#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

#### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

# MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

Thursday, December 20, 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 8:00 a.m., Tom Billy, Acting Chair, presiding.

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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 DR. WILLIAM T. HOGARTH, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

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

2

ERIC SCHWABB, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

#### OTHERS:

JAMES BALSIGER, NMFS Alaska Region
MARK HOLLIDAY, NMFS Policy Office
MARY HOPE KATSOUROS, Fish for the Future
Foundation
JOHN V. O'SHEA, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
MICHELE SHEA, Fish for the Future Foundation
LARRY SIMPSON, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
Commission
TYWANNA OTTS, NOAA Fisheries

# T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S Meeting 1: Original Charter 4 6 New Chairperson 14 Secretary's Schedule Meeting 2: Reviewer 7 Comments 2.1 Infrastructure Reviewer Comments 23 Recreational Comments 33 Regional Pilot Projects 43 NOAA Jurisdiction 79

# Meeting 3: Budget 93 Strategic Planning 109 Commerce Subcommittee 118 FishWatch 137 Top Ten Concepts 148

Recreational Improvement Program

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 2

10:12 a.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. RAFTICAN: Good morning.

MR. FLETCHER: Good morning.

MR. RAFTICAN: All right. Thanks Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: He's our, he's representative. Our good morning man.

MR. RAFTICAN: Well, I could bang the gavel a couple of times but I'm not sure it's going to get us anywhere. We formed a committee to take a look at Charter, MAFAC Charter Reauthorization.

And we, we've got а biannual authorization. And we're at that point right now. There's a copy of our existing Charter behind Tab 2 in your briefing book. And we've got an unusual opportunity, in that there are a lot of changes going on at this time. You know, not only within MAFAC but, you know, within the administration. And it might be a good time to look at different ways of -- or different ways of re-authorizing the Charter.

I've asked Mark to see if he can dig up some copies of the, our original Charters. And

I'd like to get those 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

DR. HOLLIDAY: We'll get them in an email next week.

MR. RAFTICAN: Yes. Yes. We'll get them electronically and take a look at them. And give us a little bit of background of, you know, where we have come from. So that as we look to re-authorize, next time that we're, you know, we might be able to incorporate some of the things that some of our history, in case we got any changes that might be necessary.

without We're here lot of the а documents that we need а basis of as So, I'd like to kind of open up the decisions. discussion. My feeling was, we'll take a look, quick discussion on this. the Get information. And let's put together a package for If that, if everybody's comfortable New York. with that.

Any comments on where we're going with the Charter? Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: I think I just reflect a lot of the comments through Heather when we first discussed this issue and that is, that there are

things in this Charter that don't reflect reality.

And I think we want to make it as current and as focused on how we operate, as we can. So those changes or suggestions, I think will make this document more of that kind of document.

MR. RAFTICAN: I think we're right on target with that. And it gives us an opportunity to come and make that presentation, you know, look at it, make the changes and then come forward and, in New York.

Tom.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ι think CHAIRMAN BILLY: it's critically important that the Charter continue to reflect that this committee advises the Secretary, which isn't the case right now. At least, not often. think that kind of Т level But visibility and responsibility better assures the continued existence of this Advisory Committee which I think is important to NOAA fisheries.

Given that, I think we should reconsider the current arrangement where the Undersecretary is the Chair. And the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries is the Vice-chair. If it remains that way, then it's my view that like

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

20

21

22

23

24

П

it was in the beginning, in the first few meetings the Vice-chair, the Chair or the Undersecretary should be sitting at the head of the table running the meeting. And that was the case. And NOAA, and the committee should think about some effort to make that happen with the next Undersecretary, whoever that is.

As an alternative, another option would be, to have the Chair elected from the committee.

And our communication, in terms of our report and so forth, goes directly to the Secretary with copies to the Undersecretary and the Assistant Administrator for fisheries, whoever they are.

in the end, we're reporting that directly to the Secretary the Charter as indicates. Maybe that would make us more effective and get better results right now.

MR. RAFTICAN: Okay. Randy.

MR. CATES: I agree with what you are saying but I have a question. I think, ultimately, we want to write it in a way where we report to the Secretary of Commerce. But could we write it in a way where the Undersecretary has a choice to be the Chair? And if he chooses not to,

then we elect that person? In other, in other words, we'd like you at the table but if you choose not to be, then we're going to elect somebody in your place. But ultimately we're reporting to the Secretary of Commerce.

MR. RAFTICAN: Ι think having the previous documents will make looking at that a lot You know, you've got administrative easier. provisions in the current Charter that kind of lay out the direction that this is going. It will be good to look at the others and see if there's been any change there. I think that, you know, we've talked informally around that everybody's kind of on the same page on this. Let's see if we can find a vehicle that already exists to get And if not, I think we've got to send a, make sure that we got a list of everybody involved here.

And let's convene, maybe a conference call on this, sometime further down the line. We'll you know, Tom I like the way you stated things. I think we're, you know, again, these are things that should be up for the entire review of the committee. And maybe a vote should, a motion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and a vote on it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You know, I think, like I said, I think we're all moving in the same direction on this thing. Let me see if we can find documents that lay out a ground work on it that's been there already. It will be easier to go back, if we've, if we've got an existing Charter from before that gets us there. Instead of trying to reinvent the wheel.

Mark, did you have a --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. Just to the point about even changing the Charter versus changing the procedures that MAFAC uses. It could be two separate entities. In other words, I understand the interest in changing the chairmanship to be more reflective of reality. But at the same time, the issue is to be more in tune with the Secretary or with the Vice Admiral, or the Deputy Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmospheres, there could be changes in procedures that following up every MAFAC meeting, we schedule a debriefing for the Deputy Undersecretary. Where it could be a phone briefing or it could be a face-to-face briefing of the committee, the liaison person, so

that, that might help solve the issue that you're concerned about without trying to torque the Charter.

You could change the Charter as well.

I'm just suggesting that there are certain things you can do, right now, without changing the Charter to improve the connections if you find there to be some room for improvement. And some of the other things that you want to accomplish may only be accomplished by changing the Charter.

Just keep in mind, that you have a couple of different avenues of how you'd like to, how you can solve some of the issues that are of concern to you.

MR. RAFTICAN: Mark, I think that -- Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, one reality is that the Undersecretary is never running this meeting. And so I think that needs to change in the Charter. And I think the Charter needs to reflect the fact that the AA for Fisheries is running the meeting. And that the Vice-chair should be the person elected by the appointed members to be the Vice-chair. And that's what

Tony DiLernia position is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And now that I've said that, there's language in this Charter that will allow us as Mark described, to do things to more directly bring in the Undersecretary and the Secretary by procedures that don't take changes in the Charter. We are advising the Secretary of Commerce, as it says right here and it says, we're advising him through the Assistant Administrator of Fisheries and the Undersecretary. So we want to establish a procedure that stipulates that there will be some a debriefing that, kind of year once orthe Assistant Administrator for whenever, bу Fisheries and the Vice-chair for the Undersecretary and/or the Secretary as appropriate, then there's a procedure that's been established to get that message across.

But I think the reality is that, Bill and whoever replaces him, is the one that's the kind of the nominal chairman of these meetings. And that's what this should reflect.

MR. RAFTICAN: Randy.

MR. CATES: I agree with what he is saying but I go one little step further. I think

1	we shouldn't wait and it says right here, "The
2	committee will advise the Secretary of Commerce,
3	and the Secretary, in all living marine resources,
4	matters that are responsible to the Department of
5	Commerce." I view that as, when we get done with
6	this meeting, we should have somebody from MAFAC
7	advise the Secretary of Commerce. It's pure and
8	simple. Request a meeting. This is what went on.
9	If he chooses to turn us done, let him turn us
10	down. But it's, it says, you know, right under
11	objectives and duties. I think that's, it's in
12	our Charter, already. I mean, we need to
13	MR. RAFTICAN: I think it's good going
14	back and looking at the document that, on our
15	guidelines. On our rules. And I would agree with
16	you.
17	DR. HOLLIDAY:: Just this, to that
18	point?-
19	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Just for point of
21	information, you know, Laurel's briefed me that,
22	you know, after every meeting, after you go
23	through the minutes, we generate a MAFAC report

under the FACA guidelines. And that's formally

transmitted up the chain to the Department and to, through NOAA. So there's a written record of what occurred at the meeting. And in form of a MAFAC report that's provided to the Secretary and to the Undersecretary. So I just -- I'm not saying it's good, bad or indifferent. It's just for your information.

MR. RAFTICAN: I'm hearing, you know, we're all trying to get to the same place. It's about relevance. It's about how we raise what we're doing. And actually, if we do a good job of it, we could make Bill, and Bill's successor's job easier. I mean, you know, we're working along those lines. How do we get him additional or her additional help?

But again, I -- before we start changing the Charter, I'd like to take a look at the past ones, and again, see what the history is, if there is another avenue that's better. Is everybody fairly comfortable if we do a conference call committee meeting? I'm going to say, halfway between now and New York. April or May. Does --

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. RAFTICAN: Any comments from the --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. **HOGARTH:** Well, I -- you know, having worked around the Secretary for a it's very difficult to get the Secretary's schedule for committee things, period. You know, even things that you think you ought to be able to schedule for. And so, you could try, but in fact, you get on his schedule, there's no telling when it would be and half the time it comes with the a very short notice. And if you are out of town, it will, it's going difficult.

And so, you know, I tell you, I think, the goal ought to be the, really the Admiral. And the Admiral has meetings with the Deputy on a basis. And regular we send things the Secretary for him, that would go, I mean, we send the whole thing to the -- briefing booklets. I'm just saying, getting to the Secretary, I know, also waited four days, four different Ι appointments and he wanted the meeting. It took four different appointments, before he got there. So it was four days a week that you were sort of on hold, you know, alert to get that.

MR. RAFTICAN: Randy.

CATES: Bill, I have, I mean no MR. disrespect by this, but that doesn't change our objectives or our duty. I think that we have rules to live by. And I look at this as, if we request a meeting with the Undersecretary, the Secretary of Commerce could advise him, it's his choice whether to meet with us or appoint Admiral to represent him in his place. shouldn't, because of the scheduling thing, shouldn't devalue the committee, MAFAC's existence.

I mean, I deal with a lot, with a lot of different boards, where who we are supposed to report to can't be there for whatever reason, and then he appoints his representative. That's who we advise in his place.

MR. RAFTICAN: A suggestion.

MR. RAYBURN: I think the, isn't NOAA's Science Advisory Board, that's a fairly new, last two to three years, it seems like. Maybe in that, I guess they're a FACA group too. I wondered, I'd like to see a copy of their Charter and see how they, how they have operated because I just sense,

# **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 maybe it's just a group that I know of,	when
they meet, it seems like it's something that	NOAA
really, the Administrator really pays atter	ntion
to. Maybe it's just his interest but some	thing
like that might be something for us to look to	o, as
we, as we try to revise our own.	

All right. DR. HOLLIDAY: And in discussions yesterday with Tom, we, in addition to looking to past MAFAC Charters, we're going to provide you with the Science Advisory Board and the MPA Advisory Board Charters. But they are relative to MAFAC, they are more recent vintage. And their Charters were drawn off of MAFAC's to --PARTICIPANT: Oh, is that right? So

PARTICIPANT: Oh, is that right? So we're in a circle.

DR. HOLLIDAY: But they do have different Chairperson -- in one case, it's a, the Chair's appointed by the Vice Admiral to serve as the Chair. The other committee, the Chair is elected by the membership.

So there are three different ways for three different FACA committees. But you'll have that in front of you to look at and you can discuss your pros and cons, of how you would like

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 go forward.
2	MR. RAFTICAN: Any other questions? Or
3	discussion right now? I'd like to adjourn this
4	meeting until a conference call and I'll send out
5	a time to request dates. And we'll try to give a
6	window and again, this is some time probably April
7	or May, so that we are ready to run in with the
8	document, proposed document for New York.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: And I'll just offer, in
10	the meantime, if any questions come to you over
11	the course of time that you'd like information on,
12	just give us a ring or an email and we'll get the
13	information out to the full subgroup to - make
14	sure you have the facts that you need in front of
15	you.
16	MR. RAFTICAN: Bill.
17	MR. DEWEY: The comment I raise
18	yesterday, just a couple of minor amendments to
19	the Charter to incorporate the aquaculture and
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: We've got those in the
21	notes.
22	MR. DEWEY: Okay. Thank you.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. We'll be happy to

get them.

23

1	MR. RAFTICAN: Anything else if you
2	want to get it to me in advance, we'll put
3	together a listerv so that everybody knows
4	everything that's going on. And talk again in
5	April.
6	(Whereupon, the above entitled matter went off the
7	record at 10:29 a.m. and
8	reconvened at 10:38 a.m.)
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Let's convene the
10	Vision 2020 Working Group.
11	These are the revised document.
12	Unfortunately the red line didn't print out. But
13	we have a couple of laptops here that have the red
14	lines. So we'll try to walk people through where
15	the changes were made. And we'll see if these are
16	the suggested ones that we agreed to yesterday.
17	And if the wording is as you desired. Does that
18	sound like a plan?
19	So Mary Hope, could I indulge you to
20	help us walk through these could you come
21	MS. KATSOUROS: Sure. Yes.
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: Can you sit next to Mary
23	Hope.
24	So we have, we're going to work you

1	through it as we use the attachment yesterday
2	where we annotated, where we want to make changes
3	for each of the different reviewers. I think that
4	might be the most effective way to try to work,
5	walk through this.
6	So, under general and reviewer 7, we
7	were going to make changes to page and let me just
8	look and bring this up, on page I'm looking at
9	the first red line remarks. Is that
LO	MS. KATSOUROS: Right. And there were
L1	we took out the
L2	MS. SHEA: We removed the words
L3	"economic status".
L4	MS. KATSOUROS: After the
L5	discussions we had yesterday, we thought that
L6	there was a consensus that we remove the words
L7	"economic status" to
L8	PARTICIPANT: Page number
L9	MR. CATES: Could you let us know what
20	you
21	MS. KATSOUROS: That is on page, of
22	this document
23	MS. SHEA: It was in two spots. Let me
24	pull my notes.

1	MR. DEWEY: Seven and nine. Seven and,
2	seven and twelve were two places it was supposed
3	to be.
4	MS. KATSOUROS: Seven and twelve, let's
5	see. Can we have just two minutes to get
6	organized?
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Sure.
8	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay. Why don't you
9	MS. SHEA: Well, I think we're fine. I
10	believe it was pages 7 and 12 that "economic
11	status" was removed from.
12	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.
13	MR. DEWEY: On the bottom of 7, Roman
14	Numeral I, used to have, "And economic status"
15	after the end of that sentence? And that's going
16	to go
17	MS. SHEA: So that's another change.
18	MR. DEWEY: Another change?
19	PARTICIPANT: Right?
20	MR. DEWEY: Yes.
21	PARTICIPANT: Correct.
22	MR. DEWEY: So the change in the title
23	of that section
24	PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. DEWEY: in the economic status
and then on
MS. KATSOUROS: We received comments
okay let me add, and we received comments
during the meeting from various members that were,
some changes that were not always discussed but we
incorporated them in the document before we
started doing the red lines. So, I apologize for
that. And then, when we took the sheets, we
started doing the red lines. But we had already,
but the general one had already been completed.
So we didn't go back and red line it.
MS. McCARTY: Okay. As long as you
explain it out to everybody.
MS. KATSOUROS: Okay. So I do
apologize.
MS. SHEA: Well, I could make copies of
what was given to me if you all would like to see
them.
MS. KATSOUROS: But that would be so
much more copying.
MS. SHEA: Well, I agree but I don't,
I don't know what a solution is.
DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, I'm going to

project the red line up on the screen.

MS. SHEA: That's okay.

MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks Bill.

MS. KATSOUROS: And again, there have been other comments made on the report that were mostly, as I saw them, really editorial words and they are from different members. They did not change at all the context. It just made it a little bit smoother. And those we did not red line.

And we have everyone's comments but, you know, to make copies of them, I think, would be a lot of work. And little value. Because then you would going through -- I don't think there would be anything in there that you all would disagree to. Perhaps that's a better way of saying it. Or anything of controversy.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So Mary Hope, I'm not sure that we are going to be able to track the -- using Appendix 2, as the way to find these things because they are not numbered. Like reviewer 7, unless we knew where to find them, so it might be more, look at the red lines --

1	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: from the beginning to
3	the end and see, as we do, we can cross off of
4	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.
5	MR. HOLIDAY: different comments. I
6	mean, if you have a better suggestion, I'm open to
7	it. I'm just trying to make the best use of
8	MS. KATSOUROS: Right.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: the time here.
10	MR. RAYBURN: Everybody kind of knows
11	what their issue was
12	MS. KATSOUROS: So under, the red line
13	commercial there was the one about the
14	infrastructure.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm trying to find this
16	first.
17	Yes. The red line on page 7.
18	MR. RAYBURN: Depends on if you have
19	MS. McCARTY: I can't hear you down
20	here. I can't hear you.
21	MR. FLETCHER: Speak up.
22	MS. McCARTY: I can't hear you.
23	MR. RAYBURN: We were just trying to
24	get him the it's not red lines there but that's
- 1	

1	the first of the
2	MR. DORSETT: There should be a red
3	line under number 1.
4	MR. RAYBURN: The deletion there of
5	that maybe have to, have to change now or do
6	you need that on
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, there should be but
8	it's not, it's not there. That would explain not
9	all of the changes got in the red line
10	MS. KATSOUROS: Red line.
11	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.
12	MS. McCARTY: What's the next one?
13	MS. KATSOUROS: All right. The next
14	one under commercial fisheries, the comment was on
15	page 2 of the reviewers comments. And it was
16	about the importance of involving communities and
17	community infrastructure. And we made the change
18	to page 12.
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.
20	MS. SHEA: 13 maybe.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: So the comment
22	originated, I guess, from Dewey's comment, loss of
23	infrastructure, pressure from the environmental
24	community for restrictions on commercial fishing,

loss of access to working waterfronts to be added 1 as an issue. Is that, this is this is where we 2 responded to inserting that as an additional --3 4 MS. KATSOUROS: Right. DR. HOLLIDAY: -- bullet into the text. 5 So the highlighted text, if it's too far away for 6 7 you to read, such factors include, well, "Various factors both natural and human related effect the 8 status of fish stocks and their environment. 9 Such factors included environmental changes, pressure 10 11 from the environmental community for restrictions on commercial fishing and loss of access to the 12 working waterfront necessary 13 to successfully conduct commercial fishing processing 14 and 15 distribution in the urban areas." So, two questions, is this, is this the 16 thought that wanted to get included and we put it 17 in the right place? 18 DR. HOGARTH: Chris --19 MR. RAYBURN: Chris had a question. 20 Ι had don't have MR. DORSETT: 21 22 problem with this and where it is except for this statement of, "Pressure from the environmental 23 community for restrictions on commercial fishing," 24

1	is one of the problems that we identified for
2	optimizing yields. I mean, there are a lot of
3	people in the conservation community who are
4	trying to ensure that we're optimizing yields.
5	So, I don't think this statement should be in
6	there. I don't have a problem with the other
7	ones.
8	MR. DEWEY: And I would support that to
9	be consistent with my comments yesterday. That
10	wasn't one that I was highlighting. I was mostly
11	trying to call out the loss of infrastructure, the
12	process, the distribution and so on.
13	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay. So we will
14	delete that clause.
15	MR. CATES: I would like to comment
16	that I believe in the way that that was stated, it
17	would be very true. Where commercial fishing - is
18	probably the major restriction or loss of ability
19	to, of yields is from the environmental community
20	for restrictions. It remains the, it is number
21	one issue.
22	MS. McCARTY: I agree with Randy. I
23	think that there's places where that's true.
24	Other than Hawaii. And I think that the

1	environmental community is totally not coherent in
2	that way. There's parts of the environmental
3	community that's fishing friendly. And parts of
4	the environmental community that isn't. So
5	MR. DORSETT: I could name some
6	examples where recreational fisherman are trying
7	to do the same thing for commercial fisheries so
8	if you want to put that in there as well. Say,
9	"Some environmental and recreational fishing
10	interests," and let's be fair, in terms of who we
11	are identifying here.
12	MS. McCARTY: Yes. That would be
13	PARTICIPANT: That's definitely true in
14	Alaska.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: Is that list not
16	exhaustive? Is it only those two? Or is it just
17	various pressure from different groups? What's
18	the genesis of the comment we are trying to
19	convey? The
20	MR. RAFTICAN: No. There's state
21	agencies that are also involved. There are
22	MR. RAYBURN: Could you just say,
23	"Restrictions on commercial fishing," and not
24	pressure type of words coming from

MS. McCARTY: Yes. Societal pressures. 1 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, I would advise not 2 to try to -- let's not try to go down a path of 3 4 wordsmithing but I mean, we can do this quick 5 change. That's an exception though. notion is that we don't want to single out any one 6 7 entity, we can go and fix that. If there's a list of entities that we want to file, we can fix that 8 9 as well. But I -- to go and start, you know, 10 let's try this, let's try that wordsmithing, 11 don't have, I don't think we'll have enough time to actually go down that path. But I'll take the 12 exception for this, this one change because 13 See the highlighted text, if we 14 already started. 15 just left it as, "Pressure for restrictions on commercial fishing and loss of access to 16 working waterfront." And striking, 17 "From environmental community," does that generate the 18 sense of the committee --19 MS. McCARTY: Yes. 20 21 DR. HOLLIDAY: 22

-- that we're worried about the pressure, less than who the pressure's coming from?

> MS. McCARTY: Yes.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

23

24

the

the

PARTICIPANT: Yes.
DR. HOLLIDAY: Is that the more
important aspect of it?
MS. McCARTY: Yes.
DR. HOLLIDAY: And so, could we rule on
just striking this highlighted section and then
MS. McCARTY: Yes.
DR. HOLLIDAY: be consistent with
the committee's wishes?
MS. McCARTY: I think so.
DR. HOLLIDAY: Nodding of headsokay.
MS. KATSOUROS: So then, we're going to
leave it there.
DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Are we ready for
the next line?
MS. KATSOUROS: Now, under
MR. DEWEY: To your point, if I could
please?
DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.
MR. DEWEY: Getting into the background
support but also part of the fishing process is
talking about what our preferred state is. And

1	14. And I'm just wondering if, if that preferred
2	state statement should include this context of,
3	that we maintained our, our coastal infrastructure
4	to address this problem that we called out.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: So, it's in this section
6	that's highlighted on the screen that we're
7	talking about now. Topic 14. Preferred State.
8	MR. DEWEY: It may be an added sentence
9	that our, "Our coastal commercial fishing industry
10	should have been maintained, for process of
11	distribution of these fisheries." Or something
12	like that.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: What do people think
14	about that, that suggestion?
15	MS. McCARTY: Good.
16	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
17	MS. McCARTY: Good.
18	MR. DEWEY: And I, you know, I, again,
19	then under Proposed Actions, I don't know if we
20	need to identify something to actually make that
21	happen or not.
22	Just following down through this theme
23	here. You know, we identified the problem in the
24	background

1 MS. McCARTY: Yes.

MR. DEWEY: -- we've identified what we'd like it to look like in 2020.

MS. McCARTY: Yes.

MR. DEWEY: Are there Proposed Actions that we need to try to call out that would actually result in makings of that infrastructure?

MS. McCARTY: I think yes, but probably not right now. My thought is that down the road, we should probably do a lot more work on the Proposed Actions. But I'm not sure we can do it here. I mean, we're short on Proposed Actions through the whole document because it wasn't really what we were doing, when we were putting it together. As a matter, we were just trying to imagine the end state. Isn't that right? I don't know whether we could take each one of these and take the time to talk about the actions now. I don't know, it's just a logistical thing.

MR. DEWEY: Well, it seemed like -- and I don't disagree with that. But as I was just trying to call on my theme through, of the Proposed Actions here we have, "Provide incentives for increased retention in use of under utilized

1	species, etc." And in a way, "Incentives, for
2	increased retention of this infrastructure." I
3	mean, you're almost adding that infrastructure
4	into that sentence. And
5	MS. McCARTY: Sure
6	MR. DEWEY: to make it work.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: So, a generic proposed
8	action with regard to exploring means to conserve
9	
10	MR. DEWEY: Incentives to preserve
11	that.
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: How do people feel about
13	that change to the proposed action?
14	Okay. I have another comment here if
15	it, if you're willing to let us try to create that
16	word without embarrassing me by typing in front of
17	you.
18	(Laughter.)
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'd much prefer that.
20	PARTICIPANT: That's fine.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: So I have that comment.
22	And I'll make that happen in section 5, Proposed
23	Actions. Okay. And that's in a generic way. Is
24	everybody okay?

1	MR. DEWEY: I agree. Thank you very
2	much for
3	DR. HOLLIDAY: Everybody else okay with
4	this one?
5	We can go to the next one?
6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Go to the next one.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Somebody give me an idea
8	of where I am next?
9	(Laughter.)
10	MS. KATSOUROS: Now we are going to
11	page 19. And this would include the recreational
12	comments. From reviewer 7.
13	MS. McCARTY: 19 in the new document?
14	MS. SHEA: Correct.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. So this is under
16	proposed, this is under, "Proposed Actions to
17	accomplish the Preferred State."
18	PARTICIPANT: Issue 1?
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. It's under Issue
20	1, "Recreational fishing, impact on fisherman, on
21	stocks, that's increasing, demand is increasing,
22	continue to request an increase in the number of
23	fish allocated."
24	"The proposed action in dealing with

this increased demand is to continue to promote catch and release fisheries, B," letter C, letter D, letter E. And then we added F. Is that -- and the notion was we were trying to capture the thought of improving the quality of information on the sector. Including the specific addition of the registry which was the statutory requirement on that.

Tom.

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. RAFTICAN: I think that the other comments that we also had yesterday, and actually they are also on page 19, excuse me, page 8 of the reviewer document, that would fit into page 19, the comment, area 5, may, "Sustainable management of recreational fisheries will only be successful if full support and investment of salt water anglers." Would incorporate that and then, also in addition, to that last line there, a little further down was, this is on page 8, paragraph, 1, 2, 3, background for this is, "NOAA is planning future management decisions. Plans should, " and I think you could nicely slip in, "Plan implementing a variety of programs to enhance the conservation ethic of recreational anglers." And

1	just slide that in.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: My notes, I thought we
3	had it in, and we were going to include, these,
4	those two points, the bullet points in the
5	conclusion section
6	MR. RAFTICAN: Oh, okay.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: I don't know if we did
8	that or not.
9	MS. KATSOUROS: That, I don't think we
LO	did.
L1	MR. RAFTICAN: Okay. As long as they
L2	are included, I just want the proposal slide in to
L3	either.
L4	PARTICIPANT: Which
L5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Let me confirm that we
L6	didn't include these two on page 8
L7	MS. KATSOUROS: No, I don't think we
L8	did.
L9	DR. HOLLIDAY: on highlighted issue
20	points of
21	MR. RAFTICAN: Thanks Mark.
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: So, before we, any
23	comments to that in particular, Chris?
24	MR. DORSETT: This is on another topic

but related to page 8.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Let me just try to clear this one issue. Is it on, where we take these two -- go ahead Vince.

MR. O'SHEA: Yes, I was an advocate, and thanks Tom for picking it up. I was an advocate for actually the three sentences. So, "The are conservationists first. anglers and foremost." Ιt seemed -and we did say conclusion. But I'm thinking that may just fit right into the current state of the issue, statement. So, that would take care of the first sentence.

And then I think the -- and I and I don't care whether you put in the, right after that, the enhancing part, and then the conclusion part, of the proposed action. In fact, actually, the proposed quess the action would "Enhancing that ethic then and sustainable management of fisheries." That would be the the proposed action, I think, for the Preferred State of the issue. That we want --

DR. HOLLIDAY: And so, you're proposing an alternative to including these two statements

1	in the conclusion section
2	MR. O'SHEA: Yes, since we don't have -
3	-
4	DR. HOLLIDAY: by placing, by
5	placing the first one up on the description of the
6	current situation. And by the latter, including
7	that in the proposed
8	MR. O'SHEA: The last, the last two is
9	the Preferred State of the issue. I think that's
10	where we want to end up. That we're enhancing the
11	conversation ethic and that sustainable fisheries
12	will only work if direct community buys into it.
13	MR. RAFTICAN: As long as it gets in
14	there
15	MR. O'SHEA: And again, I'll put my
16	pitch in, that that's that's strategic thinking.
17	Rather than say, catch and bag one, that's in
18	everything else. Is pretty impressed with that
19	comment. Thanks.
20	MS. McCARTY: Mark.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.
22	MS. McCARTY: I have in my notes, in
23	the general recommendations, which I think of as
24	kind of the executive summary.

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.
2	MS. McCARTY: That we agreed that the
3	statement that is number 1 under commercial
4	fisheries, "Achieve and maintains sustainable
5	levels of stocks," be added to the recreational
6	fisheries. I just to this point that we were
7	talking about. That's what I have in my notes.
8	MR. DORSETT: And that was going to be
9	my comment, as well.
10	PARTICIPANT: And we're fine with that.
11	MS. McCARTY: Since we're working in
12	recreational fisheries.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. But that, that's
14	in addition to what Vince and Tom were just
15	suggesting. Right?
16	MR. O'SHEA: Right.
17	MS. McCARTY: Yes.
18	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm a little slow. I
19	just want to catch up to make sure we've captured
20	we're going to insert on page 18, in section 3,
21	the idea behind the couple of sentences that
22	begin, "Anglers are, first and foremost,
23	sustainable management. Will only be successful

24

with full support."

1	The second thing we were going to do is
2	to take the statement and turn it into an action
3	on page did I lose my place I guess it's,
4	no, now it's on the action is on 19, has
5	another another idea that, "Implementing a variety
6	of programs to enhance the conservation ethic," is
7	one of the actions that needs to take place.
8	MR. O'SHEA: Yes. And
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Did I capture that?
10	MR. O'SHEA: And and also, I mean, I
11	would take that whole sentence. It also talks
12	about improving the overall atmosphere involving
13	fishery management. Which I think is critical.
14	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Thank you. And
15	Heather back to this general and Chris, the
16	general principle of adding something to the
17	recreational section that's in the commercial
18	section. Correct?
19	MS. McCARTY: The very first point was
20	what I have in my notes. I don't know who said
21	that.
22	MR. DORSETT: Page 8.
23	MS. McCARTY: Yes. Commercial
24	fisheries, Roman Numeral I.

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: Page 8 of the this one?
2	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
3	DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you. And it's the
4	first
5	MR. DORSETT: You can just copy that
6	and paste
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Roman Numeral I?
8	MR. DORSETT: Yes.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: So we're proposing to,
10	we propose to do this and something like that.
11	That you, maintain sustainable levels in stocks
12	commercial and recreational and you don't
13	Heather is that where satisfied that
14	MS. McCARTY: Yes, that comment does.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Everybody
16	DR. ROBERTS: Are you
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: pardon?
18	DR. ROBERTS: Are you ready for one
19	more suggestion?
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: To this specific
21	DR. ROBERTS: On F and G. Back where
22	we were on 19.
23	DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, yes, I just want
24	to clear

PARTICIPANT: Okay. 1 DR. HOLLIDAY: -- people, you need to 2 at least nod your head that you're awake and it's 3 4 So that I can --5 (Laughter.) -- and that's good. Yes. This is 6 7 We're cruising now. Okay. And Ken wants to go back for a moment 8 to page 19. And then I'll come back to you Bob. 9 So we're down at F and G. 10 11 PARTICIPANT: F and G. DR. ROBERTS: My only suggestion there 12 is that, if we're adding those, giving what NOAA 13 fisheries is doing in terms of -- we heard about 14 15 the emphasis they are putting on the registry and data, recreational data, and I would rather had 16 those two tucked at the bottom as an afterthought. 17 would rather put those first and second. 18 Because that fishery service is really going to be 19 focusing in on. As opposed to the more generic 20 promoting catch and release which I'm not sure the 21 fishery service does a lot of. But --22 23 PARTICIPANT: No.

DR. ROBERTS: -- but F and G belong up

1	near the front.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. So the
3	suggestion was to move these two, the sub-
4	components, after G towards the top of the
5	Proposed Actions. To give them more prominence
6	and relative priority. Is that okay with the
7	group as a recommendation?
8	MS. McCARTY: Yes.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: And I would try to do
10	that now but I will comment that it's a
11	Thank you. Where to next?
12	MS. KATSOUROS: Aquaculture.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: Aquaculture, we're done
14	with recreation?
15	PARTICIPANT: For the time being.
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.
17	MS. KATSOUROS: And would your comment
18	7, go to the page 23?
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: So we deleted the
20	specific reference to the EEZ and made it generic
21	to marine aquaculture, is the emphasis for this
22	proposed action? Is that all the comments, what
23	people thought we were attempting to do with this

particular comment?

1	Point me to which, where the review
2	document this comment came from. What page was it
3	on?
4	MS. KATSOUROS: 19.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Reviewer oh. 19 is
6	the reviewer document. Okay.
7	MS. McCARTY: Could you talk louder
8	than that?
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: I apologize. I'll do my
10	best. I was asking where the comment originated
11	just so I could check my notes. In the
12	stakeholder review document, where was this
13	reference or it was just a comment on the fly, I
14	guess.
15	MS. McCARTY: And this is under
16	MR. DEWEY: I think it was a comment I
17	made yesterday during discussions
18	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Thank you. Okay.
19	Mary Hope and Michele, is that what's next on the
20	
21	MS. SHEA: We're on the top of page 23.
22	We added in a bullet point regarding regional
23	pilot projects.
24	MS. KATSOUROS: And the need to get

1	commercial fisherman involved with, we're trying
2	to take from 4 and then the discussions.
3	MR. CATES: Could you, could you repeat
4	that?
5	MS. SHEA: We added a bullet point on
6	the top of page 23, in the revised MAFAC Vision
7	2020 document.
8	MR. DEWEY: So this is trying to get a
9	
10	PARTICIPANT: Right.
11	MR. DEWEY: Randy's comment about
12	the
13	MS. KATSOUROS: Right.
14	PARTICIPANTS: (Off mic comments.)
15	MS. McCARTY: There were two points in
16	that comment. The first point was, "The original
17	pilot programs will promote diversification of the
18	commercial fishing industry by encouraging
19	commercial fishing investment in aquaculture."
20	And the second point was, "There needs
21	to be a funding program for commercial fisherman
22	to allow commercial fisherman to invest in
23	aquaculture." That was the second point.
	I control of the second of the

DEWEY:

MR.

24

And that tried to be

captured actually in the bottom of 22, where that changed to that bullet.

Where the addition of, "As well as the U.S. commercial fishing families --

MR. FORSTER: Well, I feel that funding is getting too focused. I think we need some way find ways that the commercial fisherman families can benefit from the development. not fair to be -- funding is not being very helpful. These are, these are million dollar investments. And to people, it's not going to If someway they can participate in the happen. million dollar investment, for example, by having some advantageous rights to permits. Maybe a two year window in which they have preferential rights to get permits. And they do a deal with a corporation and they can become a part of that. So I would broaden it rather than by limiting the finance. And just say that, We should look to benefit find way to, they can from participate in." And then their funding can be part of that, would be my suggestion.

MS. McCARTY: Sounds good to me.

MR. CATES: Yes, there's one part 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

this that I'm not sure reflects reality. It talks about the developmental economic policies encouraging environmentalists, it's on the bottom of page 22. And it says, "For example, resources a fishery finance programming." already true. But we need to, I mean, this implies like that's not available to us today. And actually it is.

MS. McCARTY: You're talking about, in addition to that, there needs to be funding made available. Is that what you mean?

MS. KATSOUROS: For making other funding mechanisms in addition to?

MR. CATES: I think, I think John's point plays into this is, while the fisheries finance program is great, it only allows the rich to get richer. It doesn't allow the down and dirty fisherman to really apply, get a loan from them, at the scale you are going to need to, in an aquaculture venture. Because you have to be a hundred percent capitalized. And it's just not going to benefit the actual fisherman with making that leap into aquaculture. It's great if you are going to go buy a vessel. And start a business.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But if you are going to go and try to get 8 million dollars to go start an aquaculture farm, you got to be fully capitalized.

So, somehow we got to, we got to create a mechanism that allows that fisherman to make that leap. I don't have the answer to how to do that. But --

MR. FORSTER: And I don't either but I just think as a concept we should try and include But we need to think about it. I mean, one it. example I thought, as an example would be, fishing communities were given of some sort preferential right to obtain permits with a time limit and a sunset clause and all that stuff, which would allow them, as a community, to go to a business, go to an industry participant already and do a deal. And say, you know, "We've got these rights to some permits. And we can do a deal with you. You come in here and provide the capital and the expertise. And we participate in it, in some way as a community." And that may be a completely ludicrous thought. And it may be all kinds of problems with it. But the principle is find ways in which they can participate and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

benefit from, without having to go and borrow a whole ton of money. Because it's going to be really difficult.

MR. DEWEY: To this, to this point, you know, a thought that crossed my mind with the discussion yesterday, is, if there is someway, you know, fishing co-op, a fisherman can form a cooperative --

MR. FORSTER: Yes.

MR. DEWEY: -- to participate. I know, Taylor's have a black pearl farm in Fiji. And because of the Native American, or Native Fijian rights to the waters there, in order to gain permission to be able to farm there, you have to incorporate their interests. So we made them a partial partner in our company down there. And the whole community benefits from the profits from the pearl farm.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: To this point, the Ag cooperative, Ag cooperative authority is available to the fisheries. There used to be a lot of fishery cooperatives. So that -- I think that authority, to formally establish cooperatives, exists. And as NOAA used to, NOAA fisheries used

to do that. To assist in that. I assume it's not changed. I don't know if that helps anything but

MR. FORSTER: Well, it would help a lot if by establishing cooperatives, they are then given some preferential basis on which to get permits early on. Because that's the property That's -- any, any company that's looking right now, is looking at that at a million dollars, year and a half and down to the end of So that's what they would bring. They would bring a solid bit of equity up front. And now you've got something to deal with. And now they can participate in the business.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Does the capital construction fund, does that still exist?

MS. KATSOUROS: Yes. But you would have to modify it, in order to -- it's the companies that have put in money and it was, you know, it was looked at for vessels. Now, they can do it for other facilities, aquaculture, at that time, was not considered. So it would need some modification. And there is quite a bit of money in there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. RAFTICAN: Nothing that has to be put down but I just wanted to say, what if, what these guys are talking about is so incredibly important. We're talking about the building broad based support. And you're giving people a stake in it. And if you want biq business to handle it, they are certainly are good But the thing is, if you want broad questions. based support from the fishing community, you'd you know, give them a program better, they've got a stake in the game. And this stuff's got to get in there.

MS. KATSOUROS: But I think we need to read then, in my humble opinion, I think we need to, you know, add this into the background, you know, there's some hesitancy by some parts of the commercial industry. And then we put it in to the report, stating that even commercial fishery, you know, sector involved in and then under Proposed Actions, I think the, you know, there needs to be some redrafting. So that there's a flow - that, you know, we build the case.

MS. McCARTY: Yes.

MS. KATSOUROS: And I don't think that,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you know, I think we need to sit down and actually build the case.

We can send that back to, you know, I doubt if we'll have it done by the time of, we might but, it would be hard -- because you really do need to build the case. You know, you need to say -- and then you could say that these, "There are funding mechanisms out there that may need to be modified." Like the Capital Construction Fund. In order to provide. And that has quite a bit of money in there. And being that we have too many vessels, I don't think many people are ready to make the investment and buy another, you know --

MS. McCARTY: But what -- and yes, I agree with all that, Mary Hope. What John is talking about is actually more of a statutory element, in addition to, the funding element. You're talking about a statutory element that either commits or requires an, essentially a ROFR, a right of first refusal. Or even in an almost like a LAPP, in a sense. The idea of a property right or a privilege that would be given or offered to the commercial fishing community or just to a community. I mean, it's a big deal.

	like foll said. It's a very big dear. It would be
2	a policy statement of some import.
3	MR. FORSTER: And the principle's
4	established through the ITQ systems and those
5	sorts of things, and it should almost be a
6	declining value basis, use it or lose it. They
7	can't just sit on it. But in some way to reflect
8	the idea that their, they need to be part of this
9	industry. You want to get on it and move it
10	ahead. You can be part of it by actually sort of
11	being, really, the start of the whole thing. By
12	going out and getting a permit and developing a
13	plan and bringing the business partners in.
14	MS. KATSOUROS: So you want to set
15	aside
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: Excuse me, excuse me,
17	Randy has a hand up
18	MS. KATSOUROS: Oh, sorry.
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: and I'm going to
20	follow that up with a proposal that we move
21	forward on this action. And then we'll see if we
22	have a way to go.
23	Randy, could you speak your point?
24	MR. CATES: The way to do this to have

real benefit is for the commercial fisherman, knowledge, number one, and a lease. You can provide -- fisherman already have the knowledge. You can provide assistance in obtaining a lease. And the way you would do that is several ways. is, if you could, if NOAA could provide assistance in obtaining the lease. Most commercial fisherman don't understand how to go still through that process. We allow corporation or companies to do their track. But the commercial fisherman has some assistance in that.

And the second part would be, I don't know how a bill is written, but in the State of Hawaii, once you obtain the lease, you have a time limit to implement your plan. And if you're a commercial fisherman, that time limit would be longer to implement your plan than say a corporation. So that, it gives you the ability to go make your deal. To go get that investment. Because it will come to you.

But a corporation, you know, in the State of Hawaii, you have twelve months. You get your lease. In twelve months if you're not in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

business, they can take it away. That wouldn't be fair to a commercial fisherman trying to find finances.

So I would propose a way to do it is, assistance in obtaining the lease and extra time in implementing your business versus the traditional company.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So, hearing what I've I'm not going to propose the specific heard, But for this action bullet, my comment to words. "Include, explore options to modify this is, promote community and fisherman entry. Including specific privileges, cooperatives, access either by legislative or etcetera, regulatory changes."

And second, for the same bullet, to modify the comment about financing, "To go make a point to go beyond financing available through NMFS financial assistance tools."

And now to carry out this comment we have to link it back to the current situation to build the case in support of this this finding, of recommendation. Is that the sense of what we want this --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	PARTICIPANT: Right.
2	MS. McCARTY: Yes.
3	DR. HOLLIDAY: bullet to be changed
4	at, changed to? Are there any objections? So, I
5	think we've got this one.
6	The next, the next bullet down talks
7	about regional pilot projects. And I'm not sure
8	that captured the emphasis on the regional aspect
9	of it or the pilot project aspect of it. Because
LO	it was, it did mix regional pilots along with
L1	fishing families. So I wanted to get some
L2	feedback. Was this capturing the comment that we
L3	were looking for yesterday? It's at the bottom of
L4	the screen up on the
L5	MR. DORSETT: I think we captured it.
L6	DR. HOLLIDAY: So everybody okay with
L7	this? Is this clear and the direction we wanted
L8	it to capture the thought?
L9	MR. FORSTER: Just this one comment.
20	The pilot program is referred to also in the next
21	section. And in the context of the PEIS. And
22	together, I think, we've captured what we've
23	talking about.

Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY:

1	DR. HOGARTH: We may have some words on
2	
3	MS. SHEA: The next one is at the
4	bottom of 23 and top of 24. And they're coming
5	from pages 24 to 28 in Appendix 1.
6	DR. HOLLIDAY: Heather, I think it was
7	your comment yesterday on something to the effect
8	that, in the process of considering aquaculture
9	policy choices, we should include the specific
LO	factors mentioned under Programmatic EIS, but not
L1	necessarily use the term PEIS?
L2	MS. McCARTY: Right. That was my
L3	thought. And just to incorporate and I didn't
L4	even say all of them. But just so you see how the
L5	conversation about what we wanted to include in
L6	that section. You can show that we've taken in to
L7	consideration some of those major groups comments.
L8	Because there isn't anything like that in the
L9	document now.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.
21	MS. McCARTY: That was my point.
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: Tom.
23	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes. There, the last
24	two bullet points on explaining aquaculture

1	operations, "Commercial aquaculture facility
2	should not be permitted in marine sanctuaries,
3	parks, essential fish habitat, or the fragile and
4	protected areas." I don't remember that
5	discussion. Does anybody else?
6	MR. DEWEY: That was, as I recall that
7	was a bullet specifically from one of the
8	commenters.
9	PARTICIPANT: It was.
10	MR. DEWEY: It looks like it's just
11	been dropped in.
12	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
13	MR. DEWEY: And I don't know that we we
14	talked about it.
15	MR. RAFTICAN: I don't, I disagree with
16	
17	MS. McCARTY: Well, I mean
18	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes. I mean, I don't
19	remember the general discussion about
20	incorporating those comments.
21	MR. DEWEY: I didn't hear any general
22	or specific discussion on it. I think that's
23	something that should be reviewed before it gets
24	dropped in there.

1	MS. McCARTY: I agree with that by the
2	way. When I it was my comment about including
3	the reviewer's comments somehow in the document.
4	But not, we did not have a discussion about each
5	individual bullet point at the time.
6	DR. HOLLIDAY: So in response to that,
7	if I deleted this, would anybody have heartburn?
8	These two highlighted comments.
9	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Probably it would lead
10	to heartburn.
11	MS. KATSOUROS: Heartburn.
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: That's fine. I just
13	wanted to the do what the subcommittee wants to
14	do.
15	MR. DEWEY: I believe the bullet above
16	that, as well. Is another one that maybe was cut
17	and pasted without discussion.
18	MS. McCARTY: Well a number of these
19	were. We didn't discuss any of them.
20	MR. DEWEY: Well we discussed the PEIS,
21	incorporated in
22	MS. McCARTY: Right. But we didn't
23	discuss the points that were made by that one
24	either.

1	MR. DEWEY: No, no. 1 agree. So 1
2	think that the next bullet up also should be
3	deleted.
4	MS. McCARTY: Which one are you talking
5	about?
6	MR. DEWEY: Just, "Aquaculture
7	facilities should be placed in constructive ways
8	to avoid direct habitat impacts and disturbance to
9	wildlife."
10	MR. CATES: I agree. That's, that's
11	just opening a door for a complete stoppage.
12	MS. McCARTY: Well, that's going to be
13	in the bill. Stuff like that's all going to be in
14	the bill.
15	MR. DEWEY: I understand that. But I
16	don't know if it incorporates here or
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: Keep this highlighted or
18	reject it? What's the preference?
19	MR. CATES: I vote for rejecting the
20	one above. It's too vague.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: You're giving rationales
22	now. I just needed to know accept or reject.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Delete it.
24	PARTICIPANT: Delete it.

1	PARTICIPANT: Where?
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: The highlighted one
3	that's on the screen.
4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes, delete it.
5	MR. FORSTER: Going back to the next
6	one below, can be, I mean, I would personally
7	rather take them out right now
8	MR. DEWEY: Those three. The bottom
9	three. He's already deleted the bottom two. And
10	I'm proposing he delete that next one up, as well.
11	MR. FORSTER: But it could be amended
12	just by putting the word "significant" in there.
13	So, so, "To construct it in ways that avoid
14	significant direct habitat." I mean, that is the
15	whole basis of the environmental might be
16	better without more discussion to leave it up, I
17	suggest.
18	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Delete.
19	DR. HOGARTH: Going back to the
20	finance, I was looking through the
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: Bill, can we hold off on
22	the financial just for a second? I apologize. I
23	just want to make sure I get these things
24	accurate. If you don't have too much so,

Bill, you're, we'll do -- you're thought was other ones. Bullets are also subject to --

MR. DEWEY: I was saying that the bottom three bullets on page 23 were all cut and pasted in from a commenter that we haven't discussed --

DR. HOLLIDAY: So those are the three. We've already taken care of those three. Is that correct?

MR. DEWEY: Yes.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.

I'm sorry, Bill. I didn't mean to --

DR. HOGARTH: That's fine. I was just to say, I was looking for words I yesterday in the omnibus bill. And take care of individual fishing corporate loans. Because we hadn't been able to give loans to individual And the Fishing Finance Program fishing quota. says, the amended bill, all account now language is out of NOAA, "To obligate funds for individual fishing quota, loans, and traditional direct loans." So if it goes past the aquaculture bill, it will do the same thing for aquaculture, aquaculture in here. So there's a mechanism 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	will be very straightforward if you get the bill.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: That's if you get the
3	bill. Right?
4	DR. HOGARTH: Yes.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Good point. Randy.
6	MR. CATES: On the same section, but
7	on the next page, page 24.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Are we leaving
9	this PEIS or are we going to refine that? We're
10	going to get a new copy correct? A new page?
11	MS. McCARTY: No.
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: Randy. You're going to
13	a page
14	MR. CATES: One quick, there is a
15	question on EIS, right after research.
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: Understood. But were we
17	going to, on page 23, the two bullets talking
18	about Programmatic EISs. Were you directing us to
19	revise the wording to eliminate the PEIS aspect
20	and just talk about general considerations for
21	reviewer projects or do you want to continue to
22	emphasis the Programmatic Environmental Impact
23	Statement?
24	MR. CATES: I don't have an issue.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. Please. 1 MS. McCARTY: I'm sorry. I didn't know 2 you were nodding at me. When I made the original 3 4 comment, I said, and I'm looking on page 19 of the 5 comments from the reviewers, and I think I should have looked at this before when we were presented 6 7 with this. But I didn't get around to it yet. What I said was, add those instead, but without 8 adding the specific reference to a PEIS or an EIS. 9 DR. HOLLIDAY: 10 Okay. 11 MS. McCARTY: That's what I originally said. Just to clarify. 12

DR. HOLLIDAY: And I'm trying to

MS. McCARTY: As far as I'm concerned, we can take out the reference that EIS. But whatever anybody else wants to do is fine. And I guess, if you look at that paragraph on page 19 of the comments, that I have highlighted, it's a little different from what was included in here. And I may not have been very clear in my comment. But my intent was to add those concerns to our document, but not necessarily the reference to the EIS.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

determine --

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: So we'll reword this
2	comment without the PEIS reference. We're going
3	back to page 19 of the reviewer comments.
4	MS. McCARTY: Correct.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Will satisfy this
6	MS. McCARTY: Which will be the second
7	paragraph up from the bottom.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.
9	MS. McCARTY: It starts, "The PEIS
LO	shall be additional and prior," etcetera
L1	DR. HOLLIDAY: Right.
L2	MS. McCARTY: but just the
L3	eliminates of that paragraph.
L4	DR. HOLLIDAY: I got it. Thank you.
L5	Okay.
L6	Randy, I'm sorry. We're now going on
L7	to page 24.
L8	MR. CATES: The top two bullet points I
L9	think should also be deleted. I don't remember
20	having discussion on, page 24.
21	MR. FORSTER: Mark, I think you need to
22	go back up.
23	DR. HOLLIDAY: We've done that.
24	MR. FORSTER: You deleted something

1	else.
2	MR. CATES: Well, It probably came up
3	on the 23 <sup>rd</sup> .
4	MR. FORSTER: It's on top of, it's 23
5	now. It's on the bottom of 23.
6	MR. CATES: I see.
7	MR. FORSTER: Yes. There you go, those
8	last two on that one.
9	MR. CATES: It's labeled as, "A new
10	aquaculture program shall not conflict with or
11	impede upon local use of marine waters." Well
12	that's just going to eliminate any ability to do
13	it. Because everybody is going to say that we
14	have use of those waters.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: So, it sounds like these
16	two bullets also got added as the other three did.
17	Now that they're appearing in front of us, we
18	recognize they should be removed. Is that what
19	I'm hearing?
20	MR. FLETCHER: Yes.
21	MS. McCARTY: Mark, if you then add in
22	the paragraph that I was referring to earlier
23	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.

MS. McCARTY: -- there are references

to those same kinds of things in that paragraph. And so what I would like the rest of the committee to do is look at that paragraph and say right now, if you're going to ask for that to be deleted, as well. Because then, operatively, you've deleted any reference to the consent of this reviewer. Which is fine with me. I'm just saying that if that's what you are going to do, let's do it now instead of go through another iteration of this.

DR. HOLLIDAY: My proposal, we're referring to page 19 in the reviewer comment document.

MS. McCARTY: Right.

The second paragraph on DR. HOLLIDAY: the bottom there. It begins with the words, "The PEIS shall be additional and prior to any site blah, blah, " What we're proposing to do is to start with this, start with the phrase, "In the process of considering aquaculture policy choices should include." And listing then by and beginning with, "Cataloguing of local species and habitat, identifying potential risks," and work through that list as considerations in making policy choices. Without the reference to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	Programmatic EIS.
2	MS. McCARTY: And it doesn't say,
3	"shall or will not do this or any of those
4	things." It just says, "These are the concerns.
5	These should be reviewed."
6	DR. HOLLIDAY: They should be
7	considered or
8	MS. McCARTY: Should be considered.
9	MR. FORSTER: My only question to that
10	is it seems to be somewhat redundant. A PEIS, by
11	definition, does this stuff. I mean
12	MS. KATSOUROS: But we're deleting
13	that, the PEIS.
14	MS. FOY: Are you saying we do not
15	trade these two terms?
16	MR. FORSTER: I think, earlier on
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: No. The suggestion by
18	Heather was to not use the PEIS terminology. But
19	to emphasize the consideration of these factors to
20	allow the reviewers concepts to be incorporated
21	with or without that PEIS reference.
22	MR. DEWEY: Okay. I almost think I'm
23	more comfortable leaving the PEIS reference in,
24	rather than changing it to a policy consideration.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CATES: I would like the committee just to consider just deleting it altogether. Instead of taking parts and --

Well, Mr. Chairman, MS. McCARTY: Mark, what I'm attempting to do is, to give some of satisfaction to a very large group represented by UFA, United Fisherman of Alaska, who have made these comments, in good faith, with the idea of trying to help guide this process. asked for public comment. We got it. We got it largest commercial fishing from the in group And I think, probably one of the largest ones on the West Coast. That, it's comprised of 80 percent of the harvested commercial fish, off It's a big deal. And it's a big deal to Alaska. Alaska. I, for one, am a huge proponent οf aquaculture, as you know. I'm just saying, in order to exhibit some sensitivity to that groups concerns, I think we ought to include some mention That's all. I think it's good of their comments. for all of us. I wouldn't be suggesting it if I didn't think so.

So I'm sorry if I'm being too forceful

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

But I do think it's important down

2 the road. And I hope I can get some agreement from others around the table. 3 4 MS. FOY: I'd like to second. 5 DR. HOLLIDAY: So any further uр comments а thumbs thumbs down? On 6 or 7 reworking these two bullets to include factors or the list of considerations that are 8 on page 19 in that paragraph. Include them 9 10 as, in the second part. But we're not going 11 to, but I wouldn't put them in the context of of 12 describing them contents the as Programmatic EIS. Those are the two positions 13 14 proposed by Heather. 15 MR. DEWEY: I would support it if it was, if they were left in as contents of a 16 PEIS. 17 DR. HOLLIDAY: Could you speak to 18 why you think the PEIS reference is important? 19 Well, because I believe 20 MR. DEWEY: 21 that those are the types of things -- we are 22 going to be doing PEIS anyhow. And those are the types of things that are included in it. 23

on this issue.

1

I agree.

MS. McCARTY:

1	MR. DEWEY: And I'm more nervous by
2	the broad general policy statement
3	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
4	MR. DEWEY: then I am by the
5	fact that it would be likely be included in
6	the PEIS anyhow.
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: I agree with
8	Bill's amendment.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Heather's in
LO	agreement. We're all in agreement. John.
L1	Randy?
L2	MR. CATES: It should be PEIS.
L3	That's and
L4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: It's a win-win.
L5	MS. McCARTY: Okay. Great.
L6	Thanks.
L7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay?
L8	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay. Are final
L9	one.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: No?
21	(Laughter.)
22	MS. KATSOUROS: It is on page 28.
23	For the changes
24	MR. FLETCHER: Pardon me.

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: Walt, Walt, Walt,
2	wait, wait.
3	MR. FLETCHER: We missed one.
4	MS. KATSOUROS: That's
5	MR. FLETCHER: On page 25 under,
6	"Management tools for the future." I suggest
7	that we go to reviewer number 8 on page 15.
8	MS. KATSOUROS: That's what we,
9	that's where I was going. To page 28. The
10	changes are on page 28. Reviewer 8 comments
11	on page 15 of the review document, the changes
12	we made appear on page 28 of this revised
13	text.
14	MR. FLETCHER: I was, I was on the
15	Issue Statement Number 1 that talks about
16	marine manage
17	MS. KATSOUROS: Page 28.
18	MR. DEWEY: So it's the last bullet
19	on the bottom of page 28 is the new bullet.
20	MR. FLETCHER: Yes. Well I see
21	that now.
22	MR. RAYBURN: Thanks for agreeing
23	MR. FLETCHER: Because you've got
24	two different places for the Preferred State

of the issue in 2020. You've got one on 25.
MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.
MR. FLETCHER: Then another one on,
it's under Proposed Action. Because you got
proposed action twice now here too.
DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, for every
issue there's a Proposed State. And there's -
_
MR. FLETCHER: But see Issue
Statement Number 2 is tagged, "Reference in
technology." And what this one, 28 is really
focused on Marine Management Area which is
part of Issue Statement Number 1.
MR. DEWEY: So you'd like to take
that proposed action bullet back to page 25.
MR. FLETCHER: I'd like to take
that
MR. DEWEY: Bring that proposed
action back to page 25 and insert it after
MR. FLETCHER: Under Preferred
State of the issue in 2020, on Issue Statement
1.
MR. DEWEY: Preferred State of
issue, Issue Statement 1.

2	MR. FLETCHER: Yes.
3	DR. ROBERTS: Question, about the
4	question. The Marine Managed Areas. To have
5	an official designation, I know we have Marine
6	Protected Areas, MPAs.
7	MR. FLETCHER: Well, in California
8	it's Marine Protected Areas. But there's a
9	federal designation called Marine Managed
LO	Areas. And I think that was why they chose
L1	that phrase. Because it kind of reflects the
L2	federal view. Now those them people,
L3	including Tom, that would have gone to the NRC
L4	and asked them to try to lessen these two
L5	different series of designations in to one
L6	coherent set of definitions, but that hasn't
L7	happened yet.
L8	DR. ROBERTS: So the question is,
L9	is should it be MPAs and MMAs? I don't know.
20	MR. FLETCHER: This is a federal
21	document which should reflect the federal
22	approach that currently exists. And don't get
23	people confused by talking about MPAs.
24	DR. ROBERTS: But MPAs are a

MS. KATSOUROS:

Okay.

1	federal terminology.
2	MR. FLETCHER: I know okay. I -
3	_
4	DR. ROBERTS: I'm just trying to
5	avoid the confusion we're having right now
6	MR. FLETCHER: I know.
7	DR. ROBERTS: six months from
8	now.
9	MR. RAYBURN: But I think an MPA is
10	a Marine Managed Area. There are Marine
11	Managed Areas that are not MPAs.
12	MR. RAFTICAN: Right. Marine
13	Managed Area is a broader term. It
14	encompasses Marine Protected Areas.
15	MS. KATSOUROS: But it also
16	encompasses enclosed areas for fisheries.
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. So, it's
18	actually, it encompasses both. Specific
19	examples include MPAs, sanctuaries, monument
20	areas, each driven by, each driven by a
21	different federal or state statutory
22	authorities to designate that particular piece
23	of geography.

	ilualices.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: Right.
3	DR. ROBERTS: Okay.
4	DR. HOLLIDAY: So Bob, I've moved
5	it under issue number 1, is the content of the
6	response what we wanted to say? Or did we get
7	that that
8	MR. FLETCHER: You have it under
9	proposed entities. Shouldn't it be under
10	Proposed Actions?
11	DR. HOLLIDAY: I was just seeing if
12	you were paying attention.
13	(Laughter.)
14	It's there.
15	Tom.
16	MR. RAFTICAN: Bob brought
17	something up. And it actually, we've kind of
18	went to NAS and asked them to do. We're
19	looking at how to manage fisheries and how to
20	manage, you got area-based management coming
21	in. You notice the problem that we're having
22	with definitions around this room. We've
23	asked NAS to look at definitions. It was

Marine

Protected

for

specifically

24

Areas

because there's so many, there's many people -NAS has set of of they're not got а definitions, but overall terminology. California has got different terminology. get to the EU and there's some different terminology there. Does it make sense that we have one common language? I don't think about it in terms of this document.

But as we go forward on this, wouldn't it make sense to be able to get one common language that we're all speaking on this. So when we say Marine Managed Areas, we know what we're talking about when we say Marine Protected Areas, we know what we're a little tighter down the line. But wouldn't it make sense to, at least, to have some type of a cross reference so that we all speak the same language on this stuff.

MS. McCARTY: Yes.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. And I believe there are some tools that the NOS has prepared to help do that. So we'll -- I'll go back as an action item for staff to explore what that lexicon dictionary of terms is and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

see if that's applicable. And we would, and share it with the committee and see how it might be helpful to the document.

MR. RAFTICAN: Great.

MS. KATSOUROS: In 2003, there was actually a glossary of the different terms for workshop. And they brought Protected Areas workshop. And they specified the differences in this glossary. And I think the first that's probably, it was one of workshops of this Marine Protected Area. they did produce a glossary of all these different terms.

MR. RAFTICAN: The Marine Protected Area Committee, much like MAFAC, did look at something like that. And I understand that they had considerable problems on that. And that was kind of what, we went back to NAS they said, "Yes, there are problems. We'd like to look at it. Do you have a quarter of a million dollars?" And I had -- two out of the three things I was good on. The last one was a problem.

MS. KATSOUROS: I think that --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

wasn't there's though bу 1 statutory executive, the definitions came out of those 2 different statutory or executive orders? 3 4 MR. RAFTICAN: NAS uses a set of 5 definitions. I'm not sure that Marine Managed Area is in that. We can work on it --6 7 MS. KATSOUROS: Okay. RAFTICAN: Congress had been 8 MR. looking at that, later on. And then again, 9 10 the problem is, as you used references from 11 around the world, you're using a reference from Australia. You have 12 to be able to compare and contrast to do exactly what we're 13 So we get good science out of 14 doing here. 15 this. So that, probably enough for right now. DR. HOLLIDAY: Catherine. 16 MS. FOY: Hey Mark, mine's just 17 that, "The area should be 18 quick one. Is continuously monitored." That's a nice idea. 19 But that's not financially feasible. You can 20 change that to "periodically monitored" or 21 22 just remove "continuously". MR. How 23 O'SHEA: about just

24

monitored?

1	MS. FOY: That will work for me.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: Strike the word
3	"continuously," okay with everyone?
4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you. Heather,
6	and then Chris.
7	MS. McCARTY: If we are already
8	done with the ones that we have
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm not sure. Are
10	we done?
11	MS. McCARTY: because I have an
12	additional one, that, I have
13	MS. KATSOUROS: What is we're
14	done from my notes.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. Okay.
16	MS. McCARTY: From my notes, there
17	was one on, the original page 8, and which is
18	now, I think still on page 8 in the new
19	version, under "Commercial fisheries", Roman
20	Numeral III. Someone made the suggestion to
21	add to that, that the regional management
22	councils should have flexibility in designing
23	the LAPP Programs. Is what I have written

down.

But --

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: It wasn't limited to
2	LAPPS. It was council should be had, I
3	think, it was Bob Fletcher's comment.
4	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Should have maximum
6	flexibility or something
7	MS. McCARTY: Something like that.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.
9	MR. DORSETT: And I thought that
10	was in relation to the tools they have at
11	their disposable not the maximum flexibility.
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. Right. I'm
13	not reading from my notes. But there was my
14	thought, my recollection, it wasn't
15	specifically to LAPPS.
16	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
17	MS. FOY: I don't remember that in
18	there. Did that get incorporated?
19	DR. HOLLIDAY: I think that's
20	Heather's comment that it was, was not
21	MS. FOY: Did you find that?
22	MS. McCARTY: It hasn't been
23	incorporated. So I was just pointing out
24	that, it was comment we agreed to incorporate,

but didn't get incorporated. 1 DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. Chris. 2 3 MR. DORSETT: Back to page 25. 4 an issue that we couldn't solve at 5 the time. And that was under 5 --DR. HOLLIDAY: Page 25 of the, of 6 this document. 7 MR. DORSETT: Yes. 8 9 DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Thank you. It was the statement MR. DORSETT: 10 11 the jurisdiction remaining under NOAA fisheries, when in fact, there are additional 12 legal statutes where other entities may have 13 jurisdiction within certain areas. We didn't 14 15 come to any conclusion on this in our initial And we said, "We'd save it to 16 discussions. here and try and work out a solution for 17 18 everyone." talking to a couple people, 19 there are a lot of logistical concerns with 20 this is being coordinated within 21 how well And that's creating a lot of heartburn 22 and headache for stakeholders in the region. 23

And so my suggested solution is that, we talk

1	more about better coordination within NOAA, as
2	well as, the area that Bob moved in here that
3	these, that these Marine Managed Areas be goal
4	based, they be monitored, cost benefits, et
5	cetera. So that would be my proposal for
6	addressing this, if people are comfortable
7	with that.
8	MS. McCARTY: Could you say that
9	again?
10	MR. FLETCHER: Give us some
11	wording.
12	MR. DORSETT: The wording, I would
13	just take this section that Bob has and the
14	first sentence we replace base management
15	with, "All the living marine resources must be
16	better coordinated within NOAA."
17	DR. ROBERTS: You want to put the
18	"And remain within NOAA," or you want to
19	strike the last
20	MR. DORSETT: That's an issue. I
21	don't know if that's necessarily an issue we
22	have to worry about.
23	MR. CATES: I have a question.
24	We're talking about federal waters, EEZ zone.

mean, it's in their jurisdiction. 2 I'm not saying they 3 MR. DORSETT: 4 do give up any jurisdiction. I'm just saying 5 that, when you're looking Marine Managed Areas amongst the different entities within NOAA 6 you better coordinate your management 7 goals, strategies, et cetera. Because right 8 now you have this perceived conflict with the 9 10 fisheries service and sanctuary programs where 11 there are different goals for the different It's creating a lot of heartache and 12 headache for stakeholders. 13 14 MR. FLETCHER: Roger that. 15 MS. KATSOUROS: Well, you know, the -- this also, we put this there, we need 16 something in the background saying that, you 17 know, "NOAA has these different" -- so that 18 19 when you go to --And, you know, 20 MR. DORSETT: Yes. the current situation, right now, is still, 21 22 it's in the progress section. 23 MS. KATSOUROS: Right. 24 MR. DORSETT: So certainly we would

Why should NOAA give up authority on that?

need --

1

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: So that means, so, I mean, because the document will now need to be either updated to include, I mean, you know.

MR. DORSETT: It's got to be updated now because our current situation --

MS. KATSOUROS: Right.

MR. DORSETT: -- we don't really have an information. So it shouldn't be a problem.

DR. HOLLIDAY: If I might just ask Because you, question. by making this change we're really changing the emphasis of the statement. We were focusing originally on the conflict about living over marine if But we're now making resources. generic, about better coordination of placebased management in its entirety, not, should be, not just living marine resources. you're looking place-based Because management for purposes of historical significance and shipwrecks, for example. That's place-based management within NOAA.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And issues that will affect fisheries, recreation, other aspects, or any need coordination. That place-based type of management. Or it's -- and so, by making this generic place-based management coordinated within NOAA rather than place-based management of living marine resources would remain under jurisdiction of NOAA fisheries, you're really changing the flavor of, or the sense of the comment. And I'm not sure it's it's as precise or targeted if we still left in living marine resources. That's where I'm, that's my Leaving it in, as is, with living point. marine resources is ignoring this other aspect of coordination that should be approved.

MR. DORSETT: That's fine with me.

We can -- you're saying to take out, "The

living marine resources," and make it more

general to encompass the other issues that --

DR. HOLLIDAY: We're talking about

-- right. We need to have a well organized
integrated place-based management approach
under all these different statutes. Not just

-- the original intent was just to look at the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

conflict between Magnuson 1 narrow 2 responsibilities, and sanctuaries responsibilities. And this indicate 3 some 4 preference for managing fisheries under the 5 Magnuson. Now by broadening it we're still 6 linking it to LMR. And I'm suggesting perhaps 7 if you're generalizing, if that's a word, 8 parts of the statement, all the statement 9 might follow through. So you cover that range 10 11 of, if somebody's designating a shipwreck, to coordinate with the 12 they have other of NOAA to develop/manage in 13 elements effective way. 14 15 MR. DORSETT: That's good suggestion. 16 DR. HOLLIDAY: Heather. 17 McCARTY: So 18 MS. are we still trying to capture the concept of the place-19 20 based management involving living marine resources staying under the jurisdiction of 21 NOAA fisheries or not? 22 DR. HOLLIDAY: I think Chris is, 23 24 well Chris you can speak for yourself.

MR. DORSETT: Trying to keep that 1 2 in? MS. McCARTY: Yes. 3 4 MR. DORSETT: That's what I'm 5 trying to avoid. Although my initial reaction 6 was just to delete that. But I'm trying to 7 out something that might people to address the concerns that have been 8 raised. 9 10 MS. McCARTY: Do you think that there are other entities within NOAA 11 should do the 12 management place-based management involving living marine resources? 13 MR. DORSETT: 14 Yes. 15 MS. McCARTY: You do. Okay. Well, of the, the sense of the 16 the sense 17 yesterday was, that it should remain under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries except for the 18 marine sanctuary program under NOS. 19 That was 20 had yesterday. I mean, what we I'm not 21 advocating for that necessarily. I'm 22 saying that's what -- is that right? the question. 23

DORSETT: I would say that's

MR.

	Time with the except with the background we
2	have on this section and how skimpy it is. I
3	don't know if there are additional conflicts.
4	The sanctuary one is the one I know about.
5	Are there other ones? I can't tell from this
6	document.
7	MS. McCARTY: I don't know either.
8	Good point.
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: So I have the
10	suggested red line to, proposed by Chris or I
11	could accept it or reject it. What's your
12	as is, modified? What's your preference?
13	DR. ROBERTS: There was, there was
14	two issues. This was one speaking about
15	and somebody brought up striking "living
16	marine resources"?
17	DR. HOLLIDAY: That was my comment.
18	MR. CATES: I think that's a good
19	one.
20	MS. McCARTY: I don't have a
21	problem with that.
22	MR. DORSETT: Can we hear that
23	again?
24	DR. HOLLIDAY: The original intent

was to look at a very narrow construction of conflict between the Sanctuaries the living marine management of resources, Magnuson Act management of living resources. Chris's proposal to make this more generic and talk about place-based management without respect to NOAA fisheries taking precedence under Magnuson for living marine resources, suggests that that's the living is the only potential area marine resources for improvement of place-based management within NOAA. NOAA does But place-based management for other aspects that have nothing to do with living marine resources. Such, if designations of sanctuaries and monuments and other, under other authorities that would require collaboration and consultation line offices for making an appropriate policy choice for place-based management.

And I used the example of a shipwreck or some historic underwater archeological site that doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the living marine resources directly. But fishery service and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

living marine resource interests are sort of a stakeholder to that designation. So a place-based management decision within NOAA should ensure that all the different effected entities responsible for ocean management are well coordinated and integrated in the policy choice.

So going down this more, Chris's proposal to be a more generic statement about place-based management. Improving place-based management coordination within NOAA doesn't only hold true for living marine resources. Usually it holds true for all types of place-based management decision.

So that was the rationale behind, if you're making a generic, to just improve coordination of place-based management not just for LMR decisions but for all decisions having to do with place-based management.

Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: I would support the more generic version of the first sentence. But I would then suggest that we add, "The designation Marine Managed Areas involving

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

living marine resources should be	ld be based on da,
da, da." So that clarifies t	es the other part
that we added. It's a generic s	ic set of criteria
for creating Marine Managed Ar	d Areas involving
living marine resources.	
MS. FOY: He's talk	talking about the
paragraph on page 15. The review	eviewer comments .
MR. FLETCHER: I	I don't think

there's any conflict there. I think it just further defines what that language should be "The designation of focused Marine involving living Managed Areas marine should be da, da, da." resources And the other one is, "Place-based management within NOAA needs to be better coordinated."

MS. McCARTY: Yes. Yes. That's -- I agree with you.

MR. RAYBURN: I was, I was going to suggest to add a qualifier to it where the generic statement, especially in relation to the management of living marine resources or something like that to highlight that's really where were at. That would be, place-based management in NOAA should be better

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

coordinated especially actions involving living marine resources or something like that.

Bob's comfortable with the other.

He's more in to it then I am. That's really
where we're focused at, living marine
resources --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. So, since we're getting multiple options here, I'm going to go to the sort of discrete choice model.

Right now, the proposal is to have this sentence in there. And so I'll ask, do people want to leave as it is or change it to something else? I know the something else depends, but. I've got two or three different ideas competing now. And I don't know how to in the next minus three reach consensus minutes that we have. Because we're in to our lunch break right now. So unless you're willing to modify via a friendly amendment or somehow change it, I'm not sure any better way to proceed. Do we want to leave this? Do we want to change it and to what?

MR. RAYBURN: We're going to make

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	that more generic by taking "living marine"
2	resources" out of the first and then add it in
3	to the substance.
4	MR. FLETCHER: That's what we did.
5	MR. RAYBURN: But it's not added.
6	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm sorry. Someone
7	
8	DR. ROBERTS: I move that we
9	strike, "Involving marine resources," from the
10	first bullet under section 5. Involving
11	living marine resources
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm trying to get to
13	there. Come on.
14	MR. RAYBURN: Well that's it. I
15	mean, it won't let you do it so we'll just
16	have to leave it.
17	(Laughter.)
18	DR. ROBERTS: Chris may need or Bob
19	may need something in addition
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: And now it's Bob's.
21	MR. FLETCHER: I wanted to add,
22	"Marine Managed Areas involving living marine
23	resources are designated. They should be
24	based on da, da, da, da."

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: See, I hate doing
2	this. Marine Managed
3	MR. FLETCHER: No, no, no, no, no.
4	Not there.
5	MS. FOY: No, no, no, no, no.
6	Next, next paragraph.
7	MR. FLETCHER: The next slide.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: All right. I can't
9	type right. This is not what I wanted to be
LO	doing. In the next bullet?
L1	MR. FLETCHER: No. Right there.
L2	"Marine Managed Areas involving living marine
L3	resources are designated." Just insert that.
L4	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, I know. All
L5	right. So, is that what you want? Is that
L6	what everybody wants? It's a tough crowd.
L7	What do you think, Bob?
L8	MR. FLETCHER: Yes.
L9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Is that where we go?
20	Okay. Chris, are you good?
21	MR. DORSETT: I'm good.
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: Good over this
23	okay? Other changes? Shoot anyone who
24	MS. McCARTY: I'm so glad

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. So, we're
2	going to try to get back here as close as
3	possible to 1 and hear the committee and
4	subcommittee report outs. And Tom you're
5	going to chair for Tony. Correct?
6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you very much.
8	Thanks everybody.
9	(Whereupon, the above entitled matter went off
LO	the record at 12:05 p.m.
L1	and reconvened at 1:16
L2	p.m.)
L3	CHAIRMAN BILLY: All right. I
L4	think we're going to get started.
L5	MR. O'SHEA: You don't get to use
L6	those much in Juneau, do you?
L7	MS. McCARTY: Yes, sunglasses?
L8	MR. O'SHEA: I know a bit about
L9	that.
20	CHAIRMAN BILLY: All right. We're
21	going to get started. This afternoon, to wrap
22	things up, first we're going to hear from Bill
23	Hogarth regarding this, the latest budget
2	news Then we're going to get in to the

subcommittee and working group reports. And look at any outstanding action items, new business, next steps, that kind of thing. And then, any final words from Bill and and we'll adjourn.

And my hope is to move through this quickly. And maybe we can finish by 3 o'clock or so. Something like that. At least, it's the target.

All right so without further ado let me call on Bill to share with us the latest information on the budget.

DR. HOGARTH: Okay. We -- I'm not going to be talking from the Senate omnibus budget. I guess Senate has now done their budget. And it will be sent back over to the House. But basically, it it -- we're having a little bit of difficulty now getting in to the details because the Senate just did it. But I can give you basically the big picture item.

And overall all for National Marine Fisheries Service, the omnibus bill is 803.9 million dollars. And the President's request was request was 796 million. And what we had

1	for `07 we operated in active `07, was 775.6.
2	So it sounds great for the math.
3	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Now that's
4	specific for
5	DR. HOGARTH: Yes. That's marine
6	fisheries. But if you look at the okay.
7	That's it. So you'll see good, you did get
8	in to it. So you'll see this is where we are.
9	So the 803.9, most of what we deal with is
LO	the ORF. The PAC money is is usually
L1	designated. We don't get much use of it.
L2	What we ought we talk about is ORF and it's
L3	708 million dollars.
L4	MR. CATES: Bill, is this
L5	finalized?
L6	DR. HOGARTH: No, no. This is the
L7	Senate version that's going back to the House.
L8	We think it's pretty much finalized. But,
L9	you know, and I'll read you some important
20	language in just a minute. But this looks
21	like it's where we are.
22	And so, the bad news, if you look
23	at the next slide that Mark has is that, the
24	omnibus is 803.9 million. Earmarks of that

takes it down, is 55.5 million dollars. takes it down to 748. And so we had an this year, 775. So it's down to 748. And then if you look at the President, you know, we about 47, the President requests 796. we really 47.6 under the President's request. So the omnibus is really has been, you know, sounds good. But they they accomplished things by, you know, earmarks still. But they just take it out of their budget rather than add on they agree with the President's level and then they took it.

The next slide shows that some of the funded Presidential initiatives. The question about number 1 is, the House version said, "Magnuson-Stevens implementation Alaska." And so we're not sure the details of this whether they took Alaska off and gave us the money to implement Magnuson everywhere. But we did get some money for marine mammals permit and consultation. This is through the Navy work and some of the sonar, that type.

Now a little bit of money for marine mammals stock assessment. We did get

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

some money to keep the dolphin, the circle we worked on, to work on right whales and monk seals. And getting money for the sea turtle and the Atlantic salmon recovery plans. So they were some of the Presidential initiatives that were funded in some form. We've got to get through the details of how much.

The next is what -- some more of the funding. We did get some money for LAPPS. Not what we'd asked for, but some money for LAPPS. The Penobscot River Habitat Restoration. We thought we had lost that, so we don't know how much money that we do have. that's to remove some of those dams, I mean, to remove the dams of the Penobscot River.

The Open Rivers Initiative was one the interior. with us and There's the, there's the, there's some dams that sitting around that are really just blockage doing any good. This was are not supposed to be several million dollars remove those dams.

So we got some money for stock

## **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

assessment. This is continuing money for stock assessment. A little bit of money for the economics which we've been, I've been on them about these.

Regional council grants, looks like maybe up to 25 million. We're not positive, but the House voted for 25. And so the program got some, about 31 million, we think. And we got a little bit of money for La Jolla. A little bit of money for Hawaii it looks like.

Let's go, the next slide is, here's of the bad things. some Here's what's basically been eliminated. And some of these we'll have to fund, regardless. Marine mammal stock assessment. We showed you earlier is Pacific salmon section partially. 7, consultation has reduced. been Not eliminated, but reduced.

But the survey and monitoring for the Alaskan groundfish, Alaska pollock, the pollock quota this year is going down by 27 percent. Something like that. And we're losing money to do the surveys. The halibut,

## **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

sablefish. IFQ management. The Alaska crab and research and the state research. And the bluefish, striped bass money that's been in our budgets forever seems to be going, almost gone.

And then the Great Lakes restoration. And the Open Rivers project was reduced.

Pacific Island And also, the Regional Offices and Center Operation. And this was something that was a real shocker to last minute, because the that at supposed to be in the base budget. operate that region and center. We finally got it into the base budget. So now we don't know if they've just taken it out and we'll have to find it over that whole 10-12 million dollars of their budget to fund it or if they reduced it. The details are not there yet.

MR. CATES: What is that?

DR. HOGARTH: That's the operations of the regional office in Hawaii, in the Science Center in Hawaii. It's been an earmark for a long time. We finally got it 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

1	the base budget in, you know. But by being in
2	the base budget, it should have been able to
3	be singled out in the view. So we're not sure
4	what happened to this. This budget you're
5	talking about now is hot off, hot off the
6	press from last night's negotiation.
7	The next one is, these are earmarks
8	that are funded, but basically, I can tell
9	you, the right whale disentanglement program,
10	that's 94 thousand dollars to go buy rope.
11	It's goes to the lobster industry to buy new
12	line. It doesn't comes to us.
13	The Cook Inlet beluga whale
14	research, it looks like we get some of that
15	and the state gets some of that.
16	CHAIRMAN BILLY: That's 94
17	DR. HOGARTH: Thousand.
18	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Thousand? Yes.
19	Okay.
20	DR. HOGARTH: Yes. Cook Inlet and
21	beluga research right at 53. And then some of
22	these others are, most of this money for the
23	Atlantic Pacific Ring Resource Observers goes

The Sea Life Center is outside.

outside.

24

The

Otter and Stellar Sea Lion Commission. 1 2 then the Halibut and Seal Commission. That's all money that goes straight through. 3 4 And then fisheries, Maine and New 5 Hampshire get to do their own trawl survey. Then we have the shark research at Mote Lab. 6 monitoring and research 7 reef fish going, I think, to the University of Florida 8 and the Chesapeake. But most of the fisheries 9 10 management is going to, it's not clear where 11 it's going. And then there's these others. 12 But this money is going straight through 13 budget to other people. 14 The Hawaii seafood 15 inspection work. MR. JONER: What's the trawl survey 16 17 money --DR. HOGARTH: We don't know. 18 Ιt just says, "trawl survey," but we're not sure 19 which one that is. I've tried to read through 20 21 the budget. It doesn't say the words we have, 22 doesn't say. The next one is continuous. 23 The 24 horseshoe crab research goes to BPI. And then

1	the Oregon work goes to the University of
2	Oregon. Scholar research goes to
3	Massachusetts. So most of the pelagic tagging
4	goes to Monterey. So most of these, you'll
5	see here, go out to someone. Western Pacific
6	pelagic goes to JIMAR. The Fishing Mortality
7	Education Program is going, I think that's
8	somewhere in the Gulf. And then you got
9	Louisiana Fishery Recovery Resource Center for
10	491,000.
11	MR. RAYBURN: Where's the Center
12	for Ecosystem Based Fishery Management? Is
13	that
14	DR. HOGARTH: I can't tell so far.
15	I got the report language here, but it really
16	doesn't get that specific. It will though.
17	Because we'll get the individual pages and it
18	will tell us. Mark?
19	And then these others the habitat.
20	Massachusetts, Bronx River, Chesapeake Bay
21	Oyster Restoration, that's where most of our
22	money goes straight through.
23	And then you see at the bottom,

two disasters.

there's

24

6.8 million dollars

goes to the fisherman who fished in the new NWHI Monument. And Massachusetts gets almost 14 million dollars for their ground fish disaster. Total of about 55 million dollars in earmarks.

And these really are earmarks that that we do not get any use of. I don't, you know, that we seem to measure. Some of the Alaska may be written such that you can. But that's the way they've written in the past. But so, it's it's not real pretty. And then on top of this we're hearing that there will be, then a 1.7 percent just across the board recision across the board.

And just real quickly so you can finish this up. I just put that up, a few about, they're building some pages new Mississippi research laboratories in and Alabama. And it's very unclear exactly where that money goes. But the University of Mississippi Medical Center Biotechnology Research, Mississippi State University Research Technology, University of Southern Mississippi Innovation and Commercialization

## **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

Park building and construction, Alabama State University for Life Sciences building, and then a laboratory and research place in University of Southern Alabama and Science Center for 30 million. That's been additional wording there.

And then it does increase the NOAA Corps, the number of the NOAA Corps personnel.

So we finally get the NOAA Corps personnel to operate some of the new vessels.

Quickly. It does -- this says now that 8 million dollars for individual fishing quota loans. And then we have -- and not to exceed 59 million dollars for traditional direct loans of authorized for the Merchant Marine Act. So I did put IFQs in to this.

And then it's a whole new section in here that, "The Secretary of Commerce is permitted to prescribe and enforce standards of regulation effecting safety and health of, in the context of scientific and occupational diving." Is something that's been added. I'm not sure, but that's just something we weren't aware of. But they've added that to here.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	And then the Secretary to, it goes in to the
2	details of the commerce, "The Secretary of
3	Commerce provided for the compensation for the
4	monument," goes to the whole process about the
5	permits and all. And then in to the and
6	then there's another section here on the IUU
7	vessels that's been put in to this, to this
8	Bill that's on, it's on the Magnuson.
9	And last but not least it says
10	MR. CONNELLY: Bill, Bill what is
11	that about the IUU? Is it funding for
12	DR. HOGARTH: No. It just says, it
13	didn't give us any money. It just says, "The
14	Secretary shall maintain and make public a
15	list of vessels and vessel owners." It gave
16	it and what this did it says, "Whether or
17	not the United States is party to the
18	agreement of standards of such an
19	organization."
20	MR. CONNELLY: So is that a
21	requirement for you to develop a consolidated
22	blacklist of all the
23	DR. HOGARTH: Yes.

CONNELLY:

MR.

24

the

from

# blacklists?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. HOGARTH: Yes. And not, and even if we're not a member of it, even if we're not a member, if we have to. And it says, "Take appropriate actions against any," you know --

MR. CONNELLY: Yes.

DR. HOGARTH: -- and all. And we have to do regulation to implement. And then a 5.8 it's it's million it's to, a, we, dollars for а agreement between Administrator of NOAA and Administrator of National Academy of Sciences. Which they will establish the Climate Change Study Committee to investigate the serious and sweeping issues regarding the global climate change and make recommendations. But it goes on for a little bit. It goes on there.

And then I think, finally, it's an interesting one which we saw attached but we don't know what this means. It says, "The Secretary of Commerce will represent the United States Government in negotiating and monitoring international agreements regarding

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

fisheries, marine mammals, or sea turtles." And they provided, "The Secretary of Commerce shall be responsible for the development and inter-departmental coordination of policies of the United States with respect to international negotiations and agreements referred to." So that is something that we're not really sure because that has been the Department of State. So we have to look at That's where we are. that.

And that we understand that by tomorrow, the goal is for the Senate, this Bill to be back in the House. And then for a conference to be but they pretty much agreed. So it should be omnibus Bill for budget by, of tomorrow night. Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: I saw partial funding for regional councils.

DR. HOGARTH: Well, it's partial, what the President asked for. We didn't get the entire amount to, the President had asked for. I believe, that's, so, if you look at the old budget you'd see that the House gave them 25 million. And the Senate, 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

1	have the list of the individual items to know
2	what the Senate gave. It looks like we have
3	money, it's just pretty much the same that was
4	in the House budget, you know, that we saw
5	yesterday.
6	MR. FLETCHER: That would be good
7	for the regional council, wouldn't it?
8	DR. HOGARTH: It depends on the
9	council and how much goes to the commissions,
10	you know. Commission money is in with the
11	council money.
12	MR. FLETCHER: It is?
13	DR. HOGARTH: Yes. Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Randy.
15	MR. CATES: The National Marine
16	Fisheries Finance Program. I know that that
17	didn't have language in the Senate Bill. And
18	then I was told it was put back in. Do you
19	know if it was actually put in for
20	authorization?
21	DR. HOGARTH: I don't know. And
22	the other thing that's bothered me in this
23	Bill here there seems to have dropped out,

there was 3.8 million dollars, as I said to

1	you this morning, in aquaculture. It's said
2	to be used for pilot projects in the Atlantic,
3	Pacific, and Gulf. That language is all gone.
4	We'll have more specifics this afternoon.
5	So, my office, right now, is doing a side-by-
6	side comparison with the House and Senate to
7	see what, you know, what difference there are
8	and to see if there is any chance of, you
9	know, getting any input.
10	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Anyone else? Any
11	questions?
12	DR. HOGARTH: But before people
13	start leaving, I want to thank everyone for
14	the gifts, the dinner, just everything, it's
15	been overwhelming to me. And I also want to
16	thank Mary Hope for the, Fish for the Future,
17	for the food last night. And we really
18	enjoyed having everyone over. And thanks.
19	(Applause.)
20	DR. HOGARTH: It's really been
21	great. I enjoyed it very much. I'll let you
22	go to work.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Thank you. Thanks

a lot. Okay.

Now in terms of recommendations and MAFAC motions. First, let me call on Jim Gilmore, strategic planning.

MR. GILMORE: Thank you, Tom. My workgroup met this morning. Dorothy, Mary Beth, Heather, Chris, Mark, Eric, and me.

our way forward is to MAFAC develop a ocean policy document. And our principal audience for this is going to be the incoming administration. And so the idea will be that we will get to drafting, following this meeting. The idea is we would get drafts out to the full committee, feedback, and try to take final action at the next meeting on a document. I think we'll be policy level at larger where the wordsmithing, while important, hopefully won't get us in to any contentious issues. And we'll be able to resolve things through email exchanges and what have you. But the idea is that this workgroup will take on the principal drafting responsibility. Coming back to the full committee for quidance. Maybe after two or three rounds we can have a document that we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

can get signed off on 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

Obviously some things will happen. Maybe not obviously some things will happen in Congress. But some things. It's not out of realm of possibility that Congress would actually act on an issue and require us to do some changing on the fly. Something like the NOAA Organic Act. And we would, you know, obviously want to have the flexibility between the July meeting and November to make any additional changes. But the idea would be that, barring changes, we'd be where we would want to be in July. So that's the idea of where we're, where we would be going.

As Mark has scrolled up here, we would tier off Vision 2020 report to look for near term, not this year, but near term types of actions so working from, I think, it was Tom's suggestion yesterday, maybe what we need is a five year plan. And maybe it would be a four year plan for an incoming administration to be, to be looking at.

If you want to scroll down a little bit more. Cut to that. The premise, what do

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

need to do to make this happen here? are the issues? And one of the starting points for us would be to look at the NOAA Organic Act legislation that's pending. see whether we find broad policy items there that we would want to emphasize. Whether a NOAA Organic Act is an act in this Congress or Obviously that's one of the things we would be developing on the fly. It might be a moot point by next year. But if it was not, we want to do is, set this incoming Secretary, and Undersecretary, and Assistant Administrator for Fisheries on the, on path of being the principal advocate in the next administration for NOAA being the oceans agency. We want to highlight that for them.

We will look through the current agency structure to make recommendations on how we coordinate the responsibilities within NOAA. This goes to one of the issues that we talked about, yesterday in the Vision 2020, that we're getting in to place-based management. What are the, what are the issues

### **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

want to highlight? I don't we're going to resolve them, but I think we need to highlight them. That whether it's designation, or Marine Protected а closed fishing area done orcouncil, or whatever, we need to have some integration within NOAA for how that is handled. And then the management of living marine resources within those designations. We want to point to the next administration that those are issues that are, that are out That are burrs under the saddle, right there. now, that we want to deal with.

On the ecosystem based approach to management, it's clearly the way forward fisheries management. But we all recognize that there are internal and external barriers which is to say within NOAA. There are issues that are precluding а smooth path developing the best ecosystem based approach There are also contributions to management. that agencies outside of NOAA can bring to the And we want to highlight that to be table. sure that, again, the incoming administration

### **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

understands that we want to lay claim to some other resources and expertise that's out there to help us build a better picture of of the ocean environment.

We want to look at alternatives for additional funding for NOAA, I suppose that's probably not an unwelcome bullet point after what we just heard. There are proposals out there in the Oceans 21 Bill. There is a competing proposal, that Senator Stevens' advanced for getting a piece of the oil and We'd like to look at gas revenues. highlight for the again, to administration that we need to be thinking creatively about ways to get the funding for what we want.

Going back again to the discussion we've had earlier. Information, education, making NOAA a lead voice for informing the public about its accomplishments and the work that scientists and managers are doing.

Measurement of success. We all want the best ecological health for the ocean and to see how that translates into economic

# **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	productivity. So we want the policy
2	development to refer to things like
3	aquaculture, responsible aquaculture
4	development, LAPP programs to bring
5	socioeconomic stability to fisheries, enhance
6	recreational fisheries, etcetera, etcetera.
7	And we want to organize NOAA's
8	science leadership and data research to
9	emerging areas of integrated science and
10	climate change including ocean acidification.
11	Obviously, a huge issue out there, climate
12	change. And how do we corral that? Also to,
13	and tying back to ecosystem based management
14	to help us with our modeling and prediction,
15	predictions.
16	And I think that's it. Mark and I
17	always kept coming up with a different number
18	of bullet points. I wasn't sure if there were
19	
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: I always have eight.
21	But I can't find it.
22	MR. GILMORE: So that's the idea.
23	That's an ambitious set of policy items to

highlight for an incoming Secretary. I don't

envision this becoming another Vision 2020 document. I think it will be concise and to the point as incoming administrations are overrun with paper and people and all sorts of people preaching to them.

But the idea would be to highlight the fact that you have a diverse group of stakeholders here with a lot to contribute. And these are our thoughts on where the incoming administration really needs to place the emphasis and to help place MAFAC as a valuable contributor to the Secretary and the new Undersecretary.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Do you want this to be in the form of a motion?

MR. GILMORE: I guess the motion would that this workgroup be empowered to move forward with drafting to, I'll say, continuous consultation with the full committee with the purpose of coming back with a final product in July.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: I don't think that needs to be a motion. I think that's where -- unless there's any objection. It's your work

plan. Any comment on this? Accept the report. Okay.

MR. RAYBURN: I assume when you say ocean policy, are you relating to living marine resources or is it an overall ocean policy for NOAA?

MR. GILMORE: Well, I think that, you know, the linkage starts, you know, right I mean, when you start talking about climate change and ocean acidification, what you. And it has such relationship that I think we want to speak more broadly so that we don't inadvertently or advertently have too narrow a focus to what it is we want to do. Because our number one principal is really to have this Secretary come in fighting that, this is the lead agency in the federal government on oceans issues. We understand there are other agencies, many agencies, and departments other that other responsibilities. But we want Secretary to be an advocate that the expertise resides in that agency and when things effect the oceans, might not have a legislative or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	regulatory authority over what gets dumped in
2	the Mississippi and ends up in the Gulf of
3	Mexico, but the science, I think it was Eric
4	who said, "But when NOAA lays the science on
5	the table, other federal agencies have to be
6	responsive to that." So.
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Other questions or
8	comments?
9	(No reply.)
10	Do we have a motion to accept the
11	report of the strategic plan subcommittee?
12	MR. RAFTICAN: Motion.
13	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Tom.
14	Second.
15	MS. McCARTY: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Any discussion? I
17	seen none. All those in favor, all those in
18	favor say, "aye."
19	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	Any opposed?
21	(No reply.)
22	So moved.
23	DR. HOGARTH: I think maybe one day
24	we did this, I thought about this and I just

haven't made it happen. But I think it may be
good to get, you know, the head of NOS and the
head of OAR can maybe we come to a MAFAC to
talk about some of these issues. I think the
problem is, we don't communicate as much as we
should between agencies, so to speak. And I
think, we met with OAR. It was in Boulder not
long ago. And it was an excellent day and a
half meeting, I thought. It was a lot of
and so it may be good to fix a couple of these
issues like ocean acidification or some of the
sanctuary or this type of thing and just have
a, ask them to come for a session of question
and answer so we can I don't know where is
the right place to bring that up, but I
thought since you were talking about policy
and all that

CHAIRMAN BILLY: That's good. Okay. We'll keep that in mind and follow up next meeting or one of the next meetings. Good. Okay. All right.

I'd like to move on then. The next committee is the Commerce Subcommittee. And I've handed out two documents. The first

three discussions that the subcommittee had in the areas of aquaculture, quality, seafood safety and and seafood sustainability and certification. subcommittee's discussions grew out committee presentations and discussions the had over the last couple of days. I'd like to, we can either consider a motion on all three or do it separately, but I'd like to have an initial discussion.

Why don't we focus first on aquaculture. Our intent here was to acknowledge the progress that's been And since aquaculture is also a key component of our Vision 2020 Plan, that we look forward to the continued priority being placed on aquaculture by the leadership of NOAA. also wanted to signal our desire to continue to be informed about progress in this area. And with particular emphasis on a focus on commercial scale demonstration projects which came up in the discussions a day or two ago.

And finally, given the fact that there's pending legislation and/or interest in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

increasing the budget, a signal that the committee is willing to be of assistance in some appropriate way, if that's could be helpful to the leadership of NOAA in this important area.

I don't know if the subcommittee members want to add to anything to what I've said on this or any questions by any of the, any of the committee members. John.

We also don't have MR. FORSTER: full information. But in light of the budget report and the possibility that we just lost 3.8 million maybe we want to find some way to urge the administration to walk the talk. which, you know, they're dedicated to aquaculture, committed to aquaculture, I think I heard Bill say yesterday, somehow to get a message back to say, you know, confused, at least." And you know, "Is there anything that could be done to salvage that situation?" Because that would be highly devastating.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Well, this in a generic way, signals that, Bill just said

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that, it's not clear, he doesn't have enough 1 information to know if that money has really 2 disappeared, or not or if it will come back in 3 4 with the House, or in the joint meeting of the 5 House and Senate on the budget. MR. FORSTER: If it does disappear 6 7 I would suggest that in some way, shape or form we might want to find some additional 8 Because that's a big chunk out of all 9 words. 10 the good speeches and things that's been made 11 about aquaculture. Well, CHAIRMAN BILLY: will 12 we would certainly have that opportunity in July. 13 But we could do it by some other means before 14 15 that, if that becomes the case. MR. FORSTER: Yes. Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN BILLY: Now Eric. 17 18 MR. SCHWABB: My only comment, Tom, is this strikes me as a bit passive given the 19 energy that we put in to this issue and the 20 21 role that it plays in content of this 22 document. And I think, language like, you look forward to this 23 know, "We continued

emphasis," could be sort of strengthened by

something to the effect of, "We urge continued emphasis of," you know. And we're kind of put, casting ourselves in the role of, you know, let us know how this worked out, in the second paragraph. You know, we look forward to updating progress. Is there a way that we could of kind of circle a more strongly, a desire to, not only see a level of

a desire to, not only see a level of prioritize this, but be engaged in that discussion. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Thanks. Bill.

MR. DEWEY: To that point, perhaps a friendly amendment would be on that next to last line on the top paragraph. "The committee urges continued emphasis by leadership." And that then on second paragraph, I'd offer a friendly amendment, as It would read, "Much remains to be done well. and MAFAC looks forward to continuing updates on, " and then I would insert, "implementation of the ten year plan, in particular, on the legislation," to change that sentence so that it references the ten year plan.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. So it would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	now read in the first paragraph we would
2	delete the words "look forward to this" and
3	substitute "urges continued emphasis by NOAA
4	leadership." And then in the second
5	paragraph, rather than the word "progress on"
6	and substitute the words, "the ten year plan."
7	So
8	MR. DEWEY: It would read,
9	"Continuing updates on implementation of the
10	ten year plan."
11	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Implementation of.
12	Okay.
13	MR. DEWEY: In particular, on the
14	legislation.
15	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Okay.
16	Ralph.
17	MR. RAYBURN: It seems to me, we
18	would want to have Congress leadership
19	involved in it too. So not just the emphasis
20	by NOAA leadership, but by, you can say,
21	"departmental leadership or Department of
22	Commerce leadership, or something like that.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: How about
24	"Commerce/DOC"?

1	MR. RAYBURN: However it works.
2	Just seems like the Secretary needs to be
3	there.
4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. DOC/NOAA.
5	MR. DEWEY: NOAA/DOC.
6	MR. RAYBURN: DOC/NOAA? DOC/NOAA.
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. Yes, that's
8	fine. Okay. Any other comments? Nope.
9	Okay. Are you interested in a motion to
10	accept this as a motion?
11	MR. RAYBURN: Motion to accept.
12	MR. RAFTICAN: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Second. Any
14	discussion? All in favor say "aye".
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	Anyone opposed?
17	(No reply.)
18	It's approved. All right.
19	The next one is seafood safety and
20	quality. This is based on the briefing by Tim
21	Hansen and further discussion that we had at
22	the subcommittee level.
23	As you can see here, while we
24	acknowledged the progress that's been made,

clearly continuing problems. old. Some new. In that, we felt it might be best to encourage NOAA fisheries to develop a draft strategic plan. And do it cooperatively with the other responsible parties.

Tim Hansen was here for our And acknowledged that Bill had discussion. already asked Tim to lead an effort to develop a more focused strategic plan. So this fits right in with the work you had already started.

then we wanted to, also, more specific terms, as there's this review and plan, planning done to look at options for the role that NOAA could play and the resource implications of that. Recognizing that, currently, it's а user fee program. Apparently, with the exception of Hawaii from what I saw on the earlier, where there's some 500 million thousand dollars for something called seafood inspection.

But anyway, this is, the idea here would be that we would expect to receive 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

briefing in July on the initial draft strategic plan. And have a reasonable length discussion on it at that time. And then have the committee see where we go from there. Any discussion? Tim.

DR. ROBERTS: Tim mentioned, and I think Bill said something about it the other day too, that the service was very close to getting an MOU with FDA. And there was some last May, if in fact that is likely not going to happen, could we encourage it here, in this, Bill, what's the hang up there?

Well, let me tell DR. HOGARTH: This is, is sort of discouraging. you. been working on this for, MOU for probably three years. And we've been over it twice in And Bill has done more than I the last month. There is one the thing the attorneys have. have gotten hung up on. The authority. should be able to be done pretty quick. And they need us right now. They need us. got 35 people we put over there to be trained just so they can go do the work in China. Ιt would be nice to have a statement in here.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	But we're going to push it.
2	MR. RAFTICAN: Do you think you are
3	going to resolve it anyway?
4	DR. HOGARTH: We hope. And I think
5	we will. So.
6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: And my thinking is
7	the strategic would go beyond that. It would
8	build on that.
9	DR. ROBERTS: I was concerned, if
10	you can't even get an MOU, how are you going
11	to get a strategic plan?
12	CHAIRMAN BILLY: And I'm actually
13	going to try to help this process. I have
14	lunch with my former Deputy who is the person
15	in FDA that will sign such an agreement next
16	week, to see if I can encourage/accelerate the
17	process a little bit on NOAA's behalf. All
18	right.
19	Any other comments? Yes. Mark.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: I just want to make
21	sure I understand the action being proposed.
22	It's your asking the agency to go back and
23	draft a strategic plan in cooperation with

these others.

# CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.

DR. HOLLIDAY: And then have that for consideration at your next meeting. We came to the table with a series of questions that were being posed to MAFAC which was sort of the same thing. What are the important that are on your agenda for seafood quality and safety? This was the last slide that was in Tim's presentation. And so it's sort of, you're throwing it back to us. come back with a strategic plan. It would be perhaps something collaborative between and July to try to reveal what your thoughts are about some of the highest priority issues ideas in the area of seafood quality and Because we didn't really didn't get safety. to that level of a discussion after Tim's presentation.

And I think that would be very important to hear your input up-front rather than come up with a strategic plan. And then give it back to you and say, "Oh, well, we really think you ought to focus your energy here, or there, or elsewhere." So I would

### **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

propose perhaps a, somehow, maybe it's imbedded in your text, implicit in your text. But it would be that kind of exchange or, you know, seeking of information on the responses for your questions.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Now, in response, I'll speak for myself. We didn't learn enough in 45 minutes of presentation to feel in a position to provide that kind of input. And so the idea was a more, much more detailed briefing, maybe a half a day session at the July meeting, a better understanding of what FDA is doing. We learned nothing really about the MOU, about where that stands, what the states are doing.

The idea being that the July meeting would then provide that opportunity to have that dialogue as a starting point.

That's why we left it for options so it could be sort of a starting point.

Now, I don't know if anyone else wants to comment or not.

MR. DEWEY: Well, I guess, I would echo your thoughts here. I mean, we had our

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

presentation and raised а fair amount of questions. Between the distinction between inspections the USDA and FDA and the percentages. And needing some clarity that.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Sure.

MR. DEWEY: But clearly, this area of seafood safety is a concern. And if there are ways that a commerce inspection program enhance FDA's efforts, that to me, that key area that I assumed would be was addressed bу this MOA, but needing details on the MOA is important --

And don't get DR. HOLLIDAY: I think that there's not a lot of wronq. information on the table, you know, that MAFAC It's just the way the motion or the experts. report reads is, you want us to go draft a strategic plan. Yes, it has options, but it really would be a more ideal case to draft that in collaboration with MAFAC, as opposed to, after the fact. So maybe it's a draft strategic plan. Our ideas for a strategic plan.

### **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

But if the intent is to have a half day session on seafood safety and quality in July, which is a great idea, I don't think having, you know, us completing a strategic plan for consideration by you at the next meeting is really the precise task that you want us to undertake. If it is, that's fine.

I just want to make sure, when we go back and next week we start talking about what are we going to be doing now, we're going to be drafting a strategic plan or are we developing additional materials for your consideration in developing a broader briefing and information exchange in July?

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Well, a strategic plan often starts with a definition of the problems and the issues. And I'm not, it's not clear to me what are all the problems and issues are. Short term or longer term. And particularly, in the context of our Vision 2020. So, it may not have to be a complete strategic plan. For example, the aquaculture people came back with a rough draft. And it was incomplete. But it had enough there where

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	we could have that dialogue and get some
2	direction. So this maybe the word "draft"
3	isn't clear enough, "draft strategic plan".
4	Or maybe "components of a strategic plan". Or
5	something that makes it clear, we need more
6	information and a general sense of what might
7	be possible to provide our input.
8	DR. HOGARTH: How about a
9	discussion paper on the issues
10	CHAIRMAN BILLY: That's fine too.
11	DR. HOGARTH: Yes. I think what
12	you want is a discussion paper on the issues,
13	you know, facing seafood safety and quality.
14	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. That's
15	good.
16	DR. HOGARTH: And then a discussion
17	in July, you can probably then partial as
18	to which ones do we deal with and which ones
19	we may have to go back to somebody else. But
20	I think part of that would be FDA and
21	authority in the states. Authority, even in
22	enforcement and customs.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.

DR. HOGARTH:

24

That's where we have

all of them, got that issue.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Ken.

DR. ROBERTS: That would be fine with me. I just don't want to lose the emphasis of the last sentence there. In that discussion document, instead of a status report, we'd like to know what's envisioned as the specific role within NOAA fisheries.

That, and I was disturbed the other day by a couple of bullets on Tim's slide. One that said, "Assistance to industry is not within the mission of the agency." I mean it was -- he's the one that put it up. I didn't have to contrive it.

The second one was that, "The agency had assumed the role of that FDA seafood role." Well, how did that happen? You know, will it be a continuing thing in the future, if FDA bails out on certain things? I think you could sharpen those things up for us about where it's actually going to be within the agency, would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. John.

MR. CATES: Maybe somewhat like

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Tim's comment. The President has put out his
2	Food Safety Plan and his Import Safety Plan.
3	And I as part of this discussion in July, I
4	would like to understand how NMFS, the agency,
5	NOAA more broadly fits in that overall plan.
6	So there is a governmental plan being
7	developed and I would hate to have two parts
8	to the Government over here and then NOAA
9	starting on a track separately. I'd just like
10	to see how they fit together.
11	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. That's why
12	we said, "In cooperation with FDA." I know
13	FDA is at the table. I don't know if NOAA
14	fisheries is.
15	MR. CATES: It just says they are,
16	I've asked, so, but maybe that's like saying,
17	"Commerce and safety," maybe not
18	DR. HOGARTH: We have been, in my
19	book, sometimes one of the dilemmas is,
20	sometimes held in by department and not by the
21	people you know.
22	MR. CATES: That's where we're,
23	from a budget standpoint, that where we're
24	pushing for money

DR. HOGARTH: Yes.

MR. CATES: -- is in that area.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: You know, I think there's a lot more unknowns than knowns based on what we've been given so far. The idea of a discussion paper is a great starting point. The idea that there's other things going on, that we're not aware of, like what John brought up, that information should be part of this discussion in July.

Tim sounded kind of proud that one-third of the seafood was inspected. Well, I worry about the other two-thirds. And, are the voluntary inspections only the good guys getting inspected and the bad guys dodging any inspection? And that two-thirds is made up of a lot of bad guys or something. We don't know. So those are the kind of things we need to better understand. As we work down this road.

MR. CATES: Tom, just, I think it's real important. We're not going to meet for another six months. And not to rehash the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

discussion from yesterday morning. But I think it's absolutely important that we not walk away from here and think that Tim's program or the Seafood Inspection Program is a seafood safety program. It is a quality program.

And quality to a processor means, if I'm Kroger and I want my processor to cut 4.6 ounce fillets in a certain shape, that's that's all Tim is checking, from a quality standpoint is, does this meet my customer's specs? He's not going in and doing antibiotic He's not doing and going in and doing Salmonella fillet and other stuff. just real important that we understand that isn't what Tim does when he says 33 percent. He's saying, "33 percent of the stuff you buy at the retail has been inspected by DOC and make sure it's the cut, size, shape that a retailer wants it." And not, and not the the fillet Salmonella type stuff that FDA does. I think that's --

DR. HOGARTH: Yes, this is handling the stuff certainly. But it's not 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

1	MR. CATES: Yes.
2	DR. HOGARTH: they have to have
3	certain standards in there, in the operation.
4	But we don't, we do not do the individual
5	test for it.
6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Bill.
7	MR. DEWEY: I don't know what the
8	status of the MOA might be in, by our meeting
9	in July. I just wonder if it might be helpful
10	to have a FDA representative at that meeting
11	and talk about this
12	CHAIRMAN BILLY: That's a good
13	idea. Other comments? Anyone?
14	(No reply.)
15	Okay. So with the modification of
16	our requesting to develop a discussion paper,
17	I'd look for a motion to, on this item, the
18	seafood safety and quality.
19	MR. FLETCHER: I move.
20	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Second?
21	(No audible reply.)
22	Any further discussion?
23	(No response.)
24	All those in favor say, "aye".

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	Opposed?
3	(No reply.)
4	Okay.
5	DR. HOGARTH: Thank you. John, I
6	went to call on the phone, since I've really
7	been following this budget. It's still 3.4
8	million dollars for aquaculture in there.
9	MR. FORSTER: Excellent.
LO	DR. HOGARTH: 3.4 million. And
L1	there's other money that there's OAR's budget
12	that's been, I think that's for some aqua
L3	budget.
L4	MR. FORSTER: All right. Well,
L5	thank you.
L6	DR. HOGARTH: It did maintain it.
L7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Last item.
L8	There's a Commerce Subcommittee is, the
L9	discussion the full committee had on seafood
20	sustainability and certification.
21	We then took based on that
22	discussion, talked more about this area. And
23	we wanted to acknowledge the progress that's
24	been made particularly on the FishWatch
1	1

website. We wanted to signal clearly that we look forward to the continued expansion of FishWatch, further improvement of it. And there was some suggestions made yesterday which Alan noted. And further promotion of FishWatch. But it -- our discussion, it we weren't clear that just about promotion of FishWatch. And there was quite а strong feeling that NOAA should significantly educational expand and promotional efforts on fisheries management. What's being achieved in the positive sense with particular emphasis on a better public understanding of the national standards, ten standards in sustainability, as NOAA fisheries looks at it.

It was then felt that it would be worthwhile, as we kept discussing it, we were learning about new programs and the --available in the U.S. and other countries. And it would be worthwhile to ask NOAA to take a look at the whole picture and do a review. And then get some sense of what's available in terms of sustainability programs. And, but

### **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 thinking was sort of a matrix, there would be a list and then categories. And that would sort of describe the scope and the approach that's being used, what standards are being applied, any information on costs that's based, and that kind of thing. Obviously, it would be what's possible. that broader picture then would be brought back to NOAA, to MAFAC, as a basis for our further consideration, of this area.

There's also some interest in the possibility that there might be some role for NOAA as an auditor in some capacity. And there were sort of pros and the cons discussed about that. But we wanted to keep that on the table as an idea that we would look at some more, at our next meeting.

So that's that's sort of the discussion. And it's reflected here in this item. Any comments from the committee? Yes. Heather.

MS. McCARTY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What is the, what is the goal of that second paragraph exactly? I guess 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

1	not knowing why we would be so concerned about
2	NOAA auditing these programs, for example. I
3	continue to think that's a bad idea, by the
4	way. But I don't have any objection to it
5	being looked at. But what would be the goal
6	of that exercise? The review exercise. Just
7	information or
8	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. Are the ten
9	national standards, in general use, or is it
10	more are these various programs leaning more
11	on the FAO document? Or both? How is this
12	working? How is it unfolding? And how many
13	countries are there participation in this?
14	Just paint a fuller picture, as a basis, for
15	the committee deciding whether it should pay
16	any further attention to this. And if so, in
17	what way?
18	MS. McCARTY: Okay. I understand,
19	I guess. I'm just wondering whether it's a
20	precursor to
21	CHAIRMAN BILLY: We used the word
22	"study" originally.
23	MS. McCARTY: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

BILLY:

And

then

CHAIRMAN

24

we

1	changed it to kind of "review" to soften it as
2	something less intense and more fact finding.
3	MS. McCARTY: May I just continue?
4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. Sure. Yes.
5	MS. McCARTY: Is it not then a
6	precursor to MAFAC suggesting that NOAA create
7	their own certification program? Because we
8	sort of discarded that concept.
9	CHAIRMAN BILLY: No.
LO	MS. McCARTY: Okay. I'm just
L1	checking
L2	CHAIRMAN BILLY: We didn't have
L3	that in mind.
L4	MS. McCARTY: because it might
L5	just be sort of a relic of that discussion.
L6	And I'm wondering if
L7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: I don't think so.
L8	MS. McCARTY: we're not thinking
L9	about doing something, recommending something
20	like that or that we need to have someone
21	undertake this exercise.
22	CHAIRMAN BILLY: I don't think that
23	was suggested when we had our discussion at
24	all.

MS. McCARTY: Okay. I was just curious.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: One point that I thought really was a good one was brought up at the meeting by John, was that, we we also are interested in knowing just how far the certification programs are going, in terms of determinating whether or not the management is adequate. And in fact, becoming an oversight for NOAA fisheries and pointing the fingers at, "You can do more or we're going to cancel out the certification." I mean, that that was a concern.

Another point, and this kind of bridges over to the issue before, and that is, I asked, "How much work had been done helping to educate the private and the public as to the best way to maintain their products quality?" And Jim suggested, at that point, that maybe the best place for something, on that, is in the FishWatch. And while FishWatch is identified here, under "Certification", it certainly made sense

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

me, that if there is something in FishWatch that is expanded to encourage consideration by the private recreational handler of seafood quality, and here's some ways you can do it. But that's another reason why people might want to go to FishWatch, is to get that information. So --

MS. McCARTY: That's a good idea.

MR. FLETCHER: -- those are the thoughts I had.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes. Jim

Tom, this is just to MR. GILMORE: clarify in that second paragraph. As part of this review, I'd like to come back to the the motion from the previous meeting the encouraging meeting between NOAA leadership and the MSC since they are dominant program. To say, "Your program, this voluntary program that industry engages in, to some extent, does impose time commitments and agency. And the condition costs on the setting process, while it's improved, is still not perfect." And so, I guess I, as opposed to just a stand back review of the programs, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	would like there to be some dialogue between
2	the principal ecolabeling group and the agency
3	to
4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Our assumption was
5	that that meeting has not occurred.
6	DR. HOGARTH: No. It hasn't. It's
7	occurring somewhere between some of the
8	people in the Alaska but not as a whole,
9	no. And they should. That's something I
LO	didn't follow through on, basically, in time.
L1	But we can get that done. We can get that
L2	done.
L3	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Should we add a
L4	sentence in this second paragraph then?
L5	MR. GILMORE: I think as long as
L6	it's clear to the Agency that's what's
L7	imbedded in here and
L8	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay.
L9	DR. HOGARTH: Just let the minutes,
20	I think, of the meeting reflect that we will
21	report back to you by July.
22	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Ralph.
23	MR. RAYBURN: Wasn't there
24	something in there, Jim, about other countries

well? I mean, as I recall there was a group of countries that you listed that all NMFS -- for pulling those countries together and facing MSC together and come up with some unity, as far as, accepting that programs of sophisticated infrastructure program on fisheries management as being complete. just check off that section of "adequate management" on the MSC certification process.

Is that still kind of the idea or is it --

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Well, I think, you know, to -- John and I have talked about this. That we think it would be in the fisheries service interest to talk to the New Zealand Government and the Canadian Government that appear to be having independent conversations with the MSC to get а management system checkoff. And that, just strategically, seems like it would be better if those three governments were working together in getting a deal from the MSC rather than each government negotiating that separately.

So I guess some outreach to DFO and the New Zealand fisheries.

## **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	DR. HOGARTH: That's another reason
2	Canada but not New Zealand. In fact, I
3	think Canada, I found out I need to check
4	my notes, Canada was supposed to get New
5	Zealand, to get the three of us together. And
6	they haven't done it, that's all but they
7	took that on to do it.
8	CHAIRMAN BILLY: And that's a
9	little bit why this wording is the way it is,
10	in terms of, "And other countries to evaluate
11	approaches, scope, standards," see how folks
12	are playing this. What's going on that might
13	be instructional for NOAA and/or whether this
14	committee should do anything else.
15	DR. HOGARTH: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Heather.
17	MS. McCARTY: Yes. You might also
18	add the State of Alaska to that. Considering
19	that's one of the larger programs that's in
20	the program. Alaska. And they've been
21	through a recertification which is, was
22	extremely problematic.
23	DR. HOGARTH: And there's some
24	issues developing with the EU group, the

1	network.
2	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Any other
3	comments? Bill.
4	MR. DEWEY: You mentioned earlier
5	in your discussion about the application of
6	the FAO guidelines for ecolabeling. I just
7	wonder if it would be a friendly amendment in
8	the second sentence of that second paragraph,
9	"In this review, considerations should be
10	given to inserting the application of FAC
11	guidelines for ecolabeling." And a new
12	sentence, "And the need for third party
13	auditors."
14	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Moving to -
15	_
16	MR. DEWEY: "The application of FAC
17	guidelines for ecolabeling. And the need for
18	third party."
19	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Did you get
20	that?
21	MS. KATSOUROS: application to
22	FAO guidelines.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: FAO guidelines for
24	ecolabeling.

1	MR. DEWEY: For ecolabeling.
2	CHAIRMAN BILLY: "And the need for
3	third party auditors." And the rest of the
4	sentence. Okay.
5	Any other comments or suggestions
6	to any okay. Motion to accept this.
7	DR. ROBERTS: So moved.
8	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Second.
9	(No audible reply.)
10	Okay. All those opposed say "aye".
11	(Laughter.)
12	(Off mic comments.)
13	CHAIRMAN BILLY: I know. You guys
14	are awake.
15	All those in favor say "aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	All right. Passed. Okay. Okay.
18	One other thing. We also passed
19	out a draft letter. Which we've shared with
20	Bill. Which focuses on an opportunity to
21	influence an ongoing effort by NOAA's Office
22	of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.
23	Bill, I don't know if you want to
24	say anything.

MR. DEWEY: Yes. I can speak to
it. I raised this is in the Commerce
Subcommittee. We didn't talk about it
yesterday, but amongst the material passed out
to us, was a paper title "The Top Ten Concepts
for an Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management
Act of 2008." And this two pager is a work
product from the Coastal States Organization
and the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource
Management and their envisioning efforts for
listening sessions they've done around the
country over the past year. And I've tried,
at least through listening sessions out in the
west coast, to draw attention to the fact that
a lot of the aquaculture development
opportunities in marine waters are in near
shore state waters. And we could go a lot, a
long ways towards achieving Congress's goals
for aquaculture development if states were
encouraged to do some comprehensive planning
within the state laws, if accommodated.

So on number 6, finding number 6 on the second page of this document, it talks about each coastal state would prepare a

management plan that would have measurable objectives to address national priorities, protecting habitat such as, and making communities more resilient to coastal hazards and climate change. What I, we suggested through this letter is that, they consider amongst those national priorities to aquaculture to the list.

And so that's what we had, thought we recommend is a letter that would go from Dr. Hogarth to Admiral Lautenbacher, copying Jack Dunnigan, AA for NOS. To try to draw attention to this.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Just one technical -- though I may have misunderstood your question when you asked me earlier about the origin of it. The actual document is a product of NOS, as informed by, the listening sessions and other inputs that NOS receives. So it's not a product of the Coastal States Organization itself.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The ten principles, the ten principles document is an NOS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	synthesis of what they have heard throughout
2	their process of developing positions on
3	reauthorization of the coastal zone
4	management.
5	MR. DEWEY: So the letter is still
6	accurate, though the way it reads, I believe
7	omitted that. Do we need to amend the letter
8	to reflect what you just said? Or I think
9	it still works the way it's worded.
10	DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, okay.
11	MR. DEWEY: If it needs to be
12	amended, just say so Mark.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: No. I just it
14	implies as if the top ten concepts was a
15	product of both OCRM and the Coastal States as
16	their, as a joint product was how I was
17	reading it.
18	MR. DEWEY: Okay. How would you
19	suggest it be edited to be more accurate?
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: At the end of the
21	title, "As prepared by the NOAA Ocean
22	Service." So, "Was presented with the top ten
23	concepts for an integrated coastal ocean zone

management act of 2008, as prepared by --

1	MR. DEWEY: NOS.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: NOAA's Ocean
3	Service.
4	MR. DEWEY: Okay.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Because I just
6	wouldn't want the Coastal States Organization
7	to think that that we were that was
8	their work product that we were dealing with.
9	MR. DEWEY: Thanks for that
LO	clarification.
L1	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. I don't
L2	think this requires approval. It's a letter
L3	from you to the Admiral. Unless the committee
L4	feels otherwise. Are there any objections to
L5	any problems to this? It's a good idea.
L6	You can accept
L7	DR. HOGARTH: Yes. Yes. We are
L8	going to do a letter review, this memo type
L9	thing that we do, internal. But it says the
20	same thing.
21	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Okay.
22	Okay. RecFish. Bob, is there anything you
23	further you need to report on or?
24	MR FLETCHER: Only Mr Chairman

that the Executive Steering Committee of the
Marine Recreational Improvement Program will
be meeting again in the next several months to
get an update on the progress. And it might
be appropriate for me to provide that to, the
listserv for MAFAC, so that everyone is
informed as to the progress of that. And then
we'll have the item again brought up for the
July meeting to get us a further okay.
CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Okay. Any
other questions? No. Heather.
MS. McCARTY: Are we at the end of
the business part and or do we have further
to go?
CHAIRMAN BILLY: We've got one more
item related to Vision 2020. And then we're -
_
MS. McCARTY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BILLY: I'm going to
open for new business
MS. McCARTY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BILLY: or other
points.
MS. McCARTY: Well, I guess I'll

just ask the question now then. This report 1 that goes to the Secretary from the 2 meeting, is that in the form of minutes or is 3 4 it a compilation? 5 DR. HOLLIDAY: Minutes. MS. McCARTY: Minutes. And the 6 7 motions that were passed and so on. sure that the members get that. If they do, 8 I've disregarded it in the past. I was just 9 wondering if it was sent out to the members, 10 11 as well, so that we also have a record of --DR. HOLLIDAY: I believe it is. 12 MS. McCARTY: Is it? 13 DR. HOLLIDAY: 14 Yes. 15 MS. McCARTY: Okay. Chairman Billy: I've gotten the --16 DR. HOLLIDAY: Because for the June 17 meeting, Laurel prepared the document. 18 that summarized the meeting and the motions. 19 It's a summary of what is in the transcription 20 and including the major issues discussed, the 21 recommendations, actions, and 22 resolutions. that's the basis that is then transmitted And 23

with a cover sheet and the other bureaucracy,

1	up the line to
2	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
3	DR. HOLLIDAY: the department.
4	MS. McCARTY: I was just going to
5	suggest that you copy the whole group with the
6	exact report that goes to the Secretary.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: Well it is. That's
8	the, that's the document.
9	MS. McCARTY: That's the document.
10	Thank you.
11	DR. HOLLIDAY: We have letters of
12	transmittal that's, that from Bill to the
13	Secretary saying, "This is the report of
14	MAFAC." But there's nothing within that other
15	than a transmittal.
16	MS. McCARTY: Okay. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Yes. Tom.
18	MR. RAFTICAN: We have a charter,
19	today, report also.
20	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. The floor
21	is yours.
22	MR. RAFTICAN: Thank you. There's
23	been a MAFAC Charter Committee meeting earlier
24	this morning. Members discussed the re-

authorization, potential changes to charter. And I think actually, if I can steal a quote from Mr. Gilmore, he hit it pretty much on the nose, where we were going was to help place MAFAC as a valuable contributor to the Secretary and Administrator. And I think, if to categorize the discussions here that was probably be the end around results.

agreed to ferret Mark out some earlier MAFAC charters and some other background material. We will distribute that to the committee electronically. And after we get that around and time to digest, have a conference call set for sometime late in spring. will back from t.hat. We come conference call and bring draft recommendations to the full MAFAC in New York. Any other comments from the committee?

(No reply.)

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Okay. The next item is the Vision 2020, the final document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	MR. RAFTICAN: You don't need to
2	adopt that report?
3	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Your report?
4	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN BILLY: I don't
6	MR. RAFTICAN: It's the committee
7	report?
8	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Your working
9	group?
LO	DR. HOLLIDAY: The working group.
L1	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.
L2	DR. HOLLIDAY: Do I hear a motion?
L3	Second?
L4	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.
L5	DR. HOLLIDAY: So moved.
L6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: So moved.
L7	Seconded. Okay. Any discussion? All those
L8	in favor say "aye".
L9	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	All those opposed.
21	(No reply.)
22	Passed. There you go. You got it.
23	Sorry. Well done. All right.

acknowledge the work that Mary Hope and her assistants have done in helping this committee develop what I think is a really very good document. So I'd like a round of applause for them.

(Applause.)

Okay. And over lunch we talked a little about this. And they think by the end of the month they will have the complete document with, including all the reference materials and the rest of it, ready to go.

And at that time, then my suggestion is that, we formally send it to the Secretary, and the Undersecretary, whoever is appropriate in ocean policy, follow up group, whatever that's called. And anyone else who is appropriate as a next significant step.

DR. HOGARTH: Probably good to send it to the councils too. I think --

CHAIRMAN BILLY: Councils. That's good.

DR. HOGARTH: Send one to the chairman of the council. Different heads of councils.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. How do we
2	want to do that? A cover letter from you or -
3	- yes.
4	MR. O'SHEA: It seems to me that
5	this body exists to advise Dr. Hogarth and the
6	chain up. And I, and I think it would be more
7	appropriate for that going to the councils
8	from Dr. Hogarth or the Vice Admiral.
9	DR. HOGARTH: I think we'll tell
10	this committee that we would, we would submit
11	it to other responding commissions and to the
12	councils. And maybe to some of the state
13	directors is probably how we would do it.
14	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Now we were
15	responding to your request
16	DR. HOGARTH: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN BILLY: anyway.
18	MS. KATSOUROS: I'll make certain
19	that I have a draft formed by the
20	DR. HOGARTH: I think you submitted
21	something and we'll, then we'll take care of
22	it.
23	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay.
24	DR. HOGARTH: Make sure it gets

1	distribution it should, yes.
2	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Do we need
3	to do anything more as a committee then, other
4	than get it completed? And you'll follow up
5	on that.
6	DR. HOGARTH: All you need to do is
7	submit it. When you finish with it. And you
8	give it to us. That's it.
9	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Heather.
10	MS. McCARTY: Do we need to adopt
11	it in its amended form by a motion or?
12	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Should we do that?
13	MS. McCARTY: We haven't even seen
14	it.
15	MS. KATSOUROS: You've approved it
16	once.
17	MS. McCARTY: Right.
18	MS. KATSOUROS: This will be the
19	second time of approval.
20	MS. McCARTY: Right. It's being
21	added to, as per the discussions.
22	MS. KATSOUROS: Correct.
23	MS. McCARTY: So it's it's slightly
24	different in some ways. But bot much.

1	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Do I hear a
2	specific motion?
3	MS. McCARTY: I move that MAFAC
4	adopt Vision 2020 as their vision of the
5	future for U.S. fisheries.
6	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Second.
7	(No reply.)
8	Discussion. Okay. Seen none.
9	All those in favor say "aye".
10	(Chorus of ayes.)
11	Any opposed.
12	(No reply.)
13	Passed. Thanks.
14	MS. KATSOUROS: And it was a
15	pleasure working with MAFAC in producing this
16	document. And working before a holiday. We
17	enjoyed it
18	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Ralph.
19	MR. RAYBURN: I mean, until it
20	becomes formal, I guess, I guess the one
21	thought I had was, you know, there was some
22	back and forth. And folks saw it. But, I
23	mean, what happens if they discovered that

there was an editorial --

1	CHAIRMAN BILLY: We'll fix it in
2	July.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Okay. That's fine.
4	No, no. That's fine.
5	CHAIRMAN BILLY: At some point you
6	got to
7	MR. RAYBURN: Sometimes you've got
8	to shut it off. No, I appreciate that.
9	Trust.
LO	MS. McCARTY: I should just say
L1	that the committee worked on this and put in
L2	all of the changes that were recommended by
L3	the full group. As far as we know. I mean,
L4	we all had notes. And we were real
L5	persnickety about it. And I don't think we
L6	screwed it up. That's all.
L7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. I think
L8	we've dealt with the action items. Are there
L9	any other action items that anyone can think
20	of? I mean, we've talked already about the
21	meeting in July and the location.
22	DR. HOGARTH: I want to bring up a
23	point to that. And just so you can think
24	about it. You know, the meeting is in July,

the election is in November. You normally
meet again in December. Which is fine. You
know, there would be a lot of flux as far as
December is concerned. You know, I don't
know, maybe, probably December meeting or it's
not, but you won't know a lot about what's
what. But you can continue to work. I don't
know if it's better to meet right after the
election so that you know who it is. And if
it's the things you want to get in to the
process, you would have a better chance, you
know, time to do it. So you just want to
think, do you want to do it in November and do
it or do you want to do it in December. I
think is the only thing just
CHAIRMAN BILLY: Well the
transition team will be in place, whoever it
is, in December.
DR. HOGARTH: But it will be
CHAIRMAN BILLY: We could invite
them.
DR. HOGARTH: November the 9 <sup>th</sup> ,

CHAIRMAN BILLY: That's right.

1	DR. HOGARTH: So from my
2	prospective, it will probably be better off to
3	meet in December, at the meeting. And maybe
4	someone will come by.
5	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay.
6	DR. HOGARTH: And that might be
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: So yes.
8	MR. RAFTICAN: Just a suggestion is
9	that, you know, Randy had talked about meeting
10	in Hawaii.
11	CHAIRMAN BILLY: He did?
12	MR. RAFTICAN: I don't know, the
13	only way I think you can get a transition team
14	to go anywhere is just maybe
15	(Laughter.)
16	DR. HOGARTH: Little piece of
17	advice. I'm still explaining, as I leave the
18	door, I leave the building, a MAFAC meeting in
19	Puerto Rico in 2000 to a, to a good Senator
20	from Oklahoma.
21	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes.
22	DR. HOGARTH: You travel to Puerto
23	Rico, Hawaii, or Alaska, you should supposed
24	to, two-three years after, explain who went

1	and why they went. So maybe there isn't much,
2	if you that want to do that.
3	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Back in `96, when
4	I was named Administrator of FSIS, I held a
5	meeting in Solomon's Island, you know, on the
6	eastern shore. And somehow it got mixed up.
7	And they thought I had called a meeting of all
8	the senior staff in the Solomon Islands in the
9	South Pacific. You should have seen the
10	letters I got bombarded with. For years. So
11	I sympathize with that.
12	DR. HOGARTH: No. I just think it
13	probably would be better to meet in Washington
14	for that time frame. There will be a lot of
15	stuff going on and
16	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Is there
17	DR. HOGARTH: it may get
18	CHAIRMAN BILLY: does everyone
19	agree with that?
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: No, I have can
21	you guys meet in Texas?
22	MR. RAYBURN: Not in, not in
23	December. We won't be there. If I could,
24	there was some mention yesterday or the day

1	before from Tony about a carry over of this
2	class of `02 or something like that. And I
3	didn't know whether that was going to happen.
4	It would be helpful though, at any rate, if
5	there could be a, you know, an announcement
6	for nominations and stuff like that. Because
7	there's going to be a fairly substantial
8	representation that will leave the MAFAC after
9	October next year. I mean, we talked about it
10	in July. But the process seemed like for
11	nominations and stuff might, just keep it on
12	the burner, you know, so there is a good
13	transition. You'd be leaving folks like
14	Gilmore, you know, are going to go. I don't
15	know how you fill that void. So and Tony.
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: It's not my
17	decision.
18	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes, but you would
19	
20	DR. HOGARTH: Let's discuss this.
21	Mark and I have not discussed this. Let me do
22	that with him. And we'll, we will, before I
23	leave, put something down on

And

I'm

RAYBURN:

MR.

24

not,

understand, I'm not pushing for, other than, it like under the seems current it would be helpful administration, to get the MAFAC appointments made before you have, because you're having such, so many people that are scheduled to, terms expire, have that done before, you before you have the change in administration.

 $$\operatorname{DR.}$$  HOGARTH: We need to talk. I have --

CHAIRMAN BILLY: A third each time.

DR. HOGARTH: A third each time.

MR. FLETCHER: You know, we identified ten slots that are going to be gone after October. And we had said, "Only seven should be replaced. of those And three depending on who puts their name in, should be given one extra year on MAFAC." So we don't have a ten person change. If that's what we're going to do, then the three that are identified to stay on, should be then sooner rather than later. So that you know who those other seven are, that are going off. And you

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 need to --

1	may want to replace them with someone from a
2	similar industry rather than not know that.
3	So I mean, it's important that this one
4	element be determined soon. So that when you
5	go after nominations, you're only going after
6	the seven that will be going out.
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: So we'll take that
8	in to consideration in discussions. Okay.
9	Any other business? That's
10	Dorothy.
11	MS. LOWMAN: Well, it was really
12	nice that we gave Laurel the plaque. But some
13	of us were talking later and we thought it
14	would also be nice to get her a gift. So
15	Heather and I went out at noon. And we got
16	her one of the tiles made by Carol's
17	significant other. So, we just wanted to let
18	you know we're going to send it, you know,
19	hopefully with someone who's going back to
20	D.C. Because she's already left. And we're
21	going to, you know, on behalf of MAFAC.
22	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Thank you for
23	doing that.

MS. McCARTY: So you can look at

1	it. It's right over here.
2	MS. LOWMAN: You can look at it.
3	It's right over here.
4	MS. McCARTY: Several people
5	contributed. But because it's a big deal so -
6	_
7	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Okay. Any other
8	business?
9	MR. RAYBURN: Somebody going to say
LO	goodbye to Bill?
L1	DR. HOGARTH: You've said that many
L2	times. Thanks.
L3	MR. RAYBURN: Absolutely,
L4	absolutely Bill. I mean, you're a jewel. And
L5	our nation has been well served. I won't say
L6	it right, but our nation has been well served
L7	with you presence throughout your career. And
L8	I appreciate, personally, the opportunity to
L9	serve on MAFAC. And it wouldn't have happened
20	unless because of your reinvigorating this
21	outfit. And I think it's been successful
22	because of you. And I know they'll never
23	replace you. But I hope there's someone that

can carry on and keep the momentum going.

I wish you well. And I hope you being in the 1 2 Gulf makes us closer neighbors and that I'll paths will cross even more than they have in 3 4 But thank you very much for your 5 service and your friendship. (Applause.) 6 CHAIRMAN BILLY: You have the final 7 word. 8 9 DR. HOGARTH: Just thank you very Great group to work with. much. And it's 10 11 just so many good things about fisheries and talented associated fisheries 12 SO many Great to deal with. And I think existing. 13 we've got so much potential. And I just hope 14 15 reach that potential. And have the But thank you all 16 opportunity. for doing You don't get paid for doing it. 17 know all of you have other jobs and all that. 18 But it's more significant, you take the time 19

MR. CATES: Can you be nominated to sit on MAFAC now?

DR. HOGARTH: Yes.

(Laughter.)

Thanks.

## NEAL R. GROSS

to do it.

20

21

22

23

1	MS. LOWMAN: I'm sorry. But
2	there's somebody else who's sort of leaving
3	our and she's been a great assistant.
4	Well, she's not leaving NOAA. But I
5	understand she's no longer going to be not
6	answering those frantic calls about, "I can't
7	figure out how to deal with this travel
8	agency." And so I think that we should also
9	recognize the immense amount of support that
10	Tywanna has been to this group.
11	CHAIRMAN BILLY: Yes, absolutely.
12	Thank you, Tywanna.
13	(Applause.)
14	And Mark for his input, as well. I
15	thought this was really a very good meeting.
16	They did a lot of
17	(Applause.)
18	All right. This meeting is
19	adjourned.
20	(Whereupon, the above entitled
21	matter was concluded at 2:49 p.m.)
22	
23	

		17