind of be along

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

our mission as an organization.

Also we could do risk management policy. Since this is a scientific discipline, we have common scientists. These folks could do this sort of thing which would very much, I think, help the regulatory process, help them make regulatory decisions, if you will.

Develop good aquaculture practices.

I'm thinking about their thinking about good aquaculture practices for human health. Ourselves and Animal/Plant Health Inspection Service are thinking about for animal health and somebody, and I think USDA thinks about it, in terms of good practice for animal husbandry and so forth.

And we could put those things together and come up with good aquaculture practice or some policies that perhaps would solve some food safety problems and other problems in the long run. They have a document they call the Fish and Fishery Products Hazard Guide which I think are probably some of the best policy work there is in the Federal Government.

But science is always changing. We have scientists that work in the area and we could

NEAL R. GROSS

work on that in the system as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Down sides, like any mission driven organization, the is little turfy FDA а and probably wouldn't want us stepping into their area there was а true partnership certainly don't want to do anything outside of our mission such as I don't think we want to involved in the regulation of lettuce or something like that and we certainly don't want the burden of their mission. They actually regulate about 58 percent of the economy. So they have a huge I don't think it would be good for us to burden. partake of that burden particularly and we may have increased expectations. If we go there, we might have to continue to be in the seafood safety area for a long time to come and that's something that agency I think has to consider.

Just a few tickler questions, the compliments of Mark Holliday, just a few things that we kind of take away that we might think about and hopefully getting your wise counsel and advice on where we ought to be on some of these issues. What's our most important long-term objective? Is there anything we have to change in

NEAL R. GROSS

our organization to make any of this happen?

Current program, is it strong enough or does it have weaknesses? And what should we be imparting as a seafood quality and safety group as the new administration that comes in?

And with that, I'll invite any comments or thinking that you might have on this subject.

CHAIR DILERNIA: Thank you. I actually have a question and then I'll ask members if they have questions. Getting back to the benefits of seafood, the Omega 3s we're all aware of are very beneficial. Have they ever compared the effects of fish oil supplements to consumption of seafood as a health benefit? In other words, are there health benefits from the fish oil supplements that could be realized? I'm not against eating seafood, but I was just curious.

Yes, I think there are. MR. HANSEN: Ι thing of with think the to be aware the supplements are that you need to know how much of that stuff you're actually taking. If you go to a drug store and start looking at actually how much EHAs or DHAs are actually delivering, it varies to So I guess I think there are an extreme extent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	the same health benefits in general at least as
2	far as EHAs and the Omega 3. But it probably
3	depends on how much you ingest. So you probably
4	want to be looking at the label.
5	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I see Mr. Connelly's
6	hand and then I'll start taking questions from
7	around the table. Mr. Connelly first.
8	MR. CONNELLY: Yes sir. Just on this
9	issue of pill versus fish, the industry doesn't
10	seek to sell medicine. They seek to sell kind of
11	an experience of a low fat or if you have to get
12	the fat, it's the right fat, high protein meal.
13	So if you're selling a horse pill, we could give
14	you a horse pill of Omega 3. The industry doesn't
15	seek to try to at all. In fact, we are saying,
16	when someone asks that question, that you're
17	missing the point of overall fish. It's not
18	medicine.
19	MR. HANSEN: Yes, it's great food. The
20	protein is more digestible. It's the right kind
21	of fat. It's great meat.
22	MR. SIMPSON: It tastes good.
23	DR. HOLLIDAY: And that's a

24

psychological experience.

(Off the record discussion.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Forster.

FORSTER: I sense that there's a MR. lack of interagency cooperation right now which you allude to and as you suggested is discussing this. What's happening I sense is that we're leaving a vacuum out there. There's a whole lot of self-appointed groups out there, third party, so on and so forth. GLOBALGAP I saw, for example, had certified all those supermarkets in Holland just recently. We know WWF out there are doing stuff and I think that's dangerous because at the end of the day they're not accountable to any sort of political process.

So I would argue very strongly that government has to take this area of our food safety into control. Otherwise, I think we leave the whole field open to people with other agendas which can change depending on what day of the week it is.

MR. HANSEN: Yes. We've seen the problem. I just laid out, I guess, but both FDA and ourselves have seen that we can and should work together on these issues in any way we can

NEAL R. GROSS

because they not only affect what they do obviously as a food safety authority, but also affect fishery management, a whole raft of things that they do in this agency.

We have lots of reasons not always the right thing to do to help protect the public. we have our own way. So we really want to work on I'm working very hard with FDA this. About 30 years or so ago, a guy updated MOU. named Billy actually got them to agree to do a basic memorandum of understanding. We've updated that and we're back and forth. We're sort of down to one basic issue that we have to sort of solve now which is not going to be an easy issue. basically, this memorandum of understanding will sort of lay out the framework of how we interact with each other and very much I think both sides want to see it.

They've also invited us to become what they call a certified third party and do some of their foreign seafood work. I think we're also working with Agricultural Marketing Services and other commodities as well to try to fill in this vacuum. It's obvious that they're never going 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

22

23

1	get to it. They're never going to have enough
2	resources themselves to do what they need to do
3	properly regulate imports. They're going to have
4	to rely on other and we'll be one of the groups
5	hopefully.
6	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Cates and
7	Mr. Dewey. Randy.
8	MR. CATES: I have two questions. Has
9	there any work been done on gas-treated tuna
10	imports? And the second question would be if we
11	have obviously we have a problem with our
12	imports in inspection. Has there been any
13	discussions about, I hate the word "tax," where
14	the import pays for its own inspections? How are
15	we going to fund this?
16	MR. HANSEN: That's two things. The
17	Dingle Bill I think was just that. It would be
18	\$40 per line and will be charged, you know, every
19	entry will be charged \$20 to do this. This
20	represents oversight.
21	MR. CATES: On the gas-treated?
22	MR. HANSEN: No. Excuse me. On the
23	other side of it. We'd like to get involved for a

fee because we could get it done

24

and

faster

ultimately cheaper if they would allow us to inspect the fish. Whether they actually come around, I don't know. They haven't said yes yet.

(Off the record conversation.)

MR. HANSEN: On the gas-treated, we need to work on that.

(Off the record discussion.)

MR. HANSEN: I'll just stand close to the mike. Sorry. Essentially, it passed a certain color level generally that you can mask some quality problems, what we're finding. Now FDA has not -- They can't find a cause of action to take regulatory action against this -- seafood products essentially.

The CO, carbon monoxide, is a smoke. It's generally regarded as safe. It's one of the components that got a pass when we decided to be more focused on food additives and so forth and they haven't been able to make a case for what they called something to be better than it is, appearing better than it is under the statute. So essentially, there's going to be no regulatory action on CO at all in this country even though other countries have banned it and don't like and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	so forth. I don't see it.
2	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have Mr. Dewey and
3	MR. BILLY.
4	MR. DEWEY: I'm trying to get my mind
5	around the level of seafood inspection and so on
6	and I'm confused by I mean your third slide
7	talks about NOAA's seafood inspection wherein you
8	stated 33 percent of the domestic and foreign
9	33 percent of the product is being
LO	MR. HANSEN: Yes, the product.
11	MR. DEWEY: Yet FDA was just one
L2	percent or less
L3	MR. HANSEN: They don't really examine
L4	product. That's the thing. They examine
L5	processes of conditions of production and so
L6	forth.
L7	MR. DEWEY: But what we see in the
L8	press all the time is less one percent of our
L9	seafood is inspected, when, in fact, you're saying
20	here that 33 percent of it.
21	MR. HANSEN: Right. It's inspected by
22	us, not FDA. They examine one percent of imports
23	about.

MR. DEWEY: Less.

1	MR. HANSEN: Or a little less.
2	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'm confused.
3	MR. DEWEY: I'm just confused. I'm
4	trying to get a handle on the degree to which our
5	seafood is being inspected and I'm getting a very
6	mixed message here right now.
7	MR. HANSEN: All right.
8	MR. DEWEY: FDA who has the regulatory
9	authority is doing less than one percent of the
LO	imports.
L1	MR. HANSEN: Right.
L2	MR. DEWEY: But you're doing 33 percent
L3	of the
L4	MR. HANSEN: Of everything. Everything
L5	that's consumed. A lot of our seafood is exported
L6	somewhere. We may or may not look at that. It's
L7	complex, but essentially that's what Fishery
L8	Statistics came up with that our total is about
L9	1.9 billion pounds of product actually inspected
20	and the consumption in 2006 in this country was
21	5.8 billion pounds.
22	CHAIR DiLERNIA: So where does the one
23	percent come in?
24	MR. HANSEN: That's products that upon

1	entry. That's imports upon entry.
2	MR. DEWEY: But you're not the import
3	firm.
4	MR. HANSEN: No, we can't inspect it
5	until it enters. FDA will exclude us from any
6	import until they say they give the go-ahead
7	basically. Then we inspect it.
8	CHAIR DiLERNIA: So 33 percent of
9	domestic production.
10	MR. HANSEN: No, domestic consumption.
11	MR. DEWEY: The slide says "inspects
12	both domestic and foreign firms for products
13	consumed in the U.S."
14	MR. HANSEN: Yes.
15	MR. DEWEY: 1.9 billion pounds.
16	MR. BILLY: There is overlap.
17	MR. HANSEN: Yes.
18	MR. BILLY: The FDA is so limited that
19	many entities identities choose to have voluntary
20	inspection for a fee to supplement what doesn't
21	occur or supplement what does occur by FDA.
22	MR. DEWEY: Yes, I understand.
23	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Connelly.
24	MR. CONNELLY: If I could just lead you

1	through some questions. Eighty percent seafood is
2	imported. How many pounds is that or tons
3	roughly?
4	MR. HANSEN: Whatever 80 percent of
5	5.8, something like five billion.
6	MR. CONNELLY: And of that, how many
7	pounds of that or what percentage of that do you
8	inspect?
9	MR. HANSEN: Of imports?
10	MR. CONNELLY: Yes.
11	MR. HANSEN: God knows.
12	MR. CONNELLY: I think that's Bill's
13	question.
14	MR. HANSEN: Quite a bit of it
15	actually.
16	MR. CONNELLY: Is it 25 percent or is
17	it six percent or is it 75 percent?
18	MR. HANSEN: You know the way
19	statistics are collected we don't entirely know to
20	be honest with you. We don't know the breakout
21	because there wasn't I think when the
22	statistics system was sort of brought through,
23	there was probably not a heck of a lot of reported
24	seafood. And so they didn't think about that

breakout. But the long and short of it is that we inspect 1.9 billion pounds. Presumably most of that gets consumed in the United States.

MR. CONNELLY: And do you inspect for the same kinds of things as FDA? FDA does testing for contaminants or antibiotics or other things? Does DOC inspection programs test for those kinds of things or more quality, does it meet the spec, testing?

MR. HANSEN: We do both. We have a verification program. We just do some discovery sampling of the product that we inspect. Take a sample, send it to the laboratory, do appropriate testing whether that's contaminants or micro or whatever. We just do that to ensure that our program is operating the way it's supposed to be.

Most of what we do, we do what we call quality inspection. We ensure that, say you're Kroger, which is one of the biggest buyers in the United States -- you ought to know what you're getting. You've defined this quality level that you want your customers to have. Right? I mean you're in the business of doing the same thing. We just -- But they were sourcing the stuff from

1	all over the world, from people they don't know,
2	people they do know, products they may or may not
3	be familiar with. What they want us to do is go
4	in and ensure that their quality specifications is
5	being met.
6	MR. DEWEY: That's when their product
7	comes into their receipt?
8	MR. HANSEN: It could be a number of
9	places. We do it in cold storages. There is even
10	proposals for us to do it in foreign countries.
11	We do it in the firm's place. Excuse me.
12	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'm sorry.
13	MR. HANSEN: We do it anywhere all over
14	the place basically.
15	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Let me try to refocus
16	on my list. I have Tom Billy and then Mark
17	Holliday. Tom.
18	MR. BILLY: Okay. Thank you.
19	CHAIR DiLERNIA: And Mr. Roberts also.
20	MR. BILLY: I remember when I make a
21	presentation to the MAFAC Committee in 1974 to
22	address the question of whether NOAA should keep
23	the voluntary inspection program or get rid of it.

And the decision at that time was to keep it as

an integral part of the Fisheries' programs.

It's come a long way and it does a lot of things for the consumer and for good the in the variety of services that it provides. But the weak link in my opinion is FDA and I used to work at FDA and I ran the Office of Seafood which incidentally is no longer in existence. That's another step FDA has taken. They've eliminated the Office of Seafood merged the people in what they call Land Foods into one mix and the Office of Seafood was set up in 1991 to handle the last major crisis with seafood safety. The resources that were provided at that time dropped to less than 40 percent of what a year ago compared to what existed in 1991 as money was reprogrammed for other things at FDA higher priorities.

To my way of thinking, this is both a critical area that it would be worthwhile for the committee to spend some more time on and sort out what the appropriate role of NOAA is in relation to the Food and Drug Administration and other entities. There are private inspection. Through NFIand others, can talk more about what we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

industry's needs are. We can talk more about what consumers expect and make some recommendations to the new administration in terms of what would be most appropriate here.

This is a very active area, this area of food safety, more generally. I have a report here from Congress and there is currently as I tallied it up 17 separate bills all trying to address food safety in one form or another and with a wide divergence of approaches and funding mechanisms and so forth.

So I don't know that anything is really going to happen even next year. It's a complex area with lots of issues associated with it as I said and I think the MAFAC could provide some very useful policy guidance. It doesn't make sense to me to think about the morning presentation about all the things we're going to do to manage the fisheries but then not pay attention to the safety and the quality and so forth of the product.

We haven't even talked about issues like economic fraud, something that NFI and others are wrestling with as well as the Voluntary Inspection Program which is a rampant problem here

in the United States and around the world with species substitution and other types of issues. There's a lot to reckon with and I think we've heard a little bit. But we ought to spend some time looking at this.

CHAIR DILERNIA: I have Dr. Holliday, Mr. Roberts and Mr. Forster. But before I call on Dr. Holliday, it sounds like we're starting to define our agenda for our next meeting. We already have Mr. Raftican regarding our charter revision and you know the rules, Tom. If you suggest something we should do, you end up chairing it. Looks like we'll be going in that direction also.

Dr. Holliday.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you. Briefly to Bill Dewey's question about the statistics, in a had a bit with fishery former job Ι to do statistics and economics from the agency and I understand where the numbers and the confusion are. But I just want to say we'll get the numbers straightened out and it's actually pretty easy to understand once we lay it out for people. So it's not -- The confusion will be resolved.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HANSEN: Maybe the confusion with me.

But I think just quickly DR. HOLLIDAY: to Tom's point, one of the reasons Bill Hogarth wanted this on the agenda, and we made this change sort of at the last minute, was the result of we talked about this at the NMFS Leadership council and so all of the directors of the agency were asking the very same strategic questions that Tom was bringing up about what's the future direction on this topic, what's the intersection with other federal agencies, how does this comport or compete with other issues that are in front of the Fishery Service for dollars, for people and time. So what more logical place do we get some good advice than to come to MAFAC and say this is timely, it's on the Hill, it's on the newspaper, it's in front of our leadership and this is where we wanted to get MAFAC's attention and ask these questions to try to help us shape decisions and policies for the So I commend everybody for picking up on It's a terribly important issue for us to consider.

> CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Roberts.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ROBERTS: I'm going to say you're doing a stupendously good job.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

MR. **ROBERTS:** Ι look at this information and it's hard for me to draw another conclusion. We're inspecting whatever it is, one Do we have massive recalls in the seafood industry? I don't remember many. I have continuous USDA inspection of beef and poultry. Some companies go out of business because product gets out and they have to recall tons of material.

I'm looking at that contrast and I think between FDA and Customs and you guys we're inspecting one percent of some low amount. Ninety-two percent of the incidents of illnesses are in three categories and I'm not saying we don't have a problem. But I'm impressed by what I see.

Now there are things leaning obviously and so for safety, I would probably be a bit of a cynic and probably be the only one in the room that will be that way. But looking at the resources you have comparing to what USDA has, I don't say you don't have to do this job. What I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

	saying is I think you're doing it pretty well.
2	The second thing is I'd like to know
3	what's the difference in the agency between safety
4	illness type thing and quality. You said you were
5	doing quality work for the Wal-Marts, the big
6	supermarket buyers. Is that really a role for
7	NMFS as opposed to safety?
8	MR. HANSEN: First of all, quality is
9	just Safety is quality at large basically.
10	It's the same thing only we're worried about human
11	health versus satisfying your customers. It's the
12	same idea.
13	MR. ROBERTS: Okay. So the quality you
14	all are working on is related
15	MR. HANSEN: It's the safety and
16	quality what we're doing.
17	MR. ROBERTS: But the quality is only
18	related to illness type issues.
19	MR. HANSEN: No.
20	MR. ROBERTS: It's not.
21	MR. HANSEN: It's related to what
22	appeals to the consumer and we don't know exactly
23	what that is. People that buy our services know
24	it and we apply whatever standards they want to

1	apply to that.
2	MR. ROBERTS: Wait. Let me finish. Is
3	the quality thing than an economic fraud issue?
4	MR. HANSEN: That's another issue which
5	I didn't bring up but Tom did.
6	MR. ROBERTS: In times of tight budgets
7	and it's probably not going to get any better, we
8	don't have an Office of Seafood anymore in FDA, I
9	think it's time to get focused in on illness-
10	oriented safety. I'm a little concerned about
11	this quality issue. I think that's sellable
12	between the buyer and the seller and letting an
13	independent lab verify it for the buyer and the
14	seller whether it's the quality they bought or
15	not.
16	Anyway, I'm preaching. I'll move on.
17	I know Tom is biting at the bit to say something
18	I'm sure. But I think you're doing a good job
19	from what I see in the numbers quite frankly.
20	MR. HANSEN: Thank you.
21	CHAIR DiLERNIA: All right. I'm trying
22	to keep us a little bit on schedule. I have Mr.
23	Forster, MR. BILLY and Mr. Connelly. John.

Thank

FORSTER:

MR.

24

As

а

you.

technical question, in terms of inspections, do you have different uses and different routines with respect to fresh and frozen seafood? I mean because fresh has a perishability. You don't have very long to make a decision if you have a concern.

MR. HANSEN: I'll stand close to the mike so he can hear me. But essentially there's a -- it's not fundamentally different. Obviously with the fresh inspections, we have to make a decision right then and there. Frozen we have got time. We have maybe a year.

MR. FORSTER: And that was my point.

In terms of gearing up to inspect fresh seafood,

it has to be incredibly responsive because you

don't have that luxury of time.

MR. HANSEN: Yes. We have to be. So essentially what happens is we have what they call distribution firms that serve the supermarkets, Wal-Mart, and so forth and it all comes in there, fresh and frozen, and we have to make a million daily decisions when we're in the firm about whether a certain product meets a specification, the here and now stuff.

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

NEAL R. GROSS

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

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. MR. BILLY, Mr.

Connelly and then maybe we'll be able to move onto

the next agenda item. You pass? Mr. Connelly.

MR. CONNELLY: Just each department is interested in safety. USDA is interested in all kinds of activities including getting involved in inspecting catfish which they argue is their fish, not NMFS's fish. The Farm Bill is moving through. There is a grading. There is a piece that would catfish from Seafood the Inspection cut out We certainly don't think that's a good It's a Presidential issue. Do you have any idea. words on where that stands?

I don't know where MR. HANSEN: stands. Essentially, they're creating a parallel Part of the bill stated that universe. wouldn't get across of Department of any Commerce's Food Safety activities, whereas catfish is largely a food quality, food grading activity. So my take on it is that they don't want to pay They want to get it as a part of an appropriation and not have to pay the freight like they have to do with us. But I may be wrong. Ιt just because there is already seems nuts

1	program.
2	MR. CONNELLY: There's a flurry of
3	stuff going on today.
4	MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry.
5	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. Tim, thank you
6	very much.
7	Our next agenda item is the Saltwater
8	Angler Registry Program. We have Gordon Colvin
9	and Pres Pate who are running that program.
10	(Off the record discussion.)
11	CHAIR DiLERNIA: For those of you who
12	don't know, Gordon and I had the pleasure of
13	meeting originally over 20 years ago when we first
14	assumed responsibility of Director of Marine
15	Resources for the State of New York and over the
16	years I must say, Gordon, we went from probably
17	knocking heads on every issue to probably going
18	together forward on every issue. So thanks for
19	the education perhaps.
20	MR. COLVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21	That was a nice way of saying he went from trying
22	to get me fired to being a really good friend.
23	(Laughter.)

MR. COLVIN:

24

It goes to show you what

this business is like.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Our state lost when you retired.

MR. COLVIN: Thank you.

I'm here today along with Preston Pate who is another former state director and suffered a similar fate recently to talk to you about the Marine Recreational Information Program, the Fisheries' Services initiative to rebuild and reconstruct our nation's Saltwater Recreational Fishing Data Collection Program.

We're going to kind of do this as a tag team. I'm going to talk first about the work of the National Saltwater Angler Registry Team which is a big part of this process and then Pres is going to come up and talk to you about the work of the operations team or the guys who are really doing the nuts and bolts work on reconstructing the surveys themselves.

I think probably this will work fast if we give our presentations and then jointly take your questions. If that's all right with you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. COLVIN: Thank you. The Marine Recreational Information Program Initiative responsibility for it within located and t.he Fisheries Services with the Office of Science and Technology under Steve Murawski's oversight John Boreman's direction, the initiative organization, the governances as indicated here with an executive steering committee in overall for the effort and support and guidance the primary work is being conducted by three teams, the Saltwater Angler Registry Team, the Operations Team which Pres heads up and the Communications and Education Team which is headed up by Forbes Darby.

Members of the executive steering committee are indicated here. As I said, John chairs the committee and Boreman we have representation from the councils, the interstate commission executive directors on behalf of Bob Fletcher has been kind enough states. represent MAFAC on the committee and a number of folks within the leadership of the Fisheries Service as well.

The Registry Team is similarly composed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of representatives from Federal Services, myself and Ken Rickhus from Fish and Wildlife Service, membership because of heavy state the on importance as we'll see of the states to the success of the Registry Initiative with representation also from the Western Pacific Council and constituent groups.

Eric Schwaab of MAFAC has graciously agreed after having his arm heavily twisted to serve as a liaison and a support person between MAFAC and the Registry Team.

Now in setting up the overall Marine Recreational Information Program, the executive steering committee articulated several important principles that the teams trying their are darndest to adhere to. The first is that the process is to be inclusive and I think what I've talked about in terms of the membership of the teams makes that clear. We are including our principal stakeholders and partners in Fisheries Management and data collection as well constituents throughout the process and the process is a collaborative one.

This is particularly important to 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

22

23

Registry. The Registry as we will see absolutely requires a collaborative work between the states and the Federal Fisheries Service if it's to succeed and we are to attain our goals.

The process is also transparent. We're committed to making our meetings open, making our meeting proceedings available to the public via our website and other means. And I think these are all things that I think John impressed on us at the outset that we've been gratified to try to practice.

Turning to the Registry itself, the initial basis of the registry as well the overall Marine Recreational Information Program that we're going to talk about today stems from the decision by Bill and others in the leadership of the Fisheries Service a couple of years ago to National Research Council ask the to review comprehensively our Marine Recreational Data Collection Programs nationwide. The NRC review I believe was made public around the middle of April of 2006 if memory serves and it included a large number of, I think, candidly worded criticisms and recommendations for improvement for the many data

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

collection programs that we have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Key those series of among was а recommendations about the creation of a universal sampling frame or saltwater angling effort surveys based on registries of actual anglers rather than some of the past methods that have been used which included partial sample frames and telephone directories, things of that nature. The repeatedly and specifically recommended creating a national registry of all saltwater anglers without exceptions either by the Federal Government or by collection of state registries using data. Their emphasis repeatedly was registry complete making that and without exceptions.

reauthorization The Magnuson-Stevens the recommendations of the National picked on Research Council. Section 401 of the Act requires Secretary to establish a new program improve the quality and quantity of information the data collected under the Marine Recreational Data Collection Programs nationally and requires that the Service take a hard look at all of the recommendations the NRC of report and to the

NEAL R. GROSS

maximum extent practicable include those recommendations in the redesign of the survey. That included specifically a section that requires the creation of a federally-established registry of saltwater anglers. It could be a national registry or а registry divided into regional registries. But it calls on us to begin to do that in 2009.

However, although Congress asked us to carefully consider and follow the advice of the National Research Council, the mandated federal registration of anglers is limited. It's limited to those anglers and vessels that fish in EEZ or that fish for anadromous fish. All other kinds of fishing in state waters is not covered by the federal mandatory registration requirement. What this means is that Congress has created a dynamic in which the Fisheries Service has to work with the states who have the power to license if we're going to obtain the goal of a complete registry and a complete directory.

The Act enables the charging of a fee for registration, but not until January of 2011. The basis of the fee is not specified in the Act

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and therefore by default it will be undertaken consistent with NOAA policy of being consistent with the Agency's administrative cost for administering a license or a registration program.

Act says that we can register either anglers or vessels and the Registry teams believe at this point based on what we understand about the direction of future surveys is that we need to register individual anglers. We need to for-hire vessels. register We don't need register private vessels. That's been our recommendation.

Now the Act also says that anglers who registered by states licensed or exempted from this national registration program. But it goes on to say and the language emphasized here is from the statute that that could be done if the Secretary determines that the data that the state provides is adequate or that the data is used to conduct recreational surveys. In effect, the Secretary is empowered here to determine what kinds of state license data are sufficient to meet the purposes of the Act and of the surveys that will be developed and the states can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

either by submitting licensed angler data or in some respects by using their own registry data to conduct surveys that are also subject to the Secretary's review and approval.

Registry Team has adopted a development plan which is posted on the website. These goals are excerpted from the Development Plan and what I'm going to talk about for the next few slides here are what the Registry Team has recommended be the structure of the Registry Program. So I'm working from а set of recommendations ultimately we hope will find their way into NMFS policy and even through rulemaking be adopted officially.

The qoals emphasize a few things. First, we want to build a complete registry just as the NRC recommended. We know that that's going to take some time. It will not happen overnight. So the emphasis is as much on build as it is on We're building a registry. complete. We've likened it to starting with a blank phone book, the Manhattan Telephone Directory, and taking the time we will need to fill it up with the names and phone numbers of all of the nation's saltwater

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

anglers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We want to work with state registry data. We know for the reasons that we've talked about if we're going to get all of the anglers in the book we need to get state registry data from all the states. We would be perfectly happy, totally delighted, to never have to register a single angler federally.

We will work with regional data collection partnerships. We won't necessarily need to work only with states. In some instances, we can work with the folks out in the regions who are doing their own recreational data collection.

I'll get into that a more later.

And we must support the overall goals of the Marine Recreational Information Program as they develop and as they get fleshed out through the Operations Team's work. The purpose of the registry is to support improved data. That's all There is not some other agenda there. it is. The message that we want to consistently state and make sure that particularly our stakeholders understand is that this is about data collection and improvement of data.

NEAL R. GROSS

A little bit about our schedule. As I've indicated, we've completed our approach and a development plan which have been posted on the website as of this fall. The recommendations and the discussion I'm talking to you about today and that hopefully will be built into a proposed rule that will be published in early 2008 are based on that approach document.

The expectation is to get a final rule can begin in place this year so that we contemplate registering anglers and making exempted state determinations in time for the January 2009 implementation schedule.

So the process, we also have to build the physical process that will enable us to accept angler registration applications and issue registrations to them as necessary by the end of the year and then begin to actually conduct the registration process or to accept data from the exempted states in 2009.

A lot of the discussion that we've been involved in is about this question of how does a state get designated as exempted so that its anglers don't have to be federally registered 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

22

23

the team has spent most of its time on subject. One way will be for the states provide NOAA with a license or registry-based frame of anglers themselves or as I indicated earlier when I put the lines from the statute up, the state can use registry-based information in a regional survey found acceptable to NOAA. hybrid approach is what the Registry Team has recommended to the executive steering committee and the steering committee has endorsed.

A couple of points on that, states that licenses now just kind of for the record, easier to say the states that don't have There is no formal saltwater fishing licenses. license in all of the northeastern states from New Maine, Hawaii and in the Jersey to various All territories. the other states do license of one kind or another and potentially can qualify for exempted state status subject considerations we'll talk about.

There are also a number of states that are involved in regional surveys again, mostly on the West Coast. The states that may have survey programs in effect that will help to qualify for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

exemption primarily include Alaska and the Pacific states of Washington, Oregon and California. Most of the rest of the states are involved in surveys that are part of or flow from NMFS and are done more in partnership that way, although Larry's going to want to talk to me about the Gulf of Mexico I'm sure.

So when a state applies for exempted state status it will need to describe its license structure, who does it license, who does it not license, its database and how it can transfer information to us and one of the first questions that we started getting into is while states have exemptions to their licenses are those exemptions going to be okay or are they not going to be okay. Are they going to exclude too many people? Are we not going to meet our goal of a complete registry or are we?

So we talked a lot about what exemptions would be okay and the ones that we think are okay, first of all, for the young anglers that are exempted by virtually all the states. Also some of the states, not too many, but some of the states have complete exemptions

NEAL R. GROSS

for senior citizens over ages 60 to 65, anyone in that range. And we'll talk about this more, but we've recommended that we accept them for an interim period of about two years while the states figure out how to get the seniors into the phone book.

We're also thinking that folks who are fishing on licensed piers and particularly on licensed for-hire vessels. If they are exempted that's not a problem because we have other surveys that cover particularly for-hire vessels and we don't need to have people in the phone book there because we're getting their effort data out.

There's a few states that have exempted for disabled anglers and active military on furlough that just doesn't apply to very many people or very many fishing trips. We're not concerned about those.

The exemptions that we are concerned about are these. A couple of states have exemptions for fishing on licensed private boats. Anybody who is a passenger on a boat that has one of these doesn't have to get a state license. The states that have that are Delaware, Maryland,

NEAL R. GROSS

Virginia and Florida and that's a concern.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There are few states that have complete exemptions for fishing on private property, Virginia for sure, and that's probably the one state that we have the biggest concern about.

Another big one is this shore and public pier fishing exemptions. These exemptions occur in South Carolina, Florida and California. The shoreline exemptions in South Carolina and Florida probably the biggest are and most troublesome ones.

And exclusion of some marine waters.

Maryland is the only state here, I think, we have
a problem where their license only applies in the
bay. It doesn't apply anywhere else.

We've actually been involved in ongoing dialogue with each of the states that have these interestingly, all of problems and, them working on them now. They're probably actually a little farther along working on these than some of states without licenses are working licenses which is good news for us because I think we'll roll these problems up in the next year or so.

Some other challenges that we have, states that issue lifetime or long-term licenses and may not refresh the data so that any contact information we have is stale.

Combination licenses, combination on the fishing, combination saltwater/freshwater fishing. We want to make sure that we know who the saltwater anglers. So we're not calling people who aren't.

Senior licenses, I'll come back to that one. We still think we have to get seniors eventually. There's just too much fishing effort that goes on to ignore it forever.

And the other issues are the technical issues of getting data that can get to us in a form that we can compile it and use it and get it put to use in surveys.

Our goal being to get a complete everybody who fishes, directory of we that these particular problems recognize of lifetime licenses, combinations and seniors are a real problem for the states to resolve quickly. So the thought of the team was we'll accept states' licenses and grant them exempt state

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

status at the outset and in their memorandum of agreement with the service, we'll specify a two year period within which we need to collect the rest of the data, find out how to get the rest of the data in these groups within that time, how to refresh the lifetime license holder, address information, how to separate the saltwater anglers from the rest of the combination license holders, how to identify the seniors even though they may not have licenses, they don't have to license them but maybe a registration card or something like that at the state where within a two year period.

also, said. We as we've have recommended that consistent with the statute the states involved in certain kinds of surveys, again, subject to secretarial approval would be for exemptions. The eliqible recommended conditions from the team are that first the survey would be part of a regional survey, not a selfstanding survey, but the one that is regional in nature, that surveys would include and involve the use of angler registry frames for sampling and that the surveys are determined by us to meet national desian collection survey and data

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

standards that will emerge as the Operations Team brings forward its recommendations for survey redesign over time.

As I said, a lot of our consideration involves state and federal communications. a lot of emphasis on the question of how we'll communicate with the states. We've established regular progress reports and in email distribution of information to state directors on how the team is doing and how things are developing. more involved in outreach as time goes by and we start contemplating outreach activities within states, we will be reaching out to the states and invite them to participate in that. We're not going to march into a state, start doing stuff and catching them off-quard. We've already actually done a little bit of that in Virginia and North Carolina and I think it's worked out really nicely with some joint press releases.

The other thing is we tried to make it very clear to the states, particularly the states that don't have licenses or the states that have those big exemptions, that if we can help by coming and sitting down with their agency heads,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

their constituents, their state legislators, we'll do that. The team will do that. I will do that. We've been doing a fair amount of that already this year and expect to do a lot more once the state legislative sessions get into full swing and that's been received pretty well.

I put a little stuff in here on where the website is and one of the things I wanted to mention is that we've just started in a process now that Forbes is working on to reconstruct the website for all of the Marine Recreational Data stuff including not just the MRIP but the old NMFS numbers and the websites that you're all used to using to get those numbers. Hopefully, over time, you'll see that emerge as a new product that will look at lot better.

That's it for the Registry Team. Pres is going to take over on Operations and then we'll get to questions. If anybody wants to ask a couple while he's loading up, we can do that, too, to save time.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Real quick, Randy, and then we'll get to Pres.

MR. CATES: I have a question on how

NEAL R. GROSS

1	are you counting on enforcing this and, too, a
2	quick one would be why are we having any
3	exemptions at all if the goal is data collection.
4	A follow-up would be also gathering rights which
5	would particularly be important in Hawaii. Have
6	you thought of that?
7	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Do as much as you can
8	and then as soon as Pres is ready we'll come back
9	to Randy.
10	MR. COLVIN: Yes. I'll start. On the
11	issue of enforcement, enforcement will be tough.
12	If there are a lot of people involved and neither
13	the National Fisheries Service nor the Coast Guard
14	has a lot of assets to enforce this sort of thing.
15	We will be looking to the states under our JEAs
16	to help us with enforcement. Education will be a
17	big part of that process. It has to be.
18	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Second question.
19	MR. CATES: The second question was I
20	questioned why have exemptions if we're trying to
21	keep data.
22	MR. COLVIN: Part of that is just
23	reality. The big exemption that we're looking at

is the kids, the people under age 16 and all of

the state exempts their youth, every one of them.

And we, the Registry Team, felt that there were three things that we needed to consider on the case of youth. One is that when we call a household to get effort data we ask whoever we're talking to for effort data by members of the household. So in many cases, if there's an adult in the household who is contacted, they can also give us information on the trips the kids make,

not in all cases, but in many.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is Α second issue t.hat. this registration requirement is being adopted under the Magnuson. You all know that the Magnuson Act has tough penalties. Yet we have real concerns about enforcing the registration requirement involving minors. just does Ιt not seem reasonable or realistic.

And the third thing is that we are going to invite kids to register voluntarily and to the extent that we can generate a good education and outreach program that talks about the benefits of that maybe it will be attractive to a lot of them.

I think those are the main reasons.

NEAL R. GROSS

Most of the other exemptions really involve so few 1 people that they're not going to affect the data 2 at all. 3 4 CHAIR DiLERNIA: You had third 5 question related to native peoples and I think you made that --6 I'll come back to that. 7 MR. COLVIN: CHAIR DiLERNIA: You're going to come 8 back to that because there's a lot of people in 9 Hawaii. 10 11 MR. COLVIN: That's a tough one. CHAIR DiLERNIA: Pres, are you ready? 12 MR. PATE: I'm ready, Tony. 13 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Go ahead. 14 15 MR. PATE: Thank you very much. Ι apologize for not having had this presentation 16 early enough to include 17 prepared it in briefing book, but I'm going to attempt to bring 18 you the most updated information. I held off on 19 completing my presentation today until after a two 20 21 hour conference call I had this morning with some 22 of our work group members to get them up to speed

projects that I'll be talking about later.

and advanced on the development of some of the

23

Tony, I appreciate indulging me for sitting down since I'm operating two computers here if you will. I appreciate the opportunity to come before this group which I've never met with before and with Gordon bring you up to speed on where we are with the improvements and redesign to the MRFSS program, all of which has stemmed out of recent debates and arguments about the accuracy and reliability of recreational harvest statistics being used by fisheries and debates that have often overwhelmed the more productive discussions of exactly what measures are necessary to ensure the sustainable harvest by both commercial and recreational fishermen.

A lot of this had to deal with what was obviously eroding angler confidence that has occurred as the MRFSS survey was being applied for uses which it was not intended to do originally which was to track long-term trends. But use of the information evolved over time to be applied to and seasonal harvest which management resulted in a lot of skepticism about the accuracy of the program and a lot of encouragement for MRFSS to move forward with taking the measures

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

necessary to fix the problems and they did so by commissioning the National Research Council to do an independent, scientific review of the MRFSS and that report that resulted from that made a number of important findings and conclusions that set the stage for developing and implementing a plan for better collection and analysis of recreational fishing data.

Gordon's already given you some good background information and about the structure of the process. I'll concentrate on the role of and the work of the Operations Team in moving this forward. I'll try to avoid being overly redundant to some of the things that he has said, but I may not be completely successful in doing that.

The executive steering committee established the Operations Team and developed criteria for selecting its members that will give the necessary national, technical and management constituent representation on that group. Ιt charged the Operations Team with developing a list of recommendations for upgrading the MRFSS response to the NRC report, the technical workshop that we held in Denver a couple of years ago to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

bring together regional representation to identify management needs and the reauthorization requirements that were in Magnuson in addition to constituent input. The Operations Team was also asked to develop a work plan for addressing all of these requirements and recommendations.

There are a number of work groups that were formed by the Operations Team to evaluate specific issues raised in the NRC report and how these related to regional management needs. Each of the four work groups shown on this slide have from 12 to 20 members that collectively provide the depth and diversity of skills necessary complete the Operations Team's task. Many of these members represent state agencies and, Gordon said in his opening comments, the ESC and the Operations Team recognize the importance of involvement and support by our state partners and want state representation to be optimized at every opportunity.

After the work groups were formed, we held a workshop. Actually, it was down the road here at the Sirata Hotel to initiate group members to the process and assign them their respective

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and begin developing a list of priority projects in five general categories of general design, analysis, of data data areas management, the standards, the for-hire fisheries fisheries and that harvest highly migratory species.

And now I'll give you some information about the operations of each one of the subject specific work groups. The NRC concluded that both the dockside intercept random telephone survey components of the MRFSS are inadequate and suffer from weaknesses that may lead to biases to catch. An effort as to the design analysis and analysis work group was tasked with a relevant set of projects to test the substances being applied to MRFSS and redesign surveys to reduce bias.

The proposed projects of this group will assess the appropriateness of statistical estimation procedures, develop survey methods to correct error in effort of catch estimates caused by incomplete sampling of both private access sites and night fishers and fishers inaccessible by phone because they live outside the coastal zone, have only cell phones or not included in a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

complete license frame.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Another important project undertaken by this group or proposed by this group is one that will focus on more accurate estimates of discarded catch which is becoming a larger portion of angler harvest and an increasingly important consideration in the stock assessments.

MRFSS currently relies to The extent on input from state surveys applying the same sampling methodology determined by the NRC in their report to suffer from inadequate design and possibly flawed assumptions. The NRC recommended a greater degree of standardization among state surveys and between state surveys and the central MRFSS program. Achieving this will require much greater degree of cooperation and coordination the management of these surveys in Projects developed by the data Management and Standards Work Group will help standardize these data elements and ensure compatibility among the various surveys while being flexible enough to recognize the need for region specific data.

In this report, the NRC recommended that for-hire sector will be considered commercial

NEAL R. GROSS

and that survey methods and reporting requirements should be different from those applied to private anglers. The projects of the for-hire work group will review and assess for-hire data collection methodologies, identify potential sources of bias and recommend changes in survey design to correct them.

While the NRC did not identify highly migratory species, fisheries specifically, in its report, they are important targeted segments of NOAA's data collection efforts. This fishery was added to the MRIP sensitive report and Congress made it clear that all recreational data collection programs should be improved. The focus of these projects will be the geographical expansion data collection of HMS programs, assessment of current methodologies for potential biases and development of new methodologies as needed.

17 projects that There were were developed by the work groups and reviewed by the Operations Team at a meeting we had on November 28th. Αt that meeting, the projects were prioritized and the report from that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

prioritization was submitted to the executive steering committee with recommendation The executive steering committee funding. approved the Operations Team's recommendations and we are beginning immediately to begin to wrap up those projects that can be supported with available funds and the remainder when the fiscal year `08 budget is approved which we're hoping will be real soon. But even the lack of that approved budget is not going to affect our ability and opportunity to move forward quickly on these most important projects.

Mr. Chair, I won't go through that whole list of projects that were approved, but I'll give you some information about the ones that were the most high priority. Even before we got into the work group process of developing projects to address bias and the like, we started a project to test the benefits of using a dual framed survey approach which was implemented in the Gulf of Mexico in 2007 and it will utilize state saltwater license databases and telephone survey sampling frames and integrate information from the Coastal Household Telephone Survey in an effort to go

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

through all the licensed and nonlicensed fishermen.

A similar project was initiated in North Carolina in 2007 using the license program that was initiated in my own state this year and it's likely that if those are as successful as we anticipate them to be then they very well may become the standard for sampling in the future.

the highest -- The One of highest priority project evaluate whether was to estimation procedures appropriately make sample design. This project will be done in two phases and will be completed in June of 2009. The first will identify procedures and phase revisions necessary to align estimation sampling procedures and will be completed in June of `08. The second will identify procedures for phase revising historical data and will be completed hopefully as I said in July of `09.

The second highest priority was Marine Recreational Fisheries development of Minimum data elements and regional national The report from this project will be standards. adjust regional used to state and sampling

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

programs for more consistency and compatibility and will be completed by October of `08.

The third project was improving recreational fisheries discard data. The project from the discard project will be completed by June of `08 and will provide a comparison between angler reported discards and observed data for the for-hire fishery and develop methods that can be used to better estimate private angler discards.

The next project is the design and analysis methods to account for incomplete angler This will be an assessment of license frames. utilize license survey programs that make sampling databases of frames and recommendations for future surveys and will be completed by October of `08.

Private access fishing is one of great importance to the group, receiving a high priority consideration by the Operations Team project will develop pilot studies to test identify assumptions and potential biases associated with harvest by angler using private access points or other sites not acceptable by dockside samplers.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And, Mr. Chairman, Ι in quess conclusion, I'm certainly pleased to report that we've made some substantial progress since this began. Ι have to acknowledge the commitment that all participants have made in this initiative particularly the members of the various work groups which are members or representatives from the various state agencies that I'm confident as we go along that we'll make some improvements be visible in the will short that term hopefully patience by everyone to fully appreciate the benefits for the long term. With that, Mr. Chairman, I'm done.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you. I have a question and then I'll open up the questions to the Committee for both of you gentlemen. Do we have a goal date as for when we would expect the MRFSS system to be revised, completely revised, or is there -- it has to be a few years out.

MR. PATE: I think there probably are some expectations that we will be able to one day turn one light off and the other one on and have an entirely different program to work with. But that will not happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The changes that we are pursuing and will be verified as necessary by these various projects will result in some important but subtle changes to the sampling program over time. will be some projects that will be immediately applied that are not being used now such as some the sampling procedures for the for-hire industry and others. But for most of the private angling surveys, the improvements in statistical estimation and sampling design will be more subtle and affirmed over time. So there's not a magic date that we've identified for implementation of this new program. There are some changes that we immediately will be making as some of projects are complete and the others will evolve over time. want the whole process We flexible enough and with proper oversight time to be able to make adjustments as necessary as new information becomes available, as new tools statistical estimation of and license frames become available to us to use.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you. I'm going to go back to your question, your third thought, the last part of your question to Gordon and then

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I will open it up to -- I see Mr. Fletcher.

MR. COLVIN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I'm ready on that one.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay.

MR. COLVIN: The Registry Team did have a discussion of the issue that was raised in the question and the recommendation from one of our members was to consider the prospect for an exemption from the registration requirement for indigenous people and not surprisingly that came from Ed Ebisui from Hawaii.

After some considerable discussion, part of the basis for Ed's recommendation had been as I understood it that there are many instances, if not predominately, that the motivations of indigenous people for taking fish were not recreational primarily but had to do with a complex array of issues, social, cultural and so on and so forth.

The problem that we foresaw is that the team is recommending that the registration requirement be applied to angling and not to other forms of removal of fish. So that as a practical matter as we've set it up in the recommendations,

NEAL R. GROSS

a person would be required to be registered if they didn't have a commercial fishing license issued by a competent jurisdiction and they were angling in the EEZ or for an anadromous fish and that's the federal requirement. And so there was a discussion of the enforceability issues might attend to exemptions of that nature ultimately what was agreed by the Registry Team would was that we recommend that people required to register if they're angling but that we would consider a fee waiver for indigenous that's the recommendation people and going forward.

Now there are still issues with that in terms of the practicability of separating a bona fide application for a registration certificate via the internet or an 800 line from someone who really does quality from someone who is asking for a fee waiver who doesn't and we have to work that out.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Follow-up to that?

MR. CATES: Yes. Two of the points of that. Is there a budget for educating the public on this and I keep coming back to what are 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

22

23

consequences if someone does it. What's the enforcement? What's the --

MR. COLVIN: There is not a breakout yet of the budget that we will have for education. I expect to see something along those lines within the next month based on when we get a budget and then we'll be putting together our `08 spend plan for the initiative and at that time, we can share that information through Mark with the chair of the committee.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. I have Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Dorsett, Ms. McCarty and Mr. O'Shea. Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: This comment and I've said this before but I think it bears repeating, probably the most remembered two words in the NRC report when we all got together a couple of years ago as fatally flawed. Fatally flawed was in the — it was a presentation by the guy from the NRC and I would only encourage you, Pres and Gordon, to remember that this is on the lips of so many people around the nation that if you continue to try to claim that we're only going to suddenly modify MRFSS and make it better, you're going to

struggle with some of these people who think MRFSS is a dirty word and even our esteemed head of science, Steve Murawski, at one of our meeting said, "We won't use MRFSS anymore. That will not be utilized. That is dead." And that whatever we talk about in the future, this improved data system, has got to be known as something other than MRFSS and I just feel that that's important.

We have to if we're going to sell this to an angling public that is somewhat skeptical, we don't start off by waving the red flag in front of them by saying MRFSS is going to be MRFSS but it's going to be better.

And we all agree with that, MR. PATE: Rob, and Ι think it's unfortunate that the terminology of fatally flawed was used because it was not in there. It was given in the briefings. The agency and everybody keyed on that. report said was that there were some significant deficiencies of the current survey program that we needed to examine and correct and the terminology is gradually being taken out of vernacular and will be replaced with the Marine Recreational Information program over time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we're looking at totally innovative to estimate angler harvest that perhaps would rely on the surveys. But I'm not optimistic that going to find anything other than the fundamental approach that we're using for surveying our anglers. A survey is a survey and there are ways to do it to make it as good as you possibly can and that's what we're out to achieve.

In California, we did MR. FLETCHER: two things to diverge from the MRFSS that we see as being a big step forward and California calls it CRFS, California Recreational Fisheries Survey. But there are two things that I remember that really stuck out in the presentation and seemed to help get closer to becoming a credible data system in the minds of anglers was they got rid of the random digit dialing and they greatly increased the onsite personnel on board and interaction, of that through the center states and really think that in our area nobody is saying They're all saying we have a MRFSS anymore. system that could be better. Ιt still has shortcomings, but it's a lot better than what we were a few years ago and we're comfortable that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we're going in a good direction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PATE: And I think and I hope, I very certain to think that we're headed in the direction and utilizing some the opportunities that have in California that we hope we'll have nationwide at the end of the period for the angler registry. We can argue that there will be substantial improvements to the survey design surveys once we have and success of the the saltwater universal identified angler as clearly as you all do in California and we do in North Carolina. In that respect, I think we'll be taking the current survey program to another level that will be better understood by and supported by the general angler public.

MR. FLETCHER: I just have one quick question.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay, Bob, quick because we're --

MR. FLETCHER: There's a lot of interest out there about this program. You've done a good job of putting stuff on the website, but there's nothing that replaces interaction, one-on-one, with anglers and so as soon as we can,

I would encourage you to get to the regional councils and the interstate commissions with plans for public meetings to bring everybody up to speed on where we are. I think that would really be helpful.

MR. COLVIN: Yes. You're preaching to the choir on that one. The two of us talk quite a bit about the need to step it up on that arena and one of the things that you all might want to be is that is in the aware of overall end Rec Developmental Plan a milestone schedule for this July whereby the executive steering committee will essentially inform world, particularly the Congress, about what the intent is in terms of rolling this program forward and what the new beginning is going to look like come January of `09 which is the statutory deadline to qet something started. That's kind of the focal point looking we've been at strategically outreach and education is bringing ourselves to the work of Operations Team and its work groups forward to June and July, probably some kind of a workshop or discussion in the Washington area involving the entire group, the executive steering

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

committee and the teams to come to agreement on what it is we're going to bring forward as the beginning of our new survey start in January that's the point at which we really need to explode the outreach programming and that's kind of the strategy right now.

Hopefully, by then we'll have money to spend.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Moving right along,
Mr. Dorsett, Ms. McCarty and Mr. O'Shea. Quick.

MR. DORSETT: Thank you. catch on your highest priority projects the need to provide more timely recreational fishing data to managers. We have the annual catch limits and accountability measures coming online in 2010 and 2011 and how we're going to address what I think very significant problem considering recreational amount οf overages in certain regions.

MR. PATE: That wasn't necessarily a high priority project in and of itself as much as it was embedded in some of the procedural components of some of the other high priority projects and some of the more expedient needs that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the councils have, particularly South Atlantic Council which is working on their, I can say this because I'm familiar with it, catch limitations now, some of those more expedient needs can be improved with some internal adjustments made to the process once we get these projects in place and the new system in place.

There will continue to be the need for feedback from the councils about what their management needs are relative to the availability of the survey data and if we see that the needs aren't necessarily being met by the program, then we'll work as hard as we can to try and make adjustments necessary to get the data. But again, getting back to what we're dealing with here, it's fundamentally a survey and it does take time to collect and compile the information and get it to the managers. So the opportunity to use survey data for in-seasonal adjustments or opening and closing of the programs is still going to be difficult and it's not going to be perfect for that purpose. But we hope with all improvements that we make it will be better than what we have now.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. COLVIN: I haven't talked to Pres this, but one of the things that about has impressed me is that the number one priority on this project is to match estimation procedures and surveys design which doesn't sound like much but it really is -- it was the highlight of the side technical of the NRC criticism and recommendations and it's the foundation for much that has to be done to improve the quality and the timeliness of the surveys. It really is the biggest building blocks of how to lay this cornerstone.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Ms. McCarty.

MS. McCARTY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Most of my questions were answered by your answer to Randy. But I am concerned a little bit about Alaskan application of this. One of my concerns is the Alaska subsistence fishery for salmon and I assume from what you said to Randy that that would not be exempted.

MR. COLVIN: Taking a fish by angling would presumably not be. But let me tell that I think that's all moot in Alaska anyway because I'm quite convinced that Alaska will qualify for 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

22

23

1	state exemption.
2	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
3	MR. COLVIN: Either by virtue of
4	providing us with its angler license database or
5	by virtue of seeking approval of its state
6	conducted recreational survey as a survey-based
7	regional exemption.
8	MS. McCARTY: So when a state is
9	exempted, that program is just accepted whole and
10	you don't make any changes to it.
11	MR. COLVIN: Right.
12	MS. McCARTY: I see. Okay.
13	MR. COLVIN: One question that people
14	have asked me is would you take a partial database
15	from a state and say this class we'll take but
16	we'll have to send the federal registry to other
17	classes. No, we want to do it all or nothing.
18	MS. McCARTY: Okay, and one more
19	question. Does this apply to halibut as well?
20	MR. COLVIN: Yes. In the EEZ. The
21	Federal requirement in the EEZ.
22	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. O'Shea.
23	MR. O'SHEA: Yes. Thanks. It seems to
24	me that reality is we're managing fisheries.

We're going to manage fisheries based on quotas, total removal, the catch limits that Chris Dorsett talked about, and up until now, and again I'm making a generalization, there have been pockets of this, one of the ways some groups have worked against quotas is to discredit the MFRSS system by saying we didn't take that many fish and throwing that in.

But if you follow this project to its logical conclusion, the outcome is going to be a bulletproof or a more reliable system to estimate catch which is then going to be a driver, butt this up against quotas, and it seems that any of the surveying systems that we're using are going to be dependent on cooperation by the anglers.

Now we've already incidents of certain for-hire sectors in certain regions refusing to participate in data collection because they felt the data was going to be used against them. In the MRFSS data we see where there's refusals of anglers on the shore side interception to show what's in their coolers.

So my question is looking ahead how do you see that cooperation issues playing out in

NEAL R. GROSS

this and who is looking at it. Is that a policy issue for the councils or is it going to come out of this group?

MR. PATE: Ι guess you hit on what we've hoped will be one of the most important results of this process and that is increased angler confidence in the survey methodology and I can fully understand not being a statistician myself how difficult it is for people that do not work with these types of issues on a daily basis to understand how you can randomly dial people all over the coastal zones of the country and you can apply that to intercept surveys when you've never been contacted at either venue yourselves. hopeful that as we make the improvements there will be a marked increase in angler confidence and the instances of refusal to participate in element of the program will be improved and as we reach out as Bob Fletcher just suggested to the councils and interstate commissions to get information out to the constituents as fully as we possibly can there will be misses that we try to -- the ultimate success is going to depend on information and angler participation, not angler

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

only allowing us access to the information that they have or ensuring that that information is accurate and that they are giving us facts that will --

MR. O'SHEA: Even though they'll know that the more successful they are the shorter the season is going to be for them next year.

MR. PATE: Yes, it is.

Obviously, that's MR. COLVIN: the But the best we can do is to do exactly what Pres said is to build a process that people believe in results and however reluctantly are accept them because they willing to believe they're right and it is difficult. There's no question.

Bob pointed out a couple of really important things that I absolutely agreed with. One is this notion that converting to the use of angler registries sends the right message to fishermen that we're going to talk to fishermen and we're not going to talk to other people about — and so on and so forth. There's going to be more frequent contacts with fishermen as a result of that and how many times have we heard "I've

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

never been called. I never met anybody that's ever been called. I never met anybody who met anybody that's ever been called." Hopefully, we'll get to a point where the experience of having been surveyed is much more widely shared in the angler community.

The second thing is I also agree that we need to put more effort out on the docks and marinas so that there's a lot more contact and we need to pay a lot of attention to the quality of that contact, a great deal of attention, and that's something that we'll have to get to.

Now I'm talking to a member of the executive steering committee. So this is one of my bosses. So let's remember that when we get together in June.

MR. PATE: Tony, I want to go back just very quickly to a question or a point that Bob made when he commented on the increased sampling and things being done in California and we've talked about that a lot internally and the decision was made not to take the approach that you can improve the program by having more samples which statistically sounds sound. But before you

do that, fix the problems that are in your survey design and estimation procedures and then talk about optimizing your budgets to increase that sample size. So we're not discounting the opportunity to have more dockside intercept but we want to fix the fundamental problems first.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Are there any other questions? Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Just a comment. I think, Ralph, this is probably -- Someone mentioned the huge educational process that is forthcoming to get people acquainted during the building of the program and then the operation of the program. I think this is a great opportunity for the SEAGRANT office with its contacts and educational programs in all the coastal states to at least assume some responsibility to help the Fisheries Service in that regard. Is there much relationship, liaison work, going on now at that level?

MR. PATE: Honestly, I don't know how far up the stream the potential partnership is with SEAGRANT. But I will say that we're looking very closely and pursuing all partnerships. In fact, we have a meeting scheduled the first week

in January in Silver Springs to bring in the CCA and some other constituent groups and there will be resources to help perfect the plan that has been created to get the word out. But certainly SEAGRANT can play a role in that.

MR. COLVIN: I agree. I have talked to Forbes a little bit about involving SEAGRANT. I think that's an opportunity we need to look harder at. I was a member of the Board of Governors of SEAGRANT in New York. I have a good sense of what can be done with the state SEAGRANT extension program. I think there's a role for them here. I think we need to try to use that.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Randy.

MR. CATES: Real quick. Are you getting any cooperation from the states and, in particular, Hawaii?

MR. COLVIN: I'm getting cooperation from almost all the states. I think -- I would not say that we've had close communication with the State of Hawaii yet. I think that's dependent on frankly some of us getting out there and we've been unable to do that because of the continuing resolution restrictions and we need to get

ourselves there and I think that will be all that's really needed to get things moving along there.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: All right. Any other questions? I just have perhaps a comment and I hope I'm absolutely wrong. But my fear, it falls into the category be careful what you ask for, you just may get it. Another recreational community on the east coast was very active in lobbying to have the MRFSS system revised and revitalized and fixed and corrected.

I think you're going to do a good job of fixing it and when you do that, in that process, you're going to capture a lot more of the landings that currently I don't believe are being captured. And as a result, we're going to see with this improved system that the recreational community is responsible for a greater part of the mortality than they are currently being credited with. And that's a fact and that's reality.

The problem becomes when that mortality that we're now capturing with the improved system gets applied to old fishery management plans that divided many of those species between the

NEAL R. GROSS

recreational and the commercial communities. At
the time many of the FMPs were developed, the
datasets, the data collection process, for the
commercial community was, I guess, you would say
much more accurate and I think for the
recreational community it significantly under
estimated the recreational catch and mortality.
So what's going to happen is we're going to have a
great system and that great system is going to be
applied to old quotas and division of quota and
the recreational community will find that contrary
to what they had hoped that the revised system
would give them more fish or greater fishing time
or less regulations that the regulations are going
to be more significant or they would consider more
severe.
I hope I'm wrong. But that just may

develop.

MR. COLVIN: You're not suggesting, Tony, that there's going to be а need to potentially revisit some FMP based allocations.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'm suggesting that and how we're going to go about doing that that's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	(Off the record comments.)
2	MR. PATE: We're pursuing the truth and
3	how we manage to abuse the truth is
4	CHAIR DiLERNIA: It's very interesting
5	if we just use summer flounder if we have
6	MR. COLVIN: Please don't.
7	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you very much,
8	gentlemen.
9	(Applause.)
LO	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Committee, we are 4:00
L1	p.m. We're about 15 minutes or so or maybe a half
L2	hour behind schedule. We're going to take a 15
L3	minute break and when we come back, I have some
L4	more housekeeping and our last presenter. So 15
L5	minutes. Off the record.
L6	(Whereupon, at 3:56 p.m., the above-
L7	entitled matter recessed and reconvened at 4:16
L8	p.m.)
L9	CHAIR DiLERNIA: On the record.
20	Actually, Michael, why don't you go first? Go
21	ahead. You go first and on the agenda we have
22	Michael Rubino on the aquaculture program and then
23	once Michael is done, there's nothing else on our
24	agenda for today. But I do have some additional

housekeeping items that we have to get to.
Michael, why don't you lead off?

MR. RUBINO: Thanks very much and thanks for the opportunity to be on your agenda. I went up and down on the plane one more time than I thought I was going to today. But on the way, I was reading Fish Farming International which some of you probably see and on the inside they have their year end review and they have 30 sort of key things that happened in aquaculture and fisheries around the world and at the top is "NOAA Releases Ten Year Plan for Aquaculture" of those 30 items.

Of the 30 items, four other ones deal with programs or projects that NOAA is involved in, "Pioneer Takes Marine Cobia Market." This is funding through the National Marine Aquaculture Initiative and other things. There's actually "Cobia Producers Now on Police," an indication of the challenges we face in terms of permitting projects in the United States. The next one is Mussel Farm First for "Offshore USA in Hampshire" where fishermen have been working with the University of New Hampshire for a long time developing mussel cultures in deep water and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

last one is entitled "King Crabs Hatch In Alaska" at the Seward Hatchery.

Your charge to us, I guess, it was a couple years ago now to develop a ten-year plan with the NOAA aquaculture program has paid some enormous dividends not just to the program and NOAA but I hope for you as well. I wanted to give you sort of a quick update on where we are with your charges to NOAA, the recommendations that you had for NOAA, where we are on implementing the ten-year plan as a program, some of the challenges we're facing and then I'd like to hear from you in terms of whether you really think these are challenges and what we can do about them.

In your charge to NOAA, the ten-year We did that. We drafted it. plan was one. We the country for public comments, around revised it, and finally got it done. It's allowed us to present a vision of where the agency could go in aquaculture. It's broad-based. It includes on-land, near-shore, offshore, fin fish, shellfish, commercial aquaculture, stock full enhancement, the range of aquaculture activities that we're charged with. Based on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that, we also do sort of internal five-year plans that have budget and staffing attached to it and every year we revise that as we go forward.

The other thing you charged us to do was to hold a National Marine Aquaculture Center Summit which we did last spring. A number of you were -- You were all invited. A number of you A number of you were involved attended. speakers and as moderators. Thank you very much. It was one of the first time I think we had such a collection of sort of the seafood business community, everything from fishermen to large companies to banks, those who invest their money, their own sweat, their own careers asking them what would it take for you to invest in aquaculture here in the United States and then what's the role of the Federal Government in terms of supporting that, in terms of regulation, terms of research, in terms of education and terms of international coordination.

You also recommended that there be an actual budget line in the NOAA Fisheries budget that says aquaculture. We already had a budget line for the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Research that says aquaculture under which comes the Competitive Grants Program called the National Marine Aquaculture Initiative and some of the earmarks that SEAGRANT manages for the aquaculture program. In the FY `08, the budget that Congress is currently considering, there is an aquaculture line in the NOAA Fisheries budget and there is at least in terms of the President's budget an increase from \$1 million to \$4 million of funding for that line.

We don't know what we're going to get I mean, Congress is trying to resolve that right now between the Senate and the House. But internally NOAA, means that Department of Commerce, OMB, took suggestion your and implemented it.

Another one of your recommendations was to create Office of Aquaculture at NOAA. That has not been done yet. It's been in discussion for some time. The Senate draft of this Aquaculture Bill actually has a whole provision in there institutionalizing aquaculture in NOAA and create an Office of Aquaculture. It would create the regional advisory committees to advise the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Department of Commerce on aquaculture. That's one thing that hasn't been completely executed yet.

Another one was to create centers of excellence for aquaculture science within NOAA and we're actively discussing that within NOAA terms of the NOAA Fisheries and the National Ocean Service Science Center as to what format would take, how we would do it. So this past year actually we've gone around and sort of cataloged, we started with NOAA Fisheries Science Centers, what is there in terms of scientific capability, scientists and what they're doing. This next year we want to sort of match that up with what are our future requirements likely to be and what should these science centers be gearing up to do to meet those future requirements.

A couple of things about implementing the ten-year plan. The program has four key areas, regulation, science, outreach and education, and international. Regulation, it's a two-fold process. We're trying to do a better job under existing laws and regulations to process permits that come in the door, their EPA permits and their U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

which NOAA Fisheries has to comment under Essential Fish Habitat or Endangered Species Laws and one of the issues that we've had that we've worked with is on shellfish farming where Corps of Engineers is extending jurisdiction the Clean Water Act on shellfish farming. So we've worked, the aquaculture program has worked, closely with the habitat program at NOAA Fisheries as well as with the Corps of Engineers and the shellfish industry on trying to sort that out and this coming spring in the planning stages NOAA symposium will co-sponsor conference а or shellfish and the environment which Bill Dewey is involved in organizing with Sandy Schumway, Kerry Griffin from our Portland office, Susan Bunsick from my program and some others.

The other part of regulation is what are we going to do about federal waters. We have two routes, federal legislation or going through the councils and we have activities going on in both. We've drafted another bill this past year. We've reintroduced the offshore legislation. As you know, it's not just an offshore bill, but it's really a marine aquaculture bill and I'll get back

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to that in a minute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Gulf Council doesn't want to wait for national legislation. So they've been going through a multi-year process of an amendment to their regulations to ask NOAA Fisheries to develop regulations for aquaculture in federal waters. And I think they're on track. They've completed an alternatives analysis, a draft EIS. NOAA's general counsel of NMFS's general counsel is now Before it goes to EPA in looking at that EIS. January, it will be published in the Federal Register or it goes out to public comment for 40 days. So they're on track I think to have perhaps a vote at the April Gulf Council meeting on that assuming there are no issues with NMFS's general counsel. That's the regulatory side.

The research side, I mentioned what we're doing with the labs and the science centers in terms of capabilities. We also manage the National Marine Aquaculture Initiative which is a competitive grants program. In the President's budget, traditionally it's been a \$1.6 million. It's not a very big grants program. The last year we had a budget fiscal year `06. We have about \$4

NEAL R. GROSS

million put out in grants and we've put out about -- I guess we've ordered about 20 grants or so over the past two years with that money all of which is on the aquaculture website. It's a whole range of species, technologies, primarily directed at those things, at sort of -- that sort of last couple of steps of getting research into commercial application in terms of aquaculture whether it be commercial or stock enhancement. there was an emphasis on pilot and demonstration projects and the other key activities that would go along with that.

This year we don't know how much money we will have again because Congress is working on the budget right now. The Senate mark was \$6 million. The House had zero in it. So hopefully we'll know in a week or two what we have.

But the aquaculture proposals did go The team has reviewed with an outside peer review panel to do a total of 250 proposals. We've boiled that down to 40 or 50. Those 40 or 50 will be invited to submit full proposals. peer review panel will sit down with those make the final February March, and or so,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

selection. Anybody who wasn't selected for the final round can submit a full proposal as well. just shows you the level of interest. But it 250 proposals probably represented million worth of research activities and we're likely to have \$3, \$4, \$5 million. You know with \$3 million you can do two large projects and a handful of medium-sized ones. If you have \$6 million, you can do maybe four large projects at \$1 million each and five at \$200,000. So again, it's not a lot but I think over the years those projects have really allowed the agency to work with industry, state, university partners in developing some interesting things.

Also on the research side this year, we're working with USDA on a Feeds Initiative, looking at alternative feeds, sort of following an of convening an expert panel FAO process They'll meet at the end of January scientists. and then that panel will meet with a wider group of stakeholders from industry, from NGOs, from the research community and others, consumer groups, to talk about where the country should be going, at least, Commerce and Agriculture in terms of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

federal research priorities for alternative feeds.

If nothing else, we have raised a level of debate about aquaculture in the country and the role of aquaculture in our seafood supply. But by raising expectations, we've also created some challenges in the sense that it takes budget resources, people, institutions and partnerships to implement all these things.

So my biggest fear is that we've raised expectations that can't be met and there are some big challenges. There are still groups who think aquaculture of the problem, is part not solution. There are fishermen who think aquaculture as competition rather than thinking of aquaculture as another tool to produce seafood. And these are real legitimate concerns, social Anytime you do something new, there's a concerns. transition period and how do we work aquaculture in so the fabric of our seafood community is the fabric of our coastal communities. How does aquaculture reach into the heartland in terms of feeds, grants, technology and so on?

These are not easy issues. But I think that I've said and many others have said if we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

don't roll up our sleeves and tackle these issues and face them head on, the alternative is we're going to keep importing seafood for better or for worse.

And my wife likes to kid me in the morning saying, "Michael, what's wrong with importing seafood from China?" There's a lot of good seafood coming from China and lots of other places around the world.

(Off the record comments.)

MR. RUBINO: We as а country are players in this global aquaculture game in terms of technology, investment, feeds, services and so We're importing a lot of seafood. I quess I've argued and some others have argued that it's important to have domestic aquaculture even if we're going to play in this global marketplace in terms of having good models of production here, in terms of local food supply, in terms of knowing how it's grown under safe, environmentally sound conditions, all the benefits that go along with that in terms of coastal community development, maintaining working waterfronts and so on.

I think to get to the next level in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

terms of this program we need some kind of both external and internal push, a combination of both, and the current vehicle is this Marine Aquaculture Bill. There are other ways of doing it. NOAA remembers Aquaculture Act of 1980 as a driver behind NOAA Aquaculture Programs.

So many of you and many stakeholders over the years charged NOAA with developing this bill, sending it to Congress. Now really it's up to all of you and others around the country collectively to decide if this is something you would like the Federal Government to do.

As I said, the bill has a couple parts to it, the administration bill and a regulatory part to deal with what are we going to do about federal waters and offshore aquaculture and it has a research and development section for all of marine aquaculture to sort of expand a research program for aquaculture.

Most of the action on the bill has been on the Senate side. The Senate Commerce Committee staff has now drafted two versions in the Senate bill, the latest one of which came out about three weeks ago. It's a bill that has three or four

in addition to the regulatory part, research part and there's a part that institutionalize aquaculture within NOAA in terms of creating an office. The research part, by the way, has an authorizing figure our \$65 million in it, \$35 million of which would be for a research Of course, it's an authorizing figure. It's not an appropriated figure. But at least, And the Committee it's а marker. is also considering an economic incentive provision to the bill which would be again for all the marine aquaculture.

Bill Hogarth invited a small group of environmental NGOs and industry and aquaculture representatives to sit around the table and go over this Senate draft a couple weeks ago. quite surprised. Ι think lot of we had а agreement around the table on most of the key of the bill with issues а couple of key exceptions.

Most of the key exceptions and issues have to do with the business certainty of operation in terms of length of permit, an environmental bonding provision that would include

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

environmental liability without some defining that, being able to sort of retroactively change permit requirements.

So I'm hoping that over the next month or so as people send comments back to the Senate committee some of these key issues could be resolved. But I think we should know sometime in January or February whether this bill is going anywhere in this session of Congress.

Is there a Plan B? Of course, there's a Plan B. Again, a different form of a bill. through the councils could in terms of go There could somehow be an internal regulation. swell within the agencies in terms of supporting an aquaculture research program.

But that's tough to do. When I sit around the table with all the other programs in NOAA, they're all fighting over the same shrinking pie. Even if the pie stays the same, Congress adds new mandates, salaries go up two or three percent a year. So in reality some new programs, I mean, we're a rounding error. But it's tough. Even if you do all those things of sort of working with other programs, trying to get the integrated

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ecosystem assessment work to look at aquaculture, working with habitat or sanctuaries or coral reef programs, that gets you part of the way there. But at some point, you really haven't made a decision until you've made a budget decision.

Why don't I stop there as an introduction and I think as I said I want to thank all of you again for all of your advice, in a sense helping to get this process started with charge on the ten-year plan. It's invaluable to the agency and to me in terms of getting this program off the ground. I'd like to hear your ideas about these challenges and where we go from here.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Members, questions?

Comments? Mr. Rayburn.

Thank you. If you had MR. RAYBURN: the opportunity where the Secretary had come to the summit and stuff like that, it seemed like --I'm iust kind of thinking loud, out but aquaculture started as a fish issue and maybe moved to the ocean issue. I wonder if it's moved to the Commerce issue yet, at the Commerce level, where it's really a Commerce activity rather than

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

oceans, rather than fish. You know, it seems like if we're going to break through, you're better to try to elevate it to Commerce issue while you have the Secretary there that at least has spend 15 minutes at your summit saying how great it was and moved on. Have you made that transition or is that something --

And another point in that, I think, it seems like the most recent public comments on the aquaculture amendment that the Gulf council is running, whether you knew that was happening or not, you could almost predict there was something going on because of the bad press aquaculture got the week before the hearings started taking place. You could almost track when there's an article of bad press on aquaculture. You think there must be something, public hearing or something going on. Maybe if you had the Commerce involved at that level, then departmentally we'd have a better handle on dealing with some of those. Be more in getting good press proactive out from Commerce issue rather than from some of the other things.

MR. RUBINO: Several different things

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

in here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RAYBURN: Yes. I know. I just rambled on.

MR. RUBINO: Good question. Certainly, aquaculture is one of the top priorities of the Department of Commerce. The Secretary in terms of this as this legislation has the top of legislative priority. Certainly, at NOAA and it's of the Department one the top three he his staff Commerce. So and have been personally involved in terms of going to Capitol Hill and talking to senators and congressmen about the subject.

I think the other part of your question really was -- And I think the Secretary will continue that in this to the final year and office well well Admiral Lautenbacher, as as administrator of NOAA. We've gotten very good support from senior management in NOAA Fisheries Bill Hogarth has been tremendous. Sam Rauch and Steve Murawski I think have really stepped up in terms of for the regulatory side and the science side getting involved in aquaculture and getting the whole agency and all of the office

directors within the agency involved in aquaculture. So it's no longer just a little program issue, but it's become an agency issue and I think that's really broadening the debate within the agency and I think that will stand us all in good stead long term. Because then you get the perspectives of Protected Resources, Habitat, Fisheries and you're really grilled in terms of how we're doing this and the messages we sent out.

The other part of your question I think was outreach and education in terms of trying to be proactive on -- In other words, science agency, we generate science. How do we get the results of the science out there as a message? We're doing that but it's tough to do with a small staff. It's tough not to be reactive.

MR. RAYBURN: That's really my point. Yes, the Secretary can show up at a meeting or he could walk the Hill maybe, but has he really activated his staff at the Commerce level that maybe would provide more of those kinds of resources for you to progress? That's where I was heading and why I was connecting the two. It seems like the Commerce level they can get 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

22

23

1	stuff out. At least, you have a departmental							
2	initiative rather than trying to do it from two							
3	tiers down or something like that. I just didn't							
4	know whether you had that activation at the							
5	Commerce level of not.							
6	MR. RUBINO: And I think I answered as							
7	best I could.							
8	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Randy.							
9	MR. CATES: Mike, I have two questions							
10	and then for the factors, I think there are some							
11	other issues, not really a question for you,							
12	but might be of interest. The first question I							
13	have is on the reviews of research proposals. How							
14	does that mechanism set up? Who does it? And who							
15	are they? And who makes those decisions on what							
16	gets funded? That would the first question.							
17	And the other one is a simple one. Is							
18	the USDA meeting in January open to the public and							
19	where would it be?							
20	MR. RUBINO: The Feeds Initiative							
21	meeting?							
22	MR. CATES: Right.							
23	MR. RUBINO: The first question is							

about a competitive grants process. It is managed

by the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, one of the agencies within NOAA, the SEAGRANT office within that which does the work on it because the SEAGRANT money that gets passed to the states. But they also manage a couple of other things like this grants program. So they use the SEAGRANT legislative authority and process to do the competitive grants.

office invites That а peer review They have a two step process. Applicants are invited to submit a two-page proposal or a concept paper plus CDs in terms of what it is. They have a panel of about 30 people or more with scientific background as well as from other walks life who have some aquaculture expertise, involved in aquaculture and marine issues review these proposals, about five or six each. They They make comments. score them. They held a big conference call to sort of talk about them.

The results of that are then presented to the NOAA Aquaculture Program and the SEAGRANT Office in terms of them -- We make a programmatic decision to then invite a group of those projects to submit a full proposal. So most of the ones

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that get asked would be the highest rated ones by the peer review panel. But then we have to make some decisions based on program needs as well and you can't give all the money to one program, one species. So you have some distributional things.

The second round will be 40 or 50 proposals, a smaller review committee, but same kind of process to get down to however many you have. That's how that works. That's a very typical SEAGRANT review process.

What was your second question?

MR. CATES: The Feeds Initiative.

MR. RUBINO: The Feeds Initiative. We have people from NOAA and USDA and some scientists that form a steering committee to invite some experts from the U.S., Canada, Norway, Japan and some other countries to come. It's by invitation only to this first meeting just so they can sit down around the table and roll up their sleeves and talk about where are the alternative feeds and research.

I'd like them to produce a white paper summarizing the literature and summarizing -They'll then go and meet with a wider group of

NEAL R. GROSS

stakeholders at a second panel meeting to make sure they're on track in terms of key issues and to make sure from a stakeholder perspective they have all the things covered.

We're still debating about whether to have this process report to a conference that will be open to everybody or just to report on the white paper. That's still up for discussion. So it's sort of a very typical FAO style and scientists process.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Forster.

MR. FORSTER: Thank you. I guess my first. observation is the whole thing is frustratingly slow as it must be for you with the process that you're going through with all the debate around it. My first comment would be there are two things that could happen. One is the bill will go through, in which case the bill will at least get authorization if not appropriation for Then there's funding and that seems to be vital. some funding to maintain the momentum for the effort you're making.

If, for whatever reason, the bill fails, then there's a secondary backup position

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that somehow we should be thinking of making recommendations about continuing to fund the program to maintain the momentum.

And in that light, I mean, we've had discussions it seems to me lots of times about demonstration as a way of trying to get over this false impression, misimpression or however we want to express it that aquaculture is a terrible thing and I'm wondering in your discussions with the NGOs if anyone actually put on the table, "Look. There's a compromise deal which you accept that you come up with the process. We'll have three, five demonstrations, four, commercials, operations, around the country because you're on a enough scale to have an environmental biq footprint" and if they're willing to buy into that as a concept to prove the point and if they are, then great and if they're not, I think I would have to ask them why not. Because it seems to me a reasonable thing to do.

Given we have this incredible credibility problem which has been created or manipulated, however we want to look at it, about aquaculture, demonstration seems to me the one key

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

thing that we can do to try and soften some of
that to win over some public support. I mean, the
perfect example is Randy's operation in Hawaii
where he has basically good relationships with a
lot of the local people so they will understand
it. That's just because he's been there and he's
been operating. Only if we could do that in other
parts of the country. I think we would be a long
way ahead. We've been saying it for quite a while
and it's obviously much more different than just
saying it.
MR. RUBINO: I certainly think it's a

MR. RUBINO: I certainly think it's a strong option.

MR. FORSTER: Okay.

We have to find funding to MR. RUBINO: do that what you're talking about. I think we've done it modest scale through this on а very Competitive Program through Grants and some earmarks, Congressionally authorized projects that certain members of Congress have put money into.

There are some planning efforts going on. In the Gulf of Mexico, there's a group designing a pilot demonstration project right now.

Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama SEAGRANT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

programs, private companies, feed companies -- all working together. Sea World has proposed doing one in California.

There are a lot of fishermen interested in mussel farming in the Northeast of the U.S. There is some cod demonstration projects proposed, but not in federal waters but in state waters. I think there are possibilities out there.

CHAIR DILERNIA: MR. BILLY.

MR. BILLY: Another idea I'd like to put on the table is we have the unique opportunity with the election coming up to use the political process to generate interest on both the Republican and Democratic sides in aquaculture and maybe get it as part of their plank and their platforms for what they're going to do when they get into office, whichever it is.

It would take contacts for the key candidates in exploring that and then as it becomes clear who the ultimate candidates are to work that before the conventions to make that happen. But I've seen it happen in the area of food safety and other things and it certainly is doable. I don't know who would do that, whether

NEAL R. GROSS

that's something the Secretary could at least on the Republican side and maybe we could find someone else to do it on the Democratic side to cover all the bases. It's just an idea.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Any other comments or questions? Mr. Raftican.

MR. RAFTICAN: How do you raise the awareness? I mean, this is really where we're at on this. We have something that is going to happen and we just have to make sure it goes well.

Have you looked at anything about where aquaculture stands with carbon footprints and climate change? I mean, it's something that will be affected by it as terrestrial farming changes. How do you put this out as a solution to a problem as opposed to right now everybody is pointing fingers at it? You have to get them to point in the other direction. Has anything been done on that or looked at in those context?

MR. RUBINO: We've talked about the idea about looking at some carbon footprint kind of analysis but probably doing it in the context of sort of the whole life cycle analysis thing or materials balance approach it used to be called

where you look at resources and efficiency of resource use. You could also look at it as Bill McDonough, the Green Architect, would say from an ecoeffective perspective in terms of what's the footprint. So rather than doing less fad as a footprint, you actually have a footprint that works with nature and aquaculture has a lot of components of that.

It's a very efficient form of protein production. It could be done in a way where if you place the properly waste equals food something else, if you're using native species in a root cause management program, if you're using vaccinations instead of serving with antibiotics. So there are a lot of things you can do along those lines.

Somebody actually is looking at carbon footprints. I think one of the guys at the New England Aquarium has been looking at, say, salmon from Eastern Canada in an aquaculture operation going to Boston Market versus Alaskan salmon flown in from Alaska and looking at the various carbon effects, not just in terms of air miles but also in terms of resource use.

NEAL R. GROSS

And I've discussed doing those kinds of projects with Packard Foundation Modern Day A couple years ago we had a three day Aquarium. session almost of environmental scientists their who all published in journals aquaculture fisheries scientists who published in their journals and nobody talked to each other. And Paul Sandifer works for NOAA and Don Boesch at the University of Maryland co-chaired this group and they came up with some joint research topics and that was one of them.

I talked to Julie Packard and Mike Sutton last summer about reviving that group to bring these communities together from a research perspective and try to find some joint answers. I think these are ways of chipping away at some of these questions. It's not done overnight though.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Bill.

MR. DEWEY: Just a I guess as far as trying to move ball forward, the aquaculture ball forward, in my mind while there are still some flaws from the most recent Senate version, those can be worked out and you can get that bill to move. It establishes the Office of Sustainable

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Aquaculture in NOAA and pushes that office out in the regions well. That's а \$65 million as augmentation with it. A lot of the key components that you need to take this to the level it needs to go in the country, if we could work out a few of the flaws in it. Kudos to Dr. Hogarth for convening a group of people to try to work through those and find some compromise and try to make I'm certainly encouraged by the that happen. effort and I wonder if we're going to see it move I guess I would encourage MAFAC members to pay attention to it and if it's something you can get behind with your individual organizations, It's certainly an opportunity for that's great. the aquaculture to move forward.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I have request for two short comments, one from Mr. Connelly and one from Mr. Roberts and then we'll close the discussion on the aquaculture topic. Mr. Connelly.

MR. CONNELLY: Thanks. On the question of international, you referenced that as part of the plan. Who in the government is coordinating our work, say, with COFI or FAO work on the subcommittee? Who is doing that now?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. RUBINO: State would take the lead. NOAA's been involved in terms of working with state on FAO and COFI things. Ag has only recently been interested in it. We, at least in terms of NOAA, have a draft of an international strategy plan. It's really a laundry list of activities that NOAA has been involved in over the years both from an international coordination well scientific exchange perspective as as a perspective.

I get calls saying, "Michael, can you get me an airplane ticket to go to this place or to go this meeting" and I have no sort of sense of order or priority of these things. So I'm trying to get both our policy people and scientists over the next several months to sit down and figure out what our priorities are and how we cover these things. That's sort of where we are on it.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Just a general comment just about where you ended it, Mike, by getting your scientists together. The Gulf Council as you know just concluded their public hearings and the information I saw come out of those meetings in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

terms of the media coverage the same kind of thing you would see probably whether it was in Northwest or wherever, disease transfer, enrichment of waters, escapement, all the things you keep seeing being brought up.

I guess the question I have is are we still directing our research along the lines of more about how to grow certain species or are we taking a subset out and trying to address the enrichment issue and the escapement issue and the genetic pooling issue? Are we focusing any money on those things kind of generically as opposed to species specific work?

MR. RUBINO: I think that if you look at, say, the funding in the national approaches that they've done both over the past six or seven years and what we haven't done a very good job of, and again it's on our to-do list for this year, there's a lot of things on this to-do list, is to pull together summary information on these key environmental issues, not just from the projects that the U.S. Government is funding but others.

We've learned a lot over the past 20 years with what not to do with the aquaculture. I

think it could be done well. It could be done poorly. As I go around the country and look at aquaculture operations, we're operating under some very stringent environmental laws in this country. We have good actors in this country. We're doing it well. They recognize that there's room for improvement. They're working on it.

I mean I would like to shift the focus of the debate of the environmental questions to questions of how do we fit this into sort of our social fabric, how do we think about this as an opportunity in terms of producing more seafood -- Because really if you say things properly, if you use best national practices, the environmental questions really should be addressed. It does not mean there's no room for improvement, but really we've learned a lot over the past 20 years about how to do these things.

So I'd like to have a series of papers that summarize those things. It's our job as sort of the nation's oceans and fisheries science agency to do that. Whether we can get it all done by this end of this fiscal year or not, I don't know. We've identified groups of people to put

NEAL R. GROSS

those things together.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. Dr. Rubino, thank you very much.

MR. RUBINO: Thank you.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: Thank you for your time, for your presentation.

Folks, that's going to bring us almost to the end of today's items. You're getting a homework assignment for this evening. Behind Tab 9 is the 2020 document as it was sent out to NMFS. It was posted. You're all aware that it was posted on the website and over the course of a few weeks, we received a number of comments. All those comments have been duplicated. They're at your places.

Now if I may, what you're going to be doing with these comments, if you look at the last two pages of the package that you have, just tear that out, the last two pages it says "Attachment. Committee Worksheet." In preparation for tomorrow's discussion, if you go through -- The way it's arranged here, it says, "General reviewer seven." If you look at the comment, "General reviewer seven," there's a comment there and the

entire package is organized as per this list.

What I would like you to do is to look at these comments and if you feel that the comment is significant and you're ready to fall on your sword to defend it and you would want it included in the document, on your worksheet put an X or a mark so that when we come together tomorrow we three hours in order refining have to completing the document. I would like to through all these comments. I'll just basically say "General reviewer seven. How do folks feel about that? Does anyone need it included? Not included?" And unless you say yes and we see a include strong sentiment to it, then those comments will not be include because these are comments based on what we've published, what we've put out there.

I see a hand there. Let me just go over my notes here first. Okay. An example would be there's a recurring theme throughout the report that there's a need for more timely, reliable data which has credibility with stakeholders. To do this, data acquisition and assessments must be doubled within the next five years. Be prepared

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	to discuss something like that.
2	Mr. Connelly.
3	MR. CONNELLY: Have any of the comments
4	that are in the attachment that we've just been
5	handed been incorporated?
6	CHAIR DiLERNIA: No.
7	MR. CONNELLY: Okay.
8	MS. KATSOUROS: We wouldn't have been
9	that arrogant.
10	MR. CONNELLY: I would have came and
11	helped.
12	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. So that's where
13	we are with that.
14	Dr. Hogarth doesn't even know that yet,
15	but I will not be on Thursday. So I've asked MR.
16	BILLY if he could stay in my stead on Thursday
17	morning to help to chair the meeting.
18	The way it looks I have coming out of
19	today's meeting two assignments or two work tasks
20	that we are going to have to be considering as to
21	how to accomplish. One deals with the revisions
22	of the Charter for the MAFAC Charter and I've
23	asked Mr. Raftican to head that work group and the
24	other would naturally be assigned to the Commerce

subcommittee, MR. BILLY chair, to work on seafood 1 quality and safety questions. 2 When we're going to find time for that, 3 4 I'm not sure yet. I know again I won't be here on 5 Thursday. Perhaps the Charter revision work can be done during the time that was allocate towards 6 2020 on Thursday morning. Let's see how things 7 begin to shake out over tomorrow. 8 Are there any other questions? 9 Dr. 10 Hogarth, welcome. Would you like to say a few words before we --11 No, I'll wait until we 12 DR. HOGARTH: end. I'm sorry I wasn't here today. We have been 13 trying to work out something with Japan 14 15 humpback whales. So I think I finally today convinced them that they'll agree not to hunt 16 humpback whales until we can try to work through 17 the future which I will continue to do. 18 We'll talk in the morning briefly. 19 CHAIR DiLERNIA: Very good. Yes. 20 21 MR. JONER: Since you won't be here on 22 Thursday, are we going to talk about our next meeting? 23

CHAIR DiLERNIA: I'd like to do that

tomorrow. I think we're pretty tired today, but, yes, I'd very much like to talk about our next meeting which I believe we have already -- There was a general agreement to hold it in New York around the first week of July and I've been in communications with the hotel regarding that. But perhaps we can start off the day tomorrow with just going over some of those details.

Mr. O'Shea.

MR. O'SHEA: Thanks. Real quick. This has to do with the revision of the Charter and I thought I heard this morning that the Charter has to be renewed every two years and it's currently in a final stage to be signed shortly and can't be changed.

CHAIR DiLERNIA: No, it can be.

MR. O'SHEA: So -- It can be changed?

CHAIR DiLERNIA: At any time. It can

be amended.

MR. O'SHEA: Okay. Because I was getting at if the current version isn't amendable then the urgency of revising it for the next two year thing probably wouldn't otherwise have to be done this week.

	CHAIR DILERNIA. Dr. HOIIIday.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: The version of the
3	Charter that's in front of the Secretary now would
4	not be the charter that would be amended by the
5	actions that you're taking. So we would then, if
6	the Committee chose to move forward with the
7	Charter, recommend the changes, we could initiate
8	that in March and change the Charter at any point
9	in time. But we need to have the current Charter
10	in place so that the Committee maintains
11	continuity. But at any point during the two year
12	tenure of that charter you can change. So the
13	urgency depends on how quickly the committee would
14	like to proceed.
15	MR. O'SHEA: Yes.
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: But the one that's
17	currently
18	MR. O'SHEA: Not solely when it comes
19	up for renewal.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Correct.
21	MR. O'SHEA: Got it. Thank you.
22	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mr. Cates.
23	MR. CATES: I'd like to make a quick
24	comment relating to aquaculture since Mike's here

and Dr. Hogarth. First, there is a study ongoing from the House side. The questions that coming have shifted dramatically. My sense of everything is that a lot of the efforts that are going are working. Within NOAA staff, noticed a great interest in the last year. Things are better at the Fish Expo in Alaska, a complete turnaround with the engagement between fishermen and aquaculture issues. I think a lot of the efforts that are ongoing are starting to have a positive effect. I'm a lot more optimistic than I was a year ago about the bill and our sense of where we are. I just wanted to make that comment.

And let me just add to DR. HOGARTH: that. I don't know what was said today and I guess we'll have an opportunity somewhere later to have the input because I've been meeting recently the House Resources with both and with Commerce committee and I think there's some things that we need to discuss I think based on that. We'll need But we can do that it comes back up. to do that.

I'll just say there seems to be interest. It just seems to me that we don't 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

22

23

a champion so to speak and it seems like anything that happens on the Hill has to have a champion and so far we don't have one.

The Magnuson had a couple. It rammed it through. Unless you find a champion honestly Senator Stevens can't afford to be the champion for aquaculture in Alaska, but he will it and he made clear. support that very Unfortunately, we can't get a champion and really need a champion, I think, in the House. We need to think about that while we're here. want this bill, we have to go out and find a champion to go back -- before I leave -- The Secretary has made me a promise I'll stay involved in Agriculture. I don't know exactly how to keep doing all this personally.

CHAIR DILERNIA: To your point, Hogarth, I have a question and I don't know if Mr. it for Connelly perhaps can answer me Is there any one particular state or one particular area of the country that a consumption of seafood is significantly higher than the rest of the country and if we go with the 80 percent look for rule, is there room there to some

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	members?					
2	MR. CONNELLY: From a consumption					
3	standpoint, certainly Hawaii is a large consumer					
4	of fish. New England and Seattle, Pacific					
5	Northwest, obviously Alaska, places you think.					
6	DR. HOGARTH: And one other question,					
7	did you all get any briefing on the budget at all					
8	yet? I'll call tonight and see if we can get					
9	that.					
LO	MS. KATSOUROS: Did they not pass it?					
L1	DR. HOGARTH: Yes, it's not good news					
L2	for us with earmarks.					
L3	MS. KATSOUROS: But has it been passed?					
L4	DR. HOGARTH: Yes.					
L5	MS. KATSOUROS: Yes?					
L6	DR. HOGARTH: yes.					
L7	(Laughter.)					
L8	CHAIR DiLERNIA: I love it.					
L9	(Off the record comments.)					
20	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Mark.					
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: Before John Folks					
22	please. Before John Oliver left at lunchtime					
23	today, we agreed that on Thursday after lunch we					

would try to reserve some time to talk about

1	what's happening on the omnibus and we'd get some
2	slides and things sent down from the Management
3	and Budget Office. So today and tomorrow there's
4	a lot of things happening that we want to try to
5	sort that out and provide the information to you
6	on Thursday.
7	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay.
8	MR. RAYBURN: Since Bill is out of the
9	room.
10	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Yes.
11	MR. RAYBURN: It looks like we'll be
12	able to get a pretty nice gift along with the
13	room. Anybody that hasn't and is interested in
14	donating it's \$45. I appreciate it.
15	CHAIR DiLERNIA: Okay. Is there any
16	new business for this day? Tomorrow breakfast is
17	at 8:30 a.m., whatever, and business will begin at
18	9:00 a.m. We're adjourned. Thank you. Off the
19	record.
20	(Whereupon, at 5:07 p.m., the above-
21	entitled matter recessed and reconvened at 9:00
22	a.m. the next day.)

23

1				292
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				

NEAL R. GROSS