U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2006

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met at 9:00 a.m. at the International Game Fish Association, 300 Gulf Stream Way, Dania, Florida 33004, Dr. William T. Hogarth, Vice Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

MATITITW	т	TIOCADMIT	77: 00	Chair	Assistant
WILLIAM	'T'.	H()(+ARTH	Vice	Chair.	ASSISTANT

Administrator for Fisheries

RUSSELL PORTER Pacific States Marine

Fisheries Commission

LARRY SIMPSON Gulf States Marine

Fisheries Commission

ROB KRAMER International Game Fish Assn.

STEVE JONER Makah Fisheries Mgmt.
CHRIS DORSETT Gulf of Mexico Fish
Conservation Director

Lonservacion Director

TOM J. BILLY International Food Safety

Consultants, LLC

TOM RAFTICAN United Anglers of CA
JOHN V. O'SHEA Atlantic States Marine

Fisheries Commission

ERIC C. SCHWAAB International Assn. of

Fish & Wildlife Agencies

ROY CRABTREE NOAA

LAUREL G. BRYANT Executive Officer, MAFAC

ANTHONY D. DiLERNIA Office of Maritime Technology

STEVE MURAWSKI NOAA

NEAL R. GROSS

JIM BALSINGER NOAA

JAMES D. COOK Pacific Ocean Producers
PETER P. LEIPZIG Fishermen's Marketing

Association

MARY BETH NICKELL-TOOLEY East Coast Pelagic

Association

RALPH RAYBURN Texas Sea-Grant

College Program

HEATHER D. McCARTY Heather McCarty & Assoc.
KENNETH J. ROBERTS Louisiana State University

AgCenter

DOROTHY M. LOWMAN Natural Resource

Consultant

ROBERT FLETCHER Sportfishing Assn. of CA

ALSO PRESENT:

REBECCA LENT Director, International

Affairs, NOAA Fisheries

SUSAN BUNSICK NOAA Aquaculture

RACHEL O'MALLEY NOAA/OCS
CAROLINE PARK NOAA
ALAN RISENHOOVER NOAA

LINDA CHAVES Seafood Industry Issues

GORDON HELM NOAA JASON SCHRATWIESER IGFA

DIANNE BEHRINGER Florida Sea-Grant
MARK WORTH Food & Water Watch

AGENDA ITEM PAGE CALL TO ORDER: Bill Hogarth 4 INTRODUCTIONS: 7 AGENDA REVIEW: Bill Hogarth 13/31 Tony DiLernia 26 ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES: Laurel Bryant 35 QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: 53 STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY AWARDS: Bill Hogarth 59 QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 62 OFFSHORE AQUACULTURE AND 2005 LEGISLATION BILL: Bill Hogarth 75 Susan Bunsick 80 OUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 90 FOOD AND WATER WATCH IN WASHINGTON, D.C.: Mark Worth 133 SEAFOOD HEALTH AND SAFETY: QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 157 NMFS OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 187 HURRICANE IMPACTS AND RECOVERY OVERVIEW: Steve Murawski 251 Roy Crabtree 283 QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 289 REVIEW AND PLAN FOR NEXT DAY: Bill Hogarth 317 ADJOURN: Bill Hogarth 319

NEAL R. GROSS

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

9:10 a.m.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: If I could have your attention, we'll get started this morning. Despite illness and bunch of schedule the snow and а conflicts, we finally were able to get together and have the meeting that we've looked forward to this There's a lot of things we would like to talk We would really like to have a good discussion on Thursday as to where we want to really focus MAFAC next year. We have a lot of issues and we would like to do it.

And also, I guess, you all saw the Washington Post on Monday. If you didn't, there's an article in which both NOAA and IGFA are mentioned about the size of fish. So anyway, that's a good opening, I guess, for the meeting here at IGFA and NOAA and IGFA were mentioned in the same article.

We have new members at this meeting that we have for the 2005/2008 term. On Tab 2 you will see the membership, but we had approximately 31 people nominated and so we've tried to look at, you know, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

geographics and all to select the new members to make sure we got the different topics and areas covered.

We were sort of slack on PGO nominations this year if you would like to see those.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. We're losing the sound here.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Oh. Ready?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Before I forget it, we need to make sure that when you speak you identify yourself. It's very difficult for the reporter to see the names, so when you speak, just identify yourself. We have eight new members. I think five of them are in attendance today.

We have one that could not attend, Bill Dewey, who represents Taylor Shellfish from the State of Washington. He's at the aquiculture meeting, rural aquiculture. Jim Donofrio, Recreational Fishing Alliance, his father passed away, so he's not here. And then Catherine Foy from Aleutians East Borough, Steller Sea Lion work, just had a little baby girl, so she's not here. But we do have five here.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now, before we go around the room to introduce yourselves, I would like to thank Rob Kramer and the IGFA for having the meeting, sponsoring the meeting here. It's a great place to look at the history of some of the recreational fishing and I think it's really -- you need to take time and look not only here, but next door. And it shows you quite a bit of the recreational fishing and the history of this country and just how important it is.

I also want to give special thanks to Emily Collins. I don't even think she is in here, but she works with Rob. She has kept Laurel straight all week in getting this set up, so she did that, folks. She deserves a special thank you. And always we need to thank Laurel. She does a great job with MAFAC and she really wants to make sure everything goes well.

We do have a sign-in sheet out front. If anyone signs in, wants to sign-in and we will consider the topic if someone wants to speak. It will probably depend on the nature of the topic. We will probably allow them to speak to the group later.

And so we also have here from my staff --

NEAL R. GROSS

	well, let's go aloulid the room litst. Russell, do you
2	want to start down there?
3	MR. PORTER: Okay. I'm Russell Porter
4	from Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. I'm
5	sitting in this week for Randy Fisher, our director,
6	who is the Committee Member, and he is on vacation in
7	Thailand.
8	MR. SIMPSON: I'm Larry Simpson, Gulf
9	States Marine Fisheries Commission.
10	MR. KRAMER: And I'm Rob Kramer,
11	International Game Fish Association.
12	MR. JONER: Good morning, I'm Steve Joner
13	with the Makah Indian Tribe of Washington State.
14	MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett with The Ocean
15	Conservancy in Austin, Texas.
16	MR. BILLY: Tom Billy, International Food
17	Safety Consulting.
18	MR. RAFTICAN: Good morning, Tom Raftican,
19	United Anglers.
20	CAPTAIN O'SHEA: Good morning, I'm Vince
21	O'Shea, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.
22	MR. SCHWAAB: Eric Schwaab, International

1	Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.
2	DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, I'm the
3	Southeast Regional Administrator of NOAA Fisheries.
4	MS. BRYANT: Laurel Bryant, Executive
5	Director for MAFAC, NOAA Fisheries.
6	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Bill Hogarth,
7	Director of NOAA Fisheries.
8	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Tony DiLernia, Maritime
9	Technology, City University of New York, Kingsborough
10	College.
11	DR. MURAWSKI: Steve Murawski, NOAA
12	Fisheries.
13	MR. BALSINGER: Jim Balsinger, I'm the
14	Regional Administrator for NOAA Fisheries in general
15	working right now as a deputy for Bill.
16	CAPTAIN COOK: Jim Cook from Pacific Ocean
17	Producers in Honolulu.
18	MR. LEIPZIG: Pete Leipzig with the
19	Fishermen's Marketing Association.
20	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Mary Beth Tooley,
21	East Coast Pelagic Association.
22	MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn, Texas Sea-

1	Grant Program.
2	MS. McCARTY: I'm Heather McCarty. I'm
3	from Juneau, Alaska and I represent commercial
4	fishermen's interest in Alaska and the north Pacific.
5	DR. ROBERTS: I'm Ken Roberts, Louisiana
6	State University.
7	MS. LOWMAN: Dorothy Lowman, a consultant
8	based on Portland, Oregon.
9	MR. FLETCHER: Bob Fletcher, I'm with the
10	Sportfishing Association of California.
11	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And we do have one
12	vacant seat. Dr. Pizzini from Puerto Rico has
13	resigned. He said he just didn't have enough time to
14	do it, so we'll be looking at probably next week
15	getting a replacement for that. Let's go around the
16	room in the back here. I hate to keep my back to you
17	people.
18	DR. LENT: Rebecca Lent, NOAA Fisheries
19	International Affairs.
20	COURT REPORTER: You have to get in front
21	of a microphone. I'm sorry, I can't hear you.
22	DR. LENT: Rebecca Lent, NOAA Fisheries

1	International Affairs.
2	MS. BUNSICK: Susan Bunsick, NOAA
3	Aquiculture Program.
4	COURT REPORTER: Those microphones are not
5	on.
6	MS. BUNSICK: Susan Bunsick, NOAA
7	Aquiculture Program.
8	MS. O'MALLEY: Rachel O'Malley, NOAA
9	Fisheries, Office of Constituent Services.
LO	MS. PARK: Caroline Park, NOAA general
L1	counsel.
L2	MR. RISENHOOVER: Alan Risenhoover, Office
L3	of Sustainable Fisheries with NOAA.
L4	MS. CHAVES: Linda Chaves, NOAA Fisheries,
L5	Senior Advisor, Seafood Industry Issues.
L6	MR. HELM: Gordon Helm, Office of
L7	Constituent Services, NOAA Fisheries.
L8	MR. SCHRATWIESER: Jason Schratwieser,
L9	IGFA.
20	MS. BEHRINGER: Dianne Behringer, Florida
21	Sea-Grant.
22	MR. WORTH: Good morning, I'm Mark Worth

1	from Food and Water Watch. We're a nonprofit consumer
2	group in Washington.
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Thanks.
4	Before I go on, Tony, would you like to add anything?
5	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: No, thank you.
6	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tony and I didn't
7	have an opportunity to sit down and talk about how
8	this meeting would be run, so bear with us as we play
9	off of each other, I guess, for a while until we get
10	the opportunity to talk. But we will figure that out.
11	A couple of things I would like to discuss and, Roy,
12	do you want to say anything since we're in your part
13	of the world?
14	MR. KRAMER: Can't say.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Can't say it from
16	there.
17	MR. KRAMER: I would just like to welcome
18	all of you here to the southeast region. Our region
19	runs from North Carolina through Texas and includes
20	Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and our regional
21	office is about 250 miles from here in the Tampa Bay
22	area. Just down the road though is the Southeast

Fishery Science Center, which is headquartered here in Miami.

And I want to welcome you all here. Unfortunately, I think you are here on probably the coldest day of the year that we have had in Florida, although from what I'm seeing on the news, it's a heck of a lot better here right now than it is in a lot of places, particularly up in the northeast.

But if you get a chance to travel around the area some, even here in Fort Lauderdale, you'll probably notice that there are signs that are down, road signs, signs that are partly down, and you'll see a lot of trees where the tops are all broken and mangled and they don't grow like that down here normally. And what you are seeing is remnants of hurricane damage here in this area, and it's probably Hurricane Wilma that came through.

But if you were to travel north of here just a little bit into the Sebastian area, you would see the area that was hit by Hurricane Gene and Hurricane Francis two years ago. And if you went south into the Keys, there was a lot of damage and

NEAL R. GROSS

extensive flooding from Hurricane Wilma. And the Spiny Lobster Fishery lost probably 50 percent or more of their traps and Stone Crab Fishery has really been affected.

So, you know, we have a lot of fishery challenges down here, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico, but over the last couple of years hurricanes have kind of put everything into sort of a back seat.

And so keep that in mind as you're down here. I know that's on the agenda at some point this week to talk about a little bit, but that's certainly high on our list of concerns and how we ought to manage fisheries in light of the storms and what we have been through here is a real challenge.

So again, I welcome you here. It's a beautiful facility if you have never been here at IGFA before. I don't know anywhere you can go and see more big stuffed fish hanging on the wall, so it's really an interesting place to walk through and look around, a lot of history here of recreational fishing that Rod and Jason can talk to you about. So I look forward to meeting all of you.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Thanks. We'll talk a little bit now, go over the agenda a little bit. We will talk about the Offshore Aquiculture Bill. I'll do a lot of that, but Susan Bunsick is here who will help. We wanted to talk a little bit about the status and talk about the legislation, how we can -- this is a policy of the administration and we would like to finally, you know, discuss some strategies for getting it through.

Right now, we have no one in the House side, to be honest with you, that has sponsored it. Senator Stevens has planned it. He said in March we have a hearing on the Bill on the Senate side and so we would like to have a good thorough discussion here of the strategies and things we need to do. Then we're going to talk a little bit about seafood health and safety.

You know, I guess one of the 10, one of my 10 goals earlier was seafood promotion and it still is. I think we need to try not only to manage fisheries, but we need to support the fishing industry. And I think seafood promotion is a very

NEAL R. GROSS

good way to do this and I think health and safety risk is sort of something to speak of. You read about them every day.

I got here this weekend in St. Pete and got a place and Sunday night I listened to the news and it said people are getting sick from eating grouper. And two women, they showed two women, one of them looked pretty healthy to me, but she said that she ate grouper 16 years ago and she was still having effects from it. And the other one was with a cane walking around and said she got, you know, sick from eating grouper.

And at the end of the program they finally said these are the only two cases that we found out of millions of people who eat grouper every day. And I thought well, you know, you've got to put the stuff in the right context and that's what we're trying to do. We want the public to know what risks there are, what fish there are risks with, but we want people to eat healthy seafood. So we want to discuss that further.

Tab 6 is offshore aquiculture -- seafood, that's Tab 6. Okay, Tab 6. And then after lunch, we

NEAL R. GROSS

will talk little bit about the Office of International Affairs. So there's a lot going internationally and Rebecca a while back agreed to take over the office and try to reestablish that international office. We had sort of disbanded it due to SES positions. And I think it was too important to have it fragmented all over the agency. So Rebecca agreed to reestablish the office and has done a great job of getting the office back together.

The other thing she does a tremendous job of when she goes overseas, she speaks I don't know how many languages, but I'll tell you she went to Morocco and Turkey to cover for me last fall and she ended up debating with the fishermen in a public meeting in French in Morocco somewhere, but she didn't back down. She stood up and did it. So she does a great job and I think we just want to make sure people understood and we talk a little bit about international issues, because they definitely -- fishing is global and there's lots of things happening.

Then this afternoon we will talk about the hurricane impacts and the recovery and what's going

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on. I'm not real happy with what's going on, to be honest with you. This is the first fisheries disaster that's been declared as a result of a hurricane that the fishermen have not gotten one cent out of the Government, out of us. Finally, the USDA has some money for offshore recovery, but as far as fishermen themselves, this is the first disaster they have not gotten a penny. And they are really suffering.

And so tomorrow we're going to talk some about the litigation review, look back at what we're doing for litigation, and I just think it's very good to just review. We're making progress, although it seems like the last few months we had another road to get a lot of 60 day notices, but most of them were coming from the west coast, still salmon issues.

So then we're going to talk a little bit about the Magnuson reauthorization. I think the Senate has introduced its bill. The Senator plans to get it through the Senate in the next few weeks the way he talks, but we'll see how quickly he can do it. We will talk later about the House Bill. Congressman Pombo has written the bill. We think it will be

NEAL R. GROSS

released this week.

And then we're going to talk about overfishing definitions, and some of the things we have done about, you know, with overfishing. We do have a paper that is somewhat confidential and internal, but we will share, have already shared it with you, and we will discuss that as we go through the discussion.

There has been some concern about sharing information, documents with MAFAC, and the Government just has some peculiar rules and we're trying to work with them, but we want to make sure that you all get the information necessary to have the discussion. And then we're going to talk too about the saltwater angling registration that is a part of -- it's in the Magnuson, it's a part of what we think we need in order to move forward on improving the recreational data.

No one sort of believes recreational data in the MRFSS and so we tried to improve this and one of the best ways to do it, we think, is through saltwater registration, so you know that the unit or

the universe that you are dealing with rather than the phone book, and that's what we use now. And then we will talk about direct fish strategy and where we are from that standpoint.

And then on Thursday, we will talk about the subcommittees and the next meeting, but also we're going to talk to, we'll talk a few minutes this morning, but we'll probably go back and talk some more on Thursday abou what issues does MAFAC want to deal with and what do we think we need help on for the future. We think we need to take one or two real projects and try to work through those. So we'll talk a little bit about that in a minute after I go through a couple of things and then Tony will lead that.

Just for a minute, we'll talk a little bit about NOAA Fisheries and what's going on, so we'll bring you up to date on what's going on with NOAA Fisheries. Okay. There are a few things that are going on. We have a lot of vacancies. We went through a period and we finally got all the SES positions filled. Now, we've got a lot of SES positions vacant and it seems like it takes forever to

NEAL R. GROSS

fill a vacant position.

Jack Dunnigan has left us and gone to be the head of National Ocean Service two weeks ago, so the head of SF is open. Alan is acting as the head of SF. Riley retired, so that left the head of Habitat open. That job has been downtown for months. I think it was finally approved by the Department on Friday, so it has to go to the Office of Personnel Management and it takes about a week or two, so we expect to get that. The head of Science and Technology is also open. We have selected a person for that and that is downtown. We expect that probably a little bit behind the other.

Jim Balsinger came down, agreed to come down for a little while. He is acting in the deputy's position, the Deputy for Regulatory. He likes the cold weather of Alaska and for other personal reasons, he wanted to go back to Alaska. So the deputy for that, for Regulatory, has been vacant and will be vacant.

But Jim has agreed to stay for one more year to help out because, I'll have you know, I was

elected Chairman of ATGAP and being the Chairman of ATGAP plus a Commissioner plus also the Commissioner of IWC is going to take very much time, so Jim agreed to stay to basically do the day-to-day domestic stuff and pick up what I have been doing a lot of, and so I will be focusing a lot more on international. So most people will be talking to Jim more than they probably talk to me over the next few months, particularly through this November.

As Rebecca will probably tell you in our discussion, we have got probably the worst year in ATGAP that we could possibly have as far as the stock assessment and what is on the table. So we hope that we got people selected for all of the positions, I think, now, except of course SF was just vacated. So that's on the street. We hope to get that, but the rest of the positions, we have got a person selected. We're just waiting for the powers that be downtown.

I have to say and, you know, I don't know if you all have met Steve. Is this your first MAFAC meeting?

MR. JONER: No, I was at the last one.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I thought so. And Steve will need some help. He has got a lot of stuff thrown at him, so the head of S&T will be of great help to him. So when we get those filled back, we'll be up to speed.

We are looking internally at some other positions to try to be more efficient, you know, with that, constituent services and the state, federal and just things we have to deal with downtown. And so those will not affect any -- you won't see any difference in day-to-day operations.

It will just be some things we'll probably do internally to make things more efficient inside. We're potential dealing with downtown. It's a lot different dealing with the Department today than it was two years ago or a year ago, I have to say. It's taking a lot more time and effort.

But I just want to say Jim Balsinger is actually -- he has taught me a lot since he has been there. I'm one of these people that hurries up and does stuff and makes decisions quickly. Jim thinks things through and I think really -- I think it's very

NEAL R. GROSS

good for an agency, particularly in headquarters, to see him stay calm, cool and collected while the rest of us go crazy.

But he ends up making great decisions and helps me out through these decisions, so I'm glad he agreed to stay one more year to work through, but he would be in a different position. He will be really doing what I'm doing, so there will be two of us doing it. He will be doing it.

So with that, that is basically what is going on internally. You know, we'll talk about some of the other things, legislation, Magnuson-Stevens and that stuff. But as far as that, the operation of the agency, you know, there is a lot of issues around that we could talk about. You know, we got, you know, probably the worst bluefin and tuna for the last two years we have ever had in history of bluefin and tuna everybody wants blame catches, and to that everything and I don't think we know the answer. We need to go out and settle it.

So does anybody have any questions before we move on, anything so far?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Okay. I wanted to talk a little bit and discuss. We got new members and then Laurel needs to go over a very short PowerPoint, I guess, to point to some of the things that you have to do, but I just want to talk a little bit about the role of MAFAC for the new Members and maybe a little bit for the old Members.

But the charter is under Tab 2. This was chartered in 1971. We really have a very broad mandate, 1970, and, you know, it is chaired by the Undersecretary of Commerce and the purpose is advise the Secretary of Commerce on all of the marine resource matters that are the responsibility of the Department of Commerce, so that is a broad mandate. All the marine resource matters that are responsibility of the Department of Commerce, and to evaluate and recommend priorities and needed changes in national program direction.

I think that's the key, to evaluate and recommend priorities and needed changes in national program directions. So that gives you, again, a very broad mandate of what you would like to get involved

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now, the current role has been to help to identify some common ground on which we can move issues forward, help us prioritize and strategize some on how to do things. Now, the thing of it is, you know, we're not the Fishery Management Council and I think that's very clear. You don't have to deal with the management aspects. That's the Fishery Management Council's place, but you help us set priorities and needed changes.

And, you know, you don't wear any real hats here, but you're here for your background and expertise, but you're really not here to argue for one fishery or this type of thing, which you probably know.

of the three We one key are representatives of the Stakeholders Group, that's what MAFAC is. agency routinely conducts The gain input and to engage in hearings to candid discussions, and we have two other groups that work with us, the State Directors we utilize course, the Council Chairs we work with.

NEAL R. GROSS

And so today there are over 50 FACA committees in the Department of Commerce with very specific mandates and this is one. Tony, you want to add something, too, don't you?

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Well, thank you, Dr. Hogarth. There's a few items that I wanted to speak to the group about as we began. First of all, I would like to thank the group for electing me your representative of the Fishery Service. I was elected in absentia and I didn't get a chance to thank everyone, so thank you very much for your confidence and the responsibility that you have given to me.

In my office at the college, we have a big, signed frame that says, "Success is a team sport," and that is how we look at it at the college and that is how I think we should look at things here.

We're a team and our job is going to be to advise the Service, as Dr. Hogarth said.

I would like to thank the Service for a recent change almost in policy a little bit. As some of the old Members may recall, MAFAC for years has been trying to get documents released to it prior to

NEAL R. GROSS

it being released to the public, and there was a lot of concern about what the agency could or could not release to us. And just recently we had some documents released to us that have not been made public yet regarding the overfishing definition and proposed changes there.

And I would like to thank the Service for having the faith to release that to the Committee, and remind the Committee to keep in mind that it is a confidential document at this point and it should stay without our own -- we should keep it to ourselves, give the agency the advice that it wants, but keep it to ourselves and, hopefully, we'll be able to see additional documents in the future as they become available to us before they become public.

Our role is to advise the Service and that is what I hope we do over the next couple of years. One of the -- keeping in mind of advising the Service, and in that role, I think one of the functions that MAFAC can serve to the Service is to tell the Service what we think the fisheries are going to be looking like in the future.

NEAL R. GROSS

As I look around the table, we have experts from all of the regions, experts who know what the fisheries in their regions are like. We have people that have evolved over the past 30 or more years with fisheries as our fisheries have changed with the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

The regulative community that we deal with today is a lot different than that that existed 30 years ago and our climate, our business climate, has changed. I know as a businessman, if I put my charter boat captain's hat on, I have to look ahead and I have to forecast how is business going to be this year, but how is it going to be 10 years from now? How is it going to be 15 years from now? What is going to happen?

And if I'm going to be successful in my fishing business, I have to be able to do that. I have to be able to do that well. All too often the agency is reacting to what's happening on the ground at the time. They are very often just reacting to things that are evolving. I don't think we do enough planning, advanced planning, and I think sometimes we

NEAL R. GROSS

can get ourselves out of trouble and not have trouble happen if we did that advanced planning.

Now, for the Agency to do certain things, sometimes it becomes difficult because the politics run into it. But for us as an Advisory Panel, in a sense, to be able to sit together and to look and to tell the agency here is where we think fisheries are going to be 10, 15, maybe even 20 years from now, I think is something that we can do.

We can speak honestly. As business people, I guess you could say, we can try to forecast where our businesses, our fisheries, are going to be 20 years from now and tell the agency that. Perhaps with that advice, the agency could then move forward and try to make some decisions using our advice to support the decisions that it makes, giving, in a sense, a bit of cover.

We're trying to guide the development.

Let's face it. Right now we're in the world market.

Our fisheries compete with fisheries from all over the world. That didn't exist 20 years ago. The advances in sports fishing techniques that exist today didn't

exist 20, 30 years ago.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Our fishing is completely different than it was 30 years ago, even 10 years ago, and I don't think we do enough -- we, the Government, does enough in trying to address the evolution that is occurring. And, hopefully, with support from NOAA some fisheries, this group can come forward together a document and put together a report telling the agency where we think fisheries will be in the future. And perhaps they can use it, maybe not.

But I know, I look around this table and I know some people who know their fisheries very, very, very well. And if you speak with them individually, you can tell they know where they are going. I think together as a group, we have to come together as a group, as a team, and give that advice to the agency.

So think about that, please, because I have discussed it with Dr. Hogarth and I think on Thursday when we meet, we should be able to discuss how we might want to accomplish that goal. But as your representative, that's one of the goals that I hope this group can achieve in the next couple of

years.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Thanks. Now, one thing Tony and I talked about is the science side is looking at technology and how we will be doing salt fisheries in the future, you know, sampling and this type. And, you know, we just thought it would be --you know, it's a combination of fisheries 20 years from now, both have the technology or the science and what we would think fisheries would look like.

So just think about it and think about other projects. Some concern, I know, has been expressed about consistency from region to region, from headquarters to region. That's something we need to look at. There are some real concerns and issues with the Endangered Species Act. We were trying to work some of that out with Interior, but there are some real issues on the Endangered Species Act that I think we could deal with.

MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask a question, Ralph Rayburn. You mentioned that we were one of three advisory, with the State Directors, the Council Chairs, I guess, and then MAFAC, but is there

NEAL R. GROSS

any thought process? MAFAC seems to be kind of like the lone ranger in that group. You have the Councils and the State Directors merge. You know, contrary, this group, if you have any appointment to the council, you have to either leave MAFAC or those kinds of things.

So how do we fit in? It seems like the other two kind of have a leg up on what is going on. So is there any thought given about MAFAC having a liaison to the State Directors meeting or the Council Chairs meeting or something like that, so we really could be a part of the three advisory groups that you have before you?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, Ralph, that's a good thing for us to discuss. I think it could be. The Commissioners, you know, that sit here, but it may be the chairman or the vice chairman or whatever we call the person sitting next to me. We have a little bit of a problem with terminology from MAFAC, but I think that could happen very easily.

I would like to see how we can -- you know, I'm still struggling, to be honest with you,

NEAL R. GROSS

with MAFAC. I think MAFAC has a lot more potential than we realize and I would love to see it reach that. I think looking at strategies, looking at priorities, looking at these things, we need that, I think, that type of agreement. We don't really get that out of the councils.

Councils are really fighting alligators all the time. They are looking at regulations. They are looking at, you know, what is being caught, but we don't sit back and talk about, you know, policies or strategies for the future or things like that. And I think that's really what MAFAC is, is to try to -- you know, we have the Science Board, for example, that advises the Admiral and the Secretary and they get into research and looking at research and things like that, socioeconomics, what it should be.

But we need to really think carefully. I think we have got a good group now to do that. We have got to make MAFAC elevated and make it I think -- you know, you don't get paid where the councils do get paid. That is the one difference which, I think, is -- you know, it's a difference. So your time is free.

1	But I think still, there has got to be a way that we
2	could make it better.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn. You have
4	established a Strategic Planning Group. Jim I
5	can't think of Jim's last name right now. Now, don't
6	you have a Strategic Planning Group now within NOAA
7	Fisheries?
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, Jim.
9	MR. RAYBURN: Jim.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: McCallum.
11	MR. RAYBURN: McCallum.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
13	MR. RAYBURN: Yes. And so I wondered what
14	role do you see for that group and how and maybe
15	it's better to wait for Thursday. I am just concerned
16	that the group always seems to be ready to get out of
17	town or you have issues that come up that, you know,
18	deflect your attention.
19	But how do you see Jim's group playing
20	with MAFAC or is there any connection there in the
21	strategic planning for the agency?
22	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: There isn't now, but

1	it could be. But I guarantee you unless something
2	drastic happens, I'm here. I'm here until Friday
3	morning.
4	MR. RAYBURN: It's like you live in
5	drastic situations.
6	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, I hope not this
7	week, but I do think we all need to think about it. I
8	mean, because really, we do, we need to think.
9	Do you want to say something before we
10	move on?
11	MS. BRYANT: Only if you want me to cover
12	kind of administrative things.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, go ahead, before
14	we get started with the issues.
15	MS. BRYANT: All right. Is our AV person
16	here? I quickly threw a PowerPoint together. We
17	probably need to go over just some administrative
18	issues to kind of discuss and make sure we know where
19	things are and what to expect. We normally, had we
20	had everybody here and the larger group thank you.
21	I hope it's spelled all right, because I didn't have
22	a chance I need a mike? I hope it's spelled okay,

because I didn't do spell check on it, but I just wanted to go through it.

Normally, we would have kind of an introduction meeting for at least new Members and then as a refresher to second-term Members on some of the administrative requirements and all of that. We hope that we'll do that at the next meeting, which is scheduled for July 25th through the 27th in Seattle, Washington. We can talk about more of the details on that on Thursday, but at least let's get that marker down.

At that we may have a separate day or something to just kind of bring some of the attorneys back and travel and some of the housekeeping that probably needs to be done and hasn't been done for a while. But for today's purposes, I will do my best to do administrative stuff, which is not my long suit.

Travel and the SATO number. One of the issues that has been going on long-term with your travel with MAFAC is that everybody is forced to go through SATO. It's very frustrating, because a lot of times you can find tickets that are a whole lot

cheaper than what the Federal Government finds. And I have been told for years that no, you have to go through SATO if you want to get refunded.

But I have found out, and I think it has been Mr. Cook that through self-preservation I have had to beat this out of the SATO bureaucrats, and what I have found out is that if you don't go through SATO, and you find something cheaper, that's fine, but it's non-refundable. And I need to know about it in advance before you go through and do it with SATO so that I can make certain that we get that documented and authorized in your travel order.

The thing is that when you guys usually do that, it's always so much cheaper, SATO really can't push back against me as long as I can get that in your travel order ahead of time and that we know that you're really going to use it, because it's non-refundable. So no change of plans. It needs to be pretty iron-clad. But that's something that I just kind of found out in the last six months that we can kind of push back against. Yes, Tony?

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Does SATO have a -- I

NEAL R. GROSS

just discovered with the snowstorm up in New York, they must have a 24 hour emergency number for changes?

MS. BRYANT: They do.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Can you provide that to the Committee, please?

MS. BRYANT: I can, and it should be also on your travel orders. It's attached to your SATO thing, there is a 1-800 number.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BRYANT: I don't have it right now in my head, but we'll definitely make certain of that. And also, the travel orders that you have, you can travel with them. They are good to travel with for one purpose only, and that is if anything screws up and goes wrong, there's some kind of super secret code number that's on your individual travel order that if you get stuck like Tony, and all of a sudden he needs to be able to get another flight or something happens, that number allows you to access into the SATO system. They know you are legit. They can track you. They can find you and you can get this taken care of.

The other purpose for those travel orders

NEAL R. GROSS

is, when you get back to your home destination and you are grouping all of your costs and expenses together, it's to send me a copy of that travel order. I have a copy, but send it through with your stuff and then that gets all packaged together for your reimbursement purposes. So it's not like you have to have your papers with you to travel, but it is a good idea to have that number and SATO's emergency number in case anything unforeseen happens.

The hotel. What we do at MAFAC rather than everybody making a hotel reservation and having it covered on their individual credit cards and being reimbursed, we do a mass purchase order. So you will not have to worry about paying the daily/evening charge through the hotel. Incidentals, you know, you want to watch a little HBO, that will be on your bill, but phone calls, business calls, those are generally covered.

Long distance, long-term calls, those kind of things, that would not be. But you will see it in your travel order what expenses are covered. The other thing that's not covered is rental cars. We

NEAL R. GROSS

used to do that, but with, as you can imagine, 21 Members and three consultants and everybody here, that can really pump up the price. So a long time ago a policy was made internally through MAFAC that that's just something that, you know, we're not going to cover.

Some of the administrative -- and stop me if you have got questions, I just don't want to take up too much time.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But the rent-a-car was a NOAA decision, that's not a policy of --

MS. BRYANT: When it was done, it was done back a number of years ago when I first started, and I guess it was a decision because there had been a meeting and everybody got rental cars. Nobody really needed them and it really chewed through the budget quickly. And a decision was made that everybody is meeting in the same area and there is really no reason for everybody to have all of those cars. And so it was more of a MAFAC and NMFS decision.

It's not like a formal policy, but more of a business management policy that was decided. It's

not something that can't always be revisited. But at this point, we really haven't had a need for that. But if it becomes an issue, it can always be revisited.

wanted mention the financial Τ to disclosures and the certification of status. Thank you, everybody got them through to me and dealt with my pestering and badgering, only because in the days of post-9/11, the certification of status, i.e., that you are not an employee or on contract with a foreign government, has become increasingly important. So annually original want that as an I have received almost everybody's. document.

And the financial disclosures are an annual requirement as a labor saving tool. As the second-termers know, save that copy from this last year, it's important for your records. I have a copy, so if you ever lose it, you can always contact me, as does DOC, they have a copy.

But as a labor saving device, if nothing changes on that year-to-year, just copy the very top page, white out your name and signature and the date,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recopy it and then resign it and redate it. Staple it at the top and then that can become the renewed financial disclosure for every year.

Now, if something has changed, that will need to be reflected and you need to take care of that. But for those of you where it's pretty stable and it's not happening, you don't have to go through and write everything all over again.

The frustrating thing that many of you have discovered about the programming, and I don't know why this is the case, the document that I sent to you in PDF, no matter what you fill out on screen, you can't save it. I keep trying. You can't save it. So the minute you print that out and try to save it to your hard drive or something, it blanks everything out and the next time you go back, it's all blank again. So don't make the mistake of thinking I've saved it into my hard drive and I can go back and relook at it, that's why you need to have that hard Xerox copy. I don't know who made that decision way up above in DOC, but nonetheless, that's the way it works.

And meeting preparation, we can probably

NEAL R. GROSS

talk about more of this on Thursday. In June, as Tony referenced, the Committee for the first time in a long time kind of went through some reorganization and restructuring. And you will see that reflected under, I believe, Tab 2, Subcommittee Structure. We now have four standing subcommittees which includes an Executive Subcommittee.

And the goal, we also went through kind of a meeting preparation memo, and I generally start trying to, you know, beat the programmatic staff about eight weeks out, maybe 12 weeks out, what are the current hot issues, what do we want to bring before MAFAC, what are the information materials, trying to get you advance materials a month in advance. That's still a goal. It's not a reality. We were able to get them to you two weeks in advance.

We try to keep it minimum, knowing that you guys, we only get together six days a year, so we can't put a lot on the agenda. But to be able to effectively use your time, try to keep the agenda simple and get you materials in advance, rather than doing hard copy mail outs and all of that labor

intense, you do have the Members area that's off on the MAFAC page.

That area as it fills up, and it will continue to fill up following this meeting, because we will have public transcriptions that will be going up there, I will be drafting a meeting summary. It will then go back out to all of you for direction and refinement, things I may have missed or forgotten, and when we finally get that finalized, that will be posted up on the web as well as transferred to the Undersecretary from Bill and up to the Secretary, and certainly any follow through items that need to be pulled out.

Once all of those elements are then ready to go, that Members area page essentially then moves over to the public domain and then that's what you will see on your main front page of MAFAC, all the meetings, that's how we are starting to fill those up. This is relatively new since I have been taking over MAFAC and I'm still going back and finding a lot of those documents that originally, when I came on, nothing was electronic.

NEAL R. GROSS

I'm still finding those things, so you're going to find as you go down in time, there's a lot of missing elements. I'm still finding those things and hopefully at the end of 2006 we will have that fully loaded up going back to 1999, so that we really have a continual public record that is being tracked.

Any suggestions on that I would really value, and again, on Thursday we're going to be focusing more specifically on MAFAC and that can be a topic of discussion if you want then. On the meeting days, generally, we do three days of meetings, travel on either end. At the next meeting, we may want to consider having an additional day that might be dedicated to kind of orientation and review. We can talk about that and whether Bill wants to have some more programmatic staff coming up and kind of giving an overview of their programs and who is doing what.

And one of the things that we discussed at the last meeting, which again is still a goal and not a reality, but that we would like the whole group to consider; Tony likes this and Tom Billy actually was a part of suggesting this, and that is, if we're able to

get this in advance, talking about some of these vision documents that Tony and Bill were referencing earlier, some of the longer term projects. MAFAC has been asked to kind of be a long-term sounding board on aquiculture, and not only legislation, but the whole process and the development of that.

Some of those longer term topics, the goal would be to get advanced materials out to Members, hopefully a month in advance; allow subcommittee conference calls to do some advance work on that; have the first day of the meeting dedicated to fisheries overviews, kind of current events, things that are going on that we want to update the Committee on; and then go into the presentations.

Save the second day then for subcommittee work, where you're really able to break apart labor saving device, subcommittees trying to exercise and leverage your various expertise to go in and really flush out an issue for the whole group and what the issues are, the decision points or the recommendations.

And then the third day, bringing that back

NEAL R. GROSS

1	into full Committee reconvening and getting a full
2	Committee discussion and final decision on any
3	recommendation report. So that's kind of been the
4	template that we discussed at the last meeting that we
5	wanted to kind of wait until we got a whole new group
6	on board before we started to really implement. But
7	those are some of the goals. Tony?
8	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Yes, before we leave
9	the subcommittee list that's up on the screen there
10	now, I look behind Tab 2 and I see that the second-
11	term Members have been assigned and have selected
12	subcommittees. The new Members have not been assigned
13	or have not selected subcommittees yet.
14	MS. BRYANT: Right.
15	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Is there time in the
16	agenda?
17	MS. BRYANT: On Thursday, when we're
18	focusing all on kind of the Committee stuff.
19	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: So then what I would
20	say to the new Committee Members is to think about
21	which of the four subcommittees you may want to serve
22	on. And you may serve on more than one subcommittee.

1	MS. BRYANT: Correct.
2	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: And those subcommittees
3	behind Tab 2 are Strategic Planning, Budget and
4	Program; Commerce; Protected Resources; and Ecosystem.
5	Those are the four Committees currently that exist.
6	MS. BRYANT: Correct.
7	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: And so to the new
8	Members, please consider what Committees you would
9	like to serve on. And before we leave, those
10	subcommittees, I see that Mr. Billy is Chairman of the
11	Commerce Committee. But the other three Committees
12	are currently lacking chairmen.
13	MS. BRYANT: I can't
14	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Well, they're not
15	designated in the binder.
16	MS. BRYANT: No, they're not designated
17	there. Okay.
18	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: As subcommittee chairs.
19	MS. BRYANT: We didn't have that.
20	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: And also, the Table of
21	Organization has an Executive Subcommittee that
22	consists of myself, Dr. Hogarth, yourself, and the

subcommittee chairs.

MS. BRYANT: Subcommittee chairs.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: So it's important that those subcommittee chairs be selected before this meeting is over.

MS. BRYANT: Right. And I would also point, picking up on Tony's point, I think it's Tab 3, Tony, if I'm wrong, correct me, on every meeting there is also your subcommittee -- there's a Committee report from the last meeting, and you will see that, more details of that, reorganization discussion and the function of those subcommittees, why we went that way. Prior to that, it was kind of like every issue that came up, a working group would form around it.

It became very bulky and labor intensive to track who was on what and who was doing what. It was always changing. And instead, after an intensive discussion for a day or day and a half in June, what filtered out from it were these subcommittee topics as being looked at as being very broad and long term and essentially providing an umbrella under which those various subject matters could be appropriately

NEAL R. GROSS

1	addressed.
2	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. So as the new
3	Members have to keep in mind, hopefully, maybe we can
4	get to that Thursday morning for the new Members to
5	select, so that they can just communicate to yourself
6	and myself what subcommittees they care to serve on.
7	MS. BRYANT: Yes.
8	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: And then they can
9	select their chairs.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Wednesday afternoon
11	at 4:30.
12	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Wednesday afternoon at
13	4:30.
14	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: That's when we'll
15	talk about the subcommittees.
16	MS. BRYANT: Or Thursday.
17	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: No.
18	MS. BRYANT: Is it Wednesday?
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: It's on the agenda
20	for Wednesday afternoon at 4:30, folks. Okay.
21	MS. BRYANT: You would think I would know.

1 VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Determine 2 subcommittee follow-up. CAPTAIN DILERNIA: So Wednesday. 3 VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tomorrow. 4 That is pretty much it from 5 MS. BRYANT: The other thing, as I said, I kind of just threw 6 me. 7 down some random thoughts. One of the things I was unable to accomplish, thanks to the flu, I didn't get 8 9 everybody's bios down. And I really want to go through 10 and get biographies for everybody, just a paragraph. I want to also get photographs of everybody. 11 We'll post that up on the MAFAC web page. 12 13 I think that's something that has been missing for a 14 long time, so people can see and know who is serving 15 on the Committee. That is something that I hope to be able to do. 16 17 The other thing I want to mention, Tony, something new that we have been doing this last year, 18 19 been putting together conference calls. has Any 20 subcommittee, any grouping of folks that want to get put together, give me a call. I will be happy to set 21

up a phone conference call. It is cost effective and

it allows people to be able to plan in advance or get some work done, and I think that's something that we need to use more frequently and take advantage of.

And that's it. Subcommittee selection Thursday. And I would be happy to answer questions. I know that was real quick, but I wanted to just kind of give you those.

The last thing I want to mention is in the binders front of your you will travel see reimbursement form. I'm not good this administrative stuff, so bear with me, but that travel reimbursement form is in the very front pocket along with a return envelope. It is that that you fill out and insert along with any receipts.

Now, food, that is not covered. That is covered by your per diem that you receive for each day. But taxi cab receipts, shuttle receipts, those type things, and then if there is any business type associated or MAFAC associated fee that comes through on your hotel bill, if you use the business center to be able to make copies if you're doing subcommittee work or something like that and it wasn't covered,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

include that on your hotel bill.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

All of that gets folded up and put in that envelope along with your authorization form and send that back to me. It's prepaid. And then Celine will be getting that and we'll get those processed. If any current Members have other experiences that they want to share with our new Members, please do so.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Any comments, questions? Ralph?

MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn. One thing that has bothered me, and maybe you all have worked it out, but it seems like we'll come to the meetings and all of sudden we'll then а have some major subcommittee activities. Ι assume that in this organizational structure that your Executive Committee consisting of the leadership and the subcommittee chairs will give us some view before we get to the meeting on what the issues for the subcommittees will be.

It has always troubled me. It seems like, you know, it really becomes just a platform for folks in the past. So is that kind of the sense of the

NEAL R. GROSS

leadership?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.

MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: I have a question for Ralph. Ralph, how soon prior to the meeting do you think perhaps a discussion of that, perhaps a conference call, should occur? How far in advance?

MR. RAYBURN: I think at whatever point the agenda is reasonably formalized. It seems like you will do that, you know, a certain period out and you'll have the difficulty in getting the discussion documents perhaps out to us, but I would think once the agenda is formalized or even maybe in the process of formalizing the agenda, so that you can allow adequate time for subcommittees to meet.

And I would also suggest perhaps that you have specific tasks for those subcommittees to deal with if there is an issue that falls under their purview. You really have, you know, direct questions for that subcommittee to address and bring about to the full Committee for discussion and not just, you know, broad coverage of an area.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I think, too, that
2	one of the subcommittees is, I think, Protected
3	Resources, and we are getting ready to do some things
4	there, so it would probably be good to run it by this
5	Committee. We're going to put advanced notice of
6	proposed rulemaking on several things, jeopardy and
7	some things, so we probably should run it by this
8	group to look at.
9	Also, we are looking at some of the units
10	we use, you know, the BSUs and distinct population
11	segments. We're looking at that this week of what
12	we're doing under the ESA versus Magnuson, so we
13	probably so that's a good point. Anybody?
14	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes.
15	COURT REPORTER: State your name for the
16	record.
17	MR. RAFTICAN: I'm sorry, Tom Raftican.
18	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
19	MR. RAFTICAN: Would it make sense instead
20	of having pre-meeting subcommittee meetings, as the
21	report comes out, have a post-meeting so everybody
22	kind of gets it while it's still fresh from leaving

1	here and then, you know, this way it's not kind of
2	sitting in the background for, you know, five months?
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, Tom, I think
4	that is one thing we have to talk about, is that we do
5	come to the meetings and do stuff but, I mean, I think
6	to make it work effectively, we'll have to get things
7	to you outside to get comments back. You know, we
8	don't seem to do that and we need to do that.
9	MR. RAFTICAN: Conference calls may help.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Conference calls,
11	yes.
12	MR. RAFTICAN: It takes, you know, an hour
13	or two out of your day.
14	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes. The
15	subcommittees are going to have to work that way.
16	We're going to have to set those up, so that we can
17	just get comments nothing fits the schedule of
18	twice a year, you know, February and July. So we got
19	to figure out a way to we'll make it work. We're
20	going to have to work getting information out that we
21	get and conference calls or whatever we get back.

MR. RAFTICAN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: One thing about break out, I didn't explain it all this morning about the Washington Post at the time. What is it is I get to describe the discussion going on, but something we found in the south, I think it's done by Scripps and one of their people, well, by David Watson. They located, they found the lightest weighs 1.5 milligrams, 1.5. Its length is like 8.4. The male is 6.5 to 6.7 milligrams when they are fully, but the shortest evidently is another one from Southeast Asia that's about 7.9 millimeters is the female.

But then the shortest adult male is like 4.6 millimeters, the female, and the male is So the current discussion among, millimeters. know, Guinness and all, which is, you know, the lightest or the shortest. And I was talking to Rod last night, and I guess IGFA is considering now, going to have it by length, you know, having this way to measure the fish and so there will be a new category by length and then they will be all releases. So I think it's good, but it's interesting. It all comes up in one day as we come here. Quite an article 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

They confronted each other about the lightest, the shortest, so it's a little bit interesting. True scientific discussion. Yes, Ralph?

MR. RAYBURN: Yes. So is IGFA establishing a minimum size now that you could -- as a world record, too, catching the minimum size? That might be one I could, you know, strive for.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right up on the wall.

MR. KRAMER: Ralph, the minimum sizes are in the book, but what Bill was referring to is at a recent board meeting, IGFA has decided to add a new all tackle length category where not only will the fish be released alive, but for the record to qualify, it will have to be released alive and in good health. And this is a way that we see that we can help educate anglers around the world on proper handling and release techniques out there.

We're starting off with about 120 species, both fresh and saltwater species that we can manage on a measuring device. But one day, you know, there will probably be technology available that you can determine mass and some other things. So it's pretty

NEAL R. GROSS

interesting talks right now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: All right. The last bit of sort of general information before we get started is the Stewardship and Sustainability Awards. You know, we talked about this at the last meeting and we have finally -- we went out and called for nominations and, you know, there were basically six categories.

There were nominations in special recognition; stewardship and sustainability; conservation partnership; science, research and technology; coastal habitat restoration; education, community service and media. We had hoped to get these. The nominations came in January.

We had hoped to be able to move this and to have the awards banquet on February the 9th, which is the anniversary of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, but it just didn't work that quick. I mean, we just couldn't get the money set up and all because we had to get donations.

So it's going to be June 5th. We have two pretty substantial donations from West Coast Fishermen

NEAL R. GROSS

that was enough to sponsor this, and we have a list of, God, I don't know, 200 or 300 people that will be invited. We're trying to get the Hill to come. We think it's time to get the Senate and Congressmen involved because we don't ever have anything on the Hill that we invite them to. Usually Fish and Wildlife does and everybody else does, but we don't and I think we need to do that.

So we're looking forward to doing this. It will probably be at the J.W. Marriott. The reason we picked June 5th is because that is National Ocean Week. The fish fry is on the 7th there and there seems to be -- this week for the fish fry, we're going to try to focus on the Gulf, just a celebration of the Gulf seafood to try to get some visibility to the fact that they have some good, healthy seafood coming out of the Gulf and there seem to be some good concerns, so we will have that as part of it.

This came about -- the Admiral went to a marine management banquet, I guess, down in the Gulf and they gave out awards and there were people from all over. He was really impressed with how they

NEAL R. GROSS

recognized different people. And I think there is a lot that goes on in fisheries if you look at restoration and all that we really could recognize.

So what we have done, MAFAC's role is to sort through these and make the recommendations for each category. The old Members have been sent, I think, the nominations. We couldn't send them to the new Members, because at the time we didn't have them done, but the new Members will be involved the next go-round. We plan to make this an annual event.

So we're looking forward to having it. The Admiral is really looking forward to it. We think that it will bring people together. All of you will be invited and we hope you will attend, and we look for this to really build, you know. I was surprised at some of the nominations.

I was really impressed with some of the nominations, to be honest with you, that people took it seriously and did it. I think that next year you will see even more, in my opinion, but I do think we have got some very good ones for the first year. We are looking for those recommendations back by next

Friday to Laurel?

MS. BRYANT: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And then I will sit down with the Admiral and he'll have the final say, and then we will get this thing underway. There will be invitations sent out. We're going through that list now. So it will be a good week to have it, I think, because there's a lot of focus in D.C. that week and we should be able to get the -- the Hill is in session. We should be able to get them there.

Any questions or comments?

MR. RAYBURN: I hate to be talking, but stay awake everybody. Ralph Rayburn. Would it be possible that we would have -- some of us, depending on where we're coming from, we can have our agencies pay for our travel to D.C. if it's important enough.

But, you know, our liaison, for example, has to travel on his own nickel. So would it be appropriate to have a motion or something, or is there travel funds available, so that MAFAC could pay for one representative of MAFAC, either the liaison or some designee by him, to come to that and have their

NEAL R. GROSS

travel covered?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, you don't have to do a motion. We're looking at that budget now because there has been some recisions that, you know, it was 2 percent, now it has gone to 1 percent. We're looking at the budget and we would like to cover the cost period, and so we'll see what we can do.

MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I don't know how many we can invite, but we would like to make sure that MAFAC is there.

MR. RAYBURN: I understand. I mean, you know, some of us can do that if it's important enough, but there are some that have to pay for it out of their own budget and I think that's --

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We think MAFAC should do that. You are the ones that this process goes through and I think it would be good for MAFAC to then have the opportunity to talk to people from the Hill and I feel sure that we can get some of them there.

MR. RAYBURN: Okay.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: By the way, we're

NEAL R. GROSS

doing this through the Fish for the Future Foundation.

It's a 501(c)(3). 503(c)(3)?

MS. BRYANT: 501(c)(3).

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: 501(c)(3) that Mary Hope has put together. She has used it earlier for contributions so that she could do financial help for fishermen in the Gulf, and I think just before Christmas they sent out, what, about \$60,000 or \$70,000 checks to people.

She now has 1,200 people that have requested assistance from the Gulf. 1,200. But, anyway, we're using that because it is a foundation and we can get contributions to it. And, like I said, two fish companies on the west coast have made some sizeable contributions to make sure we can pull this off the first year and we'll be looking to the future.

We think it's good to have a foundation, obviously I do, for several reasons, so that we can do things like this, but also hopefully to be able to give information sometimes to the Hill through the 501(c)(3) and things that we can't do the way we are now. Yes, this is all a regulatory licensed

NEAL R. GROSS

foundation. We think Fisheries needs to have a foundation.

And if it hadn't been for the three commissions, I don't know what we would have been doing in the past. Honestly, they have rescued us several times and I think this would take some burden off of them, I would think, but we'll always be working with the commissions. This is just other things. So I think it's great. I'm looking forward to seeing the recommendation that this body maybe has looked at the nominations.

The one I'm surprised about is from the state. I won't say what state. They nominated agency, their environmental which is sort of think it's good, interesting. So I it's good. There's a lot of things going on in Fisheries. We have got to push the bright spots in Fisheries forward, you know, and I think there are some bright spots and I think this helps us. Yes, Rob?

MR. KRAMER: Rob Kramer. Bill, I have got a question. How were these awards announced or a solicitation for nominees?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BRYANT: Do you want me to answer that?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.

MS. BRYANT: We went through FishNews. We went through email lists, blast faxes, contacted our various groups, commissions, the councils. We tried to do everything we could to be able to get it exposure. We were told informally that part of the process has been that we were forced to go through a very formal process within the Department because they have got a whole bureaucracy kind of setup to bless awards things that are, essentially, for employees and stuff, but nonetheless it has gotten ripped into that particular current.

And so we were told you may informally go out, but we couldn't formally go out through the Federal Register. I don't know if the target audience
we would want to hit anyway is reading the Federal
Register notices.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: They are not.

MS. BRYANT: So I don't think that would have made much of a difference. So it was kind of like they slapped my hand and I went, oh, darn, don't

NEAL R. GROSS

get to go through the <u>Federal Register</u>, okay. So that was how we did it. I think next year what we will be able to do, because it's now -- the thing that is in your binder behind Tab 4, as last updated January 24th, is what the Department of Commerce attorneys have. It is what is actually being filed as policy.

Next year when we do this, not only will we go out earlier, but we'll probably then be able to also do announcements and kind of press notification and things like that, and be able to really reach out to other groups and get it into sort of your own email groups and things like that.

So any suggestions you have for us to get it out there further would be helpful, but we're also thinking about going through <u>Commercial Fishery News</u> and <u>U.S. Boats</u>, those kind of trade publications, as well, which we weren't able to do this time around, because that would have been a little too official in our unofficial capacity at the time, but next year I think we'll do it.

MR. KRAMER: Laurel, what is the time frame for the next call for nominees?

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. BRYANT: What we would like to do and, Bill, correct me if I'm wrong, because we would like to be able to do this essentially to coincide with the anniversary of the predecessor for the National Marine Service, which is the U.S. Fisheries Fishery Commission, which is February 9, 1870, I believe, or We would like to be able to do it in February, so we had initially planned on going out end of September, early October, for nominations and go for a month and then close it off, throw it to MAFAC. of your things, the evaluation forms, are electronic, everything.

It would not be MAFAC as a Committee evaluating this. It would be individual MAFAC Members that are evaluating this. And then those submitted back, put together, and then the top three in each category that fall out, that's what would be submitted to Bill and to the Undersecretary and then make the final determination. they Hopefully, announce it then in January and be able to actually have an event in February. But because we got kind of stopped up, we have opted to go for Oceans Week this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

year instead.

MR. KRAMER: I would just like to make a recommendation that when we do call for nominees next time, maybe go through MAFAC members and our networks to see if we can get a broad --

MS. BRYANT: Absolutely.

MR. KRAMER: -- more broader coverage there. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Any comments you all have after seeing this and looking at it all, please let us know. We really want to make this a good annual event, because I think we have got to have one, in my opinion. And I feel sure that we can get a good representation from the Hill; we're having it just about as close as you can have it without having it on the Hill itself.

I have thought about doing that, having it on the Hill, but it's tough to get people in and out and I think the security and all the aspects of that. If you have it at J.W. Marriott, you're still two blocks away, because a lot of them live right there, and they did an excellent job for us with the Health

Symposium we had there at the J.W. I was very impressed with that, the banquet facilities and all. So that is our goal right now and it really ought to make it good. Yes, Vincent?

CAPTAIN O'SHEA: Yes. I know that you had that goal of trying to do it in early February and I know postponing things is sometimes a difficult decision, but I think that, in this case, was the right decision, because then it's going to give you time to set it up and do it right and I think that's very important on the first one. And I think Capitol Hill Oceans Week, it's a busy week. There's a lot of people in town.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.

CAPTAIN O'SHEA: I think that was an excellent choice.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, I think we'll get a lot of people. I would like to say, too, we talked about a certificate. I just wanted to say that you need to think about maybe people have an idea before we leave Thursday if there's something else we can do. What do you think?

MS. BRYANT: Do you want me to tell them?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, because I don't know. I would like to know, too.

MS. BRYANT: Well, one thing I do want to say is I would like to make a suggestion for the next meeting agenda, because I think it's really important to revisit this. I have learned a lot. Having put this together and then you have people questioning, well, will you accept international nominees?

Well, I had to go back to Bill and say, well, what do you think? Well, he and the Admiral decided no, we really want to recognize domestic users as a resource that are practicing best stewardship practices and sustainability. That's what we need to focus in on. But there is a lot that I have learned through this process and I think it would be very valuable in July for us to kind of revisit and pull together that.

And I wanted to mention that, okay, the awards, what we found for the awards -- and this is kind of cool. It pulls it together. Back in the 1870s when the U.S. Fisheries Commission was

NEAL R. GROSS

established, one of the things they did similar to Audubon, they went out and they commissioned copper etching drawings of valuable fishery and living marine resource species around the country, I mean, from Maine, Newfoundland, all the way around to Alaska and the Bering Sea, including even the Pacific Islands.

And there are, I want to say, 200 and some odd original copper etching plates which we had the foresight, which is unbelievable, but we did, probably about seven, eight years ago, I remember this going on. We actually were able to get those original copper etchings digitalized and they are actually hidden and buried online under the NOAA Photo Library.

They are literally dated Commissioned by U.S. Fishery Commission, collected at Wood's Hole or collected at Washington, D.C. Fish Market, 1872. Alaskan pollock is on there, all of these very old depictions. Many of them are overfished now. Some of them have been rebuilt. Others have never been overfished. It's a real interesting history.

And what we decided was, based on who the nominees that are selected, it gives Bill an

NEAL R. GROSS

opportunity to kind of go through and really identify an appropriate species, depending upon their geographic or demographic representation that the nominee is representative of, and frame that. And it would be an individual print that would be framed and then a brass plaque with the individuals.

So it ties the past with the present and pulls it all together. So, yes, I thought you were in on that meeting. We already made that decision for you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: If anyone from Alaska wins, we will give them the one that says, even though it's not a fish, eat more whale meat. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, back in 1892, this is what happened. We also found that when we were going through this stuff and said --

MS. BRYANT: We didn't put that in.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Anything else?

Let's think of it really, as I stress again, I think

we need to do something like this. There's a lot of

people who do a lot of things for fisheries and for

conservation stewardship and things to make a fishery

NEAL R. GROSS

1	better, you know, and I think we need to recognize and
2	I think that's going to help. And so we'll do it.
3	Ralph?
4	MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn. So, Bill, if
5	you're looking for early February, maybe if you did it
6	the week before the President released his budget, you
7	would get a better budget number, do you think?
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: That's something
9	maybe we need to try.
10	MS. BRYANT: I heard that. Strategic
11	thinking, we're looking for that.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, I think the
13	budget has got stuff upstairs you're talking about.
14	Okay. Let's take a break, if that's all the time,
15	let's take a break and come back.
16	(Whereupon, off the record for a recess.)
17	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Can we get
18	MS. BRYANT: Sure.
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: started back?
20	Okay. We're going to talk a little bit now about the
21	aquaculture, and also the Legislation Bill of 2005.
22	And most of this discussion is under Tab 5 in your

book. It will show you some of the NOAA Aquaculture Programs. There's a few things here in back of it. And then you have the questions about the bill, but there's a tiny little bit, you know.

The demand for seafood in this country continues to rise, and the health people are telling us to eat at least two meals per week. We're now eating 16.6 pounds per person in the U.S. in 2005. Shrimp was close to the number one. But we have about an \$8 to \$9 billion trade deficit when it comes to seafood. So it's a large deficit.

Over 70 percent of all seafood we eat in this country is imported. And so about 40 percent of what we import is farm-raised. So, you know, there is a lot of aquaculture going on over the world. There is a lot of demand for seafood. I think we need to have good, healthy seafood in this country. You know, we can't, in many fisheries, we can't produce from the wild harvest the amount of seafood we need.

And I think to have a good stable seafood industry in this country, we need the combination of wild harvest and aquaculture. And I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

processes, the infrastructure would be better served, because they would have a steady stream of seafood, so to speak, and we wouldn't be fishing for, say, red snapper the first 10 days of the month, most months, not every month, and then dealing with Mexico or somebody else for red snapper the rest of the month.

You can fill in, you know, with farmraised. Some of the fishermen who are now commercial,
you know, have their wild harvest and could even
supplement their income by being part of the
aquaculture industry. There's no way, and there's no
intention of putting the wild harvesters out of
business. There's just no way.

You know, we don't even hold that grade of competition. You know, we don't want to go into raising summer flounder right now, for example, because we've got a good healthy stock of summer flounder. Of course, we just got sued, but anyway, we don't want to do that, in my opinion.

So, this bill was written to get the discussion going and the authority going, really. It doesn't have a lot, how can I say this properly, it

NEAL R. GROSS

doesn't set the policies. It doesn't do the regulations. It really basically is Congress telling NOAA to go forth and do the Environmental Impact study, go forth and develop regulations in a public process.

What we have tried to do is to coordinate with the other agencies. They will still have their authority, but we would, through this bill, have a clearinghouse to help people get permits. There is no plans to have a fund that we start up aquaculture, or some people say you could do the same thing here you did with the fishing bellow, you know, boats or bellow, you know, people who put them in business. That's not the intention. The intention is for us to help with research, help with permits, help, hopefully to continue the work with additional sources of food.

I think we would like to see, you know, plants and other types, rather than just use the small fish to fill or feed big fish, for example. We would like to see alternative food sources developed. The technology, as far as cages is concerned, is way ahead of what I thought it was. I mean, I think the cage

NEAL R. GROSS

culture, the cages are -- the technology is there, I mean, to prevent escapees and all.

And we think if you go offshore, then you take care of some of the other problems when you've got good flow. And so we realize there's got to be environmental parameters. There's no way, you know, we don't do this haphazardly. But, you know, we're not trying to race out and do something and do it wrong.

The reason we have not done a EIS, which a lot of people say, well, you ought to do EIS on the bill, is because the bill is changing. There has already been four changes since Senator Stevens and Senator Inouye introduced it, and they made three or four changes. And I think as you go through the hearing, there are some things that have been brought up that we're not opposed to being changed to the bill.

So to do an EIS on a moving target is costly. It will cost us probably half a million dollars to do the EIS and to do it right. You know, we think we ought to wait until the bill is passed and

NEAL R. GROSS

that's the first thing we will do over the next two years.

So we want to -- my goal is to make the U.S. more self-reliant, and to let the U.S. citizens have advantage of good healthy seafood, and to have sustainability, and I think we can do that. Susan Bunsick is part of a aquaculture group. Most of them at the World Aquaculture meeting, I guess, she drew the short straw and had to come here, because I felt it was important to have one of the people here to talk about it.

is going Susan to run through presentation rather quickly with you to the bill, so that you can understand the bill. MAFAC has been very instrumental in this where are to date in we discussing this bill. They have given us input. We are internally now developing strategy to hopefully get this through the Hill. We are looking at a business plan for aquaculture.

I think, as I said earlier this morning, it looks like there will be a hearing some time in March. We still don't have, or we really haven't gone

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and asked yet, but we're looking at who would be the best person to introduce this bill in the House. There's a couple of people in the Gulf who think they would be very much in favor of doing this, but we've got to get it introduced to the House.

We want your input. We want this bill to enable the U.S. to get involved in aquaculture in an environmentally manner in a hurry, you know, and not to put our wild harvesters out. So, Susan, I'll turn it over to you.

MS. BUNSICK: Okay. Thank you, Bill, and thank you for the opportunity to update you on the bill. Is that good enough?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.

MS. BUNSICK: Can you hear me? Okay. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to update you on the bill, and I know there is a lot of new Members here, and some of you have heard the outline of the bill before. I just want to add to what Bill Hogarth said. And I really don't mind coming here because I love coming to the ocean, and I take a nice walk along Hollywood, what do they call it, the "Broad Walk" last

night, and I get to do both. I'm going to Las Vegas after this.

The purpose of the bill overall authorizes

-- sorry, I move around. Here we go. Basically, it
authorizes offshore aquaculture to start to develop in
the exclusive economic zones. Same area we're talking
about for federal fisheries management, 300 to 200
miles offshore, the red zone there in that little map.

It's immediately in response to the U.S. Commission and Ocean Policy recommendations regarding marine aquaculture, and specifically last year, a little over a year ago, the U.S. Ocean Action Plan, which was the President's response to the Ocean Commission, committed the Administration to introducing an Offshore Aquaculture Bill to Congress. And that's what this bill is.

You see up there S.119.5, that's the number. Basically, it would authorize the Secretary of Commerce, and we envision that being delegated to NOAA, the authority issued two types of permits. The site permit, which would be for a 10 year period, renewable in five year increments. Basically, it

NEAL R. GROSS

gives someone the authority to do aquaculture in a particular area of the exclusive economic zone.

They couldn't put anything in the water until they also got an operating permit, which would say, what kind of technology, what kind of cages, what kind of species are you going to grow. And the idea there is the site permit would give that security of tenure to the business, while the operating permit would allow some flexibility if they want to do one kind of species initially, and they decide maybe the market is not there, or they have a better technology, they could adjust their operating permit without having to go back again to get another site permit.

Basic key features of the permit system. It would be open to both U.S. and non-U.S. applicants. It would be subject to terms, conditions and restrictions that could be attached to the permit. The permits would be transferable, and they would also be revocable if there are specific violations and issues that would be -- the details on the revocation would be spelled out in regulations.

In order to issue the permit, the project

NEAL R. GROSS

would have to meet environmental requirements. It would have to be compatible with other uses of the EEZ. It would have to address environmental risks. We have a whole section there, it's not on this page, I think it's on the next one, on the environmental issues, specifically address the environmental risks, be consistent with state coastal management plans.

There would be authority to establish some safety zones, the coastal staff, the Coast Guard, the ocean safety zones around the site, and the Secretary would also be able to impose fees associated with the permits, require bonds to ensure removal of equipment and gear at the site.

The process would be coordinated with other federal agencies. You have got to remember there's other agencies with permitting authority out there, the Corps of Engineers, EPA, other authorities. So, the Secretary of Commerce would have the lead in setting up a more coordinated system to review these other permits in conjunction with the specific aquaculture permits being issued.

It would allow concurrent submission of

NEAL R. GROSS

the site permit and the operating permit, hopefully come up with a decision within under 20 days of having all the information. So, if an applicant submits something, but it's not complete, the clock doesn't start ticking yet, but we want to get a timely decision. That's one of the criticisms, one of the driving forces behind this bill, is we wait too long. It just takes too long trying to do things under current law, which has lot of а qaps and inconsistencies in it.

Here is my slide on the environmental requirements. Basically, we are looking at specific risks related to, and I know you can't read this, but natural fish stocks, marine ecosystems, biological/chemical, physical features of water quality and habitat, marine mammals, other forms of marine life, birds, endangered species, and other features of the environment.

And, basically, this Section 5 gives the Secretary of Commerce the authority to establish additional environmental requirements over and beyond what EPA already has, and other agencies may already

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have. And our plan is to do this for probably a two year rule making process where we go out there and we consult with other agencies. We consult with stakeholders, you know, and this is, well, what sort of environmental -- specifically what sort of environmental requirements do we want to see?

And, as I mentioned earlier, the permit holder would have to be responsible for removing equipment, restoring the site. I know you all have a big interest in, you know, the interface between aquaculture and fishing. Basically, the law would exclude aquaculture under these permits from the definition of fishing under Magnuson, which imposes all the limits on how many fish you can have, what time of year, what minimum sizes.

However, it does not exempt the aquacultures from other restrictions under Magnuson, like you can't just go out there and collect brood stock without whatever permits would normally be required to collect brood stock.

It doesn't remove, you know, the considerations of impacts on essential fish habitats.

NEAL R. GROSS

Those reviews would still go on under the Magnuson authorities. Requires consultations with Fishery Management Councils, and then the other interface with fishing is, you know, depending on the species and the need for it, the permit condition could include a requirement to somehow mark or track the fish from the aquaculture operation so it doesn't get on the market, you know, you don't have raw fish being, trying to be sold as aquaculture fish out of season.

There is also a provision authorizing a Research and Development Program to develop sustainable technologies, and form research partnerships with industry and research institutions, universities.

Some other general provisions, the authority to issue rules and regulations. There is an authorization of appropriations. There is no specific There is a very strong monitoring amount in there. of provisions enforcement set to make sure violators are dealt with and identified.

There are some special provisions related to aquaculture that might be associated with an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

offshore oil and gas operation or other facilities permitted by the Minerals Management Service under the Outer Continental Shelf Land Act, and it basically requires some concurrence with the Secretary of the Interior on operations there, but there would still be permits issued under this law.

And there are some other jurisdictional areas, for instance, the extent to which laws dealing with, you know, theft, or vandalism, and all would apply to protect the operator offshore.

The status was already mentioned, basically a quick rundown. It was introduced in June. It was sponsored by the Senate Commerce Committee Co-Chairs, Senators Stevens and Inouye. Bill mentioned there supposedly is a hearing coming up in March. haven't heard a date yet or anything. We need some House sponsors. Over here there is a press release that came out that basically listed the commitment of the Committee to schedule a hearing soon.

There have actually been five amendments proposed so far. Basically, they deal with many of the issues raised by some of the environmental groups,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as well as the fishing industry. It has to do with permit, who is eligible for а what the requirements for documentation. I mentioned earlier, the bill does not specifically exclude foreign applicants.

There are some comments about, you know, how much detail needs to be in the environmental requirements in the bill itself, as opposed to developed through the regulatory process. There is the idea of whether states could opt out of this whole system and show when, and then there was a fifth one introduced. Those were all introduced right away in June ,and then there was a fifth one introduced in September that calls for additional studies before moving forward.

And NOAA is working to develop our official position on the amendments that have been proposed so far. Our plan is to work with Congress. We are working with the Legislative Affairs people to enact a bill that could address the concerns, but meet the general intent of what we want to do with this bill.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. McCARTY: Can we ask questions as you
2	go, or
3	MS. BUNSICK: I'm about done, so for more
4	information you can ask me now, or call us later.
5	That was perfect timing, by the way. And the up-to-
6	date status of the bill, the Library of Congress has a
7	website, thomas.loc.gov, as in Thomas Jefferson, and
8	that is where, you know, the hearings are scheduled,
9	if there are more amendments, if there is action on
10	anything, that's where you get the latest, greatest.
11	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And this will be
12	published? This will be on your website? You will
13	put this on your website, also?
14	MS. BUNSICK: Yes, yes. But I'm done with
15	my formal presentation.
16	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Heather?
17	MS. McCARTY: Mr. Chair, thank you. I'm
18	Heather McCarty. I was wondering about can you
19	tell us a little bit more about the amendments that
20	are being proposed, what their nature is and
21	MS. BUNSICK: Sure.
22	MS. McCARTY: I'm interested in that. It

may be in the book. I just haven't gotten to it yet.

MS. BUNSICK: No, it's not there yet. I don't know if that was something that we sent down, but I could make that available to Laurel afterwards in terms of, you know, the text of those amendments. Basically, the permit eligibility one strikes some language, and some of this has some technical implications, legal technical implications.

That's why the Administration is looking at it. Well, which language can we accept, you know, whether or not we accept the intent, is that the language you want? The permit eligibility has to do with, you know, whether a non-U.S. company, or a company that does not have an established U.S. subsidiary in the United States, some investor, are they eligible?

And that gets tied up in a lot of our international commitments under trade treaties, and so we have to work that out with folks at the Department of Commerce and the trade organizations, the trade agencies within the Government. And that is very closely linked to the vessel one, because the vessel

NEAL R. GROSS

1	language right now reads the vessels from certain
2	documentation requirements and fishery endorsements.
3	And so they are linked, because if you
4	allow somebody who is not a citizen to get a permit,
5	well, then they can't document their vessel. So those
6	two are pretty closely related.
7	MS. McCARTY: Mr. Chair, are those
8	amendments that are being proposed by Inouye and
9	Stevens would they act to make it easier, or more
10	difficult, for foreign companies to participate?
11	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Easier.
12	MS. BUNSICK: Go ahead.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right, it's easier
14	for them, right?
15	MS. BUNSICK: Well, if you band them all
16	together, then it's not. I think that comes down to
17	an interpretation of the language.
18	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
19	MS. BUNSICK: If they are not well, if
20	they are already a subsidiary, then it's easier for
21	them to operate because they I have to check this
22	with the I'm not sure if it would be easier or

1	harder, but
2	MS. McCARTY: That's okay. I'll look at
3	it. I just was curious.
4	MS. BUNSICK: Yes.
5	MS. McCARTY: And I have one other
6	question, Mr. Chair, if I may.
7	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Go ahead. I may have
8	confused the last answer, because I was listening to
9	two different groups on this. I got lots of calls
10	from
11	MS. McCARTY: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: from some of the
13	Alaska people
14	MS. McCARTY: I'm sure.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: that wanted to
16	make sure that they were part of it. Right. We'll
17	find out, though, soon.
18	MS. McCARTY: Okay. The other question
19	has to do with and, forgive me, you probably
20	already talked all around these issues in this body,
21	but consultation with regional councils, the Secretary
22	has to consult with regional councils before granting

1	a permit. Is that what you said?
2	MS. BUNSICK: Well, the details of that
3	are something we are working now on, how that I
4	mean, the Act doesn't have the details as to
5	specifically how that would work.
6	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
7	MS. BUNSICK: So that is something we have
8	started to look at internally.
9	MS. McCARTY: Okay. That's what I was
10	going to ask for was the details, but we know it's not
11	there yet. Okay. Thank you.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But we thought rather
13	than put that in the bill, that that would be
14	developed in the regulations, but our intent is that
15	we'll work closely with the councils, because we would
16	you know, from a management standpoint, too, you
17	know, you have to work with them on sizes, and also
18	which species you work with, you know.
19	MS. McCARTY: Right.
20	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: The Gulf Council, by
	1
21	the way, is moving pretty fast to have their own

1	getting something done.
2	MS. McCARTY: If I could, could I ask one
3	more question?
4	MS. BUNSICK: Sure.
5	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Of course you can.
6	MS. McCARTY: Thank you. As I know you're
7	all aware, Alaska fishermen don't like this very much.
8	I think the major problem they have with it is not so
9	much environmental, but marketing issues. And I know
10	you have had these discussions, as well.
11	Has there been any attempt in drafting
12	this bill, or in any of the amendments that might be
13	proposed, to deal with those issues and to set up a
14	process whereby some of these concerns might be
15	addressed now, and in the future?
16	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, I think two
17	things. Some of those we felt like would be developed
18	in the regulatory, the DIS and the regulatory package
19	to really implement this. I have a feeling that that
20	will be some of the things that will be discussed in
21	the hearing, and changes to the bill before it
22	probably goes forward, and we're willing to work with

that.

Yes, the other problem we have seen, I have seen a lot of times when you write bills that we get -- we try to implement them, and then it's not -- we get on both sides of implementing them whether we want to or not. Central Fish Habitat, we still have lots of problems with that bill and they think we're voting for what they think they've done through regulations.

So I'm personally happy with more goal posts than maybe we happen to have, but if you get into all the details, if it is not going to work in the Gulf, then it won't work in New England, won't work in Alaska. So we really do need to do this in regulations.

Now, if this bill were passed tomorrow, which it won't, but just say it was passed by June, it will be, I would say, two or three years before you really still see it in permit. It's going to take that long to have the scope of the meetings and to do the DIS and to do the regulations, you know?

I think that's where a lot of these things

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

20

21

22

should be done, but to get it through, you know, I would be very disappointed if it doesn't pass in some form, because I think this will be a blow to the U.S. fishery industry for the future, personally, I do.

MS. McCARTY: I agree with that, but I think you have to address some of these problems or else you're going to have so much opposition that --

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And they got to put them out and we've got to address them, right.

MS. McCARTY: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: If we don't, then we're dead. And I think another thing that seems to be confused, most of this, is aquaculture is already used so much for enhancement, you know, 35 percent of all the salmon in Alaska are hatchery, red drum. We have lost that in this discussion, for some reason. It has become something else, and we have got to get back to it, and we have got to address it. If we can't address the people's concerns then, you know, we have got trouble.

MS. McCARTY: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Other questions?

1	Yes, Eric?
2	MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you. Just
3	COURT REPORTER: Identify yourself,
4	please, sir.
5	MR. SCHWAAB: Eric Schwaab.
6	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
7	MR. SCHWAAB: You know, I was looking at
8	it - it looks to me like, from these numbers, that
9	it's somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 percent of
10	domestic consumption comes from offshore, overseas
11	aquaculture facilities.
12	And I just wonder, given the fact that
13	some of the big concerns relate to, you know,
14	environmental protection for domestic facilities,
15	whether there has been any kind of comparison done to
16	look at, for example, the environmental sustainability
17	of some of those overseas facilities.
18	I mean, it strikes me that this is very
19	similar to what the timber industry went through 20
20	years ago, where we had all kinds of concerns about
21	environmental effects of local production, and zero
22	concern about the impacts of imports and environmental

impacts overseas.

And one of the things that I think really turned the tide on that issue was sort of beginning to compare what we do here on a sustainable basis under effective environmental regulation is much better than what we're importing from other places, and with the oceans being interconnected, it's just so much more obvious.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes. We are looking at some of that, I think, you know, and we are. And one of the problems is, we don't want -- how do I say this? I don't want to do something that is going to sort of impact our process and industry and the seafood restaurants and all that now. If you start, you know, casting doubts, or stones at imports, when we got so much imports into the country, 70 percent of our imports, our seafood is import, then you can do damage to a lot of your processing and seafood industries here.

I think what we got to point out is that we'll have much stricter control over what is used to put on the fish to preserve them, or what is used as

far as how they are treated for disease and things. You know, we will control that, I think, much better than what's -- and this has gotten to a point. Let me tell you. We had just started and note -- it's really not -- we made no fanfare about it or anything, because we're just doing it as a service, but the inspection people are now overseas inspecting seafood for Safeway and a couple other of the large chains, because they said that they wanted us there before the seafood comes into the country. had some problems, but so quietly we're over there doing this. But, you know, we got to walk this fine line of what you do. Yes, Steve? DR. MURAWSKI: Steve Murawski. Bill, Eric makes a good point about the environmental issues associated with aquaculture offshore, and there really is an issue of whether or not the United States is exporting its environmental issues to particularly the third world --

NEAL R. GROSS

never be allowed in the United States. And the value

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.

DR. MURAWSKI: -- in practices that would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

They have

1	of shrimp imports last year, in 2004, was \$3.7
2	billion, right, which is the total value of all fin
3	fish fisheries in the United States, so it's huge in
4	terms of its potential footprint.
5	So if the United States develops best
6	practices in offshore aquaculture, and then tries to
7	make sure that other people, you know, follow those
8	best practices, particularly in terms of technology
9	innovation, you know, we could actually help, you
10	know, lift the entire industry up a little bit in
11	terms of doing this. So that's one reason to try to
12	do this.
13	MR. SCHWAAB: Yes. I mean, you allude to
14	that in this one fact sheet that's in the handout,
15	which I think may be a good way to go forward without
16	you know, while addressing Bill's concern, I mean,
17	sort of exporting BMTs.
18	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.
19	MR. SCHWAAB: And demonstrating those
20	kinds of things is a good argument, a good message.
21	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And I think Congress
22	is very sympathetic to that. What our fishermen are

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

20

21

22

subjected to, a lot of times we can get through Congress like TED, for example, you know, those restrictions. And so I think, you know, we could do more if we have something in place. Linda?

MS. CHAVES: Yes. Linda Chaves. We are actually working through the FAO Subcommittee on Aquaculture, which was just established relatively recently. And one of the things that we recently did was convene a workshop on coming up with risk assessment protocol for fin fish aquaculture, and we'll be delivering those to the FAO Subcommittee later on this year.

We're getting some interest from other countries, so we can start looking at this whole issue of risk assessment throughout other countries, so that we're all using the same baseline, so that we end up with information that can be compared. And we do want to export our best methods and practices through the FAO process to developed and developing countries.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. I think Tom, and then Peter.

MR. BILLY: Yes, thank you. Tom Billy.

As I think about this legislation, and aquaculture in general, I think of it from the consumer's perspective and, recently, the Scientific Advisory Committee that deals with the nutritional guidelines that are recommended for U.S. citizens, it's recommended that U.S. consumers increase their seafood consumption to two meals a week from the current average of one meal per week.

And if you project that out, and Linda Chaves has a graph if you want to see it, it represents increasing current demand for seafood in round weight from 7 million metric tons, currently, to 14 million metric tons by 2025.

And it seems to me that aquaculture done properly with the right safeguards that represent best practices, provides an opportunity for the U.S. to have, not only economic development, but some of the things that Bill and others have mentioned in terms of alternatives for current fishermen, and providing a significant amount of that increased demand from our own domestic production.

You're going to hear more on the next

NEAL R. GROSS

agenda item about the health justification increasing the seafood consumption, and it could well be with the science that is now being conducted that it could lead to even more demand for seafood in the And so I don't think we should underestimate future. the importance of, not only the development aquaculture potentially in the U.S., but opportunity to provide worldwide leadership in terms of best practices.

I think that's very significant because the demand is going to drive the supply. It's either going to come from here or somewhere else, as it is now, and I think we can be world leaders in the FAO forum and other forums if we choose to do so.

Finally, it's not entirely clear to me what you want from this Committee. We have been informed, but is there a specific action you would like us to take at this meeting, to take a position, to draft a letter to the Secretary, to do something, the types of things that this Committee has done in the past?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tom, I think it 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

be good if MAFAC would -- yes, some form of recognition that you have reviewed this and you support it, or you think that there are other things that need, you know, to be done and, you know, I think this would help.

I mean, if you think that there are other things, you know, other things that we need to be doing in this bill, that we need to change this bill, I mean, I don't have any problem with that being pointed out, but I think it would be helpful for the MAFAC to have some record of the involvement that you have had, because you have had a lot of involvement, probably more than any one group has had.

And, you know, if the group agreed to support it -- well, I hope the group could agree to support it, but if not, what would it take to make you be able to support it? I think it's the type of thing we need to know, because we do need -- if MAFAC doesn't support it as an advisor to the Secretary, then there's probably some problems. There's some problems there, but what would it take to make you be able to support it.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	The other thing is that Sea-Grant is
2	heavily involved in this let me tell you this real
3	quick and we with Sea-Grant, and we have put out a
4	call for proposals for \$4 million this year for pilot
5	projects in aquaculture. It won't fund a lot, but we
6	think it will fund enough to get some things going on,
7	and that is on the street now. It closes February the
8	20 th ?
9	MS. BUNSICK: February 28 th .
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
11	MS. BUNSICK: This is Susan Bunsick.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes. Okay. Peter?
13	MR. LEIPZIG: Yes. Pete Leipzig. I'm
14	curious about the mechanisms for the proposed
15	amendment for the states opting out. I can see how
16	giving the states an opportunity to opt out could
17	politically bring some support to the legislation, but
18	extending states jurisdiction is also a slippery
19	slope, in my mind.
20	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
21	MR. LEIPZIG: How would the states do it?

What would the lines be? How is that going to be

1	established? I haven't seen the amendment, so I'm
2	curious.
3	MS. BUNSICK: Okay. Well, yes. Well, the
4	amendments were not proposed by the Administration, so
5	we're still developing what our position is on that,
6	and those are the very issues that would need to be
7	looked at.
8	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. So it's a conceptual
9	amendment, or is there text to the amendment?
10	MS. BUNSICK: There is. The amendment,
11	there is text to the amendment and I could
12	actually, before I leave here I could copy a document
13	and leave it with you all that shows you the exact
14	text. But, yes, there was a specific text provided as
15	an insert to the bill that said these are the opt out
16	provisions.
17	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes. We need to get
18	those forms as I consider this.
19	MS. BUNSICK: Yes, I could do that before
20	I leave, yes.
21	MR. LEIPZIG: I would like to see it.
22	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Ken, and then

Ralph.

DR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Dr. Hogarth. Ken Roberts. I'm going to try to think out 20 years. I don't have a copy of the bill in front of me, but the synopsis I have. The way the permitting is described, it's described on a site-specific basis, and I'm sure that's the way we're thinking because of net anchoring and offshore oil structures and whatnot.

I think it might be good to prepare, at least conceptualize, that there might be mobile aquaculture sites that are related to ocean-going barges or ships or something like that, and let's think about it now while we're doing this instead of thinking that siting is a single space.

And I have a basis for doing that in terms of economics that I think might be better than being in one particular site, you know, everything from storm evasion to better environmental conditions and whatnot. So I think the technology may one day evolve there, and I think thinking of permits solely as a GPS point on a map might be a little too shallow. I think we'll need to think about it a little bit further.

Section 6 in the bill, which deals with authorizing of a research program, again, I don't have the bill, I just have a synopsis of it, I think there needs to be more thought about how it just seems to authorize a research program. And you mentioned Sea-Grant. I'm thinking back about how the Land Grant Program put food on the table.

And, again, thinking out 15 to 20 years, that there are diverse ways to approach research. can do it within your own organization. You can do it grantsmanship. it through You can do through designating regional university centers at regional aquaculture approaches. You can have programs like the Southern Regional Aquaculture Center, and other ones they have around the country.

So I think if you deal with something that's a support and a stimulator, I think the Act needs to take a -- or the bill needs to take a little more detailed look at research. That would be my preference, anyway, in looking out 15 to 20 years to get the structure. One thing I don't see in the bill is a thing that's very popular and very useful in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

technology field, is business incubators at universities.

You know, this isn't all just science. It's about how business structures itself, raises capital, attracts talent, and goes about developing products to market. And I think there is a stage in there that the business incubator type approach has some potential merit as part of the research package. And I don't see that in the bill, and I think that might be reasonably good to have in there.

The other thing I don't see is, it seems like, generally, we're dealing with the grow out phase. That's the permit. The permit is to go out here, and you've got a site, and then you have an operation permit. Again, I'm getting back to research and I'm thinking 20 years or so. I just don't see the research and the infrastructure setup that involves hatchery technology and singling production.

You know, if you look at the deficit we have in balance of trade and seafood, I'm a little rusty in this, but I think the two biggest components are probably salmon and shrimp, and the shrimp clearly

first. We're not going to close that gap with offshore aquaculture that I can see. I may be wrong 20 years from now.

In salmon, we're already competing against and probably not too well with our it, salmon aquaculture people that operate and that handle the initial waters. So our real opportunity to close the gap is probably 40 percent over there that we can attack, and I think it's going to take a focused effort at the hatchery, the singling and the brood stock baseline kind of thing, framework, to get offshore aquaculture going. I would hope the research program is going to make an investment in that. Anyway, those are comments, not questions.

MS. BUNSICK: Susan Bunsick. We are looking at a lot of that in terms, already. The thing is, the act was focusing on where are the gaps in authority, and what specific authorizations do we need, you know, to manage the offshore, but your comments are very good.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Again, I think, you know, the question is can we -- unless we have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

authority to do this and people see that there is a future, because right now there's no authority, really, when you get to this stage, or do you try to put all of these things in a bill? And we have chose not to put them in the bill, but in the policy statement, knowing that this is something that will, hopefully the bill will set the stage for future work and that's what we -- and now, maybe we're wrong.

I mean, it's a good discussion point.

But, yes, let me get Ralph and then Tom. Let me get Ralph first. Okay.

MR. RAYBURN: Ralph Rayburn. I guess one of the problems that I have had watching the bill evolve is the lack of incentives to stimulate offshore aquaculture, and that can be not only the facilities in the offshore, but as Ken mentioned also, facilities onshore, the hatcheries and those kinds of support mechanisms. Yet, it seems, as I recall, in the mid '90s or the initial Fishery Conservation Management Act, there were at that point in time a recognition of opportunities in fisheries and incentives for those.

Obligation guarantee for fishing vessel

NEAL R. GROSS

construction, capital construction for a tax deferral process, to build capital up to reinvest, those kind of things. So it seems to me from the early stages, and maybe I was just jaundice at this, efforts to, obviously, to set up the authority, but also efforts to extract a royalty from these operations and permitting fees and things like that.

So, it set the focus more of trying to capture money, funds from innovators that would get into this without an equal opportunity on behalf of the Government to actually put the money where the mouth is, that \$11 billion trade surplus -- I mean, trade deficit in seafood products is an issue within our country, and one way to deal with that is to create an offshore aquaculture, and we're willing to put our money down through these obligation quarantees or capital construction or something like that to stimulate the development offshore actually of aquaculture and provide some financial structure for those that wish to get involved in it that they could go to capital lending institutions and have Government backing of those loans.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, I guess I've always, even though I
recognize that this is just to set up the framework,
it seems like it's some opportunity within the
legislation to at least have a regulatory authority
over the those types of incentives would be some
I think, a more favorable position. And actually say
the Government is interested in offshore aquaculture;
they are interested in the deficit. They do want to do
something about it, rather than set up the authority,
and anybody that can, you know, get out there and
face the type of situations you have in the offshore,
go for it, you know. That's not the way we have done
it in the past. So it shows a little bit.

I also would be interested to maybe see the, you know, implications of the Energy Bill where I guess in that, as I understand it, Minerals Management was given some authority to regulate other activities on the continental shelf beyond just oil and gas. I think there maybe is a Register notice out now where soliciting comments on how expansive that authority should be, whether it is just related to offshore oil and gas structures and any other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

activities that are associated to that, which I think could include aquaculture, or whether it is a broader, leasing permitting type initiative.

Has the office done anything looking at that and seeing whether or not, in fact, that may preempt even this legislation? That's a question. The other was just rhetoric.

MS. BUNSICK: Yes. Thank you. Susan Bunsick. Actually, that's in my bag as one of the things I'm reviewing. My initial reading of what MMS published recently for comment seemed to to indicate that whoever wrote the notice was well-aware of legislation, because they mentioned aquaculture, and they are really looking in terms of they don't want to supersede other authorities, and it's really aquaculture that is, you know, facility, you know, on one of their facilities.

And our language does include mechanisms to work with Minerals Management Service to coordinate that process. They made a very good case as to why they need to be engaged for, you know, worker safety issues, and structure maintenance issues and,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

obviously, we do want the liability issue.

So, I haven't prepared my official comments, but my reading was that they are looking at a lot of the same issues we are, too.

MR. RAYBURN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, they have done that, too. They have signed off on this legislation, because when you do legislation in administration, it goes through everybody. God, does it go through everybody. And some of them just take real advantage of it, I think, to get their comments in, and it's difficult at times. With Magnuson we had a heck of time with the Treasury Department just understanding what we meant by IFQs and things like that.

In this we had some real issues with the Interior up front, but they all got worked out and signed-off. So the bill itself has got Administration approval from all agencies. So if they do something different, then we would have to go back and work that out. Yes, Tom?

MR. BILLY: Yes, just a reminder, as Ralph made his points, it reminded me that, at our last

meeting, we asked NOAA Fisheries to develop a 10 year
plan, and that that plan contain a comprehensive
presentation of the goals and objectives that NOAA
would put forward for our consideration in terms of
aquaculture development here in the U.S.
The plan would position this Act or this
bill in terms of the role that we would play in the
bigger picture in terms of what kinds of research,
what kinds of development, what kinds of financial
assistance, who they would expect to be the players
within the NOAA community as well as others.
So, my understanding is that they are
working on that 10 year plan, and it should be ready
for our next meeting in July. And so I would
recommend that we make aquaculture a major item on
that agenda, and have an opportunity to look at that
plan in advance, and then provide some detailed input
to that process.
VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And we will do that.
I promise we'll do that. Heather? Okay.

All right. Thank you, Mr. MS. McCARTY: Heather McCarty. I would like to make a Chairman.

couple of comments. I had some questions before, so you probably know where I'm going. I look at this from an Alaska perspective, but in a couple of different areas, and I think it applies to other places in the United States, as well, perhaps. And those two areas are the foreign ownership issue, and the market issue.

As far as foreign ownership goes, I don't know what these amendments say, and I'm not familiar enough with the language that's already in there to know exactly what the rules are, but it looks to me as though there aren't many, at this point. And that foreign ownership could play a pretty big role.

In Alaska, as you probably know, there are a number of seafood companies, most of which are owned by foreign countries, or people from foreign countries. And it has been a sore point for the whole history of the state that a lot of the benefits of the seafood resource in Alaska accrue to those countries rather than to the United States, and particularly rather than to the State of Alaska.

This is a sticky issue, and it has been

NEAL R. GROSS

around for a long time in a lot of different contexts in Alaska. I think that, before I want to put any stamp of approval on anything, I would like to see how that works. What are the economics of that? If the balance of trade issue is an important one, which it seems to be, and it seems to be one of the things that's driving this, we want to make sure that the benefits of the Offshore Aquaculture Program really do accrue to the United States, and to the individual states. I think that's a really important thing.

Perhaps the onshore facilities, the research and all the things that Ken Roberts just talked about, could go some in that direction to help make sure that the benefits are accrued to the folks in the country. And that sort of ties in with these market issues.

Perhaps, as part of this research and development section, there could be some emphasis on research into really understanding what the economics of these offshore aquaculture products might do, not just to the country, but to the coastal communities and the states where they are going to be close to. I

	chillik that is a necessary part of what we need to
2	understand before we put some of these things ir
3	place.
4	I spent a number of years as the marketing
5	manager for the largest salmon ranching operation ir
6	North America in Prince William Sound, and when they
7	put that program together, they did a really good job
8	of deciding how it would look and where it would be
9	and what it would produce, but they didn't do a very
10	good job of figuring out what the market situation
11	would be at the other end of it, and who would benefit
12	from the program.
13	I think, before people should be
14	comfortable with this, they should know the answers to
15	some of those questions.
16	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Go ahead.
17	MS. BUNSICK: Susan Bunsick. We do have
18	an economic study underway now that will have results
19	later this year that will look at many of those
20	issues, and you will have to go look at the outline to
21	see if it covers all the things you listed.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH:

22

We need to get,

1	Susan, all the amendments, and put words off and get
2	them to them today.
3	MS. BUNSICK: Yes, I can do that for you.
4	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We'll get you all the
5	amendments and the wording of the amendments. I think
6	all of you probably have the bill, right? If you
7	don't have the bill, we can get you a copy of it. But
8	we'll get you the amendments and the exact wording of
9	the amendments. Mary Beth?
10	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thank you, Mr.
11	Chairman. Mary Beth Tooley. The thing that comes to
12	my mind when I think of increased aquaculture is an
13	increased need for feed to support those operations.
14	And I was just curious if there is anything in the
15	bill that would address that.
16	You know, an increased need for feed can
17	put stress on other wild species and, you know,
18	developing feed sources for an increase in aquaculture
19	is sort of a long-term planning process, and is
20	something like that underway, or addressed in the
21	bill?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH:

22

There is a lot of

work going on on feed already. You know, the fact they are using vegetation, experiments now with vegetation for food, some supplemental from Omega 3. There is a lot of work going on. In fact, we have one lab that does a lot of research in feed. But it's not addressed in this bill. It would have to be addressed in the regulations, but it's not addressed in the bill itself that I'm aware of. Susan?

MS. BUNSICK: I mean, the feeds issue is not specific. Well, the environmental impacts are addressed, so to the extent you say the impact on wild species and the ecosystem I think indirectly it does address the feeds issue. But I think it's tomorrow morning at the Aquaculture Conference, the soybean growers are very interested in this, because they see aquaculture feeds is a market for their product.

So, I mean, there are other feeds mixes being, you know, experimented with. Of course, you have to look at what does that do to the flavor of the fish, the growth rate of the fish, the health of the fish, and all of those issues. But it's something that's important to the industry as well as

environmental groups.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Yes. I mean, certainly in New England we have a large lobster fishery that is supported by the -- that is fresh fish coming out of the ocean, and it has often been suggested that the New England Lobster Fishery is an aquaculture, you know, fishery in itself, and there has certainly been a lot of work done to try to develop other bait sources from rawhide to, you know, orange pulp from the State of Florida.

We have some of that in our ship, but they haven't found anything to replace herring or other fish sources that really support the fishery in the same way that have the same nutrition and the overall health of the species. So as aquaculture, you know, increases, then these issues all become more important.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We do have the economist coming, I think, tomorrow, that has been working on this. Don Ord will be here tomorrow, so we'll try to find some time to get some of the economic stuff.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. CHAVES: Linda Chaves. One of the things that's really important in the feed issue, is if you take a look at fish meal production over the last 20 years, it really hasn't changed that much. It has been pretty much, you know, up and down, up and down, a pretty much straight line.

What has changed is the amount of fish meal that's going into aquaculture. Still, I don't have my number right in the top of my head, but I have got it on the slide, I think about 90 percent of all fish meal production goes into other things in aquaculture, and you're slowly seeing that change, but very, very slowly as the aquaculture industry is willing to pay more than, say, chicken or cattle or pigs.

Ι think we're going to So see that continue to happen but, at the same time, we do need address other feed sources, and mixing determining, you know, when is it most important for fish to have fish meal? Is it right before it's sold, you know, that last period of time, so that you can get the -- make sure the Omega 3s are all there.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	just thought I'd offer that.
2	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: 30 percent of the
3	global goes to aquaculture.
4	MS. CHAVES: 3 percent?
5	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: 30.
6	MS. CHAVES: Not according to the FAO
7	Study I've got.
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right now, about 30
9	percent of the global fish meal production goes to
10	aquaculture. Most fish meal goes to the chicken/pork
11	industries.
12	MR. SIMPSON: Worldwide.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Worldwide, yes,
14	worldwide.
15	MR. SIMPSON: Domestic, she is probably
16	right.
17	MS. CHAVES: No, I'm talking about an FAO
18	Study that I just got.
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: As usual, it is we
20	certainly do have problems with numbers. Well, the
21	next page says about 70 percent of the fish meal used
22	in aquaculture is used that's used by salmon, trout

1	and shrimp. Okay. Figure that number out.
2	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Well, just to follow-
3	up very briefly on that. Those species that are
4	harvested to go to fish meal, or whether or not you
5	have fisheries that are directed directly, you know,
6	fish meal, or you're going, okay, and catching that,
7	then that's all going to be processed. You know,
8	those become, you know, something very political.
9	The herring SMP in New England, you cannot
LO	directly fish for herring and send it to a meal plant.
L1	You can send it on a truck up to Canada where it can
L2	go to a meal plant, but not in the U.S. So, I mean,
L3	you know, it can create fisheries that don't exit when
L4	there's a demand for fish meal, so I, you know, think
L5	it makes sense.
L6	MS. CHAVES: But it is very
L7	MR. JONER: Dr. Hogarth, you mentioned in
L8	your introduction to this that
L9	COURT REPORTER: Identify yourself,
20	please.
21	MR. JONER: I'm sorry, Steve Joner. There
22	are two parts to this. One is the grow out for

market, and the other was for supplementation of wild production, wild fish. Is that part of the bill? Is that included in there?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, please.

MS. BUNSICK: Well, to the extent -- Susan Bunsick. To the extent that your permit is going to be for an enhancement project, yes, but if you're not going to be sited in the exclusive economic zone, you know, you're going to do that. You're going to grow your fish in hatcheries on land, or you figure you're going to have your fingerlings maybe in your shore areas that are under state permitting systems.

In terms of the research, if you're doing research on a species and, you know, brood stocks and things like that, the outcome of that research could be you're going to release them into the wild or you're going to put them in a cage and throw them out, or maybe you're going to put them in a cage and grow them to a certain size and you're going to be in the EEZ. And then release them.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But it basically includes enhancement.

MS. BUNSICK: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.

MR. JONER: Ι think that's important because, I quess, if you're going to have somebody mad at you, you may well have everybody mad at you. with the Makah Tribe, we got involved with the Northwest Science Center in looking into aquaculture of sadle fish and, of course, that got the long liners None of them missed an upset, Alaska fishermen. opportunity of letting me know what they think about it.

But even within the tribal fleet, we had some people that were strongly opposed to it because of the history and the example of the experience with Atlantic salmon. And, yet, I see this as a great opportunity to help some of these coastal communities that frequently face disasters due to declining fish stocks, declining harvest opportunity.

And if this is done as a fishing industrybased initiative, something that will really benefit the communities, and I don't know how that works, you know, with all the laws and so on, but if it's done in

NEAL R. GROSS

a way that favors, targets the communities as being
the ones to do this rather than these foreign
investors, I think that is critical. And some of the
Makah fishermen saw the value of this, and invested
their own money into the research. When the Science
Center started to run out of money, a couple of
fishermen supported the Blacktop Project for a year or
two. And then as part of this, we saw the need to try
to get some enhancement going because of the over-
fished status of many of our stocks. And, of course,
that brought in the opposition from the anti-hatchery
groups.
And, again, using salmon as an example of
how things are done improperly, but there are some

And, again, using salmon as an example of how things are done improperly, but there are some good examples of salmon hatcheries that were run properly, and have served the goal of enhancing or supplementing wild production, and it's not all bad. So I think these two really go hand-in-hand, really would lead to the success of the bill and the program.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Larry?

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Larry Simpson, Gulf of Mexico. I think the comments are wonderful

NEAL R. GROSS

and excellent. It gets down to, after the studies and after the comments about specifics, would you be better off with a National Aquaculture Act, or not? And I think in the Gulf there is still some reservations about some aspects of aquaculture.

I think the answer is yes. And, you know, you got to address the feeds. You got to address the fees. You have to address the locations. You have to address the data and separating wild stock from aquaculture, in-season and out of season. Some of the big concerns in the Gulf are the environmental bonds associated with these things, you know, what is going to happen if the world comes to an end, and who is going to pay for cleaning all this up?

Now, we have had that occur on land base, and we don't want it to occur offshore. The issue of foreign activity I think is important. The framework, and Ralph mentioned the framework, is all there about how to address this. I'm concerned more about the shutdown procedures. I'm more concerned about the long-term effects of markets, and how that would occur. And, ultimately, I'm concerned about, once you

NEAL R. GROSS

institute something, how are you going to maintain the political will to make changes?

I mean, everything is good and optimal until you get into the level of too much magnitude. Imports in shrimp are very good. You can't have the product on the market without imports. Then you get to the sticky question of, how much is too much. You know, when I first started working in this business, it was about 40 percent imports into this country in shrimp. Now, it's, you know, 70, 80 percent. It's 90 to restaurants.

I mean, it's the issue of magnitude, and where is the political will once something is instituted to make changes. But overall, Bill, I would have to say, at least in the Gulf, you're better off having it. It's a good thing to discuss things as finitely as you can, and as detailed as you can, but it's all -- you're never going to answer your question about marketing.

That's going to be the political will of how to deal with it. It says consulting will consider the markets. Well, you consider it and still do it.

NEAL R. GROSS

That's not going to answer your issue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Thanks, Larry. Eric?
We might have to cut it off after this, but we have
one public person who wants to speak, too.

MR. SCHWAAB: Eric Schwaab. I will try to Actually, Steve hit on a point that I do this quick. was really thinking about over here myself in kind of a somewhat different way, but I think this opportunity for integration of aquaculture operations with wild fisheries is really sort of а argument. And with the focus in Magnuson on dedicated privileges, it becomes Ι think compelling, and the opportunity becomes even greater, whether it's for grow out or whether it's for market timing or something along those lines.

And I just wonder if there is anything either in this bill, because I don't recall, or in the Bill, that would sort of Magnuson create opportunity for that integration that would be perhaps something, there would be something in fisheries to target wild stocks, and sort of go down that road a little further. It just kind of was

NEAL R. GROSS

1	occurring to me, and Steve like touched on something
2	very similar.
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I don't think it's
4	anything specific. We need to think about that, but
5	it isn't, Eric, right now.
6	MR. SCHWAAB: There might be some
7	opportunity there.
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, I think we all
9	realize that, but the one thing we were really
10	concerned about is, we don't want to get to put and
11	take fisheries in this country. I think that's
12	dangerous, but there's a point at which you can do.
13	MR. SCHWAAB: I'm thinking more along the
14	lines of take, hold, and then time.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, yes.
16	MR. SCHWAAB: I mean, and there are some
17	places where that is happening already.
18	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right, yes.
19	MR. WORTH: I shocked myself here. It's
20	not usually cold in South Florida, but when it is you
21	shock yourself. Mark Worth again from Food and Water
22	Watch in Washington, D.C. We're a nonprofit consumer

group, and I want to thank Dr. Hogarth and Ms. Bryant for allowing me to speak, bending the rules, perhaps, but I appreciate it.

I comment today to express our concerns about NOAA's aquaculture legislation. We are very concerned about the impacts that large scale commercial aquaculture may have. Water flowing out of fish farms excessive nutrients. can carry particulates, metals, antibiotics, pesticides, other chemicals that may pose serious problems water quality and the environment.

Marine fish farms can also introduce nonnative fish into the ecosystem. Contaminants found in
farm-raised fish may threaten public health. In
addition, while touted as a way of reducing the
pressure on depleted fishing populations, marine
aquaculture feed requirements may actually increase
these pressures, as Ms. Tooley, I believe, pointed
out.

Unfortunately, we're concerned that the Administration's Offshore Aquaculture Bill allows for the permitting of fish farms with little criteria for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	addressing these issues. We are further alarmed that
2	NOAA has decided not to conduct a legislative EIS, so
3	that Congress and the public can even begin to assess
4	the effects of offshore fish farming.
5	Finally, as the Committee charged with
6	ensuring that the nation's living marine resource
7	policies and programs meet the needs of fishermen, the
8	environment and consumers, I ask that you advise the
9	Administration that this bill needs extensive work,
10	and that the Administration should not move forward
11	until open ocean aquaculture's potential problems are
12	further studied, and until NOAA presents a bill that
13	comprehensively addresses these problems.
14	And I just had a brief question for Dr.
15	Hogarth. When you said that, after the bill was
16	passed, that the EIS would be the first thing to be
17	done, if you could expand on what that might mean. I
18	was is that some sort of a programmatic EIS?
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes. What
20	MR. SIMPSON: Can you tell us how that
21	might work?
22	MR. WORTH: Thanks.

1	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Once the bill
2	thanks, Mark, really for your comments. I appreciate
3	it. I think once the bill you know, we spend a lot
4	of time discussing what we should do in EIS now on the
5	bill as it's written. The problem is, the bill is
6	changing, and I'm almost 100 percent certain the bill
7	will change even more as it goes through the House and
8	the Senate.
9	So you're working on a moving target, so
10	to speak. The first we do when we get through to this
11	is do a programmatic EIS, and start developing
12	regulations based on the EIS. It will take,
13	approximately, two to three years, in my estimation,
14	to do it. We talked about somewhere around \$500,000
15	to \$1 million to get it done and get it done right.
16	So, yes, we will not do anything until the
17	EIS, the programmatic EIS, and the regulations are
18	done through a public process.
19	MR. SIMPSON: Thank you.
20	MR. WORTH: Thank you, sir.
21	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. No.
22	MR. RAYBURN: Okay.

1	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, all right. If I
2	let you go and I let him go, then we're off schedule.
3	MR. RAYBURN: No, no.
4	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But if you got
5	keep it a little bit keep it short.
6	MR. RAYBURN: Okay. Sure. All right. Am
7	I short, or is he short?
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Both of them.
9	MR. RAYBURN: I just want to say, probably
10	within the next week or two, Sea-Grant funded some
11	study at the University of Delaware. It was a
12	framework for offshore regulatory, whatever, rules,
13	part of Susan's. It's an extension of what Susan did
14	for her master's degree at the University of Delaware,
15	and that should be out, I think, within the next
16	several weeks.
17	So it might be good to have a copy of that
18	distributed to the MAFAC Members, because it's a
19	fairly comprehensive review. It's a consensus
20	document on what may constitute a reasonable
21	consideration in developing a framework for offshore

22

aquaculture regulations.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, thank you.

Okay. Great discussion. I think we really have to focus more on this Act. I agree. July is probably not too late in this game. I'm sure it's not too late in this game, and I think we ought to really kick in

COURT REPORTER: Dr. Hogarth, your microphone.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I'm sorry. I would like to have from the group, and I'm sure that the Committee can discuss, the subcommittee this week, but try to -- the comments we have heard here, let's try to form those into some way of questions or comments or something, recommendations that we can take back and look at now, so that we can hopefully have a better discussion of those in July.

And as we develop these, we will get comments to you. You know, I don't want to force something or push something that I just guess I'm convinced that the issues that have been raised can be dealt with through the regulations and through the EIS, and I just think, if the EIS does it, I don't see

1	us, 20 years from now, being very dependent on
2	imports. But, anyway, we'll see how it goes. Now,
3	Linda?
4	MS. CHAVES: Thank you.
5	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Chaves. Seafood
6	Health and Safety.
7	MS. CHAVES: Okay. We're a little short
8	on time, so I'm going to run through this probably
9	relatively quickly, but I'm passing out copies of the
10	PowerPoint so that there are a couple of slides
11	that have a lot of detail on them. I'm not going to
12	go into that detail. If you have got questions, I
13	will be more than happy to try to answer them for you
14	afterwards.
15	First of all, NMFS has been involved in
16	the whole seafood and health issue for quite some
17	time. Back in the 1980s our SK Program actually
18	focused on seafood and health issues, and we funded
19	some very, very early research dealing with Omega 3s
20	in fish products in the northwest. I know for sure,
21	because I was the contract manager for those projects.
22	In 1985, we hosted a conference called

Seafood and Health '85, during which time we brought in the medical community, and we also talked about a lot of the findings from our research, and also what was coming in from the medical community.

At the same time, we entered into a cooperative agreement with NIH and NFI, and we hosted a very serious scientific medical conference in Washington, D.C., and I remember Bob Kiefer who was with us, some of you know him, was sitting up on the podium, and I was so impressed that he was taking notes about all of these slides. And later I said, Bob, how did you know all that? He said, Linda, I was just pretending. I had no idea what they were talking about.

So, on the one hand, we were dealing with the medical community. On the other, we were dealing with communicators and the seafood industry and talking about the marketing challenges. It was fairly easy back then because all we knew about was the good things about seafood. We were just beginning to learn about that. We weren't really hearing about anything negative.

NEAL R. GROSS

We then went further in our NIH and we actually had the center, partnership, laboratory, in Charleston at the time, and our laboratory in Seattle working on the production and testing of Omega 3 fatty acid capsules, which were then provided to NIH for a lot of research and human And I believe that ended up in research. think it was about 90 different studies that were being done. At that time you really couldn't get great Omega 3 fatty acid capsules on the market.

We have funded a project through the National Academy of Sciences. They are going to be taking a look at some of the contaminant issues, looking at benefits and risks. Particularly, they will be looking at methylmercury. That report will be out later on this year.

In December, we coordinated a conference on seafood and health, very much patterned after the one that we had done in 1985, which was held in D.C. We brought in scientists from all over the world. Tom Billy served as the Chairman of the Scientific

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Committee. Actually, the Chairman of the whole conference.

And we have been attacked because some people said, you know, it was NMFS that picked all of the speakers. It was going to be biased. Actually, I had nothing to do with selecting speakers. It was done by a scientific advisory committee which included people from National Institutes of Health, retired medical people, some of the top researchers in the field.

We are also putting money into something called ALSPAC, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children, and there we're working with CDC, FDA and NIH. This is a study that began in the early 1990s in the U.K., where they were following 14,000 pregnant women and children. And there have been a number of publications that have come out of that, and there will be more coming out further along. This study is not looking just at seafood, but it's looking at all lifestyle, dietary intakes, you name it, and Tom probably knows a little more details about it than I do.

NEAL R. GROSS

And we're also looking now at possibly doing some work with Harvard. They have asked for our assistance, and we're going to see if we can get the Northwest Fisheries Science Center to work with them looking at salmon. And there are some other universities that are coming to us also seeing --well, they think that we have money, but we'll see about that.

The conference, you can read all the topics there, and I actually have a few copies of the program if you're interested in seeing exactly what the speakers spoke about and the presentations, which will all be posted on the website once we have all the final approvals from the speakers.

But we really talked about everything, heart disease, fetal infant development, risk-benefit considerations, challenges for communicators, policy implications, and we did talk about methylmercury issues, because that is really the hot negative, and we also spoke about PCBs.

I think the messages, though, are really important. Basically, you should be eating seafood

NEAL R. GROSS

from the womb to the tomb. Couldn't help it. Sorry. And it's basically a lot more important to eat seafood than not to eat it, regardless of what contaminants are in it. The benefits seriously outweigh the risks, and this is not me just saying this. This is coming from a lot of the scientists who spoke at our conference.

And one of the things that is very, very important in the United States and other countries is that most of the consumption recommendations and advisories are based only on the risk side of the equation, and what we really need to do is to get them to take a look at the benefits, as well, and weigh them together.

This is not easy, because it is changing the paradigm, if you will, but we're talking to FDA about this, and FDA is actually doing some work looking at benefits and risks of seafood consumption.

That is something that is going to be coming out of the NAS Study. There is a lot of interest in changing the way we look at food recommendations also in other countries, but we need to sort of be moving that along

NEAL R. GROSS

because you suffer an awful lot if you don't eat seafood.

I think the last message I have on here goes to what Tom was talking about, and I think really feeds into the whole aquaculture discussion, and that is that, if going increase seafood we are to consumption the way the conference suggests we should, we are going to need more fish. There is no way it's going to be produced in the wild. The projection of needing 7 million metric tons more raw fish if we eat two seafood meals, and that's only 4 ounce meals. mean, a lot of people here, I have seen them eating seafood meals, and a 4 ounce portion is pretty small.

So we're really looking at needing to produce a lot more than 7 million metric more tons just for the U.S. market by 2025. And if we're going to be looking at aquaculture, and we have to as one of the ways to produce that fish, we should probably be taking a look at making sure that we produce the most nutritionally beneficial fish we possibly can, and also not necessarily just looking at the highest priced ones, but also producing something that the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

average and low-income family can consume.

So where do we go from here? Right now we are trying to get the website finalized. If you go to that, you can see the program. You can see all the speakers, abstracts for most of the presentations, I believe, and we are posting those presentations where the scientists have approved and we put them on the website.

And some people have said well, why can't you just put them on all after the conference? We had a number of scientists who presented unpublished material. And so they were pulling those slides out of presentations so that they can then get their work published in peer review technical journals. And we were pleased that they would share the information with us, but we also don't want to keep them from getting their publications out.

And we're getting a lot of requests for specific presentations, and we're making those available to those people who are asking for them. Formal proceedings will be coming out, and they will be published with the FAO logo on it. One of the

things I didn't talk about was that the conference was actually sponsored by NOAA, the government of Norway, the government of Iceland, the government of Canada, and FAO was not technically a sponsor, but the conference was organized with the technical participation and assistance of FAO.

And they are very, very interested in making sure that the proceedings go out with their logo, and they have asked us to make that information available, all kinds of information available for a lot of their other publications, and have asked us to participate in some of the FAO meetings, so that we can try to get the word out even more.

One of the things in the formal proceedings we're going to also do is that there are very interesting Q&A sessions after each of the presentations. Unfortunately, we had so much crammed into three days that we had to cut virtually every discussion off. And so we're going to allow some of the speakers to elaborate on the responses they gave, fuller answers that there are there really SO addressing 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

And we want to have some simplified papers put together, so that they are in plain English for average people to understand, not just necessarily the

Further on, we have been approached by American Dietetic Association and a few others, and they want to work with us on getting the whole word out about seafood and health. They see that this is lacking, and so we'll be working with them for certain, and a number of other organizations. We have had a number of opportunities to talk about the conference and some of the findings already.

Bill Seafood Choices spoke at the Conference as a luncheon speaker; that was, what, two weeks ago now, and this whole issue of seafood and heath came up with that. The Subcommittee on Trade for FAO wants a presentation on the conference. Aquaculture Association, Hawaiian there's planet meeting in Europe later on this year; they want to bring this whole issue in.

The Chilean industry is interested. We're getting a lot of requests either to provide

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

medical community.

information or to actually participate, and what we're also trying to do is get some of the speakers invited to these things, because they can actually direct the very, very specific issues. And, you know, we don't need to be in the spotlight. We really want the scientists to be in the spotlight.

They will be facilitating speaker interviews, and I have, also, some publications that have come out. Since then, the most interest -- one of them is really interesting. It's Bill's corner, and I was really glad to see that Bill is really gungho about the conference, for those of you who haven't seen that.

I also have an article, copies of an article from Global Aquaculture Alliance, and I've got the word "draft" written on the very top. It's supposed to be coming out any day. And if you take a look at this, you will see that it is not the final proof of the article, because there are a couple of places in there where they had a couple of questions that are in red. So we did get their permission to hand it out to the MAFAC Committee, but it is not

final final.

And I'll pass around a few other places where we have had some press about this just so you can get a flavor of the different types of stories that have been written about the conference.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Linda, that talk is under Tab 6.

MS. CHAVES: Your talk?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: It's on Table 2, yes.

MS. CHAVES: Bill's talk? From Seafood Choices, okay. Okay. I was going to say, we don't have formal written comments from the seafood and health conference for Bill.

MS. BRYANT: No.

MS. CHAVES: But if you go to the conference website, you will see speeches. Tom gave an opening address, an opening keynote which sort of put everything into perspective. And if you take a look at the GAA article, that was actually Tom's article as a result of the conference. And I don't have -- I only printed 20 copies, so all the Members here get copies, and those of you at the foot of the

table will have to share. Sorry.

And so where do we go in the future? And I think that you need to take a look at what the long-term U.S. strategy ought to be, and come up with a vision statement, and that is that seafood's rule in human health is understood, accepted, and realized. And if it's not realized, if we don't do anything about it, then it's all for not.

So what we see is a Steering Committee among stakeholders being formed. It's established to sort of guide how we go forward, that we have common goals and objectives regarding the role of seafood and health, that we -- once we have identified all the stakeholders, that everyone knows what their role is. It may be appropriate for Government to do some things. It may be inappropriate for us to do some things.

Whereas, industry can have a role, organizations such as the ADA has a role. There's something for everyone to do in this, and a lot of it is, obviously, educational, but at the same time if we're looking at seafood production, you know, there

are some things that need to be done there, as well.

And I alluded to the whole issue of risk-benefit being incorporated into recommendations.

And it's very, very important, we think, that public health control advisories be based on risk-benefit consideration. And we can work on that here, domestically, but it can also be taken to Kodak Selemantaries and to other international organizations where there is an interest at beginning, I think, to occur to look at this. Tom, having been chairman of Kodak Selemantaries for two terms, can probably address that issue. No, not probably, I know he can address that issue better than I can.

And ultimately, if we're going to all eat more seafood, we're going to have to increase production. Some of it can come from the wild, but I think that most of the increased production will be coming from aquaculture, be it shore based, within state waters, or in the offshore environment. And there is no reason why it can't be done consistent with environmental and conservation goals, and I think that this is, once again this sort of tailors into

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sort of the whole aquaculture discussion that we have had and I didn't plan it that way, that's just reality.

And so we've got to get our national strategy developed. One of the things that has been discussed is that there be a science-driven nonprofit institute established to serve as a resource regarding seafood and health issues. This would be the go to place where you would get peer reviewed research findings. This would not be driven by industry, but it would be driven by scientists, people who are in the field who really know what's going on.

It would be nonprofit. It would probably need funding from industry and from whoever would be willing to do it, but this is not something that industry could drive as such. We have interest already from some of the medical community to be involved in something like this, and so we'll be taking a look to see how that goes forward.

We also need to continue coordinating and participating in workshops. There are some requests already to try to bring the findings of the seafood

NEAL R. GROSS

and health conference to smaller groups all around the country, and we're trying to see how that can actually happen. And we need to collaborate with other agencies and organizations, ADA, International Food Information Council; there are a number of others that we can talk about.

And Tom can talk about a campaign that was organized while he was at USDA called the "Fight Bac Campaign." And I didn't leave the "K" off, that's "Fight Bacteria." I had it spelled with a K originally, and I was corrected. And then once again, we need to look at culturing species with beneficial nutritional profiles.

stakeholders? Who are the Government, industry, Food Marketing Institute, NFI, Salmon of the both farmed Americas, you have got and wild, professional associations, American Dietetic Association, IFIC is the International Food Information Council, they are very interested in this. is the American College of Obstetrics Gynecology. There are all kinds of organizations that are interested in this whole issue and want to work

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	together with us. We're also talking to the American
2	Heart Association. NGOs, we've identified CSPI,
3	Science and Public Interest, Citizens for
4	PARTICIPANT: Center for Science and
5	Public Interest.
6	MS. CHAVES: Center for Science and Public
7	Interest, and the Consumer
8	PARTICIPANT: Federation.
9	MS. CHAVES: Federation of America,
10	which has several million members, according to Tom.
11	The medical community. As I said, we have had a
12	number of doctors who are already talking to us and
13	saying, yes, we would like to be involved in all of
14	this. And consumers, the very, very bottom, but most
15	important because, really, the consumer is the person
16	who drives everything.
17	The nonprofit institute would have a
18	scientific advisory board, would serve as a
19	clearinghouse. It could also identify where the
20	research gaps are. I think everybody knows that
	1

doing research just for the sake of doing research,

but the idea is that there are some critical gaps in information regarding seafood and health.

And a group like this could suggest where those research gaps exist, and possibly how to get that funded and how, maybe even to bring together some collaboration between different institutes to make sure that the questions are answered.

We also need to take a look at quantifying the benefits of seafood. This did come up in one or two of the presentations at the conference that, if you eat X amount of fish in the country every day or every week, you will reduce cardiac deaths by so many, and it really does need to be translated into economic terms.

And, finally, we need to get the word out, and that's education, education, education, looking at getting people to eat seafood in schools, high schools, throughout life, and ADA is very interested in putting together education modules on this whole issue.

So right now, we have got to figure out who all is going to be involved, and where we go

NEAL R. GROSS

forward. FAO wants to be involved. The Norwegian government has already announced that they will hold the next Seafood and Health Conference in probably about three years. We're not going to wait 20 years like we did last time. And we have got these different medical groups, and who really does want to sit at the table.

We have got to identify opportunities for getting the message out. We have got to figure out what all we're going to do just this year. We have got to finish getting everything out from the conference, but what else can we do between now and January 1, 2007 just as, okay, let's get a time table and let's see where we go.

And then, of course, the horrible bottom line is that we can't do this for free, and we have got to identify sources of funding and secure that funding, be it Governments, private industry, foundations, or whatever, and that is, of course, probably the biggest challenge for us.

And so, if anybody has got more questions, you can contact me. Most of you probably have my

NEAL R. GROSS

1	email address. Jeannie McKnight with the Gallatin
2	Group worked with us on developing the conference,
3	coordinating all of that, and we'll be continuing to
4	work with her on that.
5	And then there is the website,
6	www.seafoodandhealth.org, and that is being updated on
7	a regular basis now with all the other information.
8	And when we have the proceedings available, we will
9	get that information out to everyone. So, questions?
10	MR. SCHWAAB: Linda, Eric Schwaab.
11	MS. CHAVES: Yes.
12	MR. SCHWAAB: Was EPA involved in the
13	conference?
14	MS. CHAVES: EPA attended the conference,
15	but they were not involved in the organization, no.
16	MR. SCHWAAB: We talked about this a
17	little bit at the last meeting. I mean, one of the
18	big concerns that I have is continuing discrepancies
19	in approaches between EPA and the FDA and, obviously,
20	when you talk about sort of the general public's view
21	of seafood, one of the things that they are influenced
22	by heavily are consumption advisories that are focused

1	on recreational anglers, which originate entirely from
2	EPA.
3	MS. CHAVES: Right.
4	MR. SCHWAAB: And we have advocated in the
5	past for more alignment between EPA and FDA in their
6	approaches, and I know there have been some modest
7	conversation that has taken place, but that continues
8	to be an important issue in this whole agreement that
9	hasn't been adequately addressed.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Let Steve speak to
11	that.
12	MS. CHAVES: Okay.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: There is something
14	going on with that.
15	DR. MURAWSKI: Yes. Actually, this issue
16	has come up in response to the Hurricane Katrina
17	issues with contaminants, and I think the Joint
18	Committee under the Ocean Action Plan, called SEAMOR,
19	is actually going to try to get the three agencies
20	together to talk about unifying some of their
21	advisories which, you know, are all over the map and
22	they were all over the map, you know, in terms of the

Gulf Coast, as well.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Now, the real key in this, we got to -- and one reason we're involved in this is, the American consumer has to be confused, you know, and there are some precautions that some people need to take, and we say there are five species that pregnant women should avoid.

That's fine, but see, we need to know that, but we need to get the consistent message out, and that's one reason I went to National Academy of Sciences in the hope that, with their reputation and their review of everything, that we could go to the EPA and the FDA with them, so to speak. But we're trying to address the President's Ocean Action Plan. But, well, we're just giving conflicting signals. It's not helping the consumer and it's not helping anybody. Yes, we don't want people eating seafood if they shouldn't eat seafood, but seafood is so healthy they should be eating it, then eat it, but, you know, it's a lot of confusion.

MR. SCHWAAB: And if I could just add quickly, the states ought to be involved in that

1	conversation, because the states issue the
2	recreational consumption advisories, generally on the
3	advice of the EPA.
4	MS. CHAVES: Well, it's interesting that
5	you mention the states, because immediately after the
6	conference, we had calls from several states who had
7	had someone in the audience, and they said, we have
8	got to change our advisories based upon the
9	information that was presented at this conference. So
10	that was yes, I mean, when we look at what we
11	really ought to be doing, it's a huge job. I mean,
12	it's more than one person or two people or three
13	people. It's really, really immense.
14	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Eric?
15	MR. SCHWAAB: I was just going to say, a
16	good starting point is to get the federal agencies
17	singing from the same sheet of music, so Steve's
18	comment is music to my ears.
19	MS. CHAVES: Yes.
20	MR. RAYBURN: Was there any discussion at
21	the conference about the security of the seafood, the
22	health aspects with 70 percent of the seafood consumed

currently being from foreign sources, 40 percent of that being from aquaculture? You know, projections even amongst this group, we still have contention that, you know, whether we should promote aquaculture or not, or set up a framework that would really be able to produce more seafood products.

So you would have to assume if you increase consumption, it's going to come from foreign sources. I mean, so what was the tenor at the meeting relative to use of antibiotics, non-traceable, to extend what may be cumulative over the long-term health of someone eating seafood from foreign sources? I mean, is that an issue that you addressed, and how do people deal with that?

MS. CHAVES: I'm going to let Tom --

MR. BILLY: Yes, Tom Billy. Much of the discussion originated from the medical community looking at health and health benefits and, in some instances, health risks from contaminants and other concerns. They don't give a second thought to where it's coming from. What they are looking at, the picture that they see, is that the more seafood you

NEAL R. GROSS

eat, the healthier you're going to be, from pregnant women to the elderly.

And the more research that is done, the more additional areas of health are benefitted based on the understandings that they gain from the research and the clinical trials and so forth. So, they are not thinking about that, but what is going to happen, I believe, from what I heard at the conference is, the public is going to gain this understanding, and they are going to drive demand, and that is the message I tried to say a little earlier.

And it's not just going to be a doubling of per capita consumption. I think it's going to be way more than that. You have got baby boomers. You have got huge obesity problems, and other health problems in the U.S., and this is going -- seafood is going to be part of the solution, not the total solution, but part of it.

And it's not just going to occur in the United States. It's going to occur worldwide. The same information is catching attention in Europe, so more and more demand. So from the consumer demand,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	and based on the evidence that we saw presented at the
2	conference, I think that demand is going to occur, and
3	aquaculture, I believe, is part of the solution in
4	terms of supply.
5	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Ralph?
6	MR. RAYBURN: So there is no concern for
7	the use of antibiotics in aquaculture and the impacts
8	that they could have on folks that eat a lot of
9	seafood produced in an aquaculture situation from
10	those illegal antibiotics used in other countries?
11	There is no concern for that?
12	PARTICIPANT: There is no knowledge that
13	that's going on.
14	MR. BILLY: Yes.
15	PARTICIPANT: Billy?
16	MR. BILLY: There was an acknowledgement
17	that there are problems like that, and other problems,
18	methylmercury, contaminants of various types, and the
19	burden is on the regulatory agencies to address those,
20	and have in place appropriate controls that protect
21	the consumer.
ı	1

if the current controls aren't

And

effective, then they ought to be changed or improved.

But that didn't mitigate or offset the enthusiasm that existed, particularly in the medical community, for the benefits. They see these huge benefits and the costs associated with illnesses to the U.S. economy, and it just far outweighs the risks that are associated with those things.

Should they be addressed and controlled?

Yes, and that was discussed as part of the thing, part of the overall conference.

MS. CHAVES: Yes. And I mean, they did address -- there was some discussion about PCBs, you know, discussion about methylmercury on PCBs. They were saying if you're talking about the farmed versus wild issue, they are saying that, one, the level of PCBs in farmed and wild are fairly much -- very, very close in most instances, and sometimes they are higher in one and sometimes they are higher in the other. But, nevertheless, the level is so low that it's not an issue.

And on the methylmercury, there was some very interesting research being produced by Dr. Gary

Meyers, who has been looking at the Seychelles study where people are eating over 12 seafood meals a week, and they have got relatively high levels of mercury in their systems, but they are not seeing any of the negative impacts from that.

And the reason for that may be because of selenium, whereas in the Faroe Islands, you do see a difference. You do see an impact, but there, a lot of what they are eating is pilot whales, which don't have as much selenium. So, I mean, there was really interesting stuff that coming was out at the conference.

But food security, your question, no, it wasn't addressed as such.

I think that's a real MR. RAYBURN: I mean, it's a problem for me. problem. I mean, we cycled through this again. I mean, what is the appropriate role of the Government in this situation? I mean, I bet if I put a beef conference together, medical professional Ι had at that conference would say, eat more beef. It's good for you. God, look at these people run.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You know, the trouble seems to me, where we need to focus, and this is that kind of strategic, is not the fact that we need to educate folks more on the benefits of eating seafood. What our issue should be, in my opinion is, what is the Government going to do to ensure that that seafood those people eat is safe, because we are out of contact with how it's caught, how it's produced.

You know, what is FDA going to do to screen this seafood now that we know that consumption is going to be going up, you know, and how are we going to protect our citizens from those antibiotics or those -- all the other cases? Are we sure that that product is caught in an environmentally sensitive manner, whatever that may be?

That seems to me to be the focus, not to persuade folks they need to eat more seafood, but rather, they are going to eat it, I think. What are we going to do to protect them from that, you know, not protect them from it, but protect from the sources, and the only source that is going to expand is the foreign sources.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. CHAVES: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: No, I agree. I think there are two different issues though, basically, and we are trying to work. FDA, the American public thinks FDA has a responsibility, and FDA is doing it when, in actuality, they don't have the manpower and all to do it. We are in the process of trying to negotiate with FDA. It's taking forever, but I have met with them umpteen times to let us do some of the preliminary screening, because we have people that can do it, because it's not happening.

Now, I can give you one example. They have one country that is sending catfish to this country. They are coming in, the catfish, and they have got Malachite green, which we say is a carcinogenic agent in this country. We try to send them back. We finally get them back through customs, and the next thing we know they're coming back over here, not as catfish, but as grouper, you know?

This is going on. Right now, to be honest with you, right now I have 400,000 pounds of these catfish sitting in LA, and it's going to cost us -- we

1	can't send them back anymore, and since it has got
2	Malachite green, it's going to cost us between \$2 and
3	\$3 a pound to have them destroyed. So it's going to
4	cost us about a million dollars to take care of it.
5	But I just think there are two issues. I
6	think we have got to keep people associated with the
7	health of what's in the fish, mercury or whatever, but
8	then I think the other issue is security of seafood is
9	definitely an issue that we're trying to address
10	through other avenues.
11	And the Hill has gotten interested in it.
12	The Hill thinks that fisheries should be doing more
13	of that, you know.
14	MS. CHAVES: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And I think some of -
16	- but unless we enforce the same regulations on these
17	countries that we enforce on our own people, what do
18	we the additives well, I would agree. I agree
19	with you. Eric?
20	MR. SCHWAAB: Well, you know, thanks. I
21	mean, I couldn't agree more with Ralph's point on
22	that, and there is a third set of issues, and I don't

see that at all in your messaging, and that is that there are some legitimate environmental concerns that we either are addressing, or need to address.

I mean, examples like PCBs and dioxins are things that we have already, you know, significantly reduced inputs. mean, there are still Ι some reservoirs out there that need to be addressed, you know, mercury issues. I mean, I think that it needs an important part of this effort to also be continue to work on reducing those environmental hazards where they continue to exist, and I don't see any of that in any of this messaging.

And just to kind of tag onto that, on some of these mercury issues, I mean, you better be really careful, because there is still a lot of debate out of here, and I see in these press releases a couple of studies cited that really sort of discount that concern when there's a whole bunch of other scientists on the other side of that that don't buy that, some of these things that are described in these releases at all.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: That's fine. Most 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

1	this has, I think, two sides right now.
2	MR. SCHWAAB: Yes.
3	MS. CHAVES: Yes.
4	MR. SCHWAAB: And if you only pick up on
5	one side, you run the risk of undermining your own
6	credibility. You have to be a little careful.
7	MS. CHAVES: Well, and that's why we had
8	some speakers there who did speak about all of this,
9	and those people who were talking about the latest,
10	you know, analytical work, were invited because it was
11	a different side that hadn't been heard before,
12	really, and that is why we wanted to make sure that
13	they got invited. But there was healthy debate about
14	the issue by the audience. Let's put it that way,
15	okay?
16	MR. SCHWAAB: I guess my point is that
17	that healthy debate is not reflected in some of this
18	press release material.
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Let me say something.
20	I think, you know, hearing this discussion, if this
21	is one of the priorities that this MAFAC has, then I
22	think we ought to invite FDA to the next meeting. We

ought to	talk about wh	nat they do and	l don't d	o, and you
can make	a recommenda	tion that will	go g	get to the
Hill to	help in this	discussion, k	pecause :	it's being
discussed	d on the Hill.			

I keep getting calls with, could you do this and do that, and I think there is a role of the fisheries in preliminary, you know, evaluations, and then FDA has the final say, so that if we find something, they would verify that to take action. But we're not getting -- we're getting less than 10 percent of the seafood sampled, less than 10. So I think if you all want to talk about it in your subcommittee, you want the FDA to come, I think it would be good.

MR. RAYBURN: Isn't this kind of cycled through? I mean, the fisheries were doing a lot of it and then -- I mean, when Tom was head of it. You know, then you went over to the FDA or something, right? I mean, so we're kind of -- and, you see, they really don't -- haven't really picked up on the need.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, one of the problems, too, is we have an inspection, we have a

NEAL R. GROSS

Ш	
	seafood inspection group, 200 and some people, maybe
	260 people, that have been battling back and forth
	about where these people belong. You know, we're
	taking away from us, then what do we do? Then we send
	a negotiator. I finally told him six months ago, go
	to work. If anybody asks you for anything in seafood
	inspection, we would do it.
	Like I said now, they are overseas. They

still have their Corps work, and we're working closer with FDA than we have. There is still some, a little bit of bad blood between the two, I guess a little bit, between these, but nobody seemed to know where they wanted to put them, so I just put them to work.

PARTICIPANT: Good for you.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tom?

MR. BILLY: One of the important pieces of work that was mentioned, and Bill mentioned earlier, is the contract with the National Academy of Sciences, because that contract asked an expert panel to look carefully and fully at all the hazards associated with seafood, as well as the benefits, and develop some recommendations, and hopefully, tools, that the

1	average consumer can use to make judgments about the
2	risks associated with the hazards versus the benefits
3	that are derived from seafood. And it will be a very
4	neutral, science-based kind of set of recommendations.
5	But that doesn't get to your point that
6	you raised about the fact that there are hazards, and,
7	from contaminants, some naturally occurring, and the
8	importance of making sure that the control measures
9	from FDA, from other countries, as we depend more on
LO	imports, are effective in protecting consumers. And
L1	that is an important need that has to be addressed as
L2	part of this overall area.
L3	MR. SCHWAAB: What is the time frame on
L4	that study?
L5	MR. BILLY: The end of the year.
L6	MS. CHAVES: The end of the year.
L7	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: It has gotten
L8	extended, extended on account of the stuff that went
L9	on, really.
20	MR. SCHWAAB: I mean, in answer to your
21	question, Bill, I would just suggest maybe our time
22	would be best spent debating this or discussing this

issue further after that happens --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay.

MR. SCHWAAB: - as opposed to before.

VICE CHAIR **HOGARTH:** Okav. Other questions, since we have time for lunch? This issue we need to talk about and I think, I'll just say in closing of all these issues is, you know, talked to the Councils a little bit, but liability do we have managing fisheries if managing, for example, king mackerel to the size where it would have the greatest levels of mercury.

That's one thing we do. I mean, to get them off the old fish list, you have to manage them, but you're really managing to the size that you probably wouldn't want the general public, or some members of the public to eat, but it has got a lot of ramifications. But, you know, we'll talk a little later. You know, some people have criticized us because they don't think we ought to be in this area of seafood promotion and the health aspects, but I think it is part of fisheries.

I mean, we manage the fisheries, and I

1	think these are part of it, and I think promotion and
2	health and all this is the key to all this for the
3	future. So we're going to continue doing this unless
4	somebody above me tells me to quit. Ralph?
5	MR. RAYBURN: The Marketing Council, were
6	we going to discuss it?
7	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We're going to talk
8	about it.
9	MR. RAYBURN: Talk about it later?
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We'll get to it after
11	lunch. I skipped it. We'll do it after lunch.
12	MR. RAYBURN: Okay.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I don't know why I
14	skipped it, but I skipped it, but we'll get to that
15	after lunch. So we'll break for lunch and come back
16	at 1:45.
17	MS. BRYANT: 1:45. I have got one quick
18	thing I want to mention to folks. For Thursday night,
19	those that are definitely going to be coming, Emily
20	needs our commitment so that she can call in to the
21	restaurant and the water taxi.
22	And then, I also want to make an

1	announcement. Rob reminded me, tonight, immediately
2	following the meeting, Rob, courtesy of IGFA, is
3	having a reception for us out in the Hall of Fame, and
4	invite you to walk around the museum this afternoon.
5	PARTICIPANT: And as far lunch options,
6	there is really three within walking distance, here.
7	I would recommend following the
8	(Whereupon, the meeting was recessed at
9	12:00 p.m. to reconvene at 2:00 p.m. this same day.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

DR.

It's great to be here.

LENT:

2

1

2:00 p.m.

afternoon,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I hope everybody had a good lunch.

Okay.

Good

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Go ahead, Rebecca.

everybody. I had the grouper sandwich. It was very, very good. Thank

MR. FLETCHER: Is that foreign grouper?

DR. LENT: No, that was domestic grouper.

Crabtree told me. He's closing the fishery tomorrow, so it could have been the last fresh grouper in the kitchen.

So it's good to see all of you, and thank you again for serving on MAFAC. We really appreciate your participation, and thank you for taking time on your busy agenda to talk about international. It is a really exciting time in international, I'd primarily because Dr. Hogarth is taking on a lot of leadership roles in international. He is our Whaling Commissioner, which is the only job harder than being our ICAT Commissioner.

MR. FLETCHER: Is that W-A-I-L?

DR. LENT: No, you're in charge of that, Bob. Bob Fletcher, by the way, who is our Recreational Commissioner, so he knows what it's about. And Bill is our ICAT Commissioner, Atlantic Commissioner, qot elected Tuna and he Chairman of ICAT, which is a huge, huge deal.

(Applause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. LENT: And I'm happy to say that Dr. Jerry Scott at the Southeast Center also got elected Chairman of the Science Body of ICAT, so we rule at ICAT. It's a good time to rule, because there's a lot of hot issues.

So, I'm here today mostly to get your I want to tell you a little bit about our new advice. office, as well, and just sort of walk you through things underway. don't of the We do some international work because it's glamorous or We do it because it's a legal mandate. cosmopolitan. It's a legislative mandate. Unlike a lot of other international work that might go on, it's cooperative science and MOUs and stuff, that's great, but our work is required by law.

In fact, we're getting a lot of pressure from the Hill to do more on marine mammals, because we have an international mandate for marine mammals, as well. We have all kinds of treaties and legislation. You can look those up in the materials that I left for you, and then we have some MOUs with other governments and agencies, as well.

So this is real tough to read, but I just want to tell you the history of our office. It would start with the song, "Breaking Up Is Hard To Do," I'm sure you all know that. I actually went around and stole everybody from the various offices who worked 100 percent of the time on international. We used to have an international office. About 10 years ago they, busted it up and put everybody in the program office. There's reasons for that, you know, there's reasons to keep people in the program office, but Bill decided, let's bring them all back together.

So we yanked those people out, and now we're singing the song, "We Are Family," because we're all together. It's starting to gel; it's starting to work, but we are creating a brand new office. It's

NEAL R. GROSS

new for me. I've never been an office director, so it's kind of fun.

Jean-Pierre Ple, we stole from the State Department. Не is my deputy. And we have one fisheries division that international does international fish stuff, and Dean Swanson, just like the walking encyclopedia on international fishery management, he is the division chief there. And Chris Rogers, who we got from HMS, is the guy in charge of trade and range stewardship. international trade issues as well as protected species.

So, a lot of back and forth between the two, but generally those are our two divisions. This is how many people I have. It's not enough. You never have enough people, but it's a pretty good corps group. A very important point I want to make. You know at headquarters we're only 10 percent of NOAA Fisheries; everybody else is out in the field at centers in the region. They are doing a lot of international work, a lot more than us.

In fact, one of my big challenges, my

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

friend, Bill Brennan, who is my other boss; I have two bosses, Bill Brennan and Bill Hogarth. Bill Brennan Deputy Assistant Secretary for is our at NOAA international. He expects me to be cognizant everything that's going out in the regions at centers, but that's pretty difficult. So we're working on how best to do that.

No great surprise here. If I run down the challenges that we have in domestic fisheries, guess what? We have them in international fisheries, and if anything, it's tougher. How do you get hundreds of countries to work with you on rebuilding stocks? Hey, we got it to work in Atlantic Swordfish. Economic sustainability - too many boats, over capacity. Ecosystem approach, they love it in the international world and, obviously, IUU fishing, it's a real issue on the high seas.

I have left with you, it's in your binder, and I also have it on the web, our Draft Strategic Operational Plan. We really need your help on that. If not today, then further down the line, take a look at it. It has several parts. The first part,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

basically, we just took from Department of Commerce, NOAA, NMFS, and, of course, PBEF, all of the elements that are in these existing strategic plans, because they have to jive. They have to kind of come down and we get our stuff from that.

Part 2, perhaps more interesting for you guys, is the specifics for certain regional fishery management organizations, UN meetings, all related bodies, organizations. What are the big issues that we're going to deal with, and how is the United States going to play a role.

Part 3, just the events calendar. We are constantly updating this. There is so much going on. We're not at all these events, but it's good for us to be aware of them and have our constituents be aware of them, as well. The same thing with our bilateral meetings; we're working with Dr. Hogarth to figure out, what are the countries that we want to reach out to and spend our precious dollars on bilateral meetings.

Collaboration tables, so that you can figure out and we can keep track of who all is

NEAL R. GROSS

involved in all these different activities. to take all the materials that we had from our Department of Commerce and NOAA and NMFS strategic plans, and boil it down into four overarching priorities. It's good to have Admiral three. Lautenbacher loves lists of three, but I just couldn't squeeze this into three.

So here they are. Basically, the first one is the science-based ecosystem approach management, including everything, including You know I'm an economist, so I like to beings. include economists. We are, what they say, what, the invasive species on the planet. worst Prevent deterrent patrol, IUU fishing. We are playing a big role in that by hosting the MCS Network, Monitoring Control Surveillance Network, and we hope we will be part of this new effort by a High Seas Task Force to look at IUU fishing.

The third bullet is very important. Making sure that U.S. fishermen keep their share of resources, access to resources, as well all consumers have access through free trade type

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agreements, and through balanced free trade, through linking free trade agreements with environmental stewardship.

One of the big issues, as Bill mentioned for ICAT this year, is making sure that our fishermen keep their share of quotas. We are under quota for swordfish and blue fin tuna in the Atlantic. It's time to talk again about allocation between countries. How can we make sure that the United States keeps it's share?

Now, we don't necessarily have to go out and catch 100 percent of our quota all the time, but we have concerns about U.S. quota going to other countries, because, are they going to fish it with circle hooks? Are they going to be required to have observers and logbooks? Maybe not. We would really like to make sure that we keep our historical share.

And the fourth item, this is the one that we just couldn't squeeze into another one, but it's important. It's important to Bill. This is part of Bill's agenda for ICAT chairmanship, and that is capacity building in developing countries. Careful, I

NEAL R. GROSS

1	don't mean building boats, I mean helping them to the
2	extent assistance is needed or support or technical
3	assistance, helping them develop logbook programs and
4	observer programs, and helping them get data reporting
5	and science and participate in stock assessments and
6	that kind of work.
7	So those are our four overarching
8	priorities. So, again, all this material is available
9	on the web, and then some more. We have let's see,
10	Laurel, did we ship down hard copies of those?
11	MS. BRYANT: They're all in your notebooks
12	behind tab 8.
13	DR. LENT: But not the international
14	agreements book?
15	MS. BRYANT: I have got that over here.
16	DR. LENT: There you go.
17	MS. BRYANT: They can make their own
18	copies.
19	DR. LENT: A door prize for you. That's a
20	list of all international agreements. I keep it by my
21	bedside for reading sources. It's a good one, because
22	you've got the strategic operating plan, list of

acronyms, and this award winning speech.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. Now comes your part where I'm going to put the microphone down and just listen. Here is my questions for you. Am I in your way?

PARTICIPANT: Nope. Is that the first question?

DR. LENT: What are the priorities that we have overlooked? What are some countries that you think we could work with on partnerships? We talked about this a little bit over lunch with Rob. You know, for example, South Korea emerging as a real good partner. Because we're here at IGFA, I have to say, one of our big challenges is getting recognition for the economic importance and social importance of recreational fishing. We don't always get that.

You know that famous line that we heard from our friends in Japan, "you're playing with our food," when we talked about catch and release of blue fish, that's tough And how should a one. we prioritize our efforts? I don't have enough people and money. We never do. But as they say, if you have long list of priorities, you don't have

priorities.

Bill Hogarth mentioned in his opening statement, we need MAFAC to help us evaluate and recommend priorities. And as Tony DiLernia said, you can help us plan as opposed to just react. So this is your part. I'll put the microphone down and start listening.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay.

DR. LENT: Thank you.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Thank you very much,
Dr. Lent. All right. Let's put together a list. Bob
Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. A couple of things, Rebecca. When you talked about an IUU Task Force, I'm not sure whether it included some of the black -- some of the pirate fishing that's going on in Central Pacific right now. Are you aware of that? And there's a fleet of albacore boats that we are very concerned about what appears to be an increase in the amount of that effort going on out there. And I was just curious, is that included in that discussion?

DR. LENT: Mr. Chairman?

CAPTAIN	DILERNIA:	Please,	αo	ahead.

DR. LENT: Thank you. I wasn't aware of particular case, but the Monitoring Control Surveillance Network is а bunch of countries voluntarily sharing information about these kinds of activities. The High Seas Task Force is a six member new initiative through OACD. They are going announce something in March that says, we're going to put some money into improving enforcement, but thank you for that point. That is just the kind of thing that we want to be looking at through our cooperative international monitoring efforts.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a follow-up, there. The reports that flow out of the fleet of boats fishing in the central Pacific and in toward the east side are coming from the high seas jig boat fleet, and they are going mostly to Coast Guard.

Now, I assume that you're all tuned in with Coast Guard in those efforts because, if you would prefer, I know that I work closely with those albacore boats sometimes, and I can get them to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	contact you if you or someone else, but it is
2	definitely a big concern to those guys.
3	DR. LENT: Thank you, Bob, appreciate
4	that. Yes, I'm a good person to contact, and also
5	Southwest Enforcement. I think as those guys
6	participate with you at the IATTC meetings and that
7	kind of thing, but good to know. Thank you. Didn't
8	know that.
9	MR. FLETCHER: Tony, just one other issue.
10	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. Go ahead, and
11	then Jim is next. Thanks.
12	MR. FLETCHER: I don't know. I haven't
13	talked to you that much lately. I have been
14	negotiating some access agreements with the French
15	Polynesian representatives. They have, in the last
16	couple of years, decided that they are going to
17	enforce their EEZ around Clipperton Island. Well,
18	Clipperton is in the middle of nowhere, and for those
19	of you that aren't aware, it's 588 miles
20	west/southwest of Acapulco, and about 750 miles south
21	of Cabo San Lucas.
1	

to draw a 200 mile EEZ around

And

Clipperton, you suddenly find that, historically, there has been a huge Mexican fleet operating within those waters and, up until the last couple of years, the Mexicans had a position that, because it was an unoccupied coral-atoll, that the 200 mile zone didn't apply, and so they have continued to fish there.

Well, the French now decided that they are going to call their bluff, and they put somebody on that little island for as much of the year as they can, when the Chabaxos don't come roaring right through there in the summer and fall. The Mexicans, historically, have taken 15 to 20,000 tons of yellow fin and skipjacked out of those waters. So this is going to be a real interesting discussion between those two countries.

DR. LENT: Keep me posted.

MR. FLETCHER: Yes. The last thing is, I was over able to negotiate an agreement with them to allow some of my boats to fish near the island. It was one of their protracted negotiations and we ended up not getting what we wanted, but at least they are going to let us come in there and fish. There were

1	some interesting requirements.
2	But the thing is, there is a whole new
3	group, a whole new team, that is sitting on IATTC
4	representing France that comes from these people from
5	French Polynesia. So I just wanted to make sure
6	you're aware that there are some real changes going on
7	there.
8	DR. LENT: Thank you.
9	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Bob, just as a point
10	about that island in French Polynesia. Mexico called
11	me last Thursday or Friday, and wanted to know what we
12	knew about it, and could we help them. You know, it's
13	always funny if they want to help us, but - I mean, us
14	to help them, but they don't help us much.
15	DR. LENT: We could swap the access to a
16	more
17	MR. FLETCHER: I like it.
18	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. Captain Cook?
19	CAPTAIN COOK: Jim Cook from Hawaii. I
20	like the idea that you're going to give some priority
21	to the equality of American fishermen. In our
22	fishery, Rebecca, as you know, we have been for the

last few years about anywhere from the 1 percent or 2 percent solution for turtles and long lining.

We have a fishery that, at one time, was landing a whole lot of swordfish, and then went to landing no swordfish, and is now landing a little swordfish, a resource that is in very good shape in the Pacific, which could close at some time soon because it hooked or entangled 16 loggerhead turtles.

In the same area that we're fishing, for every boat that we have there, we have 19 foreign boats. That's an old count, because now we have Spanish freezer boats fishing with us. I would like you to assure us that you're going to do everything that you possibly can to bring us some kind of equality, and that equality can come in a couple of different ways. You can get them to quit, or you can get us to get going. We're more than willing to do that.

The other thing is, we're about to become, possibly, a victim of Magnuson under over-fishing for big eye. In that case, we'll be maybe about like a one- 100^{th} of 1 percent of the solution in the Pacific

NEAL R. GROSS

based on big eye mortality. And it's important to us that we get adequate language in upcoming Magnuson reauthorization to protect American fishermen who are operating under international treaties in the Pacific. Thanks.

DR. LENT: Thank you very much, Captain Cook. And on that last point, I hope that you've had a chance to respond to some of the proposals that were made in the National Standard One Guidelines for foreign fishing, which I think recognizes what you're saying. And that's what we're pumping for in the new Magnuson-Stevens.

On the point regarding sea turtles, that is something where Dr. Hogarth has pumped in a lot of time and money and effort. We were at the table negotiating the FAO guidelines on sea turtles. Every single RFMO we go to, we're pushing on sea turtles. We're pushing for circle hooks to save sea turtles. We are pushing, and the Europeans and Japanese and others tend to protest and to push back. Japan is okay as long as it's the deep water sets or, sorry, the shallow sets, and not the deep water sets.

NEAL R. GROSS

We made some progress, but not enough, and when you consider that we import five to seven times, and probably more now, Jim -- swordfish is what we harvest domestically -- we have a responsibility as consumers to make sure that these are sea turtle friendly techniques, and that it's a level playing field with our fishermen.

So we're pushing hard. We're getting resistance. It's helpful for me to know and to hear from you that the Spanish boats are fishing alongside you in the Pacific. Same thing in the Grand Banks. Our guys have to fish with 18 off-circle hooks, but the Spanish boats next to them, no way.

So it's just not fair, and when we bring it up at the RFMOs, it's, we have got to do our own test. Excuse me, we have done the research, same place where you're fishing, same areas. We're getting just ugly about it. We're doing the best we can, but it's like baby steps in the international world, but thank you for bringing that up. We don't have a level playing field, and we're still eating that fish, and we're part of the problem.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Ralph Kramer, you had
2	your hand up.
3	MR. KRAMER: Ralph Kramer. Rebecca, could
4	you go back, please, two slides to your overarching
5	priorities.
6	DR. LENT: There.
7	MR. KRAMER: Okay. I understand the model
8	pretty clear, except for the first one. Could you
9	please be more specific on what exactly we're trying
LO	to accomplish there. Is that trying to convince other
L1	nations to follow this?
L2	DR. LENT: It is kind of my what the
L3	French call the Spanish oberes, just a place where
L4	we're trying to park everything that's important about
L5	the management, conservation of management measures,
L6	making sure we have got science and, where we don't
L7	have science, that we're being precautionary.
L8	Using an ecosystem approach, so we're
L9	taking into account habitat, bycatch, trophic levels,
20	accounting for all the species' habitats, and the
21	human component. In the human component, we're
2	looking at things like fishing capacity. Too many

boats. That's going to always make it difficult for us to manage. We can have the perfect set of management measures on the one hand, but if we have a fleet that is way too big, and I know I'm preaching to the choir, it's going to be difficult to sustainably manage. So it's very large, Rob.

MR. KRAMER: So it's trying to convince other nations to consider these components of fisheries management?

DR. LENT: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Just to that point, last year, for the last two years, but last year, particularly, we spent a lot of time trying to get a resolution passed on, you know, circle hooks and the same thing that industry is using. The EU, the European Community and John Spencer, fought it all the way. We never -- everything that is done is done by consensus. We never could get it through.

And, at the same time, we know what Spain is doing with the freezer vessels. We know they are still building large vessels in the fishery, and we know that Italy is still, you know, fishing drift U

NEAL R. GROSS

1	nets, which they shouldn't be. So all of that is
2	under the control of the EU, so that's why we're
3	trying to put some pressure. I have to put pressure.
4	And what the EU does in turn, is to try to
5	come back with all the things on recreational because
6	they claim they don't have recreational fisheries, and
7	that if they feel like they can get the U.S. on
8	recreational, that we'll give in, you know, to these
9	other desires. So it's a tough negotiation. He is a
10	good negotiator. I have to give him credit for it.
11	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. Any other
12	questions for Dr. Lent? Raftican, Tom?
13	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes, Tom Raftican. With
14	recognition of recreational fishing, how are you
15	progressing with taking economic looks at recreational
16	fishing? I think one of the driving forces in
17	anything that we do is going to be the economies, and
18	it clearly plays a role, not only domestically, but in
19	the international arena, too. Anything there?
20	DR. LENT: Thank you, Tom, and I might ask
21	Rob to help me out on this based on some of the work
22	that IGFA is doing. But we do take to the table and,

to put in Bill Hogarth's talking points, this is how many billions of dollars our recreational industry means to us.

This is how much money it generates for a kilogram of fish. It's pretty impressive. That's one way that we can get people's attention saying, yes, yes, recreational fishing is important. We're not just doing it for fun. It's also an important business, and it has a high value to our folks. We are making some progress in getting those evaluation studies around and shared with other countries, and trying to contact other economists who are doing this kind of work in other countries.

Rob, you have got a number of IGFA chapters in other countries. How could they help us with this fourth area I was mentioning here?

MR. KRAMER: Yes, I think one of the things that we're doing, Tom, is we're looking at past success stories like Costa Rica and some other places where you have truly seen the emergence of a sustainable recreational catch and release fishery there. But what I know would help us is to get

information, to get data, to get reports from the Federal Government and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, too, and then to export that.

IGFA is holding scientific symposia on four different continents this year: Brazil, in the Mediterranean, Australia, and what we're trying to do is export some of these best management practices, export some of this economic information, the models for these studies, to these other places, these other countries, and give them alternatives and encouragement.

Now, most of these places are begging for information, begging for an alternative to the way they are doing things now, and they see what happens in places like Los Suenos, which has just exploded into a huge economic success story there. They look at places like Cabo San Lucas, that was a cannery town not terribly long ago, and I know Bob knows the story behind there. Now it looks like Las Vegas with all the hotel rooms.

But it's taking that information to other parts of the world that I think is going to be very

NEAL R. GROSS

necessary, and once they have that and data, counting collecting their own their then they can put pressure on their own fishermen, countries. They can have a bigger say-so, and we're working with people in Europe around the Mediterranean and France, Spain and Italy in particular right now to help them try to get that, so any support we can have to do those is going to be helpful.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Thank you. Mr. Porter? MR. PORTER: Brad Geitner at headquarters has kind of overseen doing economic studies on the three coasts on a rotating basis, and I quess comment we would have is that, specifically, because it's being done on the west coast this year, in the past, that data has not always been processed in a very timely way, and we would really like to see that come out and be analyzed in the report written up each year, because, if it's a couple years before it's completed, it's time to do another one again, and we still don't have the data. I know the staff has been increased now, so that should run better, but we would like to push for that when that data comes out so we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	1 1					
$n \rightarrow \tau \tau \Delta$	Fnnccc	numbers	าท	_	$F I M \Delta I T$	TA7 🗀 T 7
IIa v C	CIIOBC	HUMBELD		a	$C \perp IIIC \perp A$	wav.

DR. LENT: Did you say Brad Geitner? Yes,
he actually did do a seminar the other day on his
preliminary results. I was telling Rob about that.
It's pretty amazing to see, in dollar figures and in
number of jobs, what happens when you change the bag
limit, what happens when you change the size limit, in
the recreational fishery. It's great, useful stuff
that managers can use in making the right decisions,
and in knowing the impact of their decisions. But
I'll get that message to Brad about timeliness. I
assume it takes a while to crunch the numbers, takes a
while to get them peer reviewed. You know, we've got
the Data Quality Act thing now, so it's really sticky
releasing any information until it's super-blessed.
But, thank you, I'll let Brad know and make sure he's
aware of that

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Any other questions for Dr. Lent? Mary Beth.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thank you. Mary Beth Tooley. It wasn't so much a question as just a comment on priorities, and we have transboundary

resource sharing agreements with Canada.

DR. LENT: Yes.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: It doesn't currently cover all the species that are transboundary. We have done a good job in recent time, I think, with science, and doing cooperative assessments with Canada in the northeast, and I think they also have a similar type of situations on the west coast, but I am not as familiar with them.

But currently under Magnuson, for a species where there is not a cooperative agreement, we estimate the Canadian catch, and deduct it from what the U.S., you know, fisheries can take. And, you know, I think that, for the U.S. and Canada on ground fish in the northeast, they currently have a process in place, and I think it's important to expand that to other species, as well.

DR. LENT: Great. Thank you very much for that comment. I just had a conference call yesterday, in fact, about expanding it to include the ship strike strategy for right whales. If we're going to do some alterations, we got to work with our Canadian friends,

1	so we're looking at that, and ground fish is a great
2	example of how that can be productive.
3	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Anyone else? Okay.
4	Dr. Lent, thank you very, very much.
5	DR. LENT: Thank you.
6	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: It's always a pleasure
7	to have you. Do you want to do this?
8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. First of all,
9	we said John Ward would be here tomorrow, but John
10	Ward is here, and John is working with
11	COURT REPORTER: Dr. Hogarth, could you
12	move your microphone to you, please?
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I'm sorry.
14	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: John Ward is here
16	and, you know, he has done some of the economic
17	analysis. He has been for the aquaculture stuff,
18	he has also been quite a bit involved in the Gulf and
19	really some of the shrimp work we were doing earlier,
20	but in the Gulf work with each state. In fact, just
21	for you all's information, I will tell you the type of

stuff we're doing real quick.

1	After the Hurricane Katrina, we went to
2	each state and asked them what are the things they
3	really needed, and most of them said economic analysis
4	of what has happened. Here is one of the first
5	reports of economic impact of Hurricane Katrina on the
6	Alabama seafood industry. This one is completed.
7	Louisiana is coming right behind it and Mississippi.
8	I don't know if we did it in Texas now, did we? Did
9	we do
10	CAPTAIN O'SHEA: We did it in Mississippi,
11	Louisiana and Alabama.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okav. So the other

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. So the other two are coming, but these, I think, will be excellent to get to the Hill, because the numbers keep, some people say, floating around, and I think that's why we're trying our best to give some numbers to the Hill quickly.

So, we're going to put this up on the website. We only have five copies so far, but I'm going to try to get those to the Hill and to the Department and to OMB first, and so we'll get it up on the web, but this is the type of thing John has been

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

working with the state directors on. Okay. All right.

We'll talk about the seafood marketing characteristics. You've heard me say many times today, the one about keeping the goal was to promote seafood consumption and support the U.S. fishing industry, that balance, you know, with responsible managing and sustainability. So, this proposed rule that we have set up would help the fishing industry begin the process of setting up seafood marketing councils in order to educate Americans on the export markets, health benefits of eating fish. the importance of sustainable fishing, and the value of premium fish products.

Our industry is probably one of the most heavily regulated industries anywhere when you look at the fishing industry. It is totally regulated, and so it has a lot of expensive overhead costs, and it's struggling to find, I think, equal footing to be able to compete in the domestic marketplace here.

And so we're concerned with the fact that there is a little different structure, just a lot 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

concerns about seafood marketing in the place of our industry for sustainability. I won't go through all the numbers about how much we import, how much we -you all know that. But we think that the marketing councils would help the seafood service to distinguish between differences in price and quality, tech support, making some important decisions the seafood counter.

And would not only establish the marketing councils, but this process would create an organizational framework for their development. We would have to approve or disapprove the formation of individual councils on a case-by-case basis, the taking into consideration environmental analysis, public comment, and all that goes into it.

Industry would design and fund the councils, and they would have to pass a referendum both of what they want it to be, to have a seafood council or not. But the industry participation is voluntary.

For example, one of the ones that came to us on this early was tuna, some of the tuna industry,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and one of the big holdups was, well, was it voluntary or not voluntary, and then the Supreme Court decision on beef, and so we have been holding this, but if you don't want to participate, you don't have to participate. It comes as a voluntary basis, whether you participate in the council or not, even if you're a fisherman.

We don't think this will result in any increase in fishing pressure on stocks, so we'll capitalize. We don't think it will influence any of the fishery management decisions. It's basically, to use the current science, use credible science that we have, use the sustainability of the fishery and health benefits, quality control, all this to collect the seafood, whatever part of it went to market, let them be able to market.

Yes, this is -- there used to be seafood councils years ago, and they just sort of went by the board for lots of reasons, but, you know, we feel like there's a lot of interest in them now, and we would have a lot of oversight to make sure that they promote sustainable fisheries and then not, you know, just dig

1	in and say things that are not true, this type of
2	thing.
3	So it is out for public comment.
4	Hopefully, the comment closes February the $23^{\scriptscriptstyle ext{th}}$, so
5	it's basically just to set back up the councils so
6	that we're allowed a voluntary basis, that we have
7	more control over I have the criteria and all on
8	which they operate.
9	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Okay. I have a couple
10	of questions about the councils for Dr. Hogarth. Are
11	these going to be state councils or regional?
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: They will be for
13	example, it could be whoever wants to come forward.
14	The only ones that have expressed interest so far have
15	been to be honest with you, have been some of the
16	shrimp fishermen, but basically the tuna industry has
17	come forward, and that would be on a national basis,
18	they would set up a National Seafood Marketing
19	Council.
20	But it's not it's not limited to just,
21	you know, those types, you know, it could be state or
22	it could be

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

19

20

21

22

MR. HELM: It could be any combination of those same. John Ward was just speaking briefly with the wild American shrimp folks who had some questions about it and wanted to get those questions answered. A council, we actually think it might be species-based in some cases, the tuna, the tuna species. The Tuna Foundation folks, the Shrimp Foundation folks, are the ones that we have heard from the most.

When we did some analysis, and the analysis is in the proposed rule, we found that there are about -- up to a dozen different species that might benefit economically from a marketing campaign. So it may be species-based. We just don't know. We're looking for comments on all of those.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: But we in New York have the New York Seafood Council, which is funded partly by state legislature and partly by contributions from its members.

MR. HELM: Yes.

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: So conceivably then, if there was a Wild Shrimp Association, the New York Seafood Council could get information from the Wild

1	Shrimp Association, which we could then use.
2	MR. HELM: You could be part of that
3	council.
4	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Yes.
5	MR. HELM: You could join that council,
6	and derive the benefits of that marketing council,
7	yes. What makes me believe that is the structure, the
8	framework, is what we're talking about here. Each
9	council can design its own program, and then come to
10	us with that program.
11	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Jim was first. Jim
12	Cook?
13	CAPTAIN COOK: Well, Bill asked me to
14	speak up a little bit more, so you always have to be
15	cautious of what you beg for. When I first read this,
16	I thought there was something wrong. Usually, I like
17	to get money from you and then tell you what we're
18	going to do with it. Besides, I had to read it like
19	three or four times before I finally got it.
20	So my concern now, since it's my money and
21	your approval, is what are you going to give me.
22	Because we have gone through this a lot in the past in

our industry where we have tried to get the Agency to speak up on our behalf in some substantive way and, from my perspective, we don't get near enough of it.

So I am all for it, and I'm kind of trying in my mind to see how it puts together, how to put it together, but there -- but to me, what I'm looking for is for the Agency to get behind these councils in a positive and very, very visible way. And so unless there is that component, and unless that component is very well-known to me, I don't know what I'm getting into.

And so I think that's the important part that is not fleshed out here. You talk about wanting to make sure that the things that these councils say are in line with current policy. Well, what are you going to say? You know, and what I am really wanting you to say to me is, Jim, we're going to get behind these councils. We're going to in some way certify them. We're going to in some way certify that they say.

You know, we have talked before, but, you know, I deal all the time with people from MSC,

NEAL R. GROSS

wonderful people, want to come around and want to take all our money. I will be dead five times over when they certify the first pelagic long line fishery. You know that. I am looking for some way to get into that game, and we have talked before about a sticker that said, this product is from federally managed fisheries.

Hey, sounds great to me. And all those things sound good to me, but I want to know where the

Hey, sounds great to me. And all those things sound good to me, but I want to know where the rubber meets the road on the support, because there it is. It's my money, your decision. Where is it?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I just fell off the table. You know, if this does go through, it is our opinion, and the way we would operate it is that we would be behind 100 percent. We would say, these councils, you know, have been developed and organized with sustainability with the -- you know, with the Agency backing those councils all the way, you know?

It doesn't carry money, as such, but I have watched the Hill a lot of times, and things like this have the tendency sometimes to get some money later down the road when the economy is better to help

make sure what is done. But, you know, it's an avenue for us to get behind the industry. You know, we make statements now, this, that and the other, but this is an avenue for a council to come forward. We develop it and develop the council, then we stand behind it and we support and try to give them a seal, you know, if that's the right idea.

CAPTAIN COOK: You know, I guess, you know, it's how far behind them you're going to stand, and I think that --

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Beside you.

CAPTAIN COOK: I think that, for us, that's the whole question here, and I think it's a great idea, you know, especially for us in the tuna business, but I am concerned about that part of it, and I'm concerned that we get something very, very positive. You know, surprisingly, the American public still believes in their Government to a great extent.

MR. HELM: Jim, what we would like to hear from, you know, all of our constituents, and I would love to hear this from you, is what are those specifics that you want to be in that framework

NEAL R. GROSS

document? We need to hear about that during the comment period, so that we can evaluate that and for our final rule. That's the kind of thing that we're looking for.

I have had others say well, I think that you are leaving out this part or you are unduly influencing other parts and I'm saying this is the framework. This is the developing process, please, get that information to us in the form of comments, so that we can review them and work them in, so that we have a good solid framework to meet people's needs.

CAPTAIN COOK: Yes, I will make sure and comment. And let's not forget who the number one tuna industry in the United States is now. Things have changed.

MR. HELM: One last comment about funding. Again, the only part of this that we will be looking at in terms of funding is the referendum issue and we will require perspective councils to put some kind of funding up front to make sure that the cost of the referendum, even if it turns out that that council does not form, will be borne by other than the

Government.

Other than that, we will not be involved in actually the money aspect of it. It will be the council. We will approve marketing plans that will involve money, but we will not be handling the money, at least under this proposal, at this point.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Look at the proposal and then give us comments, because they're trying to redo it and like I said it has been on each time a while back, but it just -- my only meaning was concerning until the -- what the decision will be. And so we just held it to see what happened there. And this is the voluntary program, rather than mandatory.

So if one is better than the 12 and you don't want to -- they have this policy, although it's voluntary, it can be 12 votes and officials will want to go into council. One of them would say no, it's a great benefit. The other 11 get something and then after a while it will probably cost too much and nobody wants to do it. But I think it is an avenue that we could stand with the industry.

1	CAPTAIN COOK: Well, I think there is a
2	huge opportunity here, at least for us, because as the
3	number of your losses go down, guess what, the number
4	of my losses go down. And we, after six years, have
5	zero active litigation. All of that money that our
6	members have put together to fight that, this would be
7	an ideal venue for it, in my mind, and I hope other
8	people feel the same way. And I hope we can really
9	get something positive going.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, well, you've got
11	now, you understand that out of the 16 we had, only
12	a few people realized that the 16 had zero mortality.
13	It's just one of the 16, it's just the biological
14	opinion is written on interactions and not
15	mortalities. There's a mortality trigger, too, but
16	that meets that. Pete?
17	MR. LEIPZIG: Yes, Pete Leipzig. I have a
18	few questions. First, I haven't seen the proposed
19	rule. I didn't know there was one out, so if it got
20	circulated to the group
21	DR. LENT: It did not get circulated to
	11

the group.

1	MR. LEIPZIG: I missed it if it did.
2	MR. HELM: No, it's not in the book. It
3	is available online at www.noaa.nmfs.gov and I can get
4	that information to you. If you don't know to look
5	for it, you don't
6	MR. LEIPZIG: I don't go looking for
7	things I don't know are there.
8	MR. HELM: Yes.
9	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay.
10	MR. HELM: Understood, understood. We put
11	it out in <u>FishNews</u> and got it out to as many groups as
12	we could.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Can we make copies?
14	MR. HELM: Absolutely.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Who needs a copy?
16	One, two, three, four, five, six. Okay. We'll make
17	copies for you.
18	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. It sounds very much
19	like this is a repackaging of the Seafood Council's
20	regulation from 15, 20 years ago.
21	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.
22	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. A couple questions

1	then. If it's going to be voluntary participation,
2	why would you have to have a referendum?
3	MR. WARD: The point of the referendum is
4	to
5	COURT REPORTER: Can you identify
6	yourself?
7	MR. WARD: I am John Ward with the
8	National Marine Fishery Service. The point of the
9	referendum is to identify the users who would
10	participate in the Seafood Promotion Council and to
11	ensure that those who wish to participate are the ones
12	that move ahead with the council.
13	If you vote against the referendum to have
14	a council and you don't wish to participate in it, you
15	don't have to pay the assessment or participate in any
16	of the activities of the council.
17	MR. LEIPZIG: But if it's voluntary,
18	people could drop out later after it's formed and you
19	can't anticipate that.
20	MR. WARD: Right.
21	MR. LEIPZIG: That is just a comment, I
22	guess.

VICE	CHAIR	HOGARTH:	Right.

MR. WARD: There is a procedure though for people who want to leave a council and get their assessed fees returned to them. That's part of the framework.

MR. LEIPZIG: Well, I was thinking more just I'll stop paying. You got my money. I have lost it. I'm just not going to participate anymore and there is no way to anticipate that.

MR. WARD: Right.

MR. LEIPZIG: In the past, 15, 20 years ago, I recall that the Secretary had to approve any spending plans. Is that part of this, the Agency had to approve? If a group got together and said, okay, we want this promotion, you had to write that promotion up and submit it for approval before you could spend the money.

MR. HELM: That is still in the proposal.

MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Then along the lines of the question, I am not opposed to seafood councils and promoting seafood, but just as Jim was wondering, I'm just questioning what is the benefit to people.

NEAL R. GROSS

If it's a voluntary program and you have got to seek approval from the Secretary before you can spend the money, why not just encourage people to go form their own organization, tax themselves and be free of the obligation to have approval from the Secretary in how they spend their own money?

MR. HELM: That was a question that OMB asked of us. That is a question that has come up frequently. Α lot of American Shrimp ask question and we agree. This provides -- if one goes steps necessary under through all of these this proposal to form a council, it will be a Government backed council with a certification that other groups that have formed themselves do not have.

I mean, you're right. Because it's voluntary, this is sort of like our -- I don't want to draw a parallel here because it may not be apt, but think of it from the standpoint of seafood people who want to show that their seafood is of a higher quality than others and they go through the hassle, process and they get the Government seal from the Department of Commerce that says that their seafood is certified,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	safe and healthy and wholesome and all that. This is
2	a similar plan.
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And then we need to
4	get the comments on whether we should have anything to
5	do with the spending plans. We could do other things
6	other than having to do with spending plans. I mean,
7	you could still back it without having anything to do
8	with how much money they put in. That's a comment
9	that we hope is made in this process. We don't have
10	to approve spending plans. I'm not sure if it's not
11	our money and it's voluntary that we if we set out
12	with the right criteria, obviously, we need to.
13	MR. LEIPZIG: Is the proposal placed out?
14	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
15	MR. LEIPZIG: No, I understand. I just
16	need to get a copy.
17	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Heather?
18	MS. McCARTY: Thank you. Heather McCarty.
19	I guess my comments are all exactly like these
20	gentlemen's. I don't see the benefit of it unless
21	well, I haven't read it yet, but is it the
22	certification is the certification granted by the

1	Government for quality and sustainability? Is that
2	the idea?
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.
4	MS. McCARTY: Okay. So that is the
5	advantage of having it. Okay. Because it sounds like
6	on paper so far, you know, we give a whole bunch of
7	money out of the industry pocket and then the
8	Government says this is what you have to do, and that
9	doesn't make a lot of sense to me right on the face of
10	it. So it would have to be a lot different for it to
11	be valuable to the industry in my opinion.
12	MR. HELM: Well, I just would encourage
13	you to read it.
14	MS. McCARTY: Yes, I will.
15	MR. HELM: And, again, we're looking for
16	the input.
17	MS. McCARTY: Okay. Thanks.
18	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, I mean, I know.
19	It's interesting. Some industries have asked for it
20	and others have been opposed to that. I don't know.
21	It doesn't mean you got to do if you do it, but what I
22	hoped it would do is it would help, you know, educate

1	the consumers about seafood sustainability and other
2	things and that the Government would be standing
3	beside you, so to speak, and backing this process.
4	Tom, yes?
5	MR. BILLY: You know, one possibility on
6	this Tom Billy. One possibility might relate to
7	antitrust in terms of the rules that govern when an
8	industry can and cannot get together for common
9	purposes. And I would assume, although you might want
LO	to have the lawyers look at it, that this provides a
L1	legal basis for that to happen for this kind of
L2	purpose.
L3	I have a question, which is can foreign
L4	industry be part of these marketing councils? And,
L5	secondly, could a wholly foreign group of industry
L6	form a council in the United States under what is
L7	proposed?
L8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tom, I think it's
L9	silent on that. That's a good point, but I think
20	right now it's silent, isn't it?
21	MR. WARD: Well, we don't really address
22	that, but the original law that was passed in the '80s

1	is the authority for this marketing program was to
2	promote domestic seafood. Even the Tuna Foundation,
3	which is interested in forming a council, is doing it
4	primarily because they have U.S. flagged vessels that
5	are providing them with their product or at least that
6	is how they informed us of their justification for it.
7	MR. BILLY: Once seafood gets past
8	Customs, it is domestic, so all I'm pointing out is
9	you ought to consider this in terms of what your
10	intent is.
11	MR. WARD: Right.
12	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: That's a good point.
13	We need to look at that. Chris?
14	MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett. I understand
15	that, and I haven't read the rule yet, so bear with
16	me, if it's in there or if it's contemplated at some
17	point, but it says each fishery would be looked at on
18	a case-by-case basis. But will there be some
19	criteria, some set of standards that you look at? For
20	example, it's managed at optimum yield and low turtle
21	bycatch. Is that in there now or is that in the

future?

1	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.
2	MR. WARD: There are 24, 23 criteria
3	within the proposed rule that have to be complied
4	with, yes.
5	MR. HELM: I don't know the specifics, but
6	I do remember sustainability and I guess I don't have
7	it in front of me to answer, but I will get you a copy
8	soon.
9	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And comment on those
10	criteria is another thing we want people to do.
11	MR. DORSETT: Yes, I do know that a number
12	of groups that we work with in our group will be
13	submitting some comments.
14	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Good. Ralph, chip
15	in?
16	MR. RAYBURN: Yes, there's a couple I got.
17	I understood and I haven't compared this with what
18	was done before, but if you establish your universe on
19	which you initiate a referendum, I thought this was
20	patterned more off the Agricultural Commodity Board
21	type process where if the majority within the universe
22	you have established passes a referendum, then

	everyone within that universe, whether they voted for
2	or against the referendum, would be required to make
3	an assessment based on whatever the council said, that
4	upon the request of the participant that assessment
5	could be refunded, but they don't have the option up
6	front not to make the assessment.
7	Is that when you said if they didn't
8	like it, they would pass on even making the
9	assessment, is that the way this is set up? They can
10	opt out?
11	MR. WARD: The Supreme Court decision on
12	beef that recently was passed down last summer, I
13	think it was, required us to change it so they could
14	opt out up front. They didn't have to pay the
15	assessment and then get the money refunded.
16	MR. RAYBURN: Oh, that's what the decision
17	was. It wasn't that you had to refund it if
18	requested. Right.
19	MR. HELM: Well, that was the original
20	language that you're talking about, but we made
21	modifications prior to the release of the draft.
22	PARTICIPANT: That sounds pretty cool.

1	MR. RAYBURN: One of the 24 items here
2	that the Board would have to submit is the Magnuson
3	rate, our rates that would be imposed by a council on
4	receivers or importers doing the operation of the
5	council, but the importers would probably opt out. So
6	whatever rate the Board put, the importers would just
7	say I'm not interested in playing. Is that pretty
8	much it?
9	MR. HELM: Well, we won't make the rates,
10	but that's probably a good
11	MR. RAYBURN: There is no requirement that
12	they will.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We need to maybe look
14	at this, because one country that exports, we import
15	from quite a bit, is Iceland. And Iceland has
16	expressed some interest early in what we were doing
17	here. So I really need to go back and look at what we
18	said about foreign, because I don't know, and we need
19	to look back at that.
20	It's a good point, but I know Iceland was
21	interested in what we were doing and how would it
22	operate. So if they had, you know, a company here

that	was	in	nporti	ng a	lot	of	Icel	and	fish	, cou	ld	they
be p	part	of	this	proce	ess.	So	we	need	d to	look	at	it.
Yes.	Mar	v Be	eth?									

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Mary Beth Tooley. You know, I also haven't read it, so I, you know, when I get a copy of it, I'll take a look at it. But it seems like I'm missing perhaps what the purpose of the councils would be. I mean, because we have talked education, it about marketing and but also mentioned, certification of sustainability. is obviously criteria that a particular fishery would If someone could just maybe explain have to meet. that.

MR. HELM: I will try in general terms. Again, there are 24 different steps through the certification process or things that you must meet at least under this proposal. In addition, there is the opportunity or the option to actually establish a quality standard that would -- through some other forum. In one case it might be our own seafood inspection programs for the quality portions of this.

But at any rate, what would occur in the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	end would be a Government standing behind the
2	marketing and promotional strategy of the council
3	because it has met all of the criteria listed in the
4	framework regulations.
5	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Just to follow-up on
6	that then, how would councils address mixed stock
7	fisheries in which you might have, such as, New
8	England ground fish, 19 species, you know, 13 in good
9	shape and the other six in the building program.
10	MR. HELM: Yes. Under the proposal right
11	now, the council's responsibility would be to come to
12	us and explain to us how they would do that and we
13	would either agree with them or disagree with them.
14	Is that correct, John?
15	MR. WARD: Yes.
16	MR. HELM: So in other words, we believe
17	the criteria and this is where we are looking for
18	input. We believe the criteria are strong enough to
19	allow a council to establish this marketing strategy
20	that provides for the kinds of concerns that you have.
21	We will also be looking for outside input on these,

because we will do a public comment period on this.

1	In the end and under the proposal as it
2	stands, in the end we will be looking at the comments
3	and the plans to see if it does actually meet the
4	things that the council believes it will meet.
5	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Because I think it
6	sounds like the idea for the council is to promote,
7	you know, seafood and educate the public because it's
8	really very good. But if it turns into a program that
9	really becomes about certifying sustainability of
LO	fisheries, which is done, you know, through other
L1	groups, it just gets a little confusing there to me.
L2	I mean, because, you know, some species, you know,
L3	really don't need this type of thing, but under
L4	sustainability maybe they go through the whole process
L5	only to be certified sustained.
L6	Does that make sense? I mean, there is a
L7	little confusion there to me about the purpose.
L8	MR. HELM: I understand that.
L9	MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Yes.
20	MR. HELM: The reason why we're a little
21	bit while you're in front of us, you haven't had a
22	chance to look at the various criteria and we're also

in the rule making process, and what we're looking for are these kinds of questions being raised and directed to us, so that we -- with possibly the answers, as well, so that we can more better judge the various individual concerns that there may be out there.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thanks.

MR. HELM: I'm sorry. I'm answering your question with a question. I apologize.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Thanks.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I think one of these questions is, you know, I don't know what species to take, but if you take one that is we know is overfished and the council has not done a rebuilding plan or anything, it's continuing to be over-fished, overfishing takes place and over-fished dollars, it would be very difficult, I think, for us to agree to a council to promote that particular fish. But if there is a rebuilding plan in place, you know, with a recovery plan, then I think if we've got quotas and, you know, things, it would be easy.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Excuse me. Well, you know, what makes me think of this is haddock in the

northeast is highly funded and if we could figure out a way to take it out of the water and leave, you know, cod in the water, people have, you know, some serious concerns about the ability to actually market those fish.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes.

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: But it isn't a stock fishery and so, therefore, I would ask the question.

MR. HELM: Well, I think, Mary Beth, the point being that with a workable framework and a council that is committed to meeting the criteria, if we can work together to come up with a package and again, I'm overstepping where we are in the proposed rule, but let's assume that the criteria are established that would allow for all those things to If the council was agreeing to do all of those occur. things, then we would be looking at that package with a favorable eye.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Take the wild shrimp real quick. The wild shrimp thing, I think, right now, you know, we are in the process of going through rule making for limited entry, what else is it, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they have to guarantee it's -- they have to have back introduction devices. So, I mean, I think, you know, you would look at those criteria in the campaign to sell wild shrimp, to promote wild shrimp through that council because they have done all of these things, I think, you know.

CAPTAIN COOK: If we could get a little stamp with your picture and your cell number that we could put on all of the promotional literature --

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Ralph, Pete and then Jim.

MR. RAYBURN: All right. And shrimp is an example that, you know, I would like to think about a little bit, because they are struggling with creating an identity within a commodity to get a better price for survival of the industry. And the struggle is -- and, of course, this Wild American Shrimp Group is out there. I think the last thing I did in 1989 with the Texas Shrimp Association was develop a plan for creating a shrimp marketing board and a referendum and suddenly, you know, back right after this thing had passed and, you know, they are still struggling with

it.

It seems it comes down to several things in my mind. First of all, obviously, those folks -- well, I'm not sure within that industry that there is the margin any longer for an assessment to be viable. They may have lost all that momentum, hopefully not, but maybe where they can't even afford the nickel a pound or whatever it might be that's assessed. That's the difficulty.

But it seems to me in the thought process on this, to the extent that the Government wants to partner with the industry to create these kinds of councils, and if the industry does the assessment -- I'm asking a question. If they assess themselves a certain amount of money to go towards this council and they create standards for that product and those standards in the product would be certified to those standards, and that would go out into the market as a certified product to the standards that are applicable there.

Now, the Government's role in that besides lending credibility and authority to this council, I

NEAL R. GROSS

assume they would be involved in inspecting to those standards, so that the inspectors would be a part of that. And this is one question. Would the Government's partnership in that be covering the expense of that inspection or would that be to be paid by the assessment of the industry?

And then, secondly, if it's found that the certification, the logo or whatever is violated or someone has packed and submitted that it was packed to those standards and you found out it was not, you know, is there traceability set up so that that product can be traced back and the Government will enforce those standards against the producer or the processor or is that a requirement of the council again to go through that litigation?

So I guess two questions. In this, is it a partnership relation where the Government would cover the cost of the inspection to the standards?

And, secondly, is it the Government's cost to enforce those standards if this partnership council arrangement is established?

MR. WARD: Well, it is a partnership

NEAL R. GROSS

between the Government and the council. The Secretary of Commerce designates someone to sit on the board of the council to participate in the operations of the council, so it is truly a partnership. The costs, the way the rule is set up right now, are borne by the council. The federal role is -- the costs incurred by the Federal Government are really minimal in that regard.

Talking about going beyond what happens if a quality standard is violated goes beyond what's in the rule right now and it would make an excellent comment during the commentary to how would we deal with this, but it would have to be part of that marketing program proposed by the industry that the Government had to sign off on.

And the Federal Government does have, as you well know, programs to quality control a product that is being produced. It does have quality standards. It has people who can assist in setting up those programs.

MR. HELM: It would be for service and it would fall underneath the council's requirements.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. RAYBURN: So that would have to be
2	budgeted out of that assessment?
3	MR. HELM: Right.
4	MR. RAYBURN: So the only partnership is
5	someone sitting on the board and adding some
6	credibility to the process.
7	MR. HELM: But, again, you're talking
8	about the enforcement. The enforcement will be part
9	of the council's proposal to the Government.
LO	MR. RAYBURN: Right, but it could be a
L1	legal action that any entity could take upon
L2	themselves in a breach of contract, a breach of
L3	trademark registration or whatever it may be.
L4	MR. HELM: And under the proposal, there
L5	is an annual review of the marketing strategy and
L6	there is the ability to pull the mark, the seal or
L7	whatever it is for whatever breach there might be and,
L8	as I recall, the proposal has.
L9	MR. RAYBURN: Right.
20	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Pete?
21	MR. LEIPZIG: Yes, Pete Leipzig. You had
22	mentioned Iceland, somebody else had mentioned

1	importers as being qualified for participating, so I'm
2	assuming this is not just federally managed fisheries,
3	but state managed fisheries as well. Is that a fair
4	assumption?
5	MR. WARD: There is nothing to preclude
6	them in the proposed rule.
7	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. If individual states
8	were to pass legislation or produce this, since they
9	already have to establish marketing councils that are
10	mandatory funding in their nature, is there anything
11	that precludes state contributions from funding these
12	organizations?
13	MR. WARD: Not that I'm aware of.
14	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay.
15	MR. HELM: I'm not an expert on this, but
16	I would imagine states would be part of whatever the
17	council that it was for. They could be partners
18	within that council.
19	MR. LEIPZIG: They could be.
20	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Ken?
21	DR. ROBERTS. Ken Roberts. You have done
22	a good job previously with Linda in the Seafood and

Health Conference of taking leadership and staking sort of a claim on the national interest in having people eat seafood from a health and longevity and whatever standpoint.

And I know it's probably not the case, but I'm going to state it anyway. I don't want the organization, the Agency, to go passive if a council bill would pass, because a council bill, anybody who is going to avail themselves of the opportunity to form a council, it's probably going to be on a species basis or a group of species with similar characteristics.

They are going to be delivering messages primarily about that species. And I think what you have started with constituent services in the health and seafood in general with the conference and the follow-up we see coming is that more generic national interest about keeping seafood in the forefront and it's an important part of the national diet. therefore, we can spend money on it in terms managing it properly and making it sustainable, because it's a national issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now, I just want to make sure that if the council thing goes forward we don't just say, phew, boy, now we have got something passed and the councils, if they choose to conform, and if none or very few formed, it's no longer a national issue. That I want to avoid, number one.

And, number two, I want to avoid the fact that you may get into a passive mode if, in fact, some species kind of councils get started, because they are going to be focused on a species whereby we have some bigger issues to deal with about seafood consumption and health and that's just a caution I would like to state.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I think it's a good comment. You know, to be honest with you, one of the people that came to us was the tuna industry and one of them was, I think, over canned tuna. They have been working with FDA to sort of change the contents in the tuna can, you know, to put less filler and that type of stuff.

We have had a heck of a time with FDA, but I think the tuna industry decided, well, if we can't

1	deal with FDA on what comes into the country, can we
2	do a marketing campaign of our own to say that U.S.
3	canned tuna has got less filler and more, you know,
4	more tuna and you get to set out this type of thing.
5	And that is just one thing I have never talked about.
6	You know, this may help in some of the
7	stuff, to give a better product in the campaign that
8	you're giving about a product and that type of stuff.
9	There's a lot of, I think, very-established,
10	different people of why they want it, but I think that
11	again, we can ask Heather.
12	MS. McCARTY: Oh, I pass.
13	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Ralph?
14	MR. RAYBURN: Again, the west coast would
15	know, but pretty much in the tuna industry, there is
16	no domestic canners any longer, right, and so the
17	products are all canned foreign and then brought in,
18	American Samoa. Excuse me. Okay. Puerto Rico?
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: American Samoa.
20	MR. RAYBURN: Is that a major percent?
21	Most of it was Thailand and places like that, you
22	know?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: American Samoa is the largest port period. We can't even report it because of confidentiality, but American Samoa is the largest.

MR. RAYBURN: Okay. So domestic or U.S. flagged vessels that are harvesting in the western Pacific or whatever and then delivering it to that source, it's domestic product that's interested in marketing. I mean, I see that a little different because tuna has been really hammered in the last several years with mercury content and the cans and, you know, the notification, the marketplace and the California laws and all that kind of stuff. So I really think they are in a different position.

I would certainly -- the way it seems to me in the last several years, if a commodity group, and I'm sorry this is buzzing, but if salmon has a problem, they go to their legislature and they get \$50 million to do marketing. You know, the shrimpers have a problem, and congratulations on that, but if the shrimpers have a problem, you know, they go to their member and they get \$3 million for marketing or \$17 million or whatever.

1	So why go through this? I mean, if they
2	have got the political will, they can get it for
3	nothing. It's all our money. Why put up a nickel a
4	pound unless the Government wants to really do this
5	and it kind of goes back to aquaculture. All this is
6	great and, again, I think the wisdom behind the
7	thought is super, but unless you're full partners,
8	unless you come in and say, you know, we'll give you
9	50 percent on the inspector if you take this in, we'll
10	cut his fees by 50 percent or whatever, you know, and
11	we'll cover your legal costs or something to make full
12	partner.
13	And it seems like you're better off just
14	taking that money, putting it in the pack and going to
15	the Congress or the Senate and say, hey, we need \$5 to
16	do our marketing.
17	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But, no, I think the
18	point
19	MR. RAYBURN: No strings attached,
20	basically.
21	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, I think the
22	point is we're trying to look at or I'm trying to look

at fisheries on the whole, the big things from health,
from sustainability.
MR. RAYBURN: Absolutely.
VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: From the whole big
picture.
MR. RAYBURN: Absolutely.
VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And I think the money
that goes to this wild shrimp whatever it is is
somewhat of a hodgepodge. Sometimes they get it,
sometimes they don't, you know, and if they didn't,
they wouldn't pay for it themselves.
MR. RAYBURN: Absolutely.
VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And so I think this
is an opportunity and, hey, if we put the rule out
after we get all the comment and nobody wants it, we
have wasted a little bit of time, but if they do, then
they are going to have certain criteria and we'll be
standing beside you with some type of stuff.
MR. RAYBURN: And I think it's great. I
mean to be constructive.
VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: No, you are.
MR. RAYBURN: I think that's up to the

industry. It's losing momentum every day in not having something like this. They should have done this in the shrimp 25, 30 years ago. They didn't. Now, whether they can do it today or not, I don't know.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: This is part of, I guess, fisheries, you know, how we would like to see fisheries 10, 15, 20 years from now, how we're going to have good sustainable fisheries in the U.S., that our consumers have great faith and confidence in when they go to the market that they have some choices, that they will pick U.S. seafood over the other and this type of thing. That's what we're trying to get out. Yes, Tony?

CAPTAIN DILERNIA: All right. The more I hear this discussion, the more I'm reminded of something that the environmental communities put out. I think the Blue Ocean Institute has the palm cards that they have, the little fold cards that say, you know, what is recommended, what is not recommended as far as -- and I can't tell you how many times I see them, New York City shoppers, housewives, I mean, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

-- I think it's a tremendous success story as far as the environmental community trying to get out its message as to try and educate the public on species that the community feels are species that should be consumed by the consumer and those that should be avoided.

And I see those cards all over and if there is some way that the industry can develop a process that is certified by the Government to say, well, yes, maybe what you want to do is end up on that card. That may be the number one thing you want to do, is end up on that card of recommended species because, I mean, I see many people just use that as a buying guide in New York City.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR HOGARTH:} Steve, \ \mbox{I'm going to} \\$ give you the last word.

DR. MURAWSKI: Tony makes a good point. I mean, there are two private efforts out there, the Marine Research Council and the Seafood Launch, which is what Tony is talking about. They have very different criteria, different groups are sort of finding these things. The consumers are looking for

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
7	

18

19

20

21

22

this kind of information. It's incomplete. NMFS as an agency is not in it, you know, in terms of, you know, applying criteria, looking at the laws that we have. And so I think this is a way to sort of balance up the score card a little bit.

I would say that on the Pacific side there is much more sort of aggressive industry interests and things like marine stewardship council than there is in the Atlantic right now. For whatever reason, I think, you know, it's a show coming that you will see, America.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Mary Beth?

MS. NICKELL-TOOLEY: Mary Beth Tooley. Well, I think that the concern about, you know, the cards and whether you're on the card or off the card, I mean, you know, Maine lobsters are on the card, off the card, depending on whose card it is. Considered over fish, you have some fishery that keeps going and appears to be quite healthy in the northern stock area.

Then you have, you know, the politics of the day and other fisheries in which the science is

totally ignored by the public and they go opposite direction. And I have seen it go both ways in which the Science Center says that we have a healthy, stable, if not, growing stock. People will the microphone and tell you exactly the to And then I've also seen the Science Center opposite. come forward and say that, you know, they have great concern over ground fish stock. And people who come to the microphone say that's not a problem either, because there is plenty of ground fish. certification process and how it works is really what's needed.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We hope you send some of these comments. We will go through them all carefully and we can, probably, sit on those comments anyway, so we'll take others. But if you have others, send them to us, because, you know, when we get these we need to decide on what we want to do. And so I think it has been excellent to have this discussion. As usual, it's given me lots of things to think about and a couple of things that I'm not sure we've thought about carefully enough in the process. So I can tell

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you we will do it, you kno
2	MS. NICKELL-T
3	off copies.
4	VICE CHAIR HO

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

w.

OOLEY: And we're printing

OGARTH: And we're printing off the copies, so that we can give you copies of it. Look, any time that, you know, you think I'm going too far in this, people do tell me. I've just decided that when I took the job and put up my 10 goals and this is a part of it, you know. I just think I feel very strongly that we can have a very strong fishery country for wild supplemented in this and by And if we can get the right message out, aguaculture. then this is what it's about.

And we want to and hopefully it will help us with maybe some of our international efforts of getting the framability and they won't have to export So we'll deal with it. here. But it's a lot of possibilities there. But thank you very much. with that, we'll take a break and come back and talk about hurricane impacts and recovery strategies.

> (Whereupon, off the record for a recess.) VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Are we ready?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	We all know about the hurricanes and the impact and
2	results. And we have been totally involved since day
3	one trying to bring in some of the economic impacts,
4	but they are also involved in looking at all the
5	different types of seafood and containment levels and
6	everything. We have got it right in the zone and
7	Steve was kind of roped into doing most of it.
8	Still not a lot of money has been given to
9	FEMA, a lot of money to the Gulf. How many million
LO	dollars so far, \$60, \$70 or \$80 million. So far
L1	nothing has gone directly to the fishing industry. If
L2	you go back and look historical disasters,
L3	particularly when the Secretary hold on a second.
L4	COURT REPORTER: We're getting a lot of
L5	feedback.
L6	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Still?
L7	COURT REPORTER: It seems to be okay.
L8	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. And
L9	historically, what has happened okay?
20	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
21	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. What has been
22	happening when the Secretary declared the disaster, he

1	was hoping Congress would put some money into the pot
2	and we'll go out and help fishermen recover. None of
3	that has happened so far this year, but there has been
4	a tremendous amount of time and effort spent trying to
5	look at the economics and looking at what it would
6	take to rebuild. And so Steve, oh, boy, turning over
7	to Steve, has really been totally structured with this
8	working with the Department, working with everybody,
9	EPA and all in this process. He will give you sort of
10	an update on where we are and what we have done and
11	what the impacts are. So take it away, Steve.
12	DR. MURAWSKI: Thanks, Bill. We'll kind
13	of do a little
14	COURT REPORTER: Pin on your microphone,
15	sir.
16	DR. MURAWSKI: This is like a lapel mike?
17	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
18	DR. MURAWSKI: Okay. A singer deal. As
19	Bill said, you know, almost from day one, fisheries
20	have been heavily involved. The hurricane's original
21	response and now trying to see if we can segue into
22	the rebuilding side of that. Of course, Bill has kind

of led the way on this, trying to help. We have almost weekly phone calls with all state directors, get the Gulf Commission involved in this in terms of recovery planning, the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council.

And then there is a whole raft of Government committees and commissions and, you know, of course, the President has the Gulf Recovery Council in the White House that's trying to coordinate some issues and they have a new Environmental and Clean-Up Committee that NOAA is part of now and that hopefully, you know, will get a higher profile.

And I can tell you, you know, one thing that's going on right now is that there is weekly reporting to this guy, Donald Powell, who is the head of the Gulf Council. And so there is a spreadsheet that goes down there every Friday afternoon. And we have -- actually, the spreadsheet, you know, lists all of the Government things that are going on. There is four fisheries issues that go down there in terms of both looking at Mississippi and Louisiana, particular.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You know, the monthly catch of oysters, monthly catch of shrimp, the monthly catch of fin fish, then there's imports and exports and recreational fishing, so that's right on the agenda in terms of the data that they are trying to get a lot of people interested in fisheries. Being interested in fisheries and coming up with the money is a different story and that, I think, we will have a discussion on that later.

So what I would like to do is to run through a little bit of kind of what NOAA has been up to. And I would say that, you know, this goes beyond fisheries, you know, in terms of a number of issues. And we had given a briefing earlier about Katrina and the total NOAA enterprise here. It went all the way from Max Mayfield and hurricane predictors to this recovery mission that NOAA has in terms of opening up ports and then into the fisheries and then the recovery thing.

And I can tell you that there is a report coming out right now on how the Government -- Government-wide responded to this and, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

there's a lot of headache for a lot of agencies in there. But so far I haven't heard a whole lot about, you know, NOAA's role, you know, in terms of, you know, meeting out the pain here and I think it is, you know, kind of an exception to a lot of the Government agencies in terms of how they pull together.

So very briefly, I would like to talk a little bit about a few issues that are high on our list in terms of both field activities and ongoing monitoring. Maybe you saw the beaver and the whale over there in the corner this morning. Actually, that's very updated information on a couple of these things and I tried to feed that into the report.

So we want to talk a little bit about monitoring for seafood safety. Of course, NOAA has a support role in seafood safety. It's the FDA and, to a certain extent, FDA to sets standards, but the FDA doesn't have a field component. You know, we have a major field component in the Gulf of Mexico, so we have been supplying samples for those activities.

Secondly, I want to talk about changes in resource abundance pre- and post-hurricane, some

NEAL R. GROSS

fascinating things going on in the Gulf and I think we have got some really interesting, updated information to show you. Third, wetlands restoration and losses is a very, very important issue for us. Obviously, Louisiana wetlands represent about 40 percent of the entire coastal wetlands in the United States and we have been losing them at a rate of about 25 square miles a year.

The hurricane did nothing to help that situation. And, of course, you know, many people have talked about the issues of hurricanes not only -- oh, sorry, wetlands not only being nursery habitats for fisheries, but also the first line of defense for hurricane protection, and so many of those issues are right back up on the table again.

Fourth, and certainly top on our issue and, you know, John Ward and others can speak to some of this, as well, fishery loss, you know, just a tremendous loss of infrastructure in terms of vessels and, you know, ports and icehouses and processing business, docks, etcetera, lots of loss of revenue in the fishery.

I think Roy, Bill and I will try to lead a general discussion on the rebuilding efforts because I think, you know, where we go from here is going to be extremely important and, in many cases, we don't necessarily want to just rebuild this industry as it was, you know, the day before the hurricane. We want to try to be a little bit more resilient. So I will try to go through these issues rather quickly.

Hurricane Katrina was a huge hurricane. This is what the hurricane looked like as it struck with the eye just to the east of New Orleans, you know, going up to the Mississippi coast and the massive effects on either side. Now, that's where it struck the last time but, of course, if you look at the track of Katrina, it had a major impact in the Florida keys and, in fact, I think the stone crab fishermen estimated down there something like 400,000 traps were lost in the stone crab fishery. And so, you know, there is a major dent in that fishery as well.

And, of course, on the heels of that,
Hurricane Rita. So it's kind of interesting. There

NEAL R. GROSS

1	is sort of a little gap in, you know, the main
2	hurricane effects in mid Louisiana and there is a bit
3	of an industry that seems to be working in mid
4	Louisiana right now. Now, if there are people that
5	have more local information than I, please, correct
6	that.
7	MR. SIMPSON: Could you back up?
8	DR. MURAWSKI: Sure.
9	MR. SIMPSON: For those of you that have
10	never lived through one of these things
11	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir, I can't
12	hear you.
13	MR. SIMPSON: I'm sorry. For those of you
14	that have never lived through one of those things, all
15	the parts of the hurricane are not created equal.
16	From that side, what they call the northeast quadrant,
17	that is the killer. This side over here is not nearly
18	as bad. So whenever you see that tracker going up
19	through here, here is where the heavy pounding is, the
20	same way here. So Louisiana got half of its coastline
21	a week, two weeks later, and then this side over here.

So all they got left of these parts is right there in

the middle.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. MURAWSKI: Thanks, Larry. In terms of our response -- of course, this is a small structure that we put together last summer to describe the interaction in many issues that we have going on in the Gulf. And so this is, you know, before the hurricane actually hit, but you can see that there's a whole variety of issues that go on in the Gulf in terms of like waterfall issues in the hypoxia zone, and this is an issue that the EPA investigating post hurricane to try to figure out what's going on.

We know we have got this thing called a loop current, and so right after the hurricane people in Florida, you know, were saying, hey, whatever substances might be coming out of Louisiana we have got to be monitoring over here to see what's going on, and there was lots of stuff in the papers in Florida. In fact, I think the Governor, Jeb Bush, wrote a letter to NOAA saying what are you guys doing for monitoring for potential toxic contamination?

We have got heavy industry, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

another way of saying that there is mercury emissions in some places, particularly up around Mobile Bay and other places, coastal development in terms of energy development and fisheries and protective resources issues. So these are all flew off of the plate when we were trying to look at things.

Now, for seafood safety issues, you know, we all talk about the toxic gumbo issues coming out of New Orleans, but actually there are a number of issues that we started looking at within a couple of weeks of the hurricane. First of all, the hydrocarbon releases along the lower Mississippi River where a lot of these, you know, oil storage depots and other places are.

Secondly, a lot of stuff related to potential toxics and pathogens coming out of the pumping out of New Orleans. There were a large number of vessels and there are remaining a large number of sunken vessels, you know, in the area which they all have, you know, fuel on board and other items, so that is a continuing issue.

And then the storm surge waters. You

NEAL R. GROSS

know, the storm surge particularly on the Mississippi coast came up a couple, three miles, and brought a lot of things with it. Of course, it's a heavy agricultural area so the potential for pesticides being in that storm surge water. And then the last issue is offshore releases. We know that quite a few of the -- there's quite a few oil terminals out there and rigs that were toppled, so any potential offshore releases would be important.

Now, this is a picture of the lower Mississippi River and these are the oil terminals where we know there was an actual breach that went on. About eight million gallons were released into the environment there, so a good place to start looking is, you know, in terms of are there any kind of toxic effects is right down at the crowfoot delta and in terms of what went on.

Now, a couple million gallons has actually been recovered and most of this stuff is actually up in salt marshes right now, as far as we can determine, but clearly, you know, if this stuff is going to come down the Mississippi River, we're going to have to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	start looking for it pretty quickly.
2	And just in terms of the geography, Lake
3	Pontchartrain, and this is Lake Borgne which is
4	actually not a lake. It's just an extension of the
5	Mississippi Sound. These are called the Chandelier
6	Islands and this is the outer Gulf. See, Larry, I'm
7	coming up to speed on the Gulf.
8	MR. JONER: Where is the outlet to Lake
9	Pontchartrain? I kept hearing about the storm surge.
10	DR. MURAWSKI: Yes, I have got a
11	photograph for you. This is Lake Pontchartrain here,
12	so there is the outlet to this is Lake Borgne in
13	here. So the outlet is up in here.
14	MR. JONER: Is that the storm surge
15	came through the outlet or just breached the well,
16	how did it get into the lake though?
17	DR. MURAWSKI: Well, the storm surge was
18	primarily up on the Mississippi coast. You know, that
19	is where you saw the big storm surge. But, of course,
20	I mean, there was a lot of water associated with that
21	and then, of course, this is tidal. You know, Lake

Pontchartrain is tidal so there were, you know, waters

1	that were reversing.
2	MR. JONER: So just through that outlet
3	there. That's the only
4	PARTICIPANT: Over the land.
5	MR. JONER: Well, that's what I wondered,
6	if it went over, if it reached the land.
7	MR. SIMPSON: Through the narrow part.
8	MR. JONER: Yes, okay.
9	MR. SIMPSON: But if you have ever been to
10	New Orleans, that ties in directly.
11	DR. MURAWSKI: Okay. Feel free to talk in
12	here, I mean, you know.
13	MR. SIMPSON: It went over the interstate
14	in Mississippi.
15	DR. MURAWSKI: This is like a satellite
16	photo that we use to look at water turbidity and you
17	can't really see it in the big projection here, but
18	there was a lot of troubled water. This is right
19	after the hurricane and we were looking at, you know,
20	potential for offshore releases and these kind of
21	photographs are real helpful.
22	Now, right after the hurricane Bill was

very concerned that, you know, we needed to get some seafood monitoring. So we did a couple of things. As soon as one of NOAA's research vessels, this is called the Nancy Thompson, sorry, Nancy Foster, Nancy Thompson is another Nancy in the Gulf, as soon as that was released from the duty that it was on in terms of relief efforts, we started a program to look at contamination issues.

And so the Foster went out and did a cruise where it cruises right off the delta here and then did a few stations up along the Mississippi Sound, etcetera. So these were the first data that actually came to the fore.

Now, we talked about we were able to charter our commercial fishing vessel. This is the Patricia Jean out of Alabama, which is over here, and we have a long-term contract. So about every two to three weeks Patricia Jean has been going out doing a variety of sampling, particularly in Mississippi Sound, all the way from Lake Borgne, you know, over here, all the way to Alabama and back and then also doing some of these stations as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

have а time series that starting to look at in terms of some of the data coming out of there. And we're looking at things like hydrocarbons, PCBs, flame retardants, a whole variety of things that might contaminate seafood. This is the list of the stations that the Patricia Jean is actually looking at. So we have got a long-term profile of Louisiana over to Mobile Bay in terms of what's going on.

Now, just to give you a little sense of the data coming out of this, this is for the Lake Borgne area so all the stations way over to the west, and this is the total PCBs and there are three time periods here, September, October and late October, early November. You see a little PCBs, but it has actually gone back done, and this is DDT here and you can see the same thing, not much going on.

Now, the standard for PCBs and DDT are way higher than these levels and, in fact, the standard for DDT is 5,000 parts per billion and the standards for PCBs are 2,000 parts per billion. So you can see that as a scale, we're way down there in terms of, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	know, the FDA standards for food which is reassuring.
2	This is the Mississippi Sound section and
3	you can see that we're starting to see a little blip.
4	This is what we call the low molecular weight for
5	aromatic compounds. Basically, it's fresh gasoline or
6	diesel fuel. And it starts out here, but, again,
7	these are extremely low values and you would sort of
8	think that eventually some of the oil refinement would
9	start to creep in here. If you look at the product of
10	the low molecular weight aromatic compounds, they are
11	still level, which makes a lot of sense because this
12	is fresh oil versus old oil in terms of what goes on.
13	So a very good, you know, signal in the
14	seafood and maybe, Tom, you want to comment on this a
15	little bit.
15 16	
	little bit.
16	little bit. MR. BILLY: Just a question. What are the
16 17	little bit. MR. BILLY: Just a question. What are the numbers? Is that parts per billion?
16 17 18	little bit. MR. BILLY: Just a question. What are the numbers? Is that parts per billion? DR. MURAWSKI: Yes. Jim?
16 17 18	little bit. MR. BILLY: Just a question. What are the numbers? Is that parts per billion? DR. MURAWSKI: Yes. Jim? CAPTAIN COOK: Did you test in water or in

animals. So we're basically looking at a whole bunch of things and one of the things that we need to do is to keep at this thing because, in fact, the accumulation in the food chain is going to take a long time.

You know, going out there and doing one set of samples right off the bat is not going to do anything in terms of, you know, trying to keep long-term monitoring going on. Again, these are extremely low levels in terms of, you know, any kind of standards.

There is another program called NOAA's Mussel Watch Program. This is a national program that looks at shellfish around the country in estuary areas. They have now started sampling and they are going to do several rounds. We don't have the total data, but you can see that we're trying to sample American oyster in all these areas and look at a variety of potential contaminants up to 120 different levels to try to ensure the public that, you know, the seafood is safe.

Of course, it doesn't say anything about

NEAL R. GROSS

the current abundance of oysters, which is extremely low and, you know, many of the oyster producing grounds, particularly in Mississippi and southeastern Louisiana, are, you know, virtually decimated.

Another thing that we wanted to look at was looking at water mass movements. As I said before, people in Florida are very concerned about the potential movement of toxic materials. So we looked at the drifters. These are the tracks of drifters and this is what a drifter looks like in the current to try to follow the movements of the water. Subsequent testing of the water showed actually the amount of toxic materials is extremely low anyway, but we did get a handle on the potential movements of what was going on.

Now, one of the things, of course, that people want to know, you know, is what happens with the various populations out there. Now, I have a series of data that were taken as part of a series that is called Sea Map, which is run out of the Pascagoula, Mississippi Laboratory. It's an annual bottom fish program and it looks at bottom fish and

NEAL R. GROSS

shrimp.

Now, I have to tell you this was a heroic effort, because their lives were basically destroyed and all of the equipment was basically destroyed. So these guys there, Gordon Gunter and Oregon II, did their survey. Many of them, you know, were basically living on a vessel, you know, because their homes and lives were destroyed. So they have been doing it every October, you know, since 1972 so we have a time series.

So the last data point in this time series is a 2005 data point and this is Atlantic Croaker, an important one to put on, because this is the most important of the fin fish that are taken in the Gulf Shrimp Fishery in terms of the bycatch levels and there's hundreds of thousands of tons of Atlantic Croaker that are taken in that fishery. Okay. Good. So you can see there is little left in terms of Atlantic Croaker abundance after the hurricane.

And if you look at all the statistics taken in this survey, you can see that there is a slight upward trend in total fin fish by and large,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	but, you know, about a 40 percent increase in the fin
2	fish taken in that survey. Now, there are other
3	things, such as white shrimp, and you can see there is
4	a very significant increase. Now, the thing is this
5	is only one data point and sometimes, you know, you
6	can get some, you know, variability. But white shrimp
7	is extremely important as a fishery in the Gulf and
8	you can see that there is a substantial increase at
9	least in that one data point.
10	CAPTAIN O'SHEA: This is a Sea Map after
11	the hurricane?
12	DR. MURAWSKI: That's correct.
13	CAPTAIN O'SHEA: Thank you.
14	DR. MURAWSKI: Yes, that's correct. This
15	is the northern Gulf area, so this would be the area
16	that would be influenced. You can see the last couple
17	of years have been good. The data point is down a
18	little but, overall the abundance in that survey is
19	increasing. Brown shrimp, a slight increase in the
20	abundance level, not great.
21	Now, what about the fishery itself, and

this is the new information that we just got. This is

the CPUE put in for a hurricane and this is the number of pounds per day fished in the Gulf Shrimp Fishery and this is in Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana. So you can see that there has been a bit of an increasing trend, but folks are saying there is a big increase in the CPUE, the catch per day fish by that fishery.

And it kind of settled down a little bit, around the 600 pounds per day level, but that's substantially greater than the total outcome average in this fishery.

MR. FLETCHER: Does that reflect a lack of competition, you have no boats, or is it a float?

DR. MURAWSKI: You saw that, too. Yes, well, this is the trend and so the trend off Texas, every year there is an increase you see decrease. And of course, I could go over it, but this is the Texas shrimp part. And so, basically, repeat that experiment over and over again that, you know, if left to their own devices they can be quite abundant. And then, you know, the pressure of the fishery is so high that, you know, it pretty much chews that up pretty quickly. And you can see 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

you know, over in Texas, it's kind of, you know, the same story going on there.

Okay. So that is sort of the abundance of animals and I do think just to kind of sum that part up, I do think we have an experiment ongoing there in terms of the abundance for, you know, competitors for shrimp. You know, we have got the relatively high abundance of some species like croaker and other species and, you know, if, in fact, the effort doesn't really come back anytime quickly, we're like to see a fairly significant change in the composition of the animals in that fishery and in that area.

Next, what I'm going to talk a little about is wetlands and that is a number of areas here were heavily inundated. In fact, Chandelier Islands is probably one of the areas most heavily impacted and the Chandelier Islands were really heavily impacted to the point where, I think, they lost most of their acreage to the storm and, you know, these are a broad area island that has always been very important to storm protection of the inner Gulf. And so this is a series of, you know, satellite photographs of what

NEAL R. GROSS

1	went on with that.											
2	The USGS has indicated that they think											
3	that we lost 100 square miles of Louisiana wetlands											
4	due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina and they											
5	haven't even counted the Rita ones yet, and that is											
6	about four times the normal yearly loss of wetlands.											
7	Now, that being said, I wanted to describe											
8	one lone effort that was actually a bright spark here.											
9	NOAA and other organizations, including the Corps of											
10	Engineers and Louisiana Department of Marine Resources											
11	participated in a program called CWPPR and it's the											
12	Coastal Wetlands Protection. I can't get the acronym.											
13	PARTICIPANT: Planning, Protection and											
14	Restoration.											
15	DR. MURAWSKI: You got it. Yes, okay.											
16	CWPPR.											
17	PARTICIPANT: And Restoration.											
18	DR. MURAWSKI: CWPPR. It's a program that											
19	basically the Corps funds through the bank and it's											
20	for wetland restoration programs. And what you see at											
21	the top in the photograph is that wetlands protection											

creation program and what they did was build these

1	things called terraces, and what they are is about a 3
2	foot high mound of earth, basically covered in grass
3	and the ocean is down here. So the point here is to
4	try to keep shore erosion down.
5	This is a pre Hurricane Rita photograph
6	and this is a post photograph and you can see all this
7	stuff is in place with, in fact, relatively little
8	erosion even due to the storm. Now, that I don't
9	know about this whole thing, but the point is, you
LO	know, the protection program actually stayed in place.
L1	And so we looked around at the process
L2	that was executed here, about eight or nine of them in
L3	this phase anyway, they seemed to weather the storm
L4	much better than the wetlands as a whole. And I guess
L5	the point here is that if we do good quality
L6	restoration programs, we can actually sort of
L7	stabilize these coastal wetlands.
L8	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Steve, don't leave that
L9	slide yet.
20	DR. MURAWSKI: Don't leave it there?
21	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: We might have questions
22	here.

1	DR. MURAWSKI: Sure.
2	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Help me understand.
3	You said 3 foot berms you created or a series of
4	DR. MURAWSKI: Yes, these were three
5	these things like sort of look like they came out of a
6	computer are actually 3 foot mounds of earth that come
7	up off the beach.
8	MR. BILLY: Like steps?
9	DR. MURAWSKI: Well, they are not steps.
10	They are actually just like a wall sitting here that
11	this would trap the sediments and that's why
12	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Is that any marsh grass
13	itself?
14	DR. MURAWSKI: Well, this is actually
15	under water, right, so this is this one up here,
16	this is actually in the sub tidal.
17	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: That's sub tidal.
18	DR. MURAWSKI: That's sub tidal, that's
19	right, but they're actually out of the water, right,
20	so this is like a sort of inner coastal waterway and
21	then those are berms that come out of the water. Yes,
22	I think it's to trap sediments before they go offshore

1	and to refill this in as marsh.
2	DR. CRABTREE: Yes, Steve?
3	DR. MURAWSKI: Go ahead.
4	DR. CRABTREE: This is Roy Crabtree. What
5	you see in coastal Louisiana is you'll go down there
6	and you will see a lot of these big lakes and areas
7	that are just water now, but they will tell you 10
8	years ago there was grass through all of that marsh.
9	DR. MURAWSKI: Okay.
10	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: You got the same thing
11	in Jamaica Bay now.
12	DR. CRABTREE: And it's a combination of
13	sediment washing away and subsiding. Things are just
14	sinking and the sediment is not coming down the river
15	anymore. It's causing fresh deposits along that to
16	subside, because we have canaled the Mississippi,
17	whereas it used to meander all over a large part of
18	Mississippi and the sediment was spread all out and
19	it's not anymore.
20	MR. SIMPSON: And they have channelized to
21	keep it from doing that.
22	CAPTAIN DILERNIA: Thank you. I would

1	like more information on that later. I will see you
2	later about that.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Is that what was there or is
4	that just material that they brought in?
5	DR. MURAWSKI: It was material that was
6	brought and just basically harvested around that area,
7	that's right. And, of course, there's a couple of new
8	reports about the wetlands in this area that have been
9	released. The Natural Research Council has a new one
10	about redrawing coastal Louisiana's map and also the
11	University of Maryland just put out, along with people
12	at LSU and some other people, just put out a report
13	talking about, you know, trying to rehabilitate these
14	wetlands. So it's a very important issue.
15	And one of the interesting things, the hot
16	spot of the whole thing is the roads and that's
17	actually, you know, coming out of all this flooding
18	is, you know, the roads. So it's not a very high
19	price, you know, when you think about any of the other
20	places we deal with.
21	All right. So, basically, what people
22	talk about most is feedback from Gulf fisheries and

the Gulf fishery infrastructure. Now, prior to the hurricane, this is what the fin fish and shellfish fisheries looked like in this area, so about something like \$2 million dollars per year to fishermen. This is excessive value, probably \$10 billion a year, when you think about the multiplier effects.

are, obviously, shrimp is key and then a variety of fin fish and other shellfish with counts around \$60 million a year with Louisiana County for most of the oysters, Mississippi also very important. So this is a vital area we look at. The total amount of oyster production here, it accounts for over 80 percent of the United States production of oysters. So these are extremely important things.

Now, I just want to make some general statements about overall volume, because the Coast Guard estimates something between 3,000 and 5,000 vessels, the majority of those being commercial vessels that were either run up on shore, sunken or significantly damaged at the dock. In Mississippi alone, the Coast Guard counted 452 vessels over 30

NEAL R. GROSS

feet long that were affected and, again, these are very valuable fisheries.

Revenues were down by 97 to 94 percent from the previous September or at least the long-term average, and that has represented a \$62 million loss for the industry just in terms of revenues. And, again, you know, in terms of overall impact on infrastructure, it has been devastating. This is a picture of the area with a bunch of fishing vessels where they are not supposed to be.

Now, we looked at month-to-month, trying to match up October 2005 with the previous year before the hurricane and these are data that are -- you know, that are being tracked at a very high level. compare October 2005 to the previous year, this is don't have complete information about -we November and, of course, one of the problems is our information marine fisheries sources are state agencies in many cases, and they were all wrecked and, you know, their infrastructure is gone. So it's a little bit up, you know, final numbers and Bill, of course, touched on that before. It's very difficult

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to get these kinds of numbers because of, you know, so much main damage.

But if you look at, you know, percent change, you know, or the revenue percent change in shrimp revenue, fin fish revenue, recreational fisheries, there is a lot of that coming in in imports that have improved a little bit and this is probably up through Mobile and then exports, of course, are down fairly significantly as well.

And the same thing for Louisiana, although not quite as bad as Mississippi on a percentage basis because, you know, what Larry talked about, that sort of middle section in Louisiana, there actually is some shrimp revenue that is coming in here but, of course, that revenue is way off, revenue for fisheries is way off, and exports going out of New Orleans are also in deep trouble.

Now, one of the field activities that we have been doing is because, due to the Magnuson Act that talks about communities, we have commissioned a study by an independent contractor that worked last summer, and they did a series of community profiles in

NEAL R. GROSS

334 communities around the Gulf Coast. And what they did was map, basically, every marine and fishing related business that they could find, you know, on the ground in terms of where it was.

Now, it's a very biased data source and it's all, you know, NGIS and all those kinds of things, so right after the storm we led another contract with the same contractor to go back to the communities that were affected and, basically, redo the survey to see who was still in business. And some of the preliminary numbers that we have been putting into various documents come from parts of that survey that are done.

And so, you know, for example, the number of icehouses in a particular county or whatever, so that gave us a very complete record of what was there pre- and post-hurricane. And then, of course, John has got a number of other -- John Ward has got a number of other economic studies ongoing particularly one with charter boats that are going to give us, you know, an important view on that industry.

Of course, charter fishing in the western

NEAL R. GROSS

Florida, Northern Gulf is worth about \$6 billion a year to the economy, so it's extremely important to the total makeup of fisheries. So in terms of ongoing things, as I said before, weekly reporting for the west coast through the Palas organization. We have sustained operations for looking at contaminant monitoring and work by the National Ocean Service is ongoing.

We tried to do some wetlands loss analysis to try to figure out what was going on. We hope to do abundance and distribution, both on the commercial side as well as any kind of surveys that we normally do. The community profiles, we expect the final reports of that this month, so we will have all that information. We are going to do ongoing coordination of activities with the Corps of Engineers, USGS and particularly state directors, the agencies and the Gulf people which are very valuable.

And we actually have a website where a lot of this stuff is out there and I can tell you people are very thirsty for information down here. So that's sort of brings us to, you know, that was sort of the

NEAL R. GROSS

hurricane impacts. And I just wanted to start this discussion on recovery issues. So Bill asked that the Gulf Council and the Gulf Commission put together their thoughts on rebuilding plans. And we have kind of taken, you know, what Larry and what the Gulf Council have pulled together and kind of adjusted a little bit for the circumstances down there.

So Bill and they have been -- they have been talking about a four point plan that we've got to try to see if we can, you know, recover these fisheries and make them a little bit more sustainable. It's certainly for relief issues. You know, how do we get people, you know, who are out of work working in terms of, you know, trying to help and assist in debris clean-up, try to understand what their marine debris issue is, because FEMA is very focused on debris on land, but not so focused on debris under water and that's a major issue for us.

Secondly, we can start the recovery, the long-term infrastructure and how do we do that. We've talked to the Recovery Commission in Louisiana a little bit and they are interested in our ideas as

NEAL R. GROSS

W€	ell.	We	will	try	to	deve]	Lop	and	find	cap	acity
re	eductio	ns t	o try	to m	nake	these	!	some	of t	these	over
Ca	apitali	zed	fishe	ries	in	the G	ulf	a 1:	ittle	bit	more
sı	ustaina	ble	and	maybe	a	littl	e l	ess	susce	ptibl	e to
tł	hese ki	nds	of eve	ents.							
			And I	lastly	/, t	o try	, to	100	k at	the	west

recovery issues as they might relate to coastal community resilience. Now, that being said, this is a map of the southeast United States and these are all hurricane strikes from 1955 -- sorry, 1950 to 2004. And you look at the most dense place, you know, on this map and it's right there. Something like 27 hurricanes between 1950 and 2004 and you throw on the three hurricanes that we have got, if we simply read those, this set of infrastructure in place, you know, we're just setting ourselves up for a reoccurrence of the same thing.

And so, Roy, if you want to add in anything?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just this has really posed quite a challenge, I think, for the Gulf Council, because as all this is going on, the Council

NEAL R. GROSS

has been looking at putting in place a moratorium on shrimp permits, essentially, moving into limited entry in the shrimp fishery. And the Council just towards the end of last year got a new red snapper assessment, which indicates we're over-fishing and we still over-fished and we still have significant problems with bycatch in shrimp fishery.

And it poses a real challenge to us to know how to react to some of these things now, because we have previously been in a mode of how do we bring shrimp effort down, but I'm not sure now that we're not in the mode of how much do we let shrimp effort come back up, which is a real change. And one of the phrases you hear a lot now is "don't kick them while they're down," and no one wants to come in and do that. But at the same time, everyone is sensitive about not allowing some of the problems that have plagued us for so long in the Gulf.

We don't want to recreate those again as we move forward. So the Council is trying to find that balance at keeping these problems from coming back, but at the same time trying to help these

NEAL R. GROSS

fisheries recover and then balancing all of that against their mandates to end over-fishing and rebuild these stocks. And it's quite a challenge and a lot of these things, particularly with respect to shrimp and red snapper and things that the Council is working on right now and will be dealing with when they meet in Mobile this March. So it is quite an issue.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: One of the things, I think, that's interesting, I went down about a month ago, I guess, in a meeting with fishermen with some of the Hill staff and I talked to one shrimper who said I had probably the best week I've ever had. He said I got there and in no time I had -- you know, I got a certain run. He kept talking and he said, you know, not many boats fishing. That's something that Jack or Ted would do. You know, we got so many people out there that it's hard to get, you know, a decent catch and they had spent a lot of money on -- but I think a lot of them are starting to realize that maybe the best way is not to have everybody where it was.

But he kept saying we can't buy-out, because we can't afford, you know, to have to pay back

NEAL R. GROSS

boats that come out of the fishery. And, you know, they have such a small profit margin. So we talked with the Hill. I think we would like to see them talk to the shrimp industry about a buy-out.

I think there's a lot of them right now that lost so much that they would just like to get out of the fishery. And I think right now is a good time to structure that with their help, because I think a lot of them can't afford to get back in, you know. So, you know, it's a lot of -- right now, there's no infrastructure whatsoever for fishermen and it's just bad. So hopefully the expression "don't kick us while we're down," I don't think anybody wants to do that, but we want to put them back where they made money. And I don't think many shrimp boats have made money in the last few years. They have hocked everything they own to stay in business. So a lot of challenges.

DR. CRABTREE: Just one more thing to add.

A lot of times when we talk about the industry and always talk about commercial fishing, well, this is a huge area for our charter boat industry. And, you know, a lot of the commercial guys are out there

NEAL R. GROSS

rebuilding the docks and they are trucking in ice and they are off-loading into trucks and they are starting to function a little bit.

But these charter boat fishermen in Mississippi and these areas they are not going to be back in business until there are tourists there again. And if you have seen coastal Mississippi, it's going to be a long time coming back to where it was. So their businesses aren't coming back until they have got restaurants and hotels and until people see that area as an attractive place to visit again.

And I think it's going to be a long time coming. And they can't really move their businesses and go start chartering out somewhere else, because so much of charter boat fishing is local knowledge and where the fish are and all. So I'm real concerned about the effects of all this on the charter boat fishery and I really do think they are going to be a long time coming back and that a lot of them aren't going to make it through this, because I don't know how they are going to be able to make a living from fishing at least for quite a while.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And this point a little further. Last week the oyster and -- you could go up in Tennessee. They have like an oyster feast every now and then and they're trying to get money out of the Congress for the supplemental budget, but they can't even get help now.

One guy that has a few restaurants said he had a cook and someone else living at home with him just so he could keep them. But they can't operate at full strength yet. They don't have help. It's just you hear that all throughout the industry that the recovery efforts, I guess, going in and turned down and try to do that, it's paying more money than they can make in the fishing business, a lot of businesses, so they're just lost. So it's a -- I don't know what.

I think a lot of the other restaurants said they could open six hours a day. He had enough people that he could keep the restaurant open six hours. I know my stepson was in Bay St. Louis and lost a restaurant totally. They have told him that it would probably be two years before they are liable to even think about rebuilding, because they got to

NEAL R. GROSS

rebuild the bridges in the town, because they lost all the roads and everything else.

So rather than just rebuild it the way it was, they're going to, I guess, look at zoning and redo how they build. So it's a long-term impact, you know. We really should have last fall to really get the benefit out of the oyster's fat, you know, the sack, and so we got two years from the day we get oysters back until you get oysters harvested, so we're going to see some, I think, longer terms impacts to the oyster industry.

The shrimp annual crop basically they will Fin fish, I think, is already proven. come back. it's just will we have infrastructure? Will we have, know, progress in icehouses and structures, of that because а lot changes in development, regardless of building something else, so a lot of places don't, so to speak. Chris?

MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett. I want to thank the Agency for all the work you have done on this issue. It has been a great source of information for those of us working on where we go from here. I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have a couple of questions. The first one is do you have any kind of price tag on, from your perspective, how much it would cost to do the things in your four point plan?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Steve?

DR. MURAWSKI: I shudder to give the price only because, you know, we have talked about some of these issues, but nobody really knows. Like for example, in marine debris. You know, one of the things that we are trying to do is get a survey out there and, you know, nobody knows how much debris there is, although we talked to fishermen a lot and they said there is a lot out there.

Well, until we get a, you know, good map of where -- how much debris is out there and where it is, I mean, we have put some numbers in there, you know, \$50 million for marine debris removal. But, you know, FEMA has spent billions of dollars for debris removal on land. So we don't really know about that part.

We do know that as far as the wetlands rebuilding, that is a huge one. Those projects are

NEAL R. GROSS

not cheap, you know, the terrace project, and the study that the MRC just released indicated the total price tag for replenishing the Mississippi River, getting more sediment down there, doing these projects, is something like \$2 billion.

Now, you know, our plan is much more modest, because we think that you need to upgrade the effort and continue it. And right now, about \$50 million a year is spent in CWPPR and the problem with CWPPR is it only applies to Louisiana. That is a 15 percent state match and they used to have a fund that was from oil revenues that was the source of that match. Well, the state went in and picked up that fund, you know, because they are trying to do some other things there in terms of rebuilding. So we're not sure Louisiana can participate anymore.

And right now, if Mississippi wanted to do it, there is a different piece of legislation that requires 50 percent match. And so, you know, if we're going to do some wetlands rebuilding down there, you know, with this kind of thing, you would have to adjust the legislation a little bit.

NEAL R. GROSS

The infrastructure rebuilding, you know,
pick a number. It depends on how much infrastructure
we want to rebuild in fisheries. Now, I can tell you
that the Louisiana Commission is very interested in
moving some of this, you know, expensive
infrastructure like processing plants and other
things, using the flood and inundation maps that NOAF
and other people put together and moving it up out of
the, you know, most vulnerable areas into places
where, you know, it's more likely to survive and
that's a very good thing, I mean, in terms of the
resilience of things.

The other very expensive part of this is the buy-outs and other things to reconcile the fishery, and I think the council and Roy's shop estimated that it would be something like \$250 million to do a buy-out program that, you know, would be comprehensive because it's not just shrimp fishery. It's also red snapper and other things. So it's still a substantial price tag to do the whole bit.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Now, let me tell you what. Steve, I want to tell you, because I made a

NEAL R. GROSS

statement in the hearing they had and almost got fired over it because, you know -- but if you talk to the state directors, \$1.2 billion, around \$1.2 billion to do it right, I mean, with all the aspects of this and this includes habitat restoration projects, buy-out and all.

But I'm on record as saying it, so I may as well say it again, you know. I'm sure --hopefully, we -- this won't be my resignation. But looking at what the councils have said, looking at what we have gotten from the states. It's in that neighborhood and I don't think there is a doubt about it. Yes, Chris?

MR. DORSETT: I have heard a lot of good ideas about things we should do in rebuilding. From the Administration's standpoint, when you give these reports to Mr. Powell, is there a plan being developed of exactly how this -- what this is going to look like, because I have -- my feeling is that there are these good ideas, but no one can really get their arms around it.

Without that plan there is nothing to

NEAL R. GROSS

really start from, shoot at, whatever you want to call it, and it just seems like we're still just talking around the issue, as opposed to saying here is a plan for fixing this, here is how much funding we need, let's move ahead.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Good.

DR. MURAWSKI: I agree. You know, getting people engaged in fishing issues has been hard and, you know, even our own agency. You know, they weren't necessarily focused on, you know, this as opposed to their, you know, response issues. I can tell you that it's getting more traction now. The Congress Department put together the budget issues that we had and sent them down to OMB so, you know, it's in the political realm now.

And the other thing that is positive is there is this new Environmental Subcommittee in the Gulf Group and NOAA has a representative. It's a woman that works for me who is heard in a political downtown that are NOAA's representatives to this, and this is going to be the agenda we push there. We'll see how much traction it actually gets in the big

NEAL R. GROSS

scheme of, you know, rebuilding whatever else is going on in the Gulf.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Just to follow-up with Steve, one thing about this somewhat is, there is a lot of stuff going on in D.C. I mean, there's I think almost too many people trying to jump into this. And I don't see it really being coordinated that well with the states. I don't see it visibly.

I think, you know, the Governors are going to meet soon and I think the states have ideas, but I don't see the cohesiveness of getting a small group, which in my opinion ought to be led by the states, but it ought to have federal people with it, but that's what you ought to do.

I don't know -- you know, I have even heard this past week about seafood parks, that rather than just having -- and I think that's what you were alluding to is, talking about, is to build several seafood parks along the way that you could, you know, put your infrastructure there. And, you know, not that I would try that and say, oh, I don't know why, but it did up in one -- but I think Hawaii has done a

NEAL R. GROSS

great job with developing the waterfront and putting things together.

So I think there are some very positive aspects of that that could be looked at. But, you know, everybody still seems to be awed by what happened and I think that's what happened to Congress really, was that when you looked at it, it was just so massive and then you got budget problems anyway with the way the budget is going, that nobody has stepped up and just taken charge and done it. I mean, it's like you can't get a hold. You try to get a hold of it, but you can't.

And, you know, I think you hear more about New Orleans, and I have been to New Orleans, I know it's cluttered and you see that, but if you go look at Mississippi, to me Mississippi is just totally devastated. It's gone. I mean, it's not -- you know, just everything was destroyed. It's rubble. I mean, that to me is just -- that's all you got left.

And so if you look at the state directors, particularly the two of them that I see most often, and that's Corky and John Rousell, and they have aged

NEAL R. GROSS

five	years	since	August.	I	mean,	they	are	watch	ning
the	industr	ry just	and	not	being	able	to 1	help,	not
bein	a able	to aet	it done	Sc	Raln	h?			

MR. RAYBURN: Chris, are you finished? Pretty much? I quess in Larry's meeting in October they were talking about stuff. I mean, it's where does -- and this is not negative, but I'm trying to put it together. Where does NMFS have a standing in the redevelopment of the coast? The point being is, you know, Ι assume you do and Ι sympathize. You know, we're all sympathetic with the the Gulf, whether situation in it be fisheries standpoint or the hotels or whatever it may be, schools, you know, oil and gas. I mean, they lost a lot of rigs, too.

But where does the National Marine Fishery
Service have its authority to be involved in the
redevelopment of the coast and the redevelopment of
the fisheries infrastructure, because you're really
dealing with land-based stuff and not necessarily just
the management of the species.

And I think it's good, you know, we all

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are there, but where is that authority? And that may be a source of the problem. It seems to me is a lot of folks. we are. You know, I mean, Texas went to the Gulf States meeting feeling guilty, because we didn't have a storm to talk about, you know, but we're going to probably in a handful of months.

You know, I mean, the trouble is this is all going to start over again in three months and people are still going to be talking about Rita and Katrina when there is Adrian or whatever, Blanche or whatever is going to come in, and it's going to go away because another issue is going to come up. So I'm struggling with it. I mean, I feel like just in my little bitty world that, you know, we're going to start 1st of June and I'm going to be derelict in not having -- not knowing what to do, how to respond.

And so several points there. One is, I mean, we can talk about where you're going to put infrastructure for fisheries and does the Federal Government really want to get into that, to say where you can build or, you know, how many you should build and stuff. That's one issue and I guess for our

NEAL R. GROSS

strategic	planning	that's	an	issue,	but	more	important
to me is v	what are t	he less	ons	learne	.43		

What have we found out in the last six or seven months that, come 1st of June, we'll have in place that we can do a better job of preparing and responding and recovering from the next Katrina or Rita or Wilma or David or whoever might be knocking at the door of the Gulf, because it's going to be there. If not this year, it will be next year, so what can we do? You know, what can this group, I guess -- what relevance is it to us to do those kinds of planning to help?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I'll talk first and let Steve add. I think, you know, first of all, if you look at the conditions now in Africa and with the temperatures -- did you see the waters of Africa if you look at some El Nino, you know, what do we call both, there are indications that this coming year will be just as bad, so number one. All right, so, you know.

MR. RAYBURN: We know that.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: And so I think, you

NEAL R. GROSS

know, right now we don't have a lot of funds, infrastructure. We're basically -- we just plan this out, so most of the time Congress have given us money to aid the fishermen to help get some structure back.

I mean, what we have been talking about

is, what I talk about up front, I was trying to figure out if we could work with 10 facilities up and down the coast with some type of portable ice, some type of temporary structure just so that they can get back to work, clean up the debris, you know, help get the fishing grounds open, which I think is somewhat our responsibility, but help get the fishing grounds open, get some temporary structures.

Then I think it's really coastal zone management of the states, personally. I think we were looking at that. I think from a habitat standpoint, habitat restoration, we do have very much more authority to look at habitat and those habitat parts. I don't think there is a doubt about it.

The Magnuson, and I don't have the exact words, but the Magnuson is looking more at us in disasters and more clarification and stuff, I think,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	if it gets passed.
2	MR. RAYBURN: It needs a report.
3	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: So I think, you know,
4	we did put together, and I don't know if Steve has it
5	or not, but we did put together a lessons learned from
6	a NOAA perspective after this was all over, you know,
7	and I don't know if that has been shared or not.
8	DR. MURAWSKI: I don't think it's quite
9	done.
10	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. Yes, so we are
11	doing that, lessons learned. We hope to have it way
12	before this hurricane season, the lessons learned.
13	DR. LENT: Let me just add that at the
14	NOAA Senior Executive Retreat, we prepared a proposal
15	for hazard resilient communities, I think, in response
16	to this.
17	MR. RAYBURN: If I could go. I mean, you
18	mentioned at Larry's meeting or I heard you say that,
19	and John Ward was there, that the need for a quick
20	assessment of what the impact was. You know, so when
21	you get your calls three days after the storm, you
22	know, goes inland and Senate and Congress asking you

what do we need down there and stuff, you can get that response.

So, you know, that has kind of gone through our world. Maybe there is a need to establish some type of teams or something like that that preferably would be in a non-impacted area. You know, we're looking at, you know, different groups, I mean, from the east coast of Texas to the south of Texas and have them familiar and oriented to the other areas thinking they hope there won't be a storm impacting both areas, so one team that is unimpacted can go into an impacted area, work with the person there, do the kinds of assessments and stuff.

But even if we had, from what John has done or what has been done, to consult, some way to do a quick response, you know, not only from us, but the other Sea-Grant programs in the Gulf are looking, searching, what can we do besides everybody can, you know, go in and help hand out water and do those kinds of things, but what kind of meaningful things can be done.

So it seems to me that there was -- and

NEAL R. GROSS

this probably just is our own little area, but if
there was some opportunities in the next several
months to come up with those, we can start to come up
with those initiatives that would help you better,
because you're our best link into the world of the
D.C. relative to the fisheries issues, so something
like that.
I mean, we're really searching for that
and maybe in all this, you have got those, and I would
appreciate knowing. But maybe it helps others in
other areas, too, when you have a disaster. How can

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Well, the lessons learned, we'll get it out to you. I'm sure that they are, you know, going to, you know, put it out, I mean, but we will do that and get it to you to look at.

you respond? What should you do, what could you do in

this fisheries type framework?

MR. BILLY: Could you go back to that slide that has the economic value of the various fisheries? Yes, that's it. Tom Billy. This, to me, represents sort of a framework for what NOAA could

NEAL R. GROSS

Tom?

provide some leadership on in terms of targeted recovery. Now, you can argue about some of these fisheries and some species are over-fished.

Maybe these numbers need to be adjusted and so forth, but if now the number is \$500 million, whatever it ends up being, the reestablishment of this kind of economic generation from that area of the world or the United States is something that is worthy and it's not just the numbers. It's jobs and people's lives and so forth.

And providing leadership means not necessarily that NOAA would be the one handing out the money or doing the specific planning, but fighting for the reestablishment of an appropriate fishery in that area, both commercial and recreational. And there is a long history of that.

When I worked at NOAA, we often were involved in those kinds of responses to disasters and I don't see what's wrong with it. It ought to be something that NOAA ought to play a leadership role in.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Yes, we have over the

NEAL R. GROSS

past, I can tell you we have. If you go back and look, we have done it and done it pretty well with what Congress has given us. Now, we started early. Larry Simpson set up a meeting and every week we had a phone call and we went through every state, what they felt their -- you know, because we were involved, what they thought their economic impact was, what they really needed up front and we just never got the attention.

I mean, they got attention. That's not the right thing to say. I think Congress reacted quickly. It was such -- you know, so many people displaced and search and rescue, you know, \$62 billion trying to put people in homes. You know, I put \$4.8 million. I gave the states \$4.8 million to help enforcement for search and rescue and that's all the money I had. I could take that out of enforcement.

And then we let them use some of the money that they had for oyster work, to let them go ahead and use it for this purpose. But that's all the money we have. We don't have any pot of money. And I tell you a lot of people thought, and a lot of the Hill

NEAL R. GROSS

people thought this, too, was that when we had this disaster, we had money. The disaster always is a fishery disaster. Congress, you ought to put money, you put money.

But that wasn't understood by a lot of people. This has been a very frustrating thing. I guess the state director worked enough hours to some of these types of things, you deal with us going on and it has just been totally frustrating for me.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes. This one has been difficult and frustrating for me, and I, like Ralph, have tried to -- what can we do, what can't we do, and seeing people suffering empathy of is the horrendous. I mean, last week I drove up from Highway 90 to I-10, which is a distance of maybe 2 miles, and it was in Goshen and there was a poor fellow living in Now, this is six months after the thing. a tent. is still living in a tent.

And the stories of fishermen, a lot of them are Asian, camping out and living on docks and moors, watching their boat up in the marsh and afraid because like everything they got is in that boat.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Those kind of stories are just tips of them. It's really frustrating.

There are some things that we can do and the State of Mississippi, at least I know, is working diligently on establishing a seafood park, which is north of Back Bay Biloxi, which is removed from the coastline through a bay to the north part, which is a high area. Now, as I told Hill staffers and Commerce, there is going to be an interface between land and water that seafood, as we all know, has to occupy, so there is going to be problems. And the boats can't be put, you know, on the hill, so there is always going to be a problem.

And I think Bill has shared and Steve and others have shared the difficulty of trying to address this specific issue, but it was so widespread and we had issues of housing and we had issues of roads and we had issues of towns that I think, for some reason, fisheries was kind of put off to the side. It was kind of a second thought issue, and I think that has complicated our issues.

Now, you got to remember that Congress and

NEAL R. GROSS

others have appropriated and given to the State of Mississippi and Louisiana something like \$25, \$30 billion. Now, the Governor in his wisdom is going to rebuild schools and he is going to rebuild roads and he is going to rebuild infrastructure of towns and he has called in architects from all of you all's areas to look at these things, but his first line focus is not going to be fisheries.

And what I'm afraid of in this particular one, and I have seen them all from Betsy through all of them, is that we're going to lose that tie that we have to those people who make fisheries work. We're going to lose that expertise. So some of those charter boat people who know about fishery and they can't work and they are going to get out of that job and go do something else, we're going to lose that tie, that shrimper or that deck hand who is going over to work in carpentry or something and he is not coming back and to fill that void is going to be a long time.

Now, that is the problem that I have got.

The numbers and the management things that we can do,
as Roy alluded to, is things that we should be doing.

NEAL R. GROSS

You know, how much is enough effort, you know? How much is -- what is the right balance between fin fish and shrimp, you know, bycatch, etcetera, etcetera? Those things we have got to do.

But at the same time we're doing that, we have got to realize that there is a human element to this and it's not just paper. It's people and experience and lives and so forth, and that is the frustrating thing to me, because we don't have anything to work with.

Habitat issues. I think somebody has finally realized or at least we have got a box that we can stand on to talk about habitat. For every five acres of wetlands you can reduce the tidal surge by 1 foot. You know, imagine if we had had large areas of habitat that we used to have 25, 30 years ago and a reduction of tidal surge. There would be a lot of people sitting there watching ball games and enjoying their lives again, you know? It was a tidal surge in this one. The wind damage is bad at the interface.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: The habitat issue I think is one that Congress finally bought, that they

NEAL R. GROSS

are getting bangs for their buck. There had been a lull for that, but the work has been done so that they finally realized they are getting their money's worth.

MR. SIMPSON: So I think we can plan. I think we can -- we fell down and we did not have in place a mechanism for social and economic mechanisms to determine these losses and that's our fault that we should have done in the past. And the communications aspect is horrible. We can fix that. The fuel issues are larger than any one area, you know? The habitat issues are larger that any one state and, you know, there are things that we can do.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Tom?

MR. RAFTICAN: Yes, I go back to what Ralph was saying that, you know, we're looking at months before the potential of seeing this again and how do you reinvest? And what I was wondering is, you know, I'm a big fan of letting the private sector take over as much of this as possible, and doesn't it make a lot more sense to look at low interest loans as opposed to try and go in and rebuild?

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I think that is what

NEAL R. GROSS

a lot of people have said. I mean, it's just I think
a lot of them would like to see low interest loans,
some of that through SPA, but it's very difficult,
SPA, unless you have a mechanism to pay it back to get
the low interest. And this is an instance, I think,
you have to give low interest loans guaranteed by the
Government.
MR. RAFTICAN: If this is on your plate
and it looks like you have drawn up the nexus there,

and it looks like you have drawn up the nexus there, again, it allows you set criteria of what you're going back in for. But, you know, I mean, obviously the criteria could be as strict or, certainly, as lenient as NOAA would care to make it, but it would allow, you know, basically the private sector to take over because, you know, they tend to do a better job in the long run, I think.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: So, you know, we are trying and we're looking. If you have any comments or you want to discuss this further, I mean, we'll be glad to do it. Ken?

DR. ROBERTS: Ken Roberts. I have several comments, but I'm only going to give you one

NEAL R. GROSS

suggestion, because this is very personal with me, the way we suffered and my family. Your fundamental problem, as I see it, is that Congress has not authorized you to act in ways that they authorize other agencies that have food production oversight.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Right.

DR. ROBERTS: And I'm talking about the U.S. Department of Agriculture. You know USDA has already got \$199 million for those states out of the Defense Department of Preparations Bill as an amendment for forestry, poultry, nursery crops and oysters.

USDA has got that ability through some authorization to pass money directly to food production units. You don't have that authority, and I quess the fundamental question, I mean, we can talk days about this issue, about why the National Marine Fishery Service can't respond in putting money people's hands who actually involved in are harvesting.

You are not looking at your agency as having this role similar to that the U.S. Department

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of Agriculture does and you can look at things for a long time. That is the fundamental problem. I know after a storm like this, it's important for elected officials and agency people to come into an area and look at it to get a sense, but that also creates a problem in that people who come and bare their hearts to you and other people who come down think you're there to give them aid eventually.

And now that it's not there and the poultry industry in Louisiana is getting \$20 million and the oyster industry is going to get goodness knows, \$40, \$50, \$60 million, it's a tough situation politically to try to explain. So I know Ralph and the Sea-Grant people in the Gulf are perplexed about, you know, what can we do and we can do some things educationally.

But the core issue I think, and I'm going to repeat it because I want to emphasize it so much, you are just not looked upon in NOAA as an agency that can go in and reestablish food producers into the system. And USDA does do that. They do it frequently. They do it well and that's it in a

NEAL R. GROSS

nutshell. You just don't have that ability and I wish you did. VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay. To that point, we're going to talk about Magnuson tomorrow and I'll make sure that we look at what's in there overnight, so we can have it, and if it's something that you would like to -- you know, some motion or something you would like to pass out of this that we can take back to the Hill, I will be glad to do it. I think it will be a good idea. So let's take a look when we go through Magnuson tomorrow what it is and then we'll -- and what we got in there and see if we think that does it or not. I don't know if you want to DR. ROBERTS: be in that business. I mean, if the agencies are trying to do good, then that's where you got to start.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: But I think we are in that business to a certain extent. Congress most of the time has given us the money, we have gone in and tried to do it. Alan is out of the room now, but I think in Hawaii when we shut the fishery down, they

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

gave us money and we wrote checks to individual fishermen. The court had shut us down, couldn't get them back, operating.

We have done it in different ways but,

Ken, I don't think it's clear what our role really is,

so it would be good to have our goal spelled out in

Magnuson, I think, and that would be a good point to

do. I mean, something from here would probably help

that. So, Chris?

MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett, just quickly. One of the potentially contentious issues is going to be capacity reduction and the potential for buy-out and there have been a number of reviews of past buyout programs that have been pretty critical of them. And I know MAFAC had, I believe, a capacity reduction team at some point and I actually looked to see if I could find some final report, and I didn't see one on the web and I don't know who was on that committee, they had anything that had but if some lessons learned, it could be very useful.

MS. BRYANT: Chris, the only -- it was a very short-lived working group, you're right. And I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	think the last thing that was done was perhaps your
2	first meeting or somewhere. It was in Washington,
3	D.C. and I think that was the last thing. It was in
4	the top, for instance, with the world wildlife and you
5	guys did maybe half of these things. And, Pete, you
6	may remember something.
7	That, I think, was the last time any
8	activity was done on this specifically and it has not
9	been taken up since then. It is on the web, but it's
10	not identified as over-capacity or anything. It's in
11	that working group report, but I can go online and
12	find which one that is. But I want to say it was
13	Washington, D.C. 2000 or something like that.
14	MR. RAYBURN: We were in it.
15	MS. BRYANT: Or maybe 2003?
16	MR. RAYBURN: Scott Burns was in our
17	class, wasn't he?
18	MS. BRYANT: Yes.
19	MR. RAYBURN: His party was.
20	MS. BRYANT: Yes.
21	MR. RAYBURN: And he was in it.
22	MS. BRYANT: So it was one of those groups

1	and I think we would have to go back and look, but I
2	think that's the only group. There may be one or two,
3	but we'll look out and find out specifically.
4	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: We have done some
5	more work with it internally, so we could put our
6	thinking together, and that is one reason I'm saying
7	you can't stick your money it's not going to help
8	anybody just to go ahead and wholesale give money.
9	You need to have a plan to rebuild this fishery, so
10	that they will make money and sustainable and all.
11	Okay? Thanks, Steve. Okay. Tomorrow. By the way,
12	we'll give you before you leave we have the <u>Federal</u>
13	Register notice for the
14	MS. BRYANT: Proposed rule.
15	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Proposed rule for the
16	Seafood Council.
17	MS. BRYANT: I'm going to set it over
18	there on that table.
19	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: So you get that.
20	Under Tab 11 and Tab 12 you have the over-fishing
21	draft and the salt water angling is in Table 12 Tak
22	12. Now, you may want to look at those things we gave

out that you probably would need to take a look at.

Don't forget to give either Tony or Laurel your choice of your subcommittee, the subcommittee you would like to serve on, because we do need to try to get those established tomorrow afternoon, so we can do a little bit of work in those the next day to determine the things to be able to move forward.

And, Rob, the reception is right next door when?

MR. KRAMER: It's inside the facility If you walk through underneath, there is a here. Rolex clock right there. You walk into the Greats That's where our reception will be. Hall. scheduled to start at 5:30. I have bumped it up some. The beer is already icing down. We have a full open We have hors d'oeuvres being cooked out on the bar. back that are going to be brought in.

I'm going to have all the exhibits open in the museum. So those of you that haven't been here, you can see the history, the evolution of recreational fishing from rods and reels to the greats that made the sport. So that will all be open here and it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to be open for as long as anybody wants.

I encourage you to bring your spouses or whoever you have back at the hotel because we have plenty. I know some people are going out later with their wives or husbands and that's fine, too. If you need information, we might be able to help you with that as well.

VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: I want to thank everybody for today. I thought we have had excellent discussions today. I think we need to, you know, think about the discussions and what we want to build into further actions and how MAFAC needs to be involved. But I think the discussion today has been excellent, but I would like to see it move from there with some recommendations or some action items or things you want to do in the future.

So let's think about that before Thursday, so we can really do that on Thursday, but thank you. I really appreciate it. Ralph?

MR. RAYBURN: I ask again on Thursday night if you're finished with that, Bill, for just administration. You mentioned, is it Emily Carter?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. KRAMER: Emily Collins.
2	MR. RAYBURN: Collins, yes.
3	MR. KRAMER: My assistant.
4	MR. RAYBURN: We have made a commitment
5	for the boat ride already, but you want a commitment
6	for the restaurant as well?
7	MS. BRYANT: I assumed that was folks for
8	the restaurant.
9	MR. RAYBURN: It was not.
10	MS. BRYANT: No, because we have called
11	the restaurant.
12	MR. RAYBURN: Transportation back here
13	after that, I mean, what are we going to do?
14	MS. BRYANT: That's going to be kind of on
15	our own, I understand.
16	MR. KRAMER: Yes, it's not that far. It's
17	probably, I don't know, an \$11 cab ride, something
18	like that, from where we're going to be. We had to
19	turn the bus loose and I wasn't sure who was going to
20	be here.
21	MS. BRYANT: My understanding is it's a
22	terrific area, fun to walk around in, lots of shops

1	and restaurants, so some folks may want to go in one
2	direction after dinner and then may want to come back,
3	so we have kind of left it open.
4	PARTICIPANT: Can we leave materials in
5	the room?
6	MS. BRYANT: Yes. Rob, we can leave
7	things here?
8	MR. KRAMER: Yes, materials are fine. I
9	would take your computers with you because I can't
10	lock up the room, but everything else will be fine.
11	VICE CHAIR HOGARTH: Okay.
12	MS. BRYANT: Tomorrow morning, I think
13	we'll be up again at 8:30.
14	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned to
15	reconvene tomorrow at 8:30 a.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	