UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

Wednesday, November 12, 2008

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee met in the Bienville Room in the Hotel Chateau LeMoyne, 301 Rue Dauphine, New Orleans, Louisiana, at 9:00 a.m., James Balsiger, Vice Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAMES BALSIGER, Vice Chair
MARK HOLLIDAY, Director, Office of Policy
TOM BILLY
RANDY CATES
BILL DEWEY
ANTHONY DILERNIA
PATTY DOERR
CHRIS DORSETT
ERIKA FELLER
MARTIN FISHER
RANDY FISHER, PSMFC
ROB FLETCHER
CATHERINE FOY
JIM GILMORE
STEVE JONER

NEAL R. GROSS

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

MEMBERS PRESENT (CONTINUED):

DOROTHY LOWMAN
HEATHER MCCARTY
VINCE O'SHEA, ASMFC
TOM RAFTICAN
ERIC SCHWAAB
LARRY SIMPSON, GSMFC
DAVE WALLACE

ALSO PRESENT:

TIM HANSEN
VIRGINIA HERRING
TOPHER HOLMES
WILLIAM JACOBI (VIA TELEPHONE)
PETER JONES
GARY REISNER
PHIL STEELE

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Introductions and Opening Remarks Dr. Jim Balsiger, Acting Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries | . 6 |
| Larry Simpson, Executive Director Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission | 6 |
| Agenda Review: Overview of Plenary, Subcommittee, and Working Group Agendas for the Meeting Tom Billy, MAFAC Liaison | 28 |
| New Member Orientation Mark Holliday, NMFS Policy Office | 46 |
| Ethics and Financial Disclosure Briefing (by telephone) William Jacobi, Senior Counsel, Ethics Law and Programs Division, Office of the General Counsel U.S. Department of Commerce | 97 |
| Update Briefing - Seafood Quality and Safety Tim Hansen, Director, NMFS Seafood Inspection Program | 132 |
| Subcommittee and Working Groups Briefing | |
| Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Management Subcommittee Jim Gilmore, Subcommittee Chair | 165 |
| Commerce Subcommittee Tom Billy, Subcommittee Chair | 177 |
| Recreational Fisheries Working Group Bob Fletcher, Group Chair | 183 |

$\verb|TABLE| OF CONTENTE| NTS (CONTINUED) \\$

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Protected Resources Subcommittee Bob Fletcher, Subcommittee Chair. | 190 |
| Ecosystem Approach Subcommittee Chris Dorsett, Subcommittee Chair. | 198 |
| Adiourn | 298 |

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

(9:01 a.m.)

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: This is the MAFAC Meeting which, Mark would know the exact rules but I think maybe I chair it. But it is sort of in the spirit of the motion or the action discussed at the last meeting where this committee was hoping to be more, I'm not sure I know what the word is, self-involved, I guess and wanting to elect their own chairman. I think, and in the way that Tony DiLernia did for so long, I think that my partner here to my left, Tom Billy, can run the meeting and, if necessary, Mark and I will sort of be bailiffs here and make sure everybody stays in control. But anyway, thanks for coming and Tom, please take over.

MR. BILLY: Okay, thank you. I would like to welcome everyone, particularly the several new members that we have to the committee. And we will have an opportunity in a minute for all of us to sort of introduce

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ourselves, our affiliation, and our interests, as appropriate.

There are a few initial things that Larry Simpson would like to share with us about New Orleans, and I am sure, welcome all of you as well. So, let's start there and then we will get back on the agenda.

MR. SIMPSON: Great. Thank you. Welcome to New Orleans. New Orleans, New Orleans, New Orleans, New Orleans, New Orleans, anyway they say it down here.

Some of the things that I was able to put in front of you, this is a little packet of note cards that one of my staff members who is a professional photographer has taken. Don't worry, if I didn't bring enough, the lady is coming over who did the reception tonight is bringing some more of these. So, we will get some of those for everybody. If you didn't bring your New Orleans restaurant guide, I have got a few extra copies here.

But just quickly, tonight, on the back of the thing, you see the little map, if

NEAL R. GROSS

you will go out to, Mark, what is the name of it, Bienville, walk out Bienville and straight down to the river, down Bienville and go behind Canal Place, you will see Aquarium of the Americas on the river, right down here It is five, six blocks easy at the bottom. walking if it's not raining. And that is where the little do is tonight. And there will be hors d'oeuvres and drinks and And it should be a nice venue. forth. a shark tank, and you know, the big aquarium and everything. So hopefully, that will be a fun thing for you all.

And I couldn't think of anything really to do. There is a lot of things come into my mind and so, my grandson being born yesterday.

(Applause.)

MR. SIMPSON: This is the third grandchild, second grandson. Eight pounds, 14 ounces. Evan Price Pruitt. My youngest daughter, her first. So, I just figured 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

would be best.

There will be a lady that comes in this afternoon named Ginny Herring who put all this stuff on. I said, Ginny, this is what I would like to do. And so she has handled it all. I have nothing to do with it, other than the idea. And the lady in the office, I had the idea and she did all of this.

So, welcome to New Orleans. It is a great place to eat. It is a lot of fun. This central area right here is the Vieux Carre, old city. And this was the original old city, the highest piece of ground and then it grew from there.

So, New Orleans is a fun place. Enjoy yourself. If I can help you in any way, just let me know. And I will remind you again this evening about how to get down there. And 6:00 to 8:00, you will have time, if you are not full, to go out and enjoy some of the restaurants around. They need the business.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Thanks a lot.

1 MR. SIMPSON: You're welcome.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: All right. Now, let's get on with the introductions. I'm Tom Billy. am consulting Currently, I on а limited The name of my consulting company is basis. International Food Safety Consulting. I had a 39-year career in federal service, starting with the old Bureau of Commercial Fisheries back in the '60s and always had this interest in fisheries and have now the opportunity to serve on the MAFAC Committee that I remember the first meeting of and participated in as one of the staffers.

So, I was elected at the last meeting the Committee Liaison. And as Jim indicated, share the responsibilities for sort of managing the meeting and being the liaison between the Committee and NOAA Fisheries.

So, having said that, why don't we go this way.

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Sure. I'm

Jim Balsiger. I think I know most of you. I

am the acting head of the National Marine Fisheries Service right now. I was just talking to a few of you. I will be in that position at least until January 20th and maybe until February and maybe March and maybe April and maybe a couple of years. So, it is a great job, particularly meeting people like this. So, I do feel a little bit on the bubble, but I am scrambling and working as hard as I can.

Hi. I'm DR. HOLLIDAY: Mark called Holliday. officially Ι the am Executive Director or Designated Federal Official from MAFAC. have been with Ι since Fisheries Service 1981 in various capacities in fishery statistics, economics. And I currently direct the Office of Policy and work directly for Jim and the directors of the Agency.

Any questions on logistics, your likes or dislikes about the meeting, bring them to Topher.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. HOLLIDAY: Topher Holmes who is our now Sea Grant Fellow, working with us for the current year. He was with us at the July meeting. Topher, you can finish introducing yourself.

MR. HOLMES: That's pretty much it.

Topher Holmes, Sea Grant Fellow working for

Mark this year. I'm from Oregon State

University.

MS. LOWMAN: And Ι Dorothy am consultant based Lowman. Ι am а out Portland, Oregon and I have clients in the North Pacific that include both the Best Use Cooperative as a Catcher/Processor Cooperative up in the Bering, who work on the Bering Sea, in the Gulf of Alaska, as well as I am just starting a project for TNC, The Nature Conservancy up there.

I have been doing a lot of work down here on the west coast for the Environmental Defense Fund, working on the

Pacific Council's IFQ initiative, which just took a major vote last week. And my background is I spent a number of years doing the sort of Pacific rim circuit as council staff on a variety of different councils. And this is my second term on MAFAC.

MR. GILMORE: And I am Jim Gilmore.

I am with the At-Sea Processor Association,
which is a Seattle-based trade association of
large catcher/processor vessels involved in
the Alaska Pollock Fishery, the Pacific
Whiting Fishery, and some other North Pacific
Groundfish Fisheries.

MS. FOY: I am Catherine Foy. My current links are with the Aleutians East Borough. Those are small communities that rely specifically on commercial fisheries. I am their marine mammal biologist.

I am also working with the Elliot Marine Mammal Group and Fish and Wildlife, looking at sea otters now. So, Steller sea lions, sea otters, and I have added beluga

NEAL R. GROSS

whales to the list as of yesterday.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CATES: Randy Cates. I have an open ocean fish farm in Hawaii. I represent commercial fishing. As a former commercial fisherman, I am still involved with many of their issues. And I have a marine salvage company. So, if you go off the shoreline in Hawaii, you will, unfortunately meet me in that capacity. And some R&D work for the Navy and the military, still.

MR. DiLERNIA: My name is Tony DiLernia. I am currently a professor with the City University of New York. Ι am Kingsborough Community College. Ι am the director of the maritime technology program there. For a number of years, I research vessel for City University also. Ι was a captain.

I currently also own a charter boat, operating out of New York. I represented the for-hire fleet in New York for a number of years as president of their

association. I am a former member of the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council. And I am a member of MAFAC. This is my seventh year. They decided to tick me up one more year rather than leave me around for six and retire me, I got an extra year out of the deal. Thank you, Jim. I get to sit with all of my friends for an extra year.

MR. SCHWAAB: My name is Eric Schwaab. I am the Deputy Secretary of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, where I have been for almost two years now. Before that, I was the resource director for the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, representing state fish and wildlife agencies all across the country.

In an earlier stint at Maryland DNR, I was the fisheries director as well and sort of doing Atlantic State's Commission and Mid-Atlantic Council, among other things.

MR. RAFTICAN: Tom Raftican. I have got a bit of a change since the last time

NEAL R. GROSS

I was here. I have ran for 11 years, United Anglers of Southern California but will no longer be there in that capacity, but run United Anglers for the past six years and will that capacity. continue in We work with recreational fisheries. We do а lot of habitat enhancement and fisheries enhancement and will continue to work in that direction. And also have formed a new association called the Sport Fishing Conservancy and continue to work in that capacity with fishing clubs and recreational anglers.

MR. WALLACE: Yes, my name is Dave Wallace. I am a new member of MAFAC. Ι essentially grew up in fisheries and fisheries And in my career, which has been policy. solely devoted to fisheries, I have involved in mostly commercial fishing, though I am an avid recreational fisherman. When the council system, when the Fisheries Conservation Management Act was enacted, I was involved in Surf Plan, Quahoq the Ocean

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Industry and we had already come conclusion that we were the enemy. If we were going to race for fish, we would catch all of the fish and we would give them away. that was a recipe for disaster. And so we had already started working through the old commercial, the former National Fisheries Service Commercial Fisheries, I have forgotten it, through the the name of regional administrator at that time was Fozzie Norris, to develop a program and go to Congress for legislation to protect the industry ourselves.

At that point then, we recognized that the Fisheries Conservation Management Act was going to be enacted and it was going to have the authority to manage it. And so the Mid-Atlantic Council then, within a few months of being formed, started the Surf Clam Fisheries Management Plan, which was limitedentry and a whole series of things, which was revolutionary.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ultimately, we were the first in the country to do ITQs, it is an ITQ fishery.

I represent individual companies and I represent an association who represents the ITO holders.

So, have, I think we have we demonstrated that there is a way to manage fisheries where you reduce capacity to point where it is balanced with what the resource can stand. Ι am very, interested in the marine environment. Ι happen to also be a member of the MPA advisory FAC over in NOS. And I hope to be able to use this position and that position to have a better-coordinated function between Jim and Jack Dunnigan in being able to have two overarching programs that do two different things same result, without having with the overpower the other.

And so I look forward to working with all of you. And I see the next couple of years as being very, very interesting. Thank

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.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FISHER: Hi. I'm Martin I am from Florida, St. Pete, Florida. Fisher. am vertically integrated in the grouper snapper industry. We own three commercial boats in my family. I have a wholesale business, retail business. I sit on the ad hoc advisory panel for IFQ for grouper for the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council and I have been very active in advocating and creating fishery advocacy groups, Gulf Fishing Association and Fishermen's Advocacy Organization. I am no longer part of them as Executive Director but I still support them.

And we have got a lot going on in the Gulf of Mexico, as you may know, LAPs are already in place in red snapper. We are coming up for referendum on Grouper IFQ and we have got a lot of issues, including aquaculture that is happening for us there.

MS. DOERR: I am Patty Doerr, with the American Sportfishing Association. I am

the Director of Ocean Resource Policy. ASA represents about 700 or so fishing tackle manufacturers, wholesale distributors, producers. So, everything from Shimano International down to the local bait and tackle shop in North Carolina.

We focus a lot on marine protected areas and fishery issues, obviously. We see them as a growing issue in the next several years.

And this is my first MAFAC meeting.

I am happy to be here. I am looking forward to it.

Good morning. MR. DEWEY: I am Bill Dewey. I with Taylor Shellfish am Company in Washington state. We produce about million pounds of clams, oysters, and mussels, and geoduck every year. I manage public affairs for the company I started back in 1981 with a bachelor's degree in shellfish biology and have been working in the industry ever since.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I also have a small clam firm of my own that I do on the weekends and in my spare time as well.

MS. FELLER: Hi. I'm Erika Feller.

I work for The Nature Conservancy,
particularly in our California program. I am
sure you guys know The Nature Conservancy. We
are a conservation organization focused on
biodiversity. We are in every state in the
U.S. and in about 30 countries.

in Ι kind of the guess Ι am position peculiar of conservation а because we are also trawl permit owners in California and I have been doing a lot of work on working with the groundfish industry in central California, principally.

My background in fisheries is varied and it is this issue that keeps coming back to me, over, and over, and over, again, even though I don't necessarily look for it. I have been with the Conservancy for about nine years. And in that time, I have been our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agency liaison with NOAA, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service. So, I kind of have a bit of a varied background.

And I used to work for Congressman Gilchrist for a couple of years. So, I know Eric and Dave.

MR. O'SHEA: Good morning. I'm Vince O'Shea with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. So, I have 15 coastal states from Florida to Maine. And their vision is working together to restore Atlantic stocks. Thank you.

MR. FLETCHER: Good morning. I'm Bob Fletcher, President of Sports Fishing Association in California and I have been a long-time involved in running and representing sport fishing boats but I also was on Pacific Fisheries Management Council for 15 And I am a member of Pacific States years. Marine Fisheries Commission Advisory Committee currently regional and Ι am on the stakeholders Life group for the Marine

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Protection Act in California, which is kicking off as we speak. And it should be pretty interesting. It is going to be probably rather intense, as we work to develop a network of marine protected areas in southern California.

I am going to be retiring in April from my job with the Sport Fishing Association but will continue on as a consultant working for them and perhaps others. So, nice to be here.

MR. SIMPSON: I am Larry Simpson, the Executive Director of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. It is a five-state compact from Florida to Texas. We share Florida with Atlantic. I have the west coast.

Т been with And have the Commission; June 15th it was 30 years. started in '78 and as a member, a non-voting of the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries member all Council that time. Management commission deals with, has a varied program

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 from data to the habitat, recreational 2 fishing, sport fishing, all kinds of activities. 3 So, I'm glad to have you all in the 4 southeast. 5 MR. FISHER: Good morning. I'm 6 I am the Executive Director of 7 Randy Fisher. the Pacific States Marine Fisheries 8 Commission, which includes Washington, Oregon, 9 10 California, Idaho, and Alaska. We do a lot more than either Larry 11 or Vince and we do it a lot better. 12 13 MR. SIMPSON: I knew he was going to do something. 14 15 (Laughter.) MR. FISHER: We do very similar 16 things as the other two commissions. 17 We are actively involved in disaster relief, handing 18 19 out 170 million dollars to the fishermen on the West Coast that were involved. 20 And we shut down the whole West Coast Recreational 21

NEAL R. GROSS

and Commercial Fisheries this year.

So, Congress gave us a bunch of 1 2 money and we are handing it out like crazy people. So, that is what we are doing now. 3 MR. CATES: You must have a lot of 4 friends. 5 MR. FISHER: Yes, greed is a lovely 6 7 thing. I can tell you that. MR. JONER: Good morning. 8 Steve Joner. I am with the Makah tribe, which 9 10 is a small tribe on the northwest tip of Washington state. A small tribe with a big 11 fishery. And we do everything from whales to 12 13 whiting up there. I have been at this a long time, too. In fact, I knew Jim when he was a 14 15 commoner working at Alaska Fisheries Science 16 Center long, long ago. I deal with a lot of people at this 17 table, mainly through the Pacific Council 18 19 process and also with that gentleman Jack Dunnigan who was mentioned earlier. We have a 20 sanctuary that is located within the usual 21

custom fishing grounds of the four coastal

tribes of Washington. So, I will just say that is a challenge doing that.

MS. McCARTY: I am Heather McCarty.

I guess I have been here for three years on

MAFAC. I am from Juneau, Alaska. I am a

fisheries consultant. I used to be a salmon

fisherman. I worked for the largest salmon

hatchery system in North America, Prince

William Sound Aquaculture Corporation, for

many years. I have also done public relations

and journalism.

Currently, I do governmental affairs, regulatory stuff. I spend a lot of time in the North Pacific Council meetings. I served for three years on the Essential Fish Pacific Habitat Committee of the North My current clients, my major clients Council. include the University of Alaska School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, where I ran a research program that is funded by industry, At-Sea Processors Association. I also work for a small processor in Kodiak,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Alaska, Island Seafoods. And I guess probably the most work I do is for the CDQ Group, Community Development Quota Group in western Alaska. And that is the Pribilof Islands, St. Paul Island, which I just came from yesterday. And I work for them in the Council Process and at the state and federal levels.

MR. BILLY: Okay, thanks. I would also like to ask the staff members to introduce themselves.

Good morning. MR. I'm STEELE: Phil Steele. the assistant regional Ι am administrator of the NMFS Southeast Regional Office, where I head the Sustainable up Fisheries Division. Му primary responsibilities are for working with the Fisheries Management Council.

I am here, primarily, this week to give you a couple of reports. One, on the ongoing and proposed ITQ programs in the Gulf of Mexico. It is probably more appropriate also to give you a report on impact and 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

issues in the Gulf of Mexico.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. REISNER: I am Gary Reisner. I am the CFO and Director of Management and Budget for National Marine Fisheries Service.

I will be talking about various programs to assist fishermen and fishing industries from disasters of the Capital Construction Fund.

MR. HANSEN: Hi. I'm Tim Hansen,
Director of the Seafood Inspection Program
NOAA Fisheries, a program that has a voluntary
aspect to it that inspects about one-third of
the seafood consumed in the United States.

background is in fishery Мy science. Steve Joner and I are old school chums from back when. Also, I have an almost 24 year career now with the federal government NOAA Fisheries, FDA, back and to NOAA I also serve as alternate Fisheries. And delegate for the Codex Committee on Fish and Fisheries Products.

MR. BILLY: Okay, thank you very much. Well, it certainly is obvious to me and

I hope to all of you, the rich backgrounds and diversity of experience and interests that are represented by the committee. And that, in my mind is where our strength comes from in taking on issues and new ideas and reviewing existing programs, the variety of things this committee does to, hopefully, help the NOAA Fisheries people carry out the most effective programs that are possible.

I will quickly go through the agenda. This morning is going to be devoted largely to providing information to the new members, as well as providing an overview of the committee and how it functions, some of our responsibilities with regard to financial disclosure, the ethics rules that apply to us in this capacity.

And then finally, wrapping it up with brief update of a project NOAA Fisheries has taken on with regard developing strategic plan for seafood a quality and safety. And you will hear more

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

This afternoon, we are going to stay in general session and have asked the subcommittee chairs of the existing standing subcommittees to talk briefly about what the subcommittees are focusing on, sort of their areas of responsibility, to give, particularly again, the new members a chance to understand and, at the end, you will be asked to pick one or more of the subcommittees that you would like to be associated with.

This operates in a pretty loose manner. And by that, I mean, there is a lot of flexibility. So we try to, sometimes subcommittees are working on a subject that is of broad interest and we will schedule it so any of the members that can choose to participate. So, it is not a very strict type of subcommittee arrangement. There is some flexibility that we will take advantage of when it is appropriate.

Then tomorrow, Thursday, we are

going to get some updates, looking implementation of the new provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, of the some new pay close requirements. We continue to attention this important to area and interested in keeping up-to-date with where the agency stands in implementing these various responsibilities.

We will learn a little bit about the budget and where things stand there. We will get an update on a subject that we started looking at a couple of meetings ago, which is eco-labeling. And we asked NOAA Fisheries to look at this and consider some options in terms of a potential role for the Agency in this area as we continue to explore this as an idea, to look at it and think about what might be possible.

Then we are going to look at the work we did on Vision 2020. Tony will talk about that. And perhaps more importantly, how we plan to keep the 2020 document up-to-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

and how we plan to share the document and what it represents with all of the interested parties, not only in Washington but around the country.

Then Jim Gilmore is going to talk a little bit about the transition paper we prepared to hopefully be helpful to the new administration. We will talk about that and what we intend to do with it beyond sharing it with the senior management of NOAA.

The rest of the meeting, largely, is designed to take advantage of being here in New Orleans and looking at, as examples, how the fisheries management is pursuing the new requirements in the Stevens-Magnuson Act, as well as how they are planning to move forward and address a subject that the committee has given a lot of attention to the last few meetings, and that is aquaculture.

I want to encourage the committee, as we get into this phase of the meeting, to think about what is shared with us and to

NEAL R. GROSS

think more broadly on a national basis because there similar activities going are throughout the country. Many problems that have occurred and the idea is to have this committee think, sort of evaluate, whether the current programs and strategies for dealing with disasters, dealing with significant fisheries forth changes in and so appropriate, whether there are any gaps other things that ought to be considered as we table the different bring to the from geographical areas expertise our experiences.

I think that pretty well covers the rest of the agenda. At the end, we will talk about scheduling our next meeting. We will talk about potential agenda items based on ideas that may come up at this meeting, as well as any other thoughts or recommendations that any of you have.

So, that is the agenda. It looks like a good one, in terms of getting us

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 | involved in another new area of fisheries |
|----|--|
| 2 | assistance and disaster assistance and the |
| 3 | transitions that are occurring in the |
| 4 | fisheries management area. |
| 5 | Are there any questions or comments |
| 6 | anyone has? Yes. |
| 7 | MR. SCHWAAB: I just wondered, when |
| 8 | we talk about the transition document and the |
| 9 | 2020 document, whether it would be appropriate |
| 10 | to ask Dr. Balsiger to make a few comments |
| 11 | about the federal transition underway and how |
| 12 | he might see things unfolding and whether |
| 13 | there are additional opportunities that we |
| 14 | might take advantage of in that process. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Okay, we will. Good idea. |
| 16 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: On that |
| 17 | front, if you would, I have just a few |
| 18 | MR. BILLY: Sure. |
| 19 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: statements |
| 20 | I was going to make |
| 21 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |
| 22 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: which will |

touch briefly on that. I know going around the table, letting everyone introduce themselves was a great way to kick this off, including especially the local people who have said most of what I wanted to say, welcoming people to this town.

This is a great city. I had an opportunity to be here in August when we had our fifth annual Seafood Cook-Off. And of course, that is focused on the seafood in the area but I think it is a big part of what Southern Louisiana is about, and New Orleans in particular, all the seafood and seafood It is a key part. Seafood and products. other natural living marine resources in the ocean are a key part of what this part of the So, it was a good place. country is about. So, there is more than a billion pounds of fish. There are about seven hundred million dollars of product landed commercially in the Gulf. Recreational fishermen catch almost one hundred million pounds of fish. It involves a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

huge recreational effort.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm not an economist but the recreational impact is on the order of eight hundred million dollars per year, just in Louisiana from recreational fishing.

So, it is a big part of the economy down here. There are four hundred seafood processing plants, ten thousand people work on seafood here in the Gulf. So, meeting here is quite appropriate and I look forward to the comments that come out of this.

are kind of in a period of transition, as Eric Schwaab mentioned, in the federal government, and also a little bit of a transition here in MAFAC. We have two members that aren't here. Chris Dorsett, who is a who member, is continuing an NGO representative. Which group does he work for? Ocean Conservancy. And then Ed Ebisui, who is from Hawaii, who has been a council member Western Pacific Fishing Management on the Council for a while, who is an attorney but,

and also a commercial fisherman a little bit. 1 2 But he clearly has an eye towards sustainable resources, as everyone does here. So, it is a 3 4 great committee. I think that is all the committee 5 or is there someone else? 6 John Graves is on 7 DR. HOLLIDAY: his way to the ICCAT meeting, --8 VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: 9 Yes. 10 DR. HOLLIDAY: -- the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. George Nardi, an 11 Aquaculturist from the northeast called on 12 13 Monday. He had an emergency with his business and regretfully, couldn't attend at the last 14 15 minute. Of course, John Connelly from NFI met 16 with us back in July. He said he had a conflict with the date and wouldn't be able to 17 make this meeting. 18 19 VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I don't know overlooked them. 20 how John Graves, Graves from VIMS has been instrumental in the 21

NEAL R. GROSS

U.S. tuna positions at ICCAT for a long time

now. He spends a great deal of time on that and Nardi with Aquaculture and, of course, John Connelly who we all know quite well.

Anyway, this group is in a little bit of a transition. We will clearly have new people in the government. Right now, Admiral Lautenbacher has retired and so there is a man named Bill Brennan, who is currently the head of NOAA. He will, necessarily, submit his resignation on January 20th and, most likely, it will be accepted. So, on January 21, Mary Glackin will be the head of NOAA until some appointment process is gone through. It could be weeks or it could be months.

But Mary came to see us when we met in New York City. We were pleased that she was able to make that. And she is from the, a little bit more focused -- is the recording on? She is more focused on the dry side of NOAA, satellites, weather, atmosphere. So, I think we can use some help to try to convince her that the wet side of NOAA is also not to

NEAL R. GROSS

be overlooked.

But she is a very good person. She is my direct supervisor and we get along very well. But she will be there for some period of time. She is a senior career person in NOAA right now. So, it is heartening to have someone who has got a basis in the business. She has been in NOAA for a long time.

So, we will be waiting for the transition teams from the Obama administration to come through. We all know that campaign was well organized. Lots of people. Lots of energy. And so we don't think it will be very long before they are talking to NOAA and NMFS. And we had talked briefly ahead of this time, I think it would be great if working through Glackin and Brennan and me, to the extent that the transition people come to see me, that we try to set up an interface between those transition people and this body.

And depending on their desires, it may be everybody who can happen to be where

NEAL R. GROSS

the transition team is or maybe just Tom Billy or somehow, but I think it would be important to have this group feed into that process.

This particular group, through the years, has been used differently but Dr. Hogarth, at the end of his tenure, and me find this the principle place to get policy advice on broader issues.

The Fish Management Councils, of course, make recommendations on the fish regulations for regions and that is not going to change. And we meet with them as a group from time to time but most of that time was spent on how to smooth out the logistics on how the government, how NOAA works with the Fish Councils, how to get regulations through. And they don't look at the overall policy issues for the country.

So, that is this group's job and the last few years, that has been big in the way the Agency has gone forward. So, we appreciate the time and the effort that you

NEAL R. GROSS

put in here. I recognize it is not compensated. So, it is a burden on you but it is very useful to us and to the country.

So, Tom has gone through the agenda so I am not going to talk anymore about that. Maybe I will just quit there. That is about all I think I can tell you because I think we do need to find an opportunity to feed the ideas from this group into a transition team. And did I already say we should try to take the opportunity to emphasize the wet side from Heather --

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: So, thanks, Tom.

MR. BILLY: Yes. It was, that point was clear to me in the review of the transition documents that Mary arranged for this committee to review. It was very clear of where the emphasis was, beyond the flying over the top at about 30,000 feet, as someone said, with very little detail.

NEAL R. GROSS

| VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I'm not one |
|--|
| for making lots of comments like this. I |
| won't bother you anymore but when you look at |
| the glossy material they had for us to look |
| at, from the NOAA transition, it is very |
| professionally done, but the only picture of a |
| fish on there was a cod-end full of pollock |
| being pulled up a stern ramp in the Bering |
| Sea. And unless you knew what it was, you had |
| no idea it was fish, even, you know, unless |
| you had seen a picture of one. So, we needed |
| a fish on a plate or something on that thing. |
| NOAA typically tends to use that |
| cod-end picture or else some really pretty |
| fish with big bubbly lips in a coral reef |

noaa typically tends to use that cod-end picture or else some really pretty fish with big bubbly lips in a coral reef somewhere. And we are bigger. We are more than that. Those are important. Those are hugely important. We are more than that. So sorry.

MR. BILLY: No problem. Any comments or questions, at this stage? No?

MR. CATES: I have a question.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. BILLY: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CATES: How will we make ourselves more relevant with the new administration?

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Well, I think we need to work through this. We don't know who they are, who is going to be dealing with But I think as these transition people us. through and we try, through Brennan, Glackin and myself to set up some interface between this group and them, we will discover what they are amenable to, the way they like to work, whether they want to do everything on the internet, or whether they want face-toface meetings or whether telephone calls can be set up or how they would be best served. But I think we need to be flexible to the way that they want to gain information from this committee about NOAA.

MR. SCHWAAB: Well, just one more comment on this topic. It seems to me that, in these transition processes, one of the

NEAL R. GROSS

things we need to think about is not what is important to us as much as why it is or should be important to them.

So, to some degree, Jim, the way that you and your team can sense, and I think we can help you in that, you know, sort of read the feelings a little bit, with respect to, you know, some of the priority with the incoming administration, you know, what and how can we help you sort of align some of the opportunities in our world with some of what those emerging priorities are. I think that is maybe the way we ought to be thinking about it.

MR. BILLY: Fair enough. I mean, they may decide that they are going to have a traveling team that goes around the country and wants to meet with people. And then we can maybe suggest some of the names. You know, and that is one way that they might choose to approach their work. They may just sit in Washington and expect people to come to

NEAL R. GROSS

them. They may only consider written documents or electronic communication. All of that is unknown. So, it is right at that stage where that will become, start to become clear and then we can choose a strategy as appropriate. We will see.

it is clear from think discussion, Jim, that there is interest in the committee in having that kind of an opportunity to interface and share our thinking. So, you can help us with that, you know, as you have the opportunity.

Yes, Tony.

MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, when our leadership briefs the transition folks and the new political appointees, I would just ask or remind you to emphasize that this is a non-partisan committee. It is very non-partisan. Because I know my feeling has been in the past that when, especially with change of administration, folks tend to look at things, and especially the political appointees try 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

read the tea leaves. And let's face it, you know, myself, just having served as chairman for three years is a perfect example of how non-partisan this committee was. You know, a liberal democrat from Brooklyn.

So, I would emphasize how nonpartisan the committee has always been and will continue to be.

MR. BILLY: Good point. Okay, then I would like to move on. And we will start the new member orientation portion of the agenda. And let me turn it over to Mark.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks, Tom. This is not going to be very painful, I hope. But I wanted to provide a set of materials and some tools and information access to some about how the committee is organized, why the committee exists, a little bit of the process of how we conduct our work. And I think it will be helpful both for new members current members to review this because we are going to be helping each other to try 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

become an even more effective body for the next go-round.

So, I have a number of different topics I am going to try to cover. And one of the things that we have been working on is a handbook. We have a draft of a handbook that we posted onto the MAFAC website.

So, I am going to start there and say there is a website. If you haven't seen it before, you should know that it is off of the NMFS home page. And on the website we have all of our meeting information from the current meeting and prior meetings. So there is an archive of decisions, records. There are draft summary notes of each meeting and the action items. There are transcripts of the prior meetings.

So, this is a very valuable resource and tool that more and more we are relying on using an electronic form to convey information back and forth to members. You will notice you don't have a three-ring binder

NEAL R. GROSS

in front of you. I have been trying to wean people away from these large heavy briefing books that very few people actually get to So, we have been posting a lot of the read. material online. What I have done in the blue folders that you have is provided a copy of what I am calling an annotated agenda for each of the major topics. It is just a one-pager that describes why we are talking about this topic, what do we hope to achieve. And so I would like to use that as a tool to help communicate during the meeting and remind you that we have a purpose for each of these agenda topics and these are the salient points we are trying to cover.

But all of our reference materials for this meeting are online. And I also have, as you can see, a lot of people nowadays bringing computers to meetings. I have a couple of thumb drives if you want to copy all of that material if you haven't had a chance to get to the website, we have them for you 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

borrow and load it onto your laptop.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If you have any feedback about this, if you don't like it or if you are not really into the computer side of things, we can still accommodate and make it work for you. So, we are not trying to drag everybody forward but we would like to encourage folks to take more advantage of some of these tools.

Just to quickly look at the website and you click at the advanced materials, this handbook that we have put together, this draft of a handbook is listed. It says it is fairly large size. It is in a PDF format. And we would like you to take a look at it, not during this meeting but over the course of the next month or two to take a look and see if this information in there is useful to you or if there is information or questions that you have about the committee and how we work and the materials that we need, what should be in it that is not there.

So, take a look at it over the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 course of time and give us your feedback.

Because we would like it to be sort of a living document. We can add to it because it is electronic very easily. We can modify it, keep it current, and have it as a resource for folks to use throughout their tenure as members of the committee.

So if I go to the handbook itself right now, when you bring up the PDF file, this is what you would see. And again, if you just roll your cursor over a topic, and you just click on any of the items, it will take you directly to that part of the PDF file.

So, I am going to go to Summary of MAFAC Responsibilities. I am going to speak to this for a few minutes as the beginning of my 101 on MAFAC. And of course, you can follow along if you have it. I am not going to read it but I just wanted to cover some of the main issues here.

MAFAC has been around for a long time. It is one of the longer-standing

NEAL R. GROSS

federal advisory committees. It is now in it its 35th, 36th year, since 1970. And it is a secretarial FACA committee. The Department of Commerce Secretary appoints the members. It is listed on the Federal Advisory Committee website as a Department of Commerce Committee.

It is comprised of no fewer than 15 and no more than 21 voting members. We also have the three Interstate Fisheries Commissioners, Executive Directors as the nonvoting consultants to the committee. The current charter, which is also included in the handbook, lists the Chair of the Committee, which is currently the NOAA Administrator. And the vice chair officially is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Jim And as existing members know, we Balsiger. have had a charter working group that convened over the last year and made recommendations and reported out at our July meeting to change modify charter effect and the to the arrangement chairmanship the of the 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

reporting relationships that we are in the process of submitting to the Department of Commerce for approval of those changes.

So, our current charter is actually valid through February of 2010. So we are working on updating that before then to reflect these recommendations and gain approval from NOAA and the Department for the recommendations at the July meeting.

Obviously, you know, if you have made it this far, you know what the mission is of the organization. The structure, we have gone through that.

The roles and responsibilities, I think the one thing I would want to reflect on, and we will talk a little bit about this later this morning when we hear from the General Counsel for Ethics from the Department who is going to be speaking to us on speaker phone, that there are certain responsibilities that are coincident with serving on the committee, the financial disclosure forms, for

NEAL R. GROSS

example. And some of these seem perhaps to be a nuisance or a burden to continue to maintain these. But it really is part of the benefit of having an advisory committee that is transparent, that is open.

And again, the reason behind the Federal Advisory Committee Act in the first place was to avoid providing, having advice provided to decision-makers and government that was partisan or that was made up of only a select few people that was not representative, that was not open.

So, all of our meetings are open to the public. We publish a notice three weeks in advance of the meeting, notifying the public that we are meeting. We don't meet in secret. We don't meet in private. All of our -- we have Chad Dawson here, he is our court reporter. We didn't introduce him but he is --

COURT REPORTER: Jackson, not Dawson.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. HOLLIDAY: Chad Dawson is a football player; right? Sorry. Chad Jackson who will be transcribing all of our spoken words here into a transcript and from that we take our notes from it.

And so this is all in the interest of making the public aware that a federal advisory committee is in business and is providing this broad spectrum of opinion, broad spectrum of advice, both to NOAA and to the Department of Commerce in the most open and democratic way possible.

So, the responsibilities of a member are not terribly burdensome but they may be a nuisance in terms of some of the bureaucracy associated with it. But I think there is a well-made trade-off in being able to say that this committee is representative of a diverse group and that we operate in a very open fashion.

For those new members who came on. We have seven new members in total. And we

NEAL R. GROSS

actually had 11 vacancies as of this summer. And so we made a decision based on we, the Department and NOAA, made a decision based on recommendations from MAFAC not to recruit 11 new members all at one time because that is more than half of the committee.

we wanted to allow for continuity and some continuation of function and that institutional memory. So, we asked four of the existing members to stay on for an additional 12 months. So, Bob Fletcher, Tony DiLernia, Chris Dorsett and Jim Gilmore were selected and asked if they would be willing to stay on for 12 months to provide this continuity such that come June of next year, we will open that public process again to go and ask for nominations for four, new we now have a third of members. But committee, no more than a third of committee being replaced at any given time.

So, it is a little bit of a unique circumstance so I wanted to make sure everyone

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

understood how and why we were doing this and what we plan to do. Along about June of next year, we will publish a notice in the Federal Register soliciting nominations and go through the process to bring on four additional members.

Right now we have, I think, believe it is six of our existing members whose terms expire this December and we have requested the Secretary of Commerce reappoint those members for another term and that process has begun -- so, those who were on their first term -- and again, all of this information is public. It is posted on the website, who you are, your contact, and your terms are all public information. And we are renewing the terms of existing members for their second term and that is underway right now.

We generally meet twice a year. We can have additional meetings. The biggest constraint is budget and so, on an annual

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

basis I have been given funds to sponsor two large-scale meetings. But if there is a need for meetings between then of the entire committee, we can always go back and seek some dispensation. But at the very least, we have used successfully conference calls of the subcommittees and the full committee to deal with business between meetings.

The only caution that we need to be aware of is if we are making decisions as opposed to developing an idea or discussion of things, if we are actually going to have a vote or a decision on something, we have to have prior public notice that we are going to be meeting by teleconference and we'll provide a dial a number for the public, if they want to participate.

So again, no secrets. All above-board, prior public notice. So those are some of the constraints or some of the bureaucracy that I am responsible for keeping the committee on track and not in violation 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

these guidelines and regulations. And hence, our conference call with our General Counsel at 10:45 this morning.

subcommittees The are very important part of the MAFAC. We have five standing subcommittees and an ad hoc working We are going to go more into more depth into each of those areas this afternoon. But principal subcommittees the are executive subcommittee which is the chairs of each of the other subcommittees, the Council Liaison, the head of the other subcommittees, Budget and Program Management, Commerce, Protected Species, Ecosystem Approach. The chairs of those subcommittees along with the Council Liaison, that forms the executive subcommittee.

The process of serving on the committee: if you are choosing to serve, you can serve on more than one. It is a volunteer position. You can have your choice of what areas that you want to work on. So, part of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the discussion this afternoon will be going through what the committees have been working on recently and what the committees want to work on in the future.

I would like to leave this meeting with a work plan for 2009 for each of these subcommittees and say these are the topics that we think will be hot or are of interest to MAFAC. And the role of the subcommittee is to serve up this information. It is to sort of do work between meetings, to deliberate and to prepare materials that we could bring back to the full committee for decision, discussion hopefully discussion, then decision. or Ready, fire, aim. And really use it as a tool because we only do meet face to face twice a I think the role of the subcommittee has been a very effective one. At least in my opinion, over the last years they have worked very well.

So the Executive Committee, Strategic Planning, and this is material 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

| will be using again this afternoon, that |
|--|
| briefly describes what the function of these |
| different groups were. And this ad hoo |
| working group in the last couple of years is a |
| result of reinvention of the way we collect |
| marine recreational fishery statistics in |
| NOAA, we have formed a working group on |
| recreational fisheries. And Bob Fletcher has |
| been spearheading that effort and serving as |
| the liaison between MAFAC and those efforts |
| within the Agency and the Commission's |
| constituency. |
| So, that is the overview of the |

So, that is the overview of the purpose and structure of MAFAC. Any questions on this so far? Does it make sense, where we are going? Larry?

MR. SIMPSON: Mark, did you, I had an email, did you tell them about or would you describe the unique nature of a FACA committee? I don't know if you expanded on that or not or is that relevant right now?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, I can jump

NEAL R. GROSS

into it now. I think the point about FACA, I mean the Federal Advisory Committee Act is a federal statute that governs the setup and operation of these advisory groups to the Administration. And so because it comes with the territory of having these special conditions of how we appoint members and how we conduct business.

And I guess the bottom line is one of you are representing MAFAC when you are on the committee. You are representing the interests of the organized group, bringing your expertise, you know representing the sum total of who you represent, your experience, your training to the table.

And so I think the notion of FACA, it is just providing a context for the conduct and the process of the meetings but you are still, again, working as a unit. You know, all of the decisions that we are making are consensus decisions. If there are dissenting opinions and we can't reach a consensus, those

NEAL R. GROSS

would be reported as a minority view in the record for purposes of the transcript and the meeting reports.

think So, Ι FACA provides us framework of this context of how we operate but it still comes back down to MAFAC as a unit having gotten a mission chartered by the Department. And again, there aren't other places the Secretary, the Administrator and the NMFS Administrator get this kind of advice and get this perspective. It is a policy-oriented group. We try not to be too much in the weeds. There are lots of other people who are doing the day-to-day operational advising. But the long-term, the strategic view, the higher level, whatever cliché you would like to use, I think that is really the bread and butter and the strength of what this committee can do because there is nobody else out there who is charged with looking at that.

Regional organizations, regional

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bodies, states, interstate commissions, they all have their own local perspective, but the national perspective on policy of living marine resources, and fisheries in particular, that is the purview of this group. It is an increasingly listened-to group, as evidenced by Mary Glackin's participation and asking MAFAC to comment on the strategic views of NOAA for the transition.

I will note that the comments that we submitted last week, they were spread out on Paul Doremus' desk and he was busily trying to incorporate all of these MAFAC comments into those two pages before they go public. So they weren't just being passed aside saying check the box we asked MAFAC. Не was struggling but he was trying his best because we had some pretty broad ranging comments to incorporate them in those two-pagers and the documents that will be NOAA's message to the public on transition.

Does that kind of get at what 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

- or was there more?

MR. SIMPSON: No, that's fine. It is a fairly unique thing to be the fact a chartered committee does not meet a one Sea Grant, Councils and MAFAC as I appreciate. There may be a few more.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The MPA Advisory Committee, right. And there is NOAA's Science Advisory Board. In total, there are nine principal FACA committees in all of NOAA.

All right. So, I wanted to shift gears a bit. Let me check on time. That must mean 10:04 our time.

If we could go back to the handbook for a second, a lot of people --

So, just to give you, you know, you can't tell the players without a score card, this is currently out of date. The Vice Admiral is still shown as the head of NOAA. But you should know this is a NOAA advisory committee. It is not a NMFS advisory committee, and so we deal with more than just

NEAL R. GROSS

National Marine Fisheries Service.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

This is the organizational chart for NOAA. It shows the different line offices the different across the bottom, program And sort of having a wiring diagram, offices. we are going to maintain this and keep it current as the new political appointees come I think this would be a handy in. So, reference to keep in mind. It is going to be available in that MAFAC handbook online. as changes occur, this is someplace we can go to help keep straight of who is who.

Αt the time, the NOAA same Fisheries Service org chart is something that you should all be familiar with as well. shows the current organization of the Fisheries Service. And if I have time, I little bit of Fisheries might do PowerPoint here in a moment. But this shows you the structure and --

MS. FELLER: Could you full screen it? I can't see it.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. I'm sorry.

This overall shows you the leadership organization of National Marine Fisheries Service, Jim Balsiger. And just for this purpose, I will wait for this 101 to go into a little bit more detail. Jim and his principal deputies for regulatory programs, administration and operations and science programs, those are the three major branches of the tree. And then we have our field structure, headquarters and field structure that falls beneath that.

So, this will be kept up-to-date on that handbook as well. I will provide the context and explanation of our organization in a minute in the PowerPoint. In fact, that is what is up next.

Now, some of this may be old hat to people and some of this may be brand new. But at least by going through it quickly, we will make sure that everybody is on the same page.

Now, all of this material is up on 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

website. So, if you need copies or haven't seen it yet, share it with friends, be my quest.

have stolen this from previous briefings that have been done by various folks so, it is current information. But the whole purpose of this presentation is to give you a bit background little more about Fisheries Service and Organization, because our subcommittees are sort of organized along these various lines of statutory authority for resources, fisheries protected and mammals and so was our line office structure. So, I wanted to give you some perspective on NOAA Fisheries Service itself.

A long history of involvement both in the science, management and regulation of fisheries dating back into the 1870s. And this is a picture of our organization and how we are currently structured. It is a very heavily regionalized structure. Across the country we have six regions: northeast,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

southeast, Pacific Island, southwest, northwest and Alaska. And in each of these regions, we have both a regional office that is focused principally on management and regulation and a science operation through a fishery science center, which has subordinate laboratories where specific areas and types of research and analysis take place.

So, the large part of 2700, 2600 people in the agency are located in our field structure. And then we have our headquarters located in Silver Spring. So, many of you may have current interactions with one particular regional office. And all of these functions are mirrored around the country in these six different regions.

Here is another view of the same org chart. Three branches. Sam Rauch, who will be here tomorrow, is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs on the management and regulations of protected resources and the regional administrators who

report to him. And the office directors for sustainable fisheries, protected resources, and habitat report to Sam.

On the science side, Steve Murawski is the director of our science programs and the Chief Science Advisor. He will be here later today through tomorrow. He is in charge of the Fisheries Science Centers around the country. The Science Centers include what's called Southeast Fisheries Science in Miami, for example, as well as the headquarters Office of Science and Technology where John Boreman is the Office Director, leading that operation.

And in the middle, the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations is John Oliver. And he is in charge of different operations and administrative functions, Management and Budget, the Law Enforcement Office, the Chief Information Officer. report to John as does the Seafood Inspection Program. So those are the three major trees

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 how we are organized and where we draw our expertise from.

I am not the budget expert, although I did stay at a Holiday Inn last night, but it wasn't an express.

Historical budget trends, Gary Reisner is our expert and he is going to talk a little bit more about the current scene on budget tomorrow. But the takeaway from this slide is we have had a pretty active budget cycle over the last few years. And the big difference that you will note here is delta between the President's budget and what is enacted. So we have a very interested and very assertive appropriations interest Capitol Hill that, in most years, that blue bar is something that we are operating from on an active level, and consistently is higher than the President's budget. This reflects a number of different theories and hypotheses Congressional interest and specific about just general interest projects in the or

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

investments in natural resources science and management relative to other budgets, priorities that are in the president's budget. So, we could go into detail on this but we won't.

The value of marine fisheries is big business. It is important to the economy. helps explain why This are in we Department of Commerce. Commercial Alaska, you know, the leading ports, principally, from the pollock fishery, for industrial fisheries, Menhaden in Reedville, Virginia, and Louisiana, with a large part of the tonnage of domestic fisheries; per capita, 16 and a half pounds per person and it has been hovering around that level for the last several years. Shrimp continues to be a very important component of the commercial sector.

We have a document called <u>Fisheries</u>
of the <u>United States</u> that contains all of the
statistical information. All MAFAC members
should be getting a copy of that every year

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

when it comes out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Randy?

MR. CATES: How often is that information updated?

DR. HOLLIDAY: This is all conducted on an annual basis. So, when we publish Fisheries in the U.S., we will do leading ports for the calendar year 2007. state of our statistics programs -- because it is a mosaic of state and federal programs, of the regions iterate and get updated frequently on a monthly basis. other cases, depending on the state or area, they only get updated once a year. So, the common denominator is on an annual cycle that we update all of the statistics from around the country to produce a snapshot of what is going on.

Recreational fisheries are popular around the United States. The three major statutes, you know, it should be pop quiz. Everybody knows what they are. Magnuson-

NEAL R. GROSS

Stevens Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act-- those are the principal statutory drivers but there are about 90 to 100 other ones that impact and give us authority to do things or require us to do things. These are some of the drivers that we are responding to when we make policy.

The Magnuson Act, you know, most recently, was reauthorized a couple of years ago a whole new litany of requirements on the agency and the states and the councils to do things, some of them not funded but all of them good things for the future are fisheries sustainability of that we are required to do. We will be talking a little bit about those specifically tomorrow with Alan Risenhoover's update on the Magnuson Act update in the morning.

We have some goals set out for limited access privilege programs, you know, doubling the number of LAPs. Magnuson-Steven reauthorization required a specific final 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

for ending over-fishing by 2011, mandated the creation of а national saltwater angler registry to approve recreational data. And had some very strong words to say about IUU-illegal, unregulated, unreported -- fishing in our role of NOAA and the Department in international fisheries management.

Regional Councils, there are eight Regional Management Councils. Many of you, based on our introductions are familiar or participants or members of them past or prior. job. Fisheries But it is biq а different. There are 46 Fisheries Management Plans, over 500 different stocks of fish that we are trying to manage. Scientific research is in our science centers. Again, Ι am breezing through this. So, go through this at your leisure and if you have questions or want to know more about it, you can ask us or explore our websites.

But we perform life science, physical science, social science, research,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

stock assessments, economic valuations, habitat characterizations, we have a very large science enterprise. That is the bottom line from this component and it is applied science. It is applied to the sustainability of both fisheries and non-harvested species.

Marine mammals, protected threatened major species, providing habitat and sound ecological functions for the ecosystems in which they live.

We have a joint role with the fish and wildlife service of protecting these particular endangered and threatened protected species.

I'll just kind of move through. Marine Mammal and the ESA, talking about some of our major activities and take reduction plans. Aquaculture program, we have had briefings at every one of our last, at least the last half dozen MAFAC meetings on the status of aquaculture. You have been a large part of developing the ten year plan for

NEAL R. GROSS

aquaculture. The aquaculture legislation that did not get passed this past session of Congress, but it's a key component of the equation of our responsibilities.

And of course, extending beyond just the IUU fishing. These regional fishery management organizations, a number of you are involved in ICCAT or IATTC or some of these other transboundary management responsibilities, again, these are all topics that are looking for input on policy advice and MAFAC as a role to play in helping answer questions and shape the future issues.

This is just a listing sort of geographically of some different kinds of topics that were, at the time, this was March of this year, issues that were either on our plate or on the council's plate that were causing us to make some choices, make some decisions, make some allocations, and this is an ever-changing map. But again, you can use it as a reference point of what are some of

NEAL R. GROSS

| | 1 |
|----|--|
| 1 | the territory that MAFAC could get into and |
| 2 | advise on. |
| 3 | MR. CATES: Mark, are any of these |
| 4 | slides available online? |
| 5 | DR. HOLLIDAY: They are all on the |
| 6 | website. They should all be on the website. |
| 7 | MR. CATES: Okay. |
| 8 | MR. JONER: What was this entitled? |
| 9 | I'm just trying to find it and I couldn't. |
| LO | DR. HOLLIDAY: Topher, do you know |
| L1 | what it is called on the website? |
| L2 | MR. HOLMES: I have no idea. |
| L3 | DR. HOLLIDAY: All right. On a |
| L4 | break, we will check it out for you. Other |
| L5 | questions on that? |
| L6 | MR. JONER: Mark, I just want to |
| L7 | point on your slides of the fishing ports, I |
| L8 | think I saw Kodiak listed as hake and I wanted |
| L9 | to know what Jim was up to. Is there hake up |
| 20 | there? Gas prices being what they are, we are |
| 21 | just out of bounds, five, six, seven miles. |

Just catch them in Kodiak.

| 1 | MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I would |
|----|--|
| 2 | just like to compliment Mark on the very brief |
| 3 | general update, new and old. That was just a |
| 4 | very good, you know, go and do that every |
| 5 | time. You did a wonderful job. |
| 6 | DR. HOLLIDAY: The shorter the |
| 7 | better. Right? |
| 8 | MR. SIMPSON: No, seriously. I |
| 9 | mean, that was good. |
| 10 | DR. HOLLIDAY: So the last part of |
| 11 | my act before we are going to take a break at |
| 12 | 10:30. |
| 13 | I have it is important to me |
| 14 | because it is probably one of the things that |
| 15 | takes a lot of my time, and that is travel. |
| 16 | Travel for MAFAC is not a terribly complicated |
| 17 | issue, but I feel duty bound to go through a |
| 18 | brief travel PowerPoint to remind everybody |
| 19 | old and new about what the rules are so we all |
| 20 | stay out of trouble and have a carefree life. |
| 21 | So, I am not pointing fingers. I |
| 22 | am just |

So, in fact, this is someplace in 1 2 this handbook. If I remember. MR. DiLERNIA: The travel 3 quidelines --4 DR. HOLLIDAY: 5 Yes. MR. DiLERNIA: -- 20. 6 7 DR. HOLLIDAY: Traveling for the government. All right. So this was presented 8 to MAFAC a couple of meetings with regard-- I 9 10 should let you know that I have only been doing this since, what, October of last year? 11 So, I am kind of newbie, but I have presented 12 13 at MAFAC a lot of times in my career, but I have never had the privilege of working as the 14 executive director until last fall. 15 But this 16 briefing was given at a couple of meetings before I showed up but I have modified it and 17 changed the names and provide a little more 18 19 bit of emphasis. travel for 20 when you the are considered special 21 government, you government employees and, therefore, when we 22

pay to reimburse your travel, you have follow the federal travel regulations. they are cumbersome and they are designed to provide good value to the government by our contracts with different carriers. And we have some very specific rules. And so if you are ever interested in knowing what they are, there is a link here to the federal travel regulations that govern things like how much money do you get reimbursed for a particular visit to a city, your per diem. What governs the kinds of reimbursable expenses. an answer in the form of frequently asked this link. And there is questions at information out additional travel on travel website. So, those two links you can keep an eye on.

But I liked this travel PowerPoint because it was pretty straight forward. That is travel basics. You are invited. So, we have a meeting. You are invited to come and participate in our meeting. And you are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

really considered an invitational traveler. So, you are at our invitation. We have a government travel agency that is called ADTRAV. And that is their phone number and that is their fax number and that is their email.

So when you make plans to travel for MAFAC, your first step is to call ADTRAV and say, "Hey, I want to go to this city on this date and I need a train ticket, plane ticket, some common carrier ticket." You have to make that reservation through ADTRAV and they will book that ticket for you.

MS. FOY: Mark, it does have to be through the ADTRAV in Silver Spring. They can't call ADTRAV --

DR. HOLLIDAY: ADTRAV in Silver Spring knows MAFAC and knows who you are. ADTRAV has a national 800 number in Atlanta. They [Atlanta ADTRAV staff] won't necessarily know to tell me that you are traveling. So, your itinerary, in order for us to process it

| 1 | has to come back to us. And so the Atlanta |
|----|--|
| 2 | office doesn't know you. They have thousands, |
| 3 | not thousands, at least dozens of people |
| 4 | taking calls. And Silver Spring is only three |
| 5 | people. And they have a list of the MAFAC |
| 6 | members and they know what to do when they get |
| 7 | your request for travel. They send it back to |
| 8 | us. |
| 9 | MR. JONER: Mark, I had a call |
| 10 | DR. HOLLIDAY: So this is the |
| 11 | number. |
| 12 | MR. JONER: Excuse me. I had a |
| 13 | call from that 205 area. Where is that? |
| 14 | DR. HOLLIDAY: The fax is actually |
| 15 | located in Atlanta. |
| 16 | MR. JONER: Oh, okay. Well, |
| 17 | somebody called me from there about my travel. |
| 18 | DR. HOLLIDAY: It could be. If |
| 19 | there is an overflow and they need to get, |
| 20 | they will then contact people in Atlanta to do |
| 21 | some of that work. |

MR. JONER: Oh, okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: But that is them initiating it. So our contacts should be directly with the folks in Silver Spring. Because they know MAFAC.

So do not use any other travel or airline agency. Don't go and book a flight. Don't use your own credit card. Don't do any of that stuff. Let ADTRAV book your flight and they will issue the ticket for you.

What they do, once you have made your reservation, as I said, they give you the itinerary. These are the dates you are going to travel. These are the flights that you have agreed upon. They send that to me, the inviting office, and we have prepared for you a travel order, travel authorization. It is a piece of paper that says you are on official government business as an invited traveler and these are the funds that have been set aside to cover that travel and dates, et cetera, et cetera.

We process that and that is the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

authorization that we then fax back to ADTRAV that gives them the green light to issue the electronic ticket. So, they won't release ticket until they get this travel authorization. But can't we prepare travel authorization until we get your itinerary. We can't get your itinerary unless you call ADTRAV in Silver Spring.

Ι have MR. CATES: а word of caution on that, because this has happened to me twice now. I booked through ADTRAV and it has a contact information from you on who to ADTRAV will send an email with contact. itinerary and everything and it looks like it is a done deal. But when I go to try and upgrade or whatever I want to do, the ticket is not issued, but on the email it looks like you are already done. You had better double check.

DR. HOLLIDAY: That is a good point. There are two emails that ADTRAV generates. The first one is when you make

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

your reservation and it says your itinerary has been done. The second email is when your ticket has been issued. So, way at the end of the subject line on the email, it says your electronic issue has been issued.

MR. CATES: So, newcomers, don't think --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Don't be fooled by the first one. That just means if you have a reservation, that your ticket is not ready to be issued electronically because they haven't yet received your travel authorization. And we can turn the travel authorizations around pretty quick. Some people have to book early or there are very few flights.

In one case-- was it Southwest? One of the airlines wouldn't hold a reservation for more than 24 hours. So we had to do it a second time because we weren't aware that they needed the travel order right away. But if we know about it, we can do it.

MR. CATES: My tickets on this

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | weren't issued until two days before I flew. |
|----|---|
| 2 | And I was calling two or three times a week |
| 3 | saying, "When are you going to issue the |
| 4 | ticket?" |
| 5 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. But they |
| 6 | didn't know who "John Cates" was. You're |
| 7 | listed on their MAFAC roster as Randy Cates. |
| 8 | MR. SIMPSON: Well, it's only |
| 9 | really an issue when my wife travels and you |
| 10 | want to try and pair yourself up. |
| 11 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. If you want |
| 12 | to get your travel you want to be able to |
| 13 | get your e-ticket issued so that you can |
| 14 | either upgrade using you can upgrade using |
| 15 | your own miles, but your ticket has to be in |
| 16 | hand. So you have to get that ticket early. |
| 17 | MR. SIMPSON: That is my only issue |
| 18 | is when you bring your spouse. It is kind of |
| 19 | difficult, unless they do it really in |
| 20 | advance. She's fussing because she has to sit |
| 21 | two or three rows away. |

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. HOLLIDAY:

Dorothy?

MS. LOWMAN: So, yes, I mean, you really do have to do these things. I mean, like you can't upgrade until the thing is bought, for example.

But I also wanted just to give kudos to Mark, because he really does try to work with you if you have these things and get it through this cumbersome process in a short time. So, I want to thank you for it.

MR. CATES: How far in advance can you typically give authorization?

DR. HOLLIDAY: As soon as we know what the venue is and the destination will be. You can book the flight. We just want to make sure that you are going to be going there. Every time they issue a ticket, they a non-refundable service charge us money, charge. So even if you turn a ticket back, we are still out-of-pocket some money. And in some cases, the tickets themselves are nonrefundable. Because if you do a lot of these advance purchases, if it is not a government

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

contract carrier, which is why we encourage people to use their government contract for a city-pair, which is an official carrier between two points. And most of the time, Y-class fare and that fare that is а refundable. You can turn it back in. You can exchange it. There is no fee involved. if you get a non-refundable ticket, say a 45day advance purchase and you decide you are not going to go, well, we are stuck paying the bill for it. So, we try to avoid that.

And in answer directly to your question, a month or two before the meeting, I will usually say start making your reservations with ADTRAV. And we can get your ticket issued as soon as we get the itinerary and turn that around in a couple of days back to ADTRAV, and they can release the ticket a month or two in advance.

So that is, on the invitation side, so I was going to spend the next minute or two just talking about, your trip is over, 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

come back, you are all happy but you're outof-pocket some cash because you don't have a
government credit card so you had to put some
money up front, you want to get reimbursed.

So, within five days, the federal travel regulations, if you read them, five business days later, we are supposed to be submitting voucher for you а to get In some cases, it has been weeks reimbursed. or months. I don't know why people delay. it was my money, I would be getting there on day two to get my money back, but a lot of people I have had to hound to get vouchers they could get their in so back.

Forward a copy of your travel costs and your receipts to headquarters. Send the original receipts but keep a copy for yourself, in case something happens.

You don't need to send in receipts for food. You have a set amount of money that you are going to get paid for food whether 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

eat it all today, or you can pocket that money
or you can load up on donuts. It looks like
there are brownies.

MR. DiLERNIA: The brownies are
good.

DR. HOLLIDAY: On the first day--

so, I think the per diem, it just changed for New Orleans. I think it is \$59 a day. And so you can spend it all for dinner, or lunch, but you don't need to give me your receipt. You get that money. That is called your per diem. And it is not just for your meals, it is for your meals and incidental expenses. And so, if you tip the person at the front desk, the doorman or something, all those, M-I and E, it is referred to: Meals and incidental expenses.

But on the first day of travel and the last day, guess what? The government says you only need three quarters of that. So, when you get your reimbursement, you only get reimbursed three-quarters of that \$59.

MS. DOERR: What about transfers to

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | the airport? |
|----|--|
| 2 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Transfers, they are |
| 3 | covered 100%. From your home to an airport. |
| 4 | From your airport to your hotel. Any |
| 5 | transfers are covered at full expense, |
| 6 | separately from the per diem amount that I |
| 7 | have been talking about. Save the receipt. |
| 8 | Technically, unless it is over \$75, |
| 9 | we don't need the receipt, but you would be |
| 10 | better off just to send a receipt. Keep your |
| 11 | receipts and keep track of things just because |
| 12 | you never know when things might come back and |
| 13 | someone ask for something we didn't have. |
| 14 | MR. CATES: The New Orleans tax is |
| 15 | a lot cheaper than New York. |
| 16 | DR. HOLLIDAY: New York, yes. But |
| 17 | it isn't as much fun. |
| 18 | MR. DiLERNIA: What do they charge |
| 19 | you in New York? |
| 20 | MR. CATES: Well, to go the |
| 21 | airport, we paid \$75. |

NEAL R. GROSS

Really?

MR. DiLERNIA:

| 1 | MR. SIMPSON: Well, but what is |
|----|--|
| 2 | neat about New York is you can use your credit |
| 3 | card. I don't know if the taxis here do that. |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay, so, I am almost |
| 5 | done with this, and we are coming up on our |
| 6 | break, and we have a 10:45 appointment with |
| 7 | the attorney. |
| 8 | MR. O'SHEA: You guys are paying |
| 9 | for luggage now, right? |
| 10 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Good question. I |
| 11 | presume. You know, we will find out but I |
| 12 | presume. I never travel with checked luggage. |
| 13 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Yes, but they |
| 14 | usually give you a receipt. |
| 15 | DR. HOLLIDAY: That's another |
| 16 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: That is a |
| 17 | business expense. |
| 18 | DR. HOLLIDAY: You can explore the |
| 19 | travel regulations. |
| 20 | If you stay in a spot for more than |
| 21 | four days, you can have your dry-cleaning |
| 22 | done. Is that right? |

1 VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Except 2 Alaska or Hawaii. In Alaska or Hawaii, you don't get your clothes cleaned, but any place 3 else after four days you can. That is true. 4 It's in there. 5 DR. HOLLIDAY: That is a legitimate 6 7 business expense that will be reimbursed. Get a receipt. 8 How about a taxi to a 9 MR. BILLY: 10 restaurant? DR. HOLLIDAY: No. You are on your 11 There are plenty of places to eat within 12 13 walking distance. That is the government's view. If you are out in a desolate area, in a 14 hotel that doesn't have food service and you 15 need to go offsite to get a meal, they will 16 consider it. But if you are in a location 17 that has food facilities, there is no reason 18 19 to even ask for reimbursement simply because you want to go to your favorite restaurant. 20 All right. So, you have sent your 21

summary of your travel costs, your receipts

| 1 | are in. We prepare a travel voucher and we |
|----|---|
| 2 | submit that electronically to NOAA finance. |
| 3 | NOAA finance is going to then direct deposit |
| 4 | your reimbursement into your account. And |
| 5 | that is why we have asked you to all maintain |
| 6 | this direct deposit form that has a bank |
| 7 | account number that you want these funds put |
| 8 | into. And if you change that bank or your |
| 9 | bank is no longer in business |
| 10 | MR. DiLERNIA: Lehman Brothers. |
| 11 | DR. HOLLIDAY: fill out another |
| 12 | form. Randy? |
| 13 | MR. CATES: Are you notified when |
| 14 | the direct deposit goes through? |
| 15 | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes. You get an |
| 16 | email. |
| 17 | DR. HOLLIDAY: You should be |
| 18 | getting an email. If you are not, let me know |
| 19 | and I will see why not. But you should get a |
| 20 | little notice saying "such and such a date a |
| 21 | deposit was made in an account with this |
| 22 | amount." |

| 1 | MR. CATES: And so we can go back |
|----|---|
| 2 | and check. On the last travel, I don't |
| 3 | remember recalling ever getting |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Getting reimbursed |
| 5 | or getting an email? |
| 6 | MR. CATES: Both. |
| 7 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well |
| 8 | MR. DiLERNIA: Did you use that |
| 9 | number I gave you, the deposit number? |
| LO | (Laughter.) |
| L1 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. |
| L2 | MR. CATES: I just wanted to check |
| L3 | on it. |
| L4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Your |
| L5 | responsibilities are to know the regulations. |
| L6 | Ignorance of the law is no excuse. Make your |
| L7 | travel arrangements only through ADTRAV. Do |
| L8 | not use your credit card to purchase tickets. |
| L9 | I will repeat. Do not use your credit card |
| 20 | to purchase tickets. |
| 21 | For train travel, obtain your |
| 22 | authorization prior to traveling. It is very |

difficult to do it after the fact. Debt forgiveness doesn't work. Submit the signed vouchers and receipts on a timely basis.

And you know, try as you might, we won't reimburse you for things that the federal travel regulations say are against the law. And I say that because we are next to Bourbon Street.

(Laughter.)

DR. HOLLIDAY: The government is charged a service fee for each ticket issued. If you drive to the airport, you will get mileage for your car. If you park it in the parking lot, you will get the parking at the airport reimbursed.

We generally do not allow rental cars. So when there is a common conveyance to get to a hotel, there is no reason for you to pay for a rental, for us to reimburse you for a rental car that is going to sit at \$29 a day for parking when you have no place to go except back to the airport.

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | If we are at a venue and there was |
|----|--|
| 2 | no other way there we could authorize it, but |
| 3 | we generally do not authorize rental cars. |
| 4 | Okay. |
| 5 | Okay, I'm done. Any other |
| 6 | questions, we can pick them up during the |
| 7 | break or throughout the meeting. Or at any |
| 8 | time you are uncertain about something, give |
| 9 | me a call or an email. I would be happy to |
| 10 | talk to you. |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Thanks, Mark. |
| 12 | That was very good. |
| 13 | Now, we are going to have a break. |
| 14 | How hard is 10:45? |
| 15 | DR. HOLLIDAY: He is going to be on |
| 16 | the phone at 10:46. |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: So, we have got ten |
| 18 | minutes for a coffee break. So, be back in |
| 19 | your seats in 10 minutes. And you can have |
| 20 | your coffee with you. |
| 21 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off |
| 22 | the record at 10:36 a.m. and |
| | |

| 1 | resumed at 10:50 a.m.) |
|----|--|
| 2 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Will, can you hear |
| 3 | us okay? |
| 4 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. Can you hear me? |
| 5 | DR. HOLLIDAY: So far, so good. |
| 6 | So, Tom is going to do an introduction and |
| 7 | then we will turn it over to you. |
| 8 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. |
| 9 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. We have on |
| 10 | the line Will Jacobi. He is Senior Counsel |
| 11 | focusing on the Ethics Law and Programs |
| 12 | Division, Office of General Counsel in the |
| 13 | Department of Commerce. And we thought it was |
| 14 | important, particularly for the new members |
| 15 | but also a review for the existing members of |
| 16 | our obligations with respect to ethics and the |
| 17 | law. |
| 18 | So, I'll turn it over to you Will. |
| 19 | And I assume if we have questions, we should |
| 20 | just go ahead and ask them as you make your |
| 21 | presentation? |
| | 1 |

MR. JACOBI: Yes, just feel free to

| 1 | interrupt. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |
| 3 | MS. DOERR: Can you turn it up? |
| 4 | MR. BILLY: Yes, I'm going to try. |
| 5 | Okay. Go ahead, Will. |
| 6 | MR. JACOBI: Hey Mark, I guess I |
| 7 | can't hear the people in the audience. So, if |
| 8 | a question does come up you will have to maybe |
| 9 | chime in. Okay? Because I can hear you but I |
| 10 | didn't hear in the background. |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: Okay, Will. We will |
| 12 | MR. JACOBI: We'll see how it goes. |
| 13 | Hello? |
| 14 | MR. BILLY: Sounds good. |
| 15 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. So, I am going |
| 16 | to give you a brief summary of the ethics that |
| 17 | apply to members of the Marine Fisheries |
| 18 | Advisory Committee. And as members of this |
| 19 | committee, you are considered what is called |
| 20 | SGEs, that is a special government employee. |
| 21 | And as such, you are subject to federal ethics |

regulations just

laws

and

22

full-time

like

government employees like me, but the restrictions that are placed on you are not as great as they are on me, and I will point those out as we go along here.

But Ι am the person who reviews your financial disclosure reports. And I have spoken with a few of you and you file these every year. And the purpose of the review is determine whether all to you have any potential conflicts between the duties of your position as a committee member and any stock holdings you have or any outside activities in which engaged. And Congress you are recognizes that people like you are asked to these committees based serve on on expertise in the field, and therefore it is expected that you are going to have conflicts or that you are going to be engaged in outside activities that are related to the subject are in which you are providing advice. course, you are going to have conflicts.

And accordingly, there is a special

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

statutory provision that allows for the of a conflict of interest waiver issuance based government's for on the need your services.

reviewing So, when Ι am your reports, if I see a potential conflict I would request that a waiver be prepared. And that is why it is important that you fully disclose all stock holdings and of your positions so that we can get all the potential conflicts covered by a waiver.

Now I guess backing up a step, what is a conflict? What is a financial conflict? And let me just explain what the financial conflict of interest statute basically says, which is that you cannot participate in a matter as part of your government duties in which you have a personal financial interest.

And your financial interest includes not only your own but those of your spouse and your outside employer. And when I speak of outside employer-- and you probably

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think that MAFAC is your outside employer-but when we speak of outside employers, we
mean your real job. Your full-time jobs. So,
you know, your outside employers, their
financial ethics is imputed to you as well as
your spouse, your minor children, and any
organization on which you serve as a board
member or officer or trustee.

So for example, let's say that you are in the aquaculture business, and as part of your MAFAC duties you are asked to make a recommendation NOAA implementing on Well, that is going to aquaculture plan. affect your outside financial interest. You know, the financial interest of your employer. So that would be a matter that can create a conflict. if potential Oryou are commercial fisherman, and one of the issues that is all making comes up you are recommendations on whether vessel monitoring systems should be on all commercial fishing boats or as a commercial fisherman, that is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to affect your financial -- even though affect it is going to all commercial fishermen, it is still going to affect your financial interest as a commercial fishermen. So again, that would be an area in which you would be working on matter that affects your financial interest and you couldn't participate in that matter unless an exemption applied and a waiver was issued.

By the way, when we talk about not matters participating in affecting your financial interest, it is not just voting on a matter, it is providing advice and making recommendations. It doesn't have to be final decisions. It could be any input that you making into a decision is participation, not just when you say, "I didn't vote on it but I did participate." That is not the way we analyze it.

MR. BILLY: You need to speak up a little bit.

MR. JACOBI: I need to speak up a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | little bit? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: Just a little, yes. |
| 3 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. Any questions, |
| 4 | at this point? |
| 5 | MR. BILLY: Is this the preferred |
| 6 | approach, the waiver? |
| 7 | MR. JACOBI: I'm sorry. What? |
| 8 | MR. BILLY: Is this the preferred |
| 9 | approach for anyone that might have a conflict |
| LO | of interest, just to do the waiver as |
| 11 | appropriate? |
| 12 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. I mean, and I am |
| 13 | making a determination based upon the review |
| L4 | of the report. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |
| L6 | MR. JACOBI: Keeping in mind, |
| L7 | people may be sitting there and thinking well, |
| L8 | why didn't I get a waiver, I may have this |
| L9 | conflict. There are some regulatory |
| 20 | exemptions that would allow you where we don't |
| 21 | need to have a waiver. For example, if your |
| | |

only outside interest is your employer, and

your employer is going to be affected by a decision you make but they are just going to be affected as a member of an industry, then there is a regulatory provision that allows committee several advisory members to participate in matters, in general policy matters that could affect their employer as a member of the industry. So in that case, you don't need to get a-- we determined that we don't need to issue a waiver in that case. it is just an employer.

That said, if the matter is going to have a special and distinct effect on your employer, then that is not covered. And that's something that we wouldn't even issue a waiver for. And even if we have issued waivers for anyone, they are only waivers that allow you to participate in general policy matters that could affect your financial your outside employers. interest or waivers don't allow you ever to participate in a matter that is going to have a special 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

distinct affect or that specifically involves your outside interest.

And for example, the waivers would cover commercial fishermen being allowed to participate in the decision to put VMS systems on commercial fishing boats and stuff, that is not going to have a special and distinct effect on you as a commercial fisherman. It is going to affect everybody. But if it was a decision affecting your particular employer, that wouldn't be covered by a waiver.

And the special and distinct issues, my understanding that is never going to come up. As a matter of fact, you guys are operating on a much higher policy level. So, these specific, what we call matters involving specific parties, we don't anticipate that is going to come up for MAFAC. Waivers that we are issuing are going to be just fine.

MR. BILLY: Okay, thanks.

MR. JACOBI: Now, the other point is is that if you have an outside employer, as

NEAL R. GROSS

I said, there is a regulatory provision that allows you to participate in general policy matters that would affect an outside employer as a member of this industry, but if you own stock in the company, that is a different story. Then there needs to be a waiver issued because that regulatory provision just covers the employment interest. It doesn't cover stock ownership. And I know that was an issue for at least one member who had an outside business and that would have been covered by But he also owned the regulatory provision. stock in the company, so we needed a waiver for that.

I'm probably getting into too much detail. The people that needed waivers got waivers. If you have a specific question, we can speak about that later, but I am pretty comfortable that everyone that needed a waiver got a waiver.

Okay. So that covers financial conflict of interest, I believe. And another

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

non-financial conflict of interest. is rule here is And the that you can't participate in a matter involving somebody with whom you have close ties. And again, this is a non-financial conflict. And this up when you are dealing with only comes matters involving specific parties. And again you know, close ties are your employer, your spouse's employer, your former employer who-for the last year, an organization with whom you are active with who is not your employer. But again, we don't anticipate that MAFAC is going too involved in any specific matters. So this, generally, is not going to be an But that is just another rule that apply to all Federal Advisory still does Committee members.

That covers conflicts of interest.

Another area I wanted to touch on was gifts.

There are rules for government employees in terms of accepting gifts. And the basic rule is that you cannot accept a gift from anyone

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who is a prohibited source. And a prohibited source means anyone that has business or is seeking business with the department. And the Department of Commerce just doesn't cover NOAA, it covers a whole range of-- it covers commerce, it covers everything.

You also cannot accept a give if it is offered to you because of your government position, your MAFAC position. However, there are numerous exceptions to the gift restrictions which will pretty much overcome everything I just said.

(Laughter.)

MR. JACOBI: The basic exception is that if it is a gift that is valued at under \$20, you can accept it. There is a limit. You can't accept more than \$50 per year from the same source but if it under \$20, it is never going to be a problem.

The other exception and the most relevant for you all, is the gift based upon an outside business relationship. So, if

NEAL R. GROSS

somebody is offering you a gift based upon what you do in your real job, then you don't have to worry about gift restrictions. In other words, if it is not related to what you are doing as a MAFAC member, you don't have any concern.

But, let's say you guys are down there for your meeting and some interested outside party wants to have a party for you and MAFAC is down there and they are having a party for you. You may know that person from your outside business, but if you are being invited to an event because of your MAFAC position, then the gift restrictions do apply. So that is just something to be aware of.

that said, there is another restriction, there is another exception that they allow you to attend the event, if it meets the criteria for widely-attended а gathering. And that means that a certain number of people have qoing, to be including government people, and it has 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 | represent a diversity of views. But I am not |
|----|---|
| 2 | going to go too far down that road because I |
| 3 | haven't heard anything like that is happening |
| 4 | down there yet. |
| 5 | So just be aware that as members of |
| 6 | MAFAC the gift rules, the federal ethics |
| 7 | rules, including the gift rules do apply to |
| 8 | you. It is just something to be aware of. |
| 9 | Any question there? |
| 10 | Okay. Government activities. |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: Hold on. |
| 12 | MR. CATES: I have a question. |
| 13 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. CATES: Is there any problem |
| 15 | with one MAFAC member for example, if we are |
| 16 | here on business and we go out to dinner, one |
| 17 | MAFAC member buying another MAFAC member his |
| 18 | dinner? Do you understand that question? |
| 19 | MR. JACOBI: Yes, I understand the |
| 20 | question. So that is a good point. There is |
| 21 | a rule on gifts between employees. And that |

is fine, as long as everybody is at the same

level. So there is no problem with what you just said. But if a subordinate, there is a rule that subordinates cannot give a gift to a supervisor, and a supervisor cannot accept a gift from a subordinate.

We had a situation recently where I was asked a question about another committee buy a retirement wanted to qift for Admiral, the Vice Admiral. qift And the restrictions are implemented in that because the committee members were government employees, and their appointing authority was Lautenbacher. So, technically, they could not buy a gift for him because you could not buy a gift for a supervisor.

However, as with that rule, as is the case with all of these rules, there seems to be there are many exceptions to them which would allow it. And there is an exception where you can buy a gift for a supervisor for a significant life event. And a retirement would meet that criteria.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I am not asking -- your appointing official is the Secretary. So, I am not suggesting that anyone buy a gift for this secretary, but that would be a similar scenario. So, that answers the question?

MR. CATES: Yes, a lot of people are buying me dinner.

MR. JACOBI: Okay. Those are the gift rules.

Non-government activities. Working for a foreign government is generally okay. This used to be in issue but we got clarification that. Under the on constitution, employees government cannot accept compensation from a foreign government. That really applies more to me. We got some clarification. For members of federal advisory committees, if you're working for a foreign government, that is generally okay. It is not going to be an issue for MAFAC members. So, if you are working for a foreign government, that is fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That said, there are restrictions representing foreign on governments and representing foreign entities. And that is why you sign that certification of And this is a little bit status statement. outside of my area. It is actually a lot outside of my area. But you can't be engaging in representational activities for foreign governments or foreign entities if it requires registration under the foreign agents registration it requires act or your registration under the lobby and disclosure act.

So, I can't really answer any follow-up questions on what that means, other than if you are required to register under those acts with respect to representation for foreign governments or foreign entities, that can be a problem. I think everybody is filing certification status statements saying they are not engaged in those activities.

But staying on the issue 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 | lobbying in the government, some of you may be |
|----|--|
| 2 | engaged in lobbying activities before Congress |
| 3 | or before federal agencies and that is fine, |
| 4 | but there is a restriction. Now for me, me as |
| 5 | a full-time government employee, I am not |
| 6 | allowed to lobby a federal agency on behalf of |
| 7 | others on any matter. It is just prohibited. |
| 8 | For you all as members of a federal advisory |
| 9 | committee, you also there are restrictions. |
| 10 | The only restriction, though, is that you |
| 11 | cannot lobby a federal agency or a federal |
| 12 | court but that is not likely but you |
| 13 | cannot lobby a federal agency concerning a |
| 14 | specific party matter on which you |
| 15 | participated as a MAFAC members. And as I |
| 16 | pointed out before, it is unlikely that you |
| 17 | guys are going to deal with specific party |
| 18 | matters because MAFAC is not dealing with |
| 19 | individual parties. You guys are at a much |
| 20 | higher level. You know, you are not talking |
| 21 | about specific party matters, but to the |
| 22 | extent that you ever do and when we say |

| 1 | "specific party matter," I mean like something |
|----|--|
| 2 | that involves an identifiable party like a |
| 3 | contract, or a grant, or a license, or |
| 4 | litigation. But again, I don't believe that |
| 5 | is what you all are doing. But if you did, |
| 6 | then you couldn't go back and communicate with |
| 7 | government officials about that same matter in |
| 8 | your private capacity. |
| 9 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Will, we have a |
| 10 | question for you. |
| 11 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. |
| 12 | MR. DiLERNIA: Hi, Will. Tony |
| 13 | DiLernia here. I am member from New York. |
| 14 | Will, let me give you a for |
| 15 | instance. MAFAC develops a policy supporting |
| 16 | the offshore aquaculture bill. |
| 17 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. DiLERNIA: And at a later date, |
| 19 | I happen to be meeting with my senators from |
| 20 | the State of New York, and they ask me about |
| 21 | what issues are going on. And I tell them |
| 22 | that I support the offshore aquaculture bill. |

| 1 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. DiLERNIA: Is that permitted? |
| 3 | Is that, we are good with that? |
| 4 | MR. JACOBI: Yes. The only thing I |
| 5 | would caution on that is that when you are |
| 6 | meeting with members of congress, unless you |
| 7 | have authority to do so, you don't want to say |
| 8 | you are speaking for MAFAC. |
| 9 | MR. DiLERNIA: No. |
| LO | MR. JACOBI: But no, you can do |
| L1 | that. |
| L2 | MR. DiLERNIA: As an individual I |
| L3 | can. |
| L4 | MR. JACOBI: The restrictions |
| L5 | yes, what you just said was perfectly fine. |
| L6 | The restriction that I am referring to only |
| L7 | applies to federal agencies and federal |
| L8 | courts. It doesn't apply to making |
| L9 | representations before Congress. You can go |
| 20 | before Congress and talk the same thing to |
| 21 | Congress that you are talking about in MAFAC. |

MR. DiLERNIA: So then we have, to

1 carry it a step further, at this point --2 MR. JACOBI: The MAFAC issue that we are talking about was not a specific party 3 So the restriction wouldn't apply to 4 matter. that in any event. So, it is okay anyway. 5 6 You can talk to anybody about that because it 7 is not a -- you can talk to a federal agency about it because it is not a specific party 8 matter. 9 MR. DiLERNIA: 10 Okay. Let me give you another for instance. 11 MR. JACOBI: All right. 12 13 MR. DiLERNIA: We have a document here. It is called Fisheries 2020, which is 14 15 our vision of the future of fisheries. 16 on in this meeting we will be discussing how we should use this document. And it has been 17 we take the document suggested that 18 19 duplicate it and send it to all of the members 20 Congress. That would be acceptable?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. JACOBI: I'm thinking.

Hello?

21

| 1 | MR. DiLERNIA: It's a public |
|----|--|
| 2 | document, at this point. It has been |
| 3 | published. |
| 4 | MR. JACOBI: Well the reason I am |
| 5 | just hesitating in my response is that, is |
| 6 | this something that you would be doing outside |
| 7 | your MAFAC duties? |
| 8 | MR. DiLERNIA: No. This is |
| 9 | something the committee would do. I mean |
| LO | MR. JACOBI: Yes. The only person |
| l1 | the reason I am just hesitating in |
| L2 | answering is because I know there are some |
| L3 | lobbying restrictions but I don't know |
| L4 | there are some grass roots lobbying |
| L5 | restrictions, and I think that what you are |
| L6 | doing is permissible. But that is more of a |
| L7 | general law well, it is another division |
| L8 | that would answer that question. |
| L9 | But, Mark, I am just a little bit |
| 20 | hesitant to answer that question for sure. I |
| 21 | think it sounds okay, but I know there are |

some restrictions on using appropriate funds

| 1 | for lobbying. |
|----|--|
| 2 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well I think for our |
| 3 | purposes now, I think there is a little bit of |
| 4 | uncertainty. So we will say we will take that |
| 5 | up outside the meeting and follow up with Tony |
| 6 | and the rest of the committee when we get a |
| 7 | more clear answer for ourselves. |
| 8 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. |
| 9 | DR. HOLLIDAY: All right? |
| 10 | MR. JACOBI: I would want to |
| 11 | discuss that with our general law division. |
| 12 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. We can talk |
| 13 | to Hector and others. |
| 14 | MR. JACOBI: Yes, okay. |
| 15 | MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you. |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: Another question. |
| 17 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. |
| 18 | MR. CATES: If we are asked to |
| 19 | Randy Cates here with Aquaculture I have |
| 20 | been asked to meet in several congressional |
| 21 | meetings. Do we have to make a disclosure |
| 22 | that we are a MAFAC member, even though we are |

| 1 | there representing our own company's interest? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. JACOBI: No, I don't think so. |
| 3 | MR. CATES: Okay. |
| 4 | MR. JACOBI: I mean, it is up to |
| 5 | you. But if you are going to talk say you |
| 6 | are a MAFAC member, you don't want to be doing |
| 7 | so in a way that would suggest that MAFAC is |
| 8 | endorsing what you are saying. |
| 9 | MR. CATES: Right. |
| LO | MR. BILLY: Okay. Go ahead. |
| L1 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. I'm going |
| L2 | ahead? |
| 13 | MR. BILLY: Yes. |
| L4 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. That pretty |
| 15 | much covers it. The only other thing I will |
| L6 | touch on is I know it is not timely is |
| L7 | political activities. Political activities, |
| L8 | for me, there are a lot of restrictions on me. |
| L9 | There are pretty much no restrictions on you |
| 20 | guys except that you shouldn't be engaging in |
| 21 | political activities on government premises or |
| | 1 |

during your duty hours. Other than that, you

| 1 | guys don't really have any restrictions on |
|----|--|
| 2 | you. |
| 3 | Like for instance, I can't engage |
| 4 | in fund raising activities, but you can. But |
| 5 | again, not too timely, but just to let you |
| 6 | know. |
| 7 | That pretty much covers everything |
| 8 | I have to say. Any other questions? |
| 9 | MR. BILLY: Okay, Heather. |
| 10 | MS. McCARTY: Yes, this is Heather |
| 11 | McCarty. I was curious if you have ever had |
| 12 | any inquiries or any concerns expressed to you |
| 13 | from anyone regarding MAFAC as a group or |
| 14 | MAFAC members. |
| 15 | MR. JACOBI: Any inquiries about |
| 16 | MAFAC? |
| 17 | MS. McCARTY: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. JACOBI: They really wouldn't |
| 19 | come to me. I mean, I wouldn't be getting |
| 20 | those inquiries. I mean, I am just kind of |
| 21 | here to review your reports and provide |
| 22 | guidance to you guys and tell you about the |

rules.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If some of you had a problem with MAFAC it probably wouldn't get down to, it could get down to me eventually. But if there was a problem it wouldn't come to our office. If you are asking about whether there is anything has been in the news about investigations, you know, somebody would report that, I guess, to the Office Inspector General.

And I guess conceivably somewhere down the road they would come to me and ask me a question but I have never heard anything come up with MAFAC. But I am somewhat down the food chain.

MS. McCARTY: Okay, thanks.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Another question here. Steve.

MR. JONER: Yes, this is Steve Joner. I have a non-MAFAC related question. What do you know about the Pacific Whiting Treaty and the holdup there because of the

conflict of interest?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JACOBI: Well, I know that it hasn't been resolved yet because, you know, I guess Congress is still out and I know that they are still being held up. You know, the statute says that the members are subject to the conflict of interest rules. So, that needs to be resolved.

MR. JONER: And so specifically, what was the problem there?

MR. JACOBI: The problem was that, under the Pacific Whiting Treaty, the statute that members be appointed, says are to basically the members should be it says appointed from industry. And remember I said earlier when we were talking about the rules, you know, Pacific Whiting is not a federal advisory committee. Remember when I there was a conflict of interest waiver that there is a special statutory provision that Congress expects that you guys as FACA members, they are looking for people

expertise. So they expect that there is going to be conflicts. So there is a special statutory provision that allows for the issuance of a waiver, based upon the government's interest in having you serve.

But Pacific Whiting Treaty, that is not a federal advisory committee. So that waiver wasn't available for those members. And again, the statute says, you know, they are looking for people, you know, some people that are in the industry. So obviously, they are going to have conflicts, too. And the statute says the conflict of interest rules are going to apply to the members of the Pacific Whiting Commission or Pacific Whiting Treaty. So, it kind of creates a log jam.

I mean, it is difficult for them to be able to provide guidance without violating the conflict of interest statute. So, there has to be a fix to the situation. I'm not sure what it is going to be but it has to be fixed.

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | So, that was the problem. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. JONER: Okay, thank you. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Okay, Randy? |
| 4 | MR. CATES: I have a quick |
| 5 | question. On the website, you give examples |
| 6 | of a problem and if you work for a company and |
| 7 | you are a MAFAC member, is that company |
| 8 | allowed to apply for grants within Commerce? |
| 9 | MR. JACOBI: Yes, I don't see what |
| 10 | the problem is going to be there. Are you |
| 11 | asking whether you, as a member of the |
| 12 | company, can apply for the grant? |
| 13 | MR. CATES: Or as an employee of a |
| 14 | company that you work for, is the company |
| 15 | allowed to apply for a grant? |
| 16 | MR. JACOBI: That is outside of my |
| 17 | area but I don't know of any ethics rules that |
| 18 | would be, any such rules that would bar that |
| 19 | would be under some grant rules. But that |
| 20 | would shock me if that was the case. |
| 21 | MR. CATES: Okay. |
| 22 | MR. JACOBI: But the more pertinent |

| 1 | question would be, assuming you could do it, |
|----|--|
| 2 | whether you as the MAFAC member could apply |
| 3 | for the grant, could communicate with Commerce |
| 4 | officials. And again, before I mentioned that |
| 5 | there was that rule that says that federal |
| 6 | employees generally cannot communicate with a |
| 7 | federal agency on behalf of another. |
| 8 | So, I couldn't do it but for |
| 9 | advisory committee members, that restriction |
| 10 | is more narrow. You all just, the only |

advisory committee members, that restriction is more narrow. You all just, the only restriction on you all is that you can't communicate with federal agencies concerning a matter on which you are working on, a specific party matter on which you are working as a member of MAFAC.

So, if you are not working on that grant as a member of MAFAC, which you are not because that is not what you guys are doing, you would be able to communicate with Commerce officials about that grant.

MR. CATES: Okay.

MR. JACOBI: So, assuming that

NEAL R. GROSS

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there is no grant restrictions that would bar your initial question, I would be really surprised if that was the case.

You could ask the grant people when you are applying for the grant but they will probably just, they won't -- yes, I would be very surprised. Okay?

MR. CATES: Thank you.

MR. BILLY: Other questions anyone?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, if other questions come up, are you okay with people contacting you directly? I mean, you have given their contact information out to the past members or should they come through me?

MR. JACOBI: Contacting me is fine. You know, if they want to go through you or if they want to go through me that is fine. You know, if they have a specific question they think it is easier to contact me, you know, that is actually, that is the better way to do it. They like using you for the distribution of what, you know, the 450s and

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | all of that. But contacting me is perfectly |
|----|---|
| 2 | fine. |
| 3 | DR. HOLLIDAY: All right. So, I |
| 4 | will re-circulate your contact information to |
| 5 | make sure they know how to contact you |
| 6 | directly. |
| 7 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. |
| 8 | DR. HOLLIDAY: No other questions |
| 9 | right now? Will, I really appreciate your |
| 10 | spending the time with us this morning. I |
| 11 | think many people found it very helpful and |
| 12 | you provide some good food for thought for |
| 13 | other future questions that come up as well. |
| 14 | MR. JACOBI: Okay. My pleasure. |
| 15 | Okay. Have a good rest of the meeting. |
| 16 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks very much. |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: Okay, thank you. |
| 18 | MR. SIMPSON: Well we all, as |
| 19 | United States citizens, own stock in all of |
| 20 | these companies. |
| 21 | MR. BILLY: All right. |
| 22 | DR HOLLIDAY: So before we move |

off this topic, --

MR. BILLY: Yes.

DR. HOLLIDAY: -- liaisons. So this is an opportune time for us to look at our requirements for financial disclosure and certification of non-foreign agent. So, the new members have just gone through this process so you can tune out for a minute.

For the existing members, you have to do this on an annual basis and this is the last meeting before the turn of the calendar year. So, it is my first attempt to try to get you to work with me to re-up, as they say.

MR. JONER: How about if I just turn my travel in on time.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Well here is the deal. I have, for each existing member, I think almost every member, if we come out right. I have a folder here. And inside it will be your last year's financial disclosure statement with your signature whited out and then Xeroxed. Okay? So nothing has changed

| 1 | from last year's report. You know, things may |
|----|--|
| 2 | have but |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Values have gone down. |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Never ask for |
| 5 | anything that has to do with the value of your |
| 6 | holdings, it is just the name of it. |
| 7 | So, if things have changed, you can |
| 8 | take this home with you and just write on an |
| 9 | addendum sheet and staple it and sign it. And |
| 10 | 90 percent of the work is done. And there is |
| 11 | also a blank certification of status statement |
| 12 | that you are not a foreign agent. That needs |
| 13 | to get signed again. |
| 14 | And so I am handing these out now. |
| 15 | And you don't have to do them at the meeting. |
| 16 | But rather than send it to you in the mail |
| 17 | and explain it to you and I have saved on the |
| 18 | postage and I get to give you all some really |
| 19 | neat folding things that look pretty cool. |
| 20 | So, I am going to hand these out |
| 21 | and then we will go on to the next agenda |
| 22 | item. But I wanted to, so, I have discussed |

| 1 | this with Will. Everything is legit the way |
|----|--|
| 2 | we are doing it but he would like to get them |
| 3 | back. And he said at the end of the year, I |
| 4 | would like to get them back in a month's time |
| 5 | or something so that he can get through all of |
| 6 | these and make sure that everything is fine. |
| 7 | MR. DiLERNIA: Can't we just sign |
| 8 | them and give them back to you right now, |
| 9 | Mark? |
| 10 | DR. HOLLIDAY: If you want to, you |
| 11 | are absolutely welcome to do so. But I don't |
| 12 | want to pressure you if you want to go and |
| 13 | review it in detail and do that. |
| 14 | I will just wander around. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Okay, thanks for doing |
| 16 | that. This is really a good way to do it. |
| 17 | Okay, I am going to move on to the |
| 18 | next item. At the last meeting in New York |
| 19 | City, we asked NOAA Fisheries to develop a new |
| 20 | strategic plan. And I thought I would read |
| 21 | from the report what we said. This is a |
| | |

resolution that was passed unanimously. It

develop reads "We recommend that NOAA strategic plan for seafood safety based on input from our own seafood safety people and from FDA," the Food and Drug Administration, "with emphasis completing the an on memorandums of understanding with FDA and emphasis on internal organizations, economic increased research into public fraud and confidence in seafood and especially increased research into food safety technologies and include the positives and the job well done of the current seafood safety program."

So, it is a lot of words, essentially to say we want NOAA Fisheries to step back like they did with aquaculture earlier and develop a strategic plan for this important area of seafood safety and quality and labeling and all the related issues.

And we have with us today Tim Hansen. He is the director of the National Marine Fisheries Services Seafood Inspection Program and he is going to provide us a status

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

report on the work that has been initiated to develop this strategic plan that we have asked for. So, Tim, the floor is yours.

MR. HANSEN: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As Tom mentioned, we were charged with creating the plan, a strategic plan for 2020 for seafood safety. However, we didn't complete it. And we purposely didn't complete I will give you some reasons for that. will also go over, you know, what we have We have made substantial progress. think we can conclude it very soon. We have a significant reason for wanting to wait. We think that although we want to have a vision for the future, the near term vision is kind of clouded and there are several reasons for And so, the ad hoc group and myself asked the chairman if he wouldn't indulge us with a little time delay. And he graciously granted that Thank request. you, Mr. Chairman.

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, the reason for the delay is really, there is a lot of things going on in the area of food regulation and seafood safety. And something that really kind of obscured the picture kind of on the short term. So, I will go over those very quickly.

First, we have got, Jim mentioned, we have a new administration. that will means we have а NOAA Administrator, perhaps а new Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, maybe not. this, since political appointees do establish priorities, our new senior managers, if you will, may or may not want to make priorities in this area. We just don't know. We hope they do.

Secondly, and this is a real zinger, and many of you may not be aware of this activity but in the 2008 Farm Bill, there is a provision in that bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to include catfish, which means that USDA Food Safety

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Inspection Service becomes a regulatory authority for catfish. So they would be regulating catfish in the same way they would be other food products such as meat, poultry, mostly meat under the Inspection Act.

It also gives them the authority to define what is a catfish. And in 2002 Farm Bill, a catfish was a North American catfish. it seems that the Secretary of And now Agriculture may want to include all catfish. And the reason for that is there is a desire requlate foreign produced catfish, basically from Vietnam who out compete our catfish industry. They want to control export and control the safety of those. I will go into what that entails in just a second.

The Act also would give the opportunity to USDA to regulate all farm-raised fish if they were so petitioned by the industry.

So, eventually this could evolve into anything that has to do with aquaculture

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would have a different regulatory authority than wild caught fish. We don't know if it is going to go there but I have got to tell you that the food safety inspection service is absolutely enthusiastic about the idea. So, they are gearing up for it.

Another thing, another provision is also authorizes the Aq Marketing that it Service, which has the same authority as us but they do everything on a fee-for-service voluntary basis, know, all food you seafood. This commodities except would authorize them to for create а program catfish, a voluntary program.

We have been talking to them and they seem less enthusiastic about this. So, we are going to have a public meeting probably early next year, a joint public meeting in catfish country to sort of cure the concerns of folks down there. Yes, sir?

MR. DEWEY: Tim, on the Farm Bill where it spoke to the ability for FSIS to do

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 | inspection of other fishery products in farm- |
|----|--|
| 2 | raised fish if they are petitioned, who does |
| 3 | that petitioning? |
| 4 | MR. HANSEN: My understanding it |
| 5 | would be the interested industry. So, if the |
| 6 | foul industry in Idaho decided they prefer |
| 7 | USDA regulation versus FDA regulation, |
| 8 | MR. DEWEY: Well, it is not |
| 9 | necessarily some other third party that |
| LO | somehow thinks that |
| 11 | MR. HANSEN: Well, I'm not sure of |
| 12 | that. |
| L3 | MR. DEWEY: thinks that certain |
| L4 | farm-raised fish should be inspected by them. |
| L5 | MR. HANSEN: I'm not sure who has |
| L6 | standing in this case. |
| L7 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: The |
| L8 | Agriculture Department, based on past |
| L9 | questions, would take that into consideration |
| 20 | in making the decision whether to accept a |
| 21 | petition and make a species amenable under the |
| | |

meat act.

MR. DEWEY: But the petition would have to come from the group wanting the inspection versus, or to be inspected versus a third party that would say, this product needs to be inspected by him.

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: There is no hard and fast provision. So, I am sure the Department would factor in a third party involvement in deciding whether to accept the petition or not.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. Well, also the other little zinger here is that this will facilitate USDA authority but didn't take any away from FDA who still thinks they have authority over this commodity.

So, here we are not knowing who -part of our job is to enforce regulatory rules
in the voluntary firms that we inspect. And
whose regulatory rules would be enforced, who
is charge? Would we have some competition
from Ag Marketing who may read a parallel
program to ours for farm-raised fish. So that

NEAL R. GROSS

kind of clouds the picture and we are not sure where all of this is going but it should become clear in the next few months. I believe that Food Safety Inspection Service has to come out with some regulations early this year, in 2009. So, we will get a clearer picture of all of that at that time, perhaps.

On the FDA front, they are implementing something called the Food Protection Plan which, if you are interested, is on the website, which is a whole bunch include food safety things to across board, not just seafood. So, they are going to be changing the way they do business, it would appear. And we may have to sort of adjust our way of doing things, whatever that They are talking about things such as is. applying HACCP to all food groups, charging for re-inspections. There are a whole of things in there that were much different than they were in the past.

Also, they have a pilot, they are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

starting a pilot of third party inspections for aquacultured shrimp. And that is basically, they are trying to see if they can take the results of a third party, like the Seafood Inspection Program, we are going to participate in that, or a private group of food inspections that occur overseas. So, that is a change. We don't know where they are going with that, whether they will be successful or not.

Okay, there is also, there has been a lot of bills in Congress of late. And I would expect the next session, which is apparently a little more Democrat, might have some bills to offer. And one never knows if these things will become law or not. But, there is a likelihood that one might.

And fifth and last, we are currently on a continuing resolution in the government. There is the last 2008 funds are applied to 2009. There is not a lot of extra money rolling around for new ideas, new

NEAL R. GROSS

initiatives and that sort of thing.

But given all of this, and one last thing I have got to say is you asked us if we would be in the consultation with FDA. I mean, Don Kramer was in the room last time, he readily agreed. That has not happened, trying to get FDA to a three day meeting to resolve all of that is like putting toothpaste back in its tube. But I do have a meeting scheduled with him next week. Hopefully, we can get to some of that.

So, with all of this, we think the near term may be a little cloudy but maybe it will clear up. And perhaps we will have a better strategic plan because we will have a clearer vision in a few months than one that is a little more appropriate under the circumstance, given all of the change.

We have made, moving on to what we have done, we have made some good progress on this. We have come up with sort of a rough plan that needs a little more work and I will

go over that with you.

We have three possible visions. Seafood is the safest, most desirable animal protein source. Safe consistent quality and accurately labeled seafood benefits the public. The third one is safe consistent quality, accurately labeled and sustainable seafood benefits public health and the nation's ecosystem.

We are leaning toward the second but the more I read the third, I think I like it. But that is to be hashed out with our ad hoc committee and we will come up with a final vision statement. It will be something like one of those three.

Okay, so we come up with four goals. I will just read them off quickly. Consumer perception and understanding. Science, NOAA science and technology, NOAA's policies, priorities and organization. NOAA's Seafood Inspection and Certification Program.

So just going over these quickly.

Goal One, consumer perception and And the tag line is obtain understanding. optimal health benefits to increase seafood several consumption. Now, there are objectives here, of which take one is to measures to increase consumption to at least 12 ounces per week per person, as recommended by USDA, FDA, and EPA. That is pretty And right now, the American public ambitious. consumes about 16 pounds of seafood per annum. That would push it up to something like 37 to 38 pounds per annum. So that is, that would probably promote health. But it will probably will involve a lot of aquaculture products.

So anyway, objective two, establish international clearinghouse for seafood and health information, dealing with the benefits and risks of seafood consumption. We recognize that there is just lot of information all over the world in different databases and different genres, held by different governmental sources private 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

sources. We would like to see that all come together and be able to use that information maybe a little more fully.

Establish an external seafood advisory panel to help set priorities on seafood health research. A seafood safety program can provide input for the development of dietary recommendations.

Objective four would be establish public information and outreach. We have our Fishwatch. We would like to enhance that a little more to a lot of different programs and ways to communicate risk and benefit to the public.

Support research and development of analytical capabilities. Identify nutritionally beneficial components of fish and shellfish and develop tools for consumers to subscribe, an interactive decision to support programs.

If you belong to Kaiser Permanente, they have some wonderful things on their

NEAL R. GROSS

website and you see them around on WebMD and so forth. We would like to develop a few more specifically associated with seafood consumption.

The second goal, NOAA's policies, priorities and organization. And the tagline is NOAA issues new guidance to improve coordination of programs and research in support of an adequate seafood supply, and product quality, safety, and labeling.

Okay, a bunch of objectives here. We have become, NOAA has become a leader in development of national and international seafood safety policy. seafood We want inspection and NOAA enforcement would ensure that most products in the marketplace were accurately labeled, met seafood standards, safety standards. And we would like to add an objective to NOAA's strategic plan regarding the importance of seafood and health for the economy of the nation or make safety and consistent quality of the seafood a priority.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Redirect some of what we call Product Quality and Safety appropriations we get specifically for this purpose toward improving the nation's health and commerce through seafood safety.

Redirect Saltonstall-Kennedy some appropriations, which are a grant program that National Marine Fisheries has towards seafood safety issues. Improve data management through NOAA that could be used for seafood safety. The Seafood Inspection Program does not have a database system. That would be part of the thing. So, you would something with that kind of reach. New certifications, be able to track trends and maybe do some management stuff.

Play a larger role in international fora, such as Organization of International Epizootics, which is animal disease, Codex, which is international food safety, a food standards body, and various methods, contaminant, nutrition, et cetera.

Going on to the third is NOAA

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 | Science and Technology. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. DEWEY: Tim, do you want us to |
| 3 | interrupt you with questions? |
| 4 | MR. HANSEN: Absolutely. |
| 5 | MR. DEWEY: So, from a food safety |
| 6 | standpoint, I guess I am curious why more of |
| 7 | an involvement with OIE. That is more animal |
| 8 | health than it is anything else, isn't it? |
| 9 | MR. HANSEN: Yes. But that is an |
| 10 | international organization that deserves our |
| 11 | support, I think is what our scientists are |
| 12 | saying. |
| 13 | MR. DEWEY: I don't disagree with |
| 14 | that. I just couldn't see the link to the |
| 15 | food safety. |
| 16 | MR. HANSEN: Okay. Anything else? |
| 17 | The third goal is science and |
| 18 | technology. Some of the objectives are |
| 19 | offered. NOAA will survey its science to |
| 20 | identify both its current capabilities and |
| 21 | capacities. NOAA will take steps to better |
| 22 | coordinate internally with other agencies on |

science and technology matters. NOAA will attain equivalence with other laboratories, both domestic and international through ISO 17025 certification, provide science support to international standards setting bodies. Again, Codex, ISO, ISSC. NOAA will conduct seafood contaminant surveillance pharmaceuticals, pathogens, biotoxins, environmental contaminants. NOAA will conduct research to help modernize methods contamination detection. will And NOAA develop the capacity to provide scientific data to risk assessors or risk managers for emerging seafood safety data and will conduct seafood risk assessment.

The fourth goal is seafood inspection and certification. The seafood inspection group was lucky enough two weeks before we got together to develop this. We had our own strategic planning session and we came up with about 20 objectives. I will not go through all of them because they are kind

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 down in the weeds for you guys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But the tagline is NOAA increases its inspection, certification and compliance verification capability in response to consumer industry needs, and international trade requirements.

So there is three general, I will just kind of characterize this. We want to increase capacity of Seafood Inspection by creation of a management database, rewriting the regulations, improved inspector enhancement, inspector training. We want to take measures to promote the cooperation and collaboration with federal, state, and international food safety organizations, such as updating MOU with FDA, and creating an MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, sorry, with the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service and, ultimately, Food Safety Inspection Service. It looks like we will be dealing with them on catfish farms.

Third, we will provide programs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 that satisfy the needs of industry and the consumer, such as creating a joint program with Fisheries Enforcement and FDA can address economic fraud issues in seafood, expanding auditing services, possibly eco-labeling services, if necessary, and new and modernized U.S. standards for grades of fish and fishery products.

So that is kind of where we are. I think two of these four goal areas are pretty well complete. I think they need one more makeover. Two of them probably need some more work and we should have this done in six months. Any questions on it?

MR. DEWEY: On that last point, you talked about eco-labeling services, if And that is obviously something necessary. MAFAC has taken up and talked about in some detail. And my thinking was the direction was not. I mean, so it says eco-labeling services. Does this mean to be able to respond to non-profit eco-label?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | MR. HANSEN: Well, there is kind of |
|----|--|
| 2 | let me tell you kind of what is going on |
| 3 | here. Obviously, there is a non-profit |
| 4 | MS. McCARTY: Can you talk a little |
| 5 | louder? We can't hear you down on this end. |
| 6 | MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I'll speak |
| 7 | up. |
| 8 | There is MSC, the eco-label private |
| 9 | group party organizations that have kind of |
| 10 | taken the lead on this thing. I think the |
| 11 | thought was that maybe in some way possible, |
| 12 | maybe government ought to step up in some way. |
| 13 | That, I don't think, is going to be decided |
| 14 | by the Agency. But there is also a lot going |
| 15 | on. I was in Europe last week to talk about |
| 16 | new requirements by the European Commission to |
| 17 | require every shipment to have a so-called |
| 18 | catch certificate that shows essentially that |
| 19 | the product or the shift in the consignment |
| 20 | was caught legal and this applies to wild- |
| 21 | caught fish. |

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. DEWEY: I know we are going to

| 1 | get into the eco-labeling discussion a little |
|----|--|
| 2 | bit more again later. But I guess I was a |
| 3 | little bit concerned seeing it in there about |
| 4 | increasing services when, at least the |
| 5 | direction so far from MAFAC is not to go down |
| 6 | this path. |
| 7 | MR. HANSEN: Another reason to not |
| 8 | finalize this thing because we haven't got a |
| 9 | final decision by the Agency. |
| 10 | Yes, Heather. |
| 11 | MS. McCARTY: Tim, I guess I am a |
| 12 | little confused as to exactly where we are |
| 13 | with this and what you are expecting from |
| 14 | MAFAC and I guess I am asking this to Tom as |
| 15 | well. |
| 16 | I think if we are going to talk |
| 17 | about it here, we obviously need to have it in |
| 18 | front of us in some way. Maybe I missed it. |
| 19 | Maybe it has been sent out. |
| 20 | MR. HANSEN: Yes, well, I had |
| 21 | provided a three-page summary. |
| 22 | DR. HOLLIDAY: What Tim presented |

| 1 | is on the website but the strategic plan is |
|----|---|
| 2 | not. But that is the point of his |
| 3 | presentation. It is not ready to be reviewed |
| 4 | by MAFAC. |
| 5 | MS. McCARTY: Oh, okay. |
| 6 | DR. HOLLIDAY: His opening remarks |
| 7 | focused on the request for delaying delivery |
| 8 | of that until these other factors were |
| 9 | considered and the draft was completed to the |
| 10 | point of being circulated for comment. |
| 11 | MS. McCARTY: So we are not |
| 12 | expecting, a this meeting, to comment on this |
| 13 | plan at all? |
| 14 | DR. HOLLIDAY: No. It has not been |
| 15 | provided for you to comment on. |
| 16 | MS. McCARTY: Okay. |
| 17 | MR. HANSEN: The ball is on our |
| 18 | court, basically. |
| 19 | MS. McCARTY: I was just wondering. |
| 20 | Thanks. |
| 21 | MR. BILLY: Dorothy? |
| 22 | MS. LOWMAN: Well, I think there is |

a little bit of a chicken and an egg thing though for me. Because you said well, we don't know what the administration, the incoming administration's priorities might be and there is some confusion about who has what authority. But that also could be seen as an opportunity to try to provide some clarity and really get, you know, a heads up, which I would hope that you would take.

MR. HANSEN: Hopefully, we will have some opportunities to --

My understanding is MR. BILLY: that MAFAC has spoken clearly asking that the Agency develop a strategic plan that covers the areas I read earlier. And that process is under way. Tim is here today to sort of give us a status report and a little flavor of their current thinking, the options, the possibilities, the scope of the strategic the interfaces that plan, all he has identified that they need to have to make this work.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But once there is a draft strategic plan, I assume then it will go through an Agency process and when it is accepted by the Agency as a draft, it will then come to the committee like the aquaculture plan did for our full consideration and input. And then the Agency would consider that input in finalizing this strategic plan.

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I guess want to quibble with you wording saying the Agency would accept it and then send it out to I think we would review it though. wouldn't be accepted until we get the public input on it, which this would be the most important part but there would be other opportunities for the public as well. that, I'm worried about whether than we accepted it and what came out --

MR. BILLY: Yes. Okay. Are there other general questions? Specific?

MR. GILMORE: Just a little bit off of the topic but going off of something 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

Tim said about being in the EU last week. We have been very interested in the North Pacific about these import certifications that will be required in the beginning of 2010, I guess. But can you give us some clue as to where it is heading in terms of --

MR. HANSEN: Yes, well, it was a positive meeting. The EU-EC officials, first of all, said, look, we are not targeting the United States. We don't think there is much illegal fishing, unregulated fishing going on there. We have all these measures in place, these fisheries management plans, all the states who are doing their work and so forth and we are not really concerned.

Our big concern going in was that, I don't know if you have seen the draft catch certificate, but there was a lot of very specific information that would be very hard to track to be able to attest to, shall we say. They are willing to give us, what do they call it? They had a term of art, a

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | ministry arrangement where they would just |
|----|--|
| 2 | accept our system. We wouldn't have to sign |
| 3 | that in order to be certificated. You would |
| 4 | still have to sign the certificate but it |
| 5 | would be much simpler. |
| 6 | MR. GILMORE: Would it be combined |
| 7 | with the health certificate? |
| 8 | MR. HANSEN: We asked that. They |
| 9 | are not being real hopeful because DGRA and DG |
| 10 | SANCO, the two, one is the health and one is |
| 11 | the fisheries people, apparently don't mesh |
| 12 | that well. So, it would have to be up to |
| 13 | SANCO to allow that. And apparently, they |
| 14 | turned down other, some developing countries |
| 15 | just on that point. |
| 16 | So, it looks like we are probably |
| 17 | going to sign a separate certificate. It will |
| 18 | be a simplified certificate, maybe having |
| 19 | information about the consignment and so forth |
| 20 | that you see on the health certificate. |
| 21 | So, we are very hopeful that, this |

seems very doable. We show some of the fish

tickets and how we track things and what our qualities are, you know, as far as digitally what we have for databases. And they were pretty impressed. And moreover, they said, well, they might, you know, if there was some irregularity they would want us to follow up on it and we would have to figure out the information some how. And it wouldn't be like in the food safety world where they would come and do an audit, which is if you know anything of the food safety audits with us and FDA have been very painful. So, it would be very simplified.

So, we came away feeling like, you know, this is a pretty doable thing. We are going to have to organize ourselves a little better to figure out how to do it. I would think Seafood Inspection would issue a certificates for a small fee and that would enable the consignment to go to Europe.

MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. That would be NMFS Seafood Inspection Program that

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | we should |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. HANSEN: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. GILMORE: Thank you. |
| 4 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Tim, somebody |
| 5 | from the European Community was at the tuna |
| 6 | meetings in San Diego last week. You said |
| 7 | that the regulations have just been passed, or |
| 8 | approved, or whatever within the last couple |
| 9 | of weeks. |
| 10 | MR. HANSEN: Yes. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: And so, there |
| 12 | should be some language out there that we |
| 13 | could look at to see exactly what it says and |
| 14 | if they have decided to enforce it by an |
| 15 | administrative thing, maybe that trumps some |
| 16 | of the language that might be there. But they |
| 17 | promised to send it to us. |
| 18 | MR. HANSEN: I brought it with me |
| 19 | because it was in my briefcase from the last |
| 20 | trip If anybody wants to see what the |

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR

BALSIGER:

21

22

regulation looks like.

VICE

But

| 1 | apparently it just adopted them. So, it might |
|----|--|
| 2 | be interesting to get the very final last one |
| 3 | that they approved after any amendments or |
| 4 | changes might be made. |
| 5 | MR. BILLY: Maybe that could be |
| 6 | circulated to the committee. |
| 7 | MR. HANSEN: Sure. |
| 8 | MR. BILLY: Anyone interested? |
| 9 | MR. HANSEN: I would be more than |
| 10 | happy to provide that to anybody who wants to |
| 11 | gaze at a couple hundred pages of regulation. |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: Any other questions? |
| 13 | Okay, Tim, one last question from me. |
| 14 | You know, we haven't scheduled our |
| 15 | next meeting but it is possible it could be as |
| 16 | early as in the springtime. And if that is |
| 17 | the case, do you anticipate that you will be |
| 18 | in a position where you will be able to share |
| 19 | a full draft of the strategic plan by then? |
| 20 | MR. HANSEN: I think we are not |
| 21 | that far off, essentially. It is just a |
| 22 | couple of the goal areas, I think, needs some |

| 1 | rework. A couple, like I said, a couple of |
|----|--|
| 2 | them are in pretty good shape. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Okay. So, the answer |
| 4 | is yes. Okay. Any other questions? Okay. |
| 5 | All right, thank you very much. |
| 6 | Now, our lunch break. Let me give |
| 7 | it to Mark for any administrative |
| 8 | announcements. |
| 9 | DR. HOLLIDAY: So, we are going to |
| 10 | break for lunch. We have four recommendations |
| 11 | from the concierge in terms of places you |
| 12 | might want to check out. We asked for some |
| 13 | places that would be quick and nearby. |
| 14 | Deanies, from the front entrance, it is a |
| 15 | seafood place, two blocks to the right. Out |
| 16 | the front door, two blocks to your right. |
| 17 | Go out the front door from the |
| 18 | entrance, two blocks to the left, Johnny's Po' |
| 19 | Boys for sandwiches. Pretty good? We got a |
| 20 | thumbs up from Larry for that. |
| 21 | And the same direction, same as the |
| 22 | above, Petunia's. They have everything, |

| 1 | including breakfast until 3:00, just in case |
|----|--|
| 2 | you are wondering for tomorrow night or |
| 3 | tomorrow morning. |
| 4 | And Bourbon House. Left then right |
| 5 | one block. They have a Creole menu. |
| 6 | Or there is the restaurant here in |
| 7 | the hotel. So, find some place reasonably |
| 8 | quick. We will be back here at 1:00 to start |
| 9 | |
| 10 | MR. DiLERNIA: Mark, is this room |
| 11 | going to be secured? Can we leave the laptops |
| 12 | here or should we take them back to our rooms? |
| 13 | Are they going to lock up here? |
| 14 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, the doors |
| 15 | don't really lock that well. |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: Okay, see you at 1:00. |
| 17 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off |
| 18 | the record at 11:57 a.m. and |
| 19 | resumed at 1:39 p.m.) |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

MR. BILLY: We'll get started This afternoon we are going to focus, as I mentioned earlier, on the subcommittee and working group activities. The committee has found over the years that it is easier to focus in on a particular issue in a smaller setting and consider the issue, input from staff as appropriate, then bring a recommendation, a draft recommendation to the full committee. Among other things, I believe it allows a little more focus and it also allows us to have a series of subcommittee meetings simultaneously, so we can cover more ground and provide а broader of array recommendations to NOAA Fisheries.

As you see here from the agenda, we have a variety of standing subcommittees.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

| 1 | MR. JONER: It looks like we have |
|----|--|
| 2 | some sitting ones, too right here. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: It almost looks like he |
| 4 | is fishing. |
| 5 | MR. BILLY: The idea is to |
| 6 | introduce the new members to the work that the |
| 7 | subcommittees have recently been involved in, |
| 8 | as well as to open the door to potential new |
| 9 | projects or issues that the subcommittees may |
| LO | want to take up over the next year or two. |
| 11 | So with that, I will first call on |
| L2 | Jim Gilmore to tell us a little bit about this |
| L3 | Strategic Planning, Budget and Program |
| L4 | Management Subcommittee. Jim? |
| L5 | MR. GILMORE: Thanks, Tom. Yes, |
| L6 | the name of the committee is pretty specific |
| L7 | and so, fairly indicative of the types of |
| L8 | things that we have tried to get involved in |
| L9 | with with the subcommittee. And I think this |
| 20 | has come out of members' experiences on the |
| 21 | committee, where we have tried to figure out |
| | |

how we can be the most helpful to the Agency,

be relevant with a committee that is meeting, at most, twice a year. And we would find getting ourselves peek at а а proposed regulation three weeks before it is going to be issued for comment and saying, oh, we have this comment, and this comment, and this And the response is, well, we have been working on this for two years and you have seen it. And thanks for your input and we look forward to what the public comment is going to that going to be we are receiving in three weeks on it. So, we are trying to figure out some way to be a little bit more proactive.

The budget is another good example of where the Agency is working on the current fiscal year and they are already budgeting for the next year and beyond. And so I am not sure that we have accomplished the objective that we have set out but that was at least my recollection of why we picked this subject area as an area to focus on to try to get some

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | advice to the Agency and help them in their |
|----|---|
| 2 | policy development before the general public |
| 3 | gets through it. |
| 4 | And I will say that I missed the |
| 5 | meeting where I was made the chairman of the |
| 6 | subcommittee. And so there could very well be |
| 7 | other agendas at work here for what is going |
| 8 | on. And |
| 9 | MR. DEWEY: Let that be a lesson to |
| 10 | newcomers. |
| 11 | MR. GILMORE: That's right. Good |
| 12 | attendance has its rewards. |
| 13 | But I looked up the subcommittee |
| 14 | membership just before this meeting. And what |
| 15 | I found on the website was a little out of |
| 16 | date. Some of the former members like Pete |
| 17 | Leipzig of MAFAC were still listed on there. |
| 18 | And so I don't have the current membership |
| 19 | roster but |
| 20 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well that is the |
| 21 | current membership. |
| 22 | MR. GILMORE: Oh, it is. Okay. |

DR. HOLLIDAY: I mean, I did that intentionally because I wanted the people to realize that was the committee standing as of the July meeting and then the people who have rolled off and who obviously we would consider replacing them or adding to it. There is no other listing other than that one as our official list.

MR. GILMORE: But I quess my, you know, in looking over who is formally on the committee, the reason I went and looked it up, frankly, is because we have had such diverse participation in the subcommittee meetings that, to me, I really do just consider all the members of MAFAC to be members of subcommittee. Generally, what we have done is set aside a block in the afternoon for the subcommittees to meet, sometimes necessarily overlapping in what they are doing and people go where their interests are. So, we just have a number of folks who have come in to various projects that interest them. And 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

would encourage the new members, you know, not to look too much at the organizational boxes but take advantage of your MAFAC membership to do that.

I guess one other point I would make, and let me just say while I might have been appointed chairman in absentia, I am not quite sure -- I am part of that class of four who have just been reappointed for a single year after the termination of our three-year term. And so my guess is I am probably only here for one more MAFAC meeting. Whatever we do in the spring or early summer. And so, I would just say that I know we have some committee members who aren't here at this meeting. So, they would be good targets to take over the subcommittee. We have at least four, I think, potential chairmen there from those who can't defend themselves. But also, I would suggest others.

If we are going to get into -- I would say right now we are not halfway through

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

anything. We can talk for a few minutes about this transition document that we worked on at the last meeting and through to this meeting. But now might be a good time, also, to change the chairmanship of that so that you would be going forward beyond just the next meeting with a new chairman. That would make sense to me, I think.

I would like to speak MR. BILLY: Jim and I talked this morning and our thinking was that maybe we would, continuity reasons, we would continue with the same chairs of the subcommittees through the next meeting but invite the current members to consider whether they would be interested in becoming a chair of one of the subcommittees indicate to Mark before the next and SO And then Jim and others can decide meeting. how they want to pursue identifying the new chairs of the committees. It will give a chance for the new members to have this week's experience plus another meeting and we can fit

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that into the schedule.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I think all of us, now that I am the committee liaison, I would like to be duties for relieved of my the Commerce Subcommittee. Jim indicated, As he is short-timer and I think all of the others are we'll provide people as well. So, opportunity to get more familiar with the work of the subcommittees and consider whether they want to spend additional time, it is not a lot, but some additional time involved in the So, we will sort of take care work of MAFAC. of that at the next meeting. Does anyone object to that?

Okay, good. Okay, Jim.

MR. GILMORE: I notice on our schedule that tomorrow morning from 11:00 to noon we are scheduled to discuss the Vision 2020 document and the transition reports. So, I don't know how much you want to get into that right now. But I guess I would just at least start by highlighting for folks that

NEAL R. GROSS

MAFAC did look at this current transition as an opportunity to get its oar in the water. We prepared a transition memo. It is on the website. And so I hope everybody has had a chance to see it. I will just run through it very briefly for those who haven't seen it.

We pulled out, essentially, three emphasize with the issues to incoming administration. One building off was tiering off of the Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization and the catch limits and catch landmark accountability measure, those provisions that are a part of the, a big part of the buy-in for users is going to be knowing that the stock assessment work is there in the setting of the catch limits, so we don't just keep having the fights that we often have in various parts of the country that, well, the science is, in fact, how can you pick that number.

So, we wanted to highlight for the incoming administration that there does need

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 be a financial commitment made to enhance stock assessments around the country, so that we can smooth this transition to the catch limits and catch monitoring requirements.

We emphasize the LAP provisions in the reauthorization as well. Again, kind of tiering off of the annual catch limit language to say that we are really bullish on going beyond that individual and to catch accountability, we need adequate funding, again, for those line items. And we emphasis what the FY09 number was proposed at and also the issue of cost-effective implementation of whether that using outside LAPs, means observers or agency observers. Whether it is a private sector or a public sector approach, let's find the most cost effective way of operating these LAPs programs.

And in the issue of IUU fishing, again, a huge area of emphasis in the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization. And we wanted to highlight again that this a big

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mandate from Congress. It is an important mandate but it needs to be supported by the incoming administration.

So, we lay out those three broad issue areas and then we talk about aquaculture development, climate change. I am just rereading this this morning and thinking that I am not sure that we have got the word ecosystem base management in there. So, maybe I would like to tinker with that at some point and recreational fisheries.

So, I think this holds up pretty well as a document. And it is, I officially submitted. Mark had pointed out would have had to do a Federal we Register notice in order to get a formal vote of the committee to meet to adopt this, even by teleconference. So, we sent basically, and said, unless hear we an objection, we are moving forward. And so this has been formally submitted to the Department. And whether we talk about it now or tomorrow,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think the issue is what is next with the 1 2 transition team on this. That's it for me. 3 4 MR. BILLY: Any questions, 5 comments? No? Oh, okay. Well, are we going MR. FLETCHER: 6 7 to talk about it now or are we going to talk about it tomorrow? 8 MR. BILLY: I think I would like to 9 defer to tomorrow, if we can. 10 I mean, if there is a general question or comment but we 11 will get into the substance tomorrow. 12 13 DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, I think for today's purpose, we were trying to explore 14 15 what ideas beyond what the -- we wanted to 16 provide information on what the committee has been working on to date and then brainstorm 17 some ideas about what the committee could be 18 19 working on over the next 12 months, what hot topics would be of concern 20 or strategic planning, budgeting and policies, 21

as

at

those down on paper

put

22

least

| prospectus of a draft working agenda for the |
|--|
| next year. And that would then inform people, |
| okay, that committee is going to be working on |
| these issues. I would like to work on those |
| issues and I would like to put my name in to |
| be a member of that committee, even if we have |
| there is always opportunities for people to |
| attend subcommittee meetings, even if they are |
| not officially a member, as Jim pointed out |
| but we wanted to have a core group of people |
| who has some affinity for that. And that was |
| another of the objectives for this discussion |
| this afternoon of organizing the |
| subcommittees, both its membership and its |
| sort of working agenda for the next year, what |
| issues do you think would be on the table that |
| would fall under these different categories. |
| And that would help us in the staff support to |
| provide research or an analysis or speakers, |
| or help formulate agendas for future meetings |
| if we had some sense of where the different |
| subcommittees wanted to go, we could then be |

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | more active in providing that kind of support. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: Okay. All right, the |
| 3 | next one is the Commerce |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm sorry. |
| 5 | MR. BILLY: So having said that |
| 6 | DR. HOLLIDAY: In terms of process, |
| 7 | you can go through each one of these and come |
| 8 | back to membership and topics or do them |
| 9 | sequentially. But I just don't want to lose |
| 10 | that as one of the objectives. |
| 11 | MS. McCARTY: The chairman was just |
| 12 | thinking he got back on schedule real quick. |
| 13 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, that is why |
| 14 | there is so much time allocated. It was more |
| 15 | than just a report on |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: My thought was to |
| 17 | circle back after we do, particularly the new |
| 18 | members have a better sense of each of the |
| 19 | subcommittees. Plus, I know you have a |
| 20 | handout that we will make available as well in |
| 21 | a few minutes. |
| 22 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay. Just checking |

in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: The Commerce Subcommittee, by its title again, has a very broad mandate. Anything to do with business matters, consumers, economics in the macrosense that relate to fisheries both commercial, recreational fisheries matters that can be taken up by the Commerce Subcommittee.

And currently, you heard one of the items that we are dealing with, which is the seafood safety quality and labeling, which for a variety of reasons in the last year or two, it has come up on the radar screen of the Agency and, based on discussions we had at the subcommittee and then the full committee level, we have asked now for the strategic plan that you heard sort of a rough outline of.

The committee dealt extensively with aquaculture over the last two or three years and as a result of those discussions and

NEAL R. GROSS

considerations asked the Agency to develop a strategic plan which led to what is called the Ten Year Plan, which has since been adopted by the Agency after a public comment and input process and is now guiding the activities of NOAA Fisheries in the area of aquaculture.

Eco-labeling is another matter that has come up. We first were briefed by Mark and others on what currently is going on nationally and internationally. We learned a lot about some of the strategies that are being pursued by the food and agricultural organization of the United Nations, FAO, as well as some of the NGOs in this area. And had several in-depth discussions about this in deciding what, if anything, this committee might recommend to NOAA Fisheries about that. That is an ongoing area of consideration and it is on the agenda again later.

We have provided a lot of input to the 2020 document, particularly in the area of supply and demand considerations as it relates

NEAL R. GROSS

to seafood. Looking at not only what currently is the economic picture for the seafood business but what it looks like 10, 20, 30 years out, based on information that is available from various sources. And based on that, provided input to the drafters of the 2020 report.

And then finally, technology. New technology, the need for technology as it would relate to fisheries, and providing advice and input into that broad area as well.

the So, those of are some discussions that the committee and focused subcommittee has Like Jim on. described, while there is a set membership, there has been a wide variety of committee members that have participated, depending on what we happened to be dealing with at a particular MAFAC meeting.

I would be happy to answer any questions anyone might have. It is a very broad subject area and it has been quite 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

active subcommittee, at least in the three years that I have been on MAFAC.

Yes, Tony?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DiLERNIA: Mr. Chairman, not directly related to subcommittee, the but while we are on the topic of reviewing the subcommittee structures that we have, I recall that when I was first appointed six years ago, different there subcommittees with were different working groups at the time. And that during my six-year membership here, I have watched the subcommittees and the working groups evolve and change in response to issues that have come up with the needs that the Agency has had.

this And insomuch is as an information session for our new members, would ask that perhaps we should all keep that in mind, that while these subcommittees currently exist, there is nothing etched in stone and that we could always form with new members or if senior members see a need for a

NEAL R. GROSS

different subcommittee, we could create it.

And possibly, if the members of our current committee don't see a need for the continuation of the committee to dissolve that committee and move on to others.

I imagine that is still the same process that we follow. I just wanted to reiterate that for our new members to keep that in mind.

MR. BILLY: Yes, in fact, as sort of a working guidance, a working group is thought of as a good approach for something that is going to be very finite, going to get into something, we will be involved for two or three years, whatever it is, and then it will end, as compared to a standing subcommittee that is open-ended and there will continuously be issues that should be considered by the subcommittee. Just as a sort of a general rule of thumb.

Any other questions about the Commerce Subcommittee? Okay. I'm just going

NEAL R. GROSS

to keep moving. I know we are a little ahead of schedule but we are going to come back to some recommendations or considerations for topics after we work through this initial discussion.

The Recreational Fisheries Working Group is headed by Bob Fletcher. Why don't you --

MR. FLETCHER: Yes, just to kind of spring off what you said about working groups maybe for a finite period, I wanted to point out that the Recreational Fisheries Working Group was created as a result of changes to the Magnuson Act that required the nation to do a better job of counting all recreational fishermen, upgrading what was a broken system of the infamous MRFS, Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey.

We began by looking at how the Agency would be implementing the new requirements as a result of Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization. And we are now in the kind

NEAL R. GROSS

of the tail end of that in that the registry will be, the process will be implemented in January but I doubt very much if regulations requiring the registry of all anglers for those states that are not able to get an exemption, I don't think that will be up and running right away. But I think that in January, the Agency will begin the process of encouraging those states to recognize that the time has come and that they will be bringing those states online hopefully in the near future.

I think the working group felt very strongly that upgrading the collection of recreational fisheries data was critical as well as upgrading the nation's ability to count how many anglers are out there. We need to know how many recreational fishermen are impacting the resources and we don't have a really good number as of right now. So that is really why the working group is up and running and, I think, there will be a real

NEAL R. GROSS

need for a meeting of that working group.

At the next meeting, there will be a real value to bringing John Boreman back so that the new members can listen to John, who has really been the key for the Agency in pulling together a lot of disparate elements into this new process. And I want to give John Boreman a lot of credit for all of the work he has done and all of the work that has been done by a lot of state representatives, federal representatives as they try to get this system running better.

Now, having said that, there are a few issues that continue out there and one of those is very much affecting the West Coast in that it has been kind of ahead of the curve in counting the anglers and getting better catch information. And I hear, and I am very hopeful, that there will be some funds made available to assist the West Coast in doing even a better job. Because up to now, most of the focus has been on pilot programs in areas

NEAL R. GROSS

where information isn't quite at the level that we have the West Coast, on especially in the last few years, California has gone away from **MRFSS** and created a little bit upgraded system that they call the California Recreational Fisheries Survey.

But I know there are some people that are interested in recreational fisheries that have just joined and I encourage them, Patty, to put their names forward. I think that the committee at least has a need to meet again at the next meeting to get a report on the implementation of what they call MRIP Marine Recreational Information Program.

Beyond the next meeting, I think that would be an interesting discussion as to whether or not there continues to be a need. It has been a timely group and there has been some good discussion and I think some good direction provided. And I will give huge kudos to the three executive directors of 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 | Marine Fisheries Commission because they have |
|----|---|
| 2 | been involved very directly and their staffs |
| 3 | in assisting NMFS in the right direction in |
| 4 | bringing people onboard and getting them into |
| 5 | subcommittees and where there is working |
| 6 | groups of their won that do a good job of, I |
| 7 | think, to meet the directive of the Magnuson- |
| 8 | Stevens reauthorization. |
| 9 | So, I look forward to being here |
| 10 | through next spring and then someone else can |
| 11 | pick up the baton, if that is something that |
| 12 | needs to be done. But I think that, we talked |
| 13 | about the difference between a subcommittee |
| 14 | and a working group and I think this was a |
| 15 | very good example of that. So, I will be |
| 16 | happy to answer any questions, Tom. |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Any questions or |
| 18 | comments? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Of the three |
| 20 | commissions, which one did the hardest work? |
| 21 | Probably Randy or |

FLETCHER:

22

Well, since I work

| 1 | for him, I will have to say that by far and |
|----|--|
| 2 | away. |
| 3 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Just a point of |
| 4 | information for those who hadn't heard, Dr. |
| 5 | Boreman has announced his retirement effective |
| 6 | this December. So we won't have him to kick |
| 7 | around anymore. |
| 8 | MR. FLETCHER: Oh, no. Maybe we |
| 9 | will get Bonnie to step up. Is she still |
| 10 | there? Well, Bonnie is the current director |
| 11 | the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in |
| 12 | Miami. So, she has stepped up to |
| 13 | directorship. |
| 14 | MR. FLETCHER: Well, we have got |
| 15 | Gordon Colvin and |
| 16 | DR. HOLLIDAY: There will be people |
| 17 | who can do that, I was just |
| 18 | MR. FLETCHER: There will be people |
| 19 | that can do that. That's too bad. John did a |
| 20 | good job. |
| 21 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. |
| 22 | MR. O'SHEA: Just out of curiosity |

| 1 | then, there are really two issues. One, the |
|----|--|
| 2 | big issue is filling that position. But then |
| 3 | the other is, it seems to me, time critical, |
| 4 | is honcho and the MRIP. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: John |
| 6 | Boreman's position, we have advertised that |
| 7 | and maybe the position is even closed already. |
| 8 | We are trying to get some overlap. But if it |
| 9 | hasn't closed, it is going to close very |
| 10 | shortly. We hope to find someone, somebody |
| 11 | who will be, he or she will be here for the |
| 12 | last month. |
| 13 | MR. O'SHEA: So those two |
| 14 | responsibilities, you are looking at covering |
| 15 | them simultaneously, hopefully. Meaning not |
| 16 | is it Director of S&T but the MRIP director or |
| 17 | whatever you call it, project leader. |
| 18 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Yes, I guess |
| 19 | it is not entirely clear that whoever we hire, |
| | I control of the cont |

NEAL R. GROSS

and I am not sure the hiring process will go

fast enough to overlap with John but that was

the original plan. But whoever we hire may

20

21

have a particular set of skills that aren't lined up very well with MRIP and we may give that assignment elsewhere. Until that, we will be falling under the S&T head and we will make sure that that -- we are paying attention to this. So, we will make sure that we don't lose track.

MR. O'SHEA: Right. Thanks.

MR. BILLY: Comments, questions?

Okay, Bob, you have the floor again.

MR. FLETCHER: Yes, this [Protected Resources Subcommittee] has been a real easy job because we haven't had That may change though. And this is meeting. interesting time for going to be an subcommittee because with the change in administrations, there may be interest for us again in bringing this up. I think it is really past due that we have come back and taken another look at who operates the Marine Mammal Protection Act. I got sucked -- I was given 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

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

FLETCHER: -- because of my MR. longstanding and somewhat outspoken belief that there needs to be some recognition that while many, many marine mammal stocks still in need of protection, there are a few who have done a great job of recovering after the act was passed. And California sea lions are the case in point. And we on the West Coast continue to struggle. And the Act really doesn't address the problem of robust mammals populations of marine and the interactions that they have in so many areas. And so from my perspective, and to a great extent, the West Coast perspective, is that we need to begin to consider ways to improve the act and recognize the successes that have resulted from the Act's protections.

Now having said that, I know there a lot of you here who are also in areas where there is significant concerns and that there are populations that are in decline. Right

NEAL R. GROSS

whales is a classic example of a terribly threatened endangered population.

So, I think all of this needs to be looked at in the context of reauthorization of the MMPA. So, the next group of MAFAC members that choose to get involved in this, I think, need to be ready to provide some guidance to the agency and, as they begin to develop a position on reauthorization.

There have been a number of bills introduced and they have gone nowhere. And some of them I thought were pretty reasonably good looking. And I hope that under this new administration and this new Congress that they seriously begin to look at that, even though it is a terribly contentious issue, I am hopeful.

So, while the subcommittee has not been active in the last few years, mainly because every time we get an update on legislation, it is to hear about the latest bill dying. I think perhaps, and I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

know, I would be interested to hear, Jim, if you have any senses about whether or not this might become a serious issue in the next Congress.

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I quess we are all waiting to see what the new Congress is about with the new administration and what their priorities will be. I expect not the first bill they look at will be the Marine Mammal Protection Act. But NOAA identified this as one of our legislative priorities for the new Congress was to get the Marine Mammal Protection Act reauthorized. There is a number of issues with it and, as you have said, there has been several draft bills in the past. It isn't clear that they will start with any of those. And so this may be a very important time to start looking at what some of those issues are.

And I am not sure that the greatest focus is on dealing with those marine mammals that have become nuisances, you know, overgrow

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 their numbers. So, if that is the big 1 2 issue to MAFAC, I think paying attention to that is important. 3 There are other issues about what 4 our species under endangered species act and 5 how they relate the Marine Mammal Protection 6 7 Act and a few things like that. It will probably look forward to getting advice from 8 this committee. 9 10 MR. BILLY: Cathy. MS. FOY: I would like to put the 11 scientific permitting process on the table, 12 13 too. We can't hear you, 14 MR. BILLY: 15 Cathy. 16 MS. FOY: The scientific permitting process, I would like to see that discussed at 17 some point. Mike Payne has come a long way. 18 19 I don't know that, given the intricacy of the way two acts work together, ENC and MMPA, it 20 is a long drawn out process and it is really 21

22

difficult to --

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: That's an interesting point.

MS. FOY: -- conduct good science.

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: The division permitting of protected our resources, the permitting section, I'm not sure what the right word is, the Protected Division is beleaquered on both Resources sides, of course. And they try to keep us out of lawsuits and they try to sort of negotiate with both parties, as they get permits. agree with you. It's a problem. So, I don't know whether this whole committee would want to hear it but if we have a subcommittee that is interested in that aspect, it might pay to have Mike Payne talk to the subcommittee and you could understand what some of the issues Not so all 20 of us wouldn't have to sit around and hear but if there are a half a in dozen that are interested that specifically, and I can understand why you That would be a good starting point would be.

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 | to get something together for the committee. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FLETCHER: Just one comment. |
| 3 | If this is the direction that we choose to go, |
| 4 | I would suggest that perhaps you offer the |
| 5 | opportunity to several groups in different |
| 6 | areas who have faced the same issues and maybe |
| 7 | get a representative of a couple of those to |
| 8 | come to be involved with the Agency to talk |
| 9 | about it. Because it is not just Catherine's |
| 10 | area that is a problem. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: You're talking |
| 12 | about geographic area? |
| 13 | MR. FISHER: Yes. |
| 14 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I wonder if - |
| 15 | - there still may be a way to do it if MAFAC |
| 16 | wanted to, is to facilitate such a meeting |
| 17 | around the country and focus it and bring it |
| 18 | to |
| 19 | MR. FLETCHER: I think that's a |
| 20 | great idea. |
| 21 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: me as the |
| 22 | Agency, as Mike as PR or MAFAC, however you |
| | |

wanted to do it. We would be interested in some suggestions of that type.

MR. BILLY: I've got Randy, and then -- Randy?

MR. CATES: I have, I think it is directly related to this area maybe of this committee. In Hawaii we have two problems right now that are arising. green sea turtles are a protected species. is very obvious to most folks there they probably don't need to be anymore. And there is a resistance by some NOAA folks to do the science, to take them off the major species there is a calling for potential because native Hawaiians for fishing with them. we are starting to hear more problems between the community and whether the science is getting done.

And the second is monk seals.

There is a desire to protect monk seals. And how you do that protection is having some conflicts with fisheries, bringing them to one

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 | area, introducing in another area. It is |
|----|--|
| 2 | becoming more of a public issue that I would |
| 3 | say needs to be looked at. |
| 4 | MR. BILLY: Okay, thanks. |
| 5 | MR. JONER: And it is also |
| 6 | appropriate to address this now as we are |
| 7 | moving toward ecosystem management. Because |
| 8 | how can you manage the ecosystem when one of |
| 9 | the main species in the ecosystem is |
| 10 | unmanaged. I mean, if it is protected, you |
| 11 | can't do anything about it. |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: Any other comments? |
| 13 | Are you all set? Okay. |
| 14 | Okay, then finally, the Ecosystem |
| 15 | Approach Subcommittee. Chris, welcome. |
| 16 | MR. DORSETT: Thank you. |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: I haven't said welcome |
| 18 | to you. I am glad you arrived. |
| 19 | MR. DORSETT: I appreciate it. |
| 20 | MR. BILLY: Yes, you might want to, |
| 21 | all of us sort of introduced ourselves, |
| 22 | particularly to the new members. |

MR. DORSETT: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: So, you might want to start by doing that.

MR. DORSETT: I am Chris Dorsett and my title has changed. I am now Vice President for Fisheries Conservation and Management with the Ocean Conservancy in Austin, Texas. And I, like three others, am serving an additional one year term with the committee.

like This, Protected Resources Subcommittee, has been a pretty easy one to chair because we also, to my knowledge, never met after we initiated this. I think there are a couple of reasons for that. One is we started the Vision 2020 process and Magnuson implementation really geared up. And so a lot of the members on this committee were very active in working on recommendations ecosystem approaches to management and also engaged in the Magnuson discussions about this topic.

NEAL R. GROSS

Ιt was put together to initiatives for development the and implementation of ecosystem based approach to fisheries management. And just to give you a sense of a timeline in MAFAC activities, when Ι first started, there was actually ecosystem-based management task force. And in May 2003, that task force issued a report to the administration.

In January 2005, at our meeting, we probably had a half day of presentations from the Agency on the ecosystem-based approach to management which led to, at the subsequent meeting, formation of this subcommittee. Then again, because of other issues, of picking up steam and to my knowledge I haven't heard a whole lot out of the Agency on this topic in quite a while. We have been pretty dormant.

One issue we did pick up in July 2006, we got a presentation on the United Nations initiative on bottom trawling. So, we did pick up that international component but

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

again, never really did anything with it.

This is obviously, still, a very hot topic and we should consider how best to utilize this subcommittee or it might be one where we want to switch directions. For example, at the last meeting we heard a lot about focus on climate change and where that might fit and what kind of role we want to play there. And then one other advice to the committee as we move forward is it is great to have a number of these subcommittees but let's make sure we are going to actually utilize Because the more we have, since people them. are spread across various subcommittees, it can be difficult, I think, to get people who are interested in the issue if it is sort of, people feel like the ship has sailed and they can be more productive in other subcommittees.

MR. BILLY: Okay, good. Questions or comments?

I do have that same sense like my first meeting we talked a lot about ecosystem

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 approach to management and that all just seems 2 to dissipate. Is that true? MR. DORSETT: No. 3 (Laughter.) 4 MR. BILLY: All right. 5 MS. McCARTY: I actually think, Mr. 6 Chairman, 7 that the ecosystem approach being integrated 8 management is into management and it's being adopted, I think. 9 10 And that is my impression, is that it has fisheries become accepted part of 11 an management, at least in the North Pacific. 12 13 guess maybe I am speaking just for the North That is my impression. Pacific. 14 MR. BILLY: Is that true? 15 MR. DORSETT: Ι think bits and 16 pieces all of 17 are spread across these subcommittees. But I haven't seen quite the 18 19 integrated big picture framework that we saw Hawaii meeting in, what 20 at the was January '05 in terms of developing the tools 21

22

and all that good stuff.

I know there are various initiatives regionally on trying to develop modeling approaches and things like that.

MR. BILLY: Okay, Dorothy.

Yes, I think that, I MS. LOWMAN: mean, there are a lot of topics. We were looking at the transition document but that is how we do fisheries management now. think it does different things mean different regions. It is -- I think that this could be a committee, since we come from all over, that we could spend, you know, provide some useful ways of how to integrate this And I also do think that the climate more. change issue comes this place. I mean, and then again, looking at those NOAA transition documents, it seemed like lots was focused on climate change and I didn't see the little place where fisheries fit into those very And that might be -- I don't know if that is the right subcommittee to park that in but I do think it does need some work 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

next year or so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: Okay, Tony.

DiLERNIA: Thank MR. you, Mr. Chairman. From my perception on the Coast, and Vince can help me out or correct me if I am wrong, but I don't see a major rush to start to replace single species management or quota management with any type of ecosystem management plans. I think there has been a lot of discussion and there has been review but no one is ready to jump in. And I haven't seen any serious modifications FMPs to go along the lines of the ecosystem management.

The closer you look at the ecosystem management, in the East Coast is the Northeast, New England Fisheries Management's Council's Multi-species Plan. But that, I mean, I just haven't seen it yet. quess we need to know more about understand it more before we go modifying plans.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. BILLY: Okay, Tom.

Yes, Ι think a MR. RAFTICAN: couple of things. One, I would agree with Heather that a lot of this is already being into the plans incorporated that are out there. But the other thing is it still is kind of a piecemeal approach. And you are looking at, you know, predator-prey gets to be But we are also looking at pretty easy. habitat management and how does that factor in forage fish. You really get into an awful lot the management, marine protected zone You know, looking at aerial areas. management, is this the next step in that?

And I think the other thing that often is overlooked is exactly what Mr. Fletcher was saying before. You have got some populations that are robust and those aren't factored in. And I think there is a way. And maybe this is a place where MAFAC, instead of sitting back and reviewing what is coming forward should really take a step toward

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 trying to lead in some of these areas. 2 MR. BILLY: Thanks. Randy? CATES: My question would be MR. 3 does MAFAC or NOAA, does it have a definition 4 of ecosystem-based management? 5 It means so many different things to so many different 6 7 groups that, what is the definition of it? VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: I believe 8 that we do have a definition. 9 But my comment 10 would be the same. People use that term hoping to get to a different ends. And of 11 Tony's idea about groundfish in New 12 13 England, a lot of people think that ecosystem management there means that you can ignore the 14 fact that -- not Tony --15 16 (Laughter.) VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: 17 -- but some people think that you have got 11 species that 18 19 are in great abundance. You have got three completely intermixed with those 20 that

NEAL R. GROSS

protect those three, you only fish the 11 that

hardly existing at all anymore.

21

22

And so to

are in good abundance. And actually, there's a few more species than that, 17, perhaps, in that plan. There is a couple of them that are hurting. And so to protect those, you have very low levels of fishing you have to put on the rest of them.

Some people, some fishermen, think ecosystem management means you don't worry about those weak ones. It is an ecosystem so you just fish those that are in abundance and you don't worry about the individual species. I mean, a lot of people look at that.

The opposite end is true and some people think when you have only 850,000 tons of pollock in the Bering Sea, you should subtract off maybe 500,000 tons for marine mammals, explicitly. And that is their idea of ecosystem management. And those are as dramatically different as you could want to be when it comes to the purposes for having it.

I think that we have lost a little bit of progress on ecosystem management with

NEAL R. GROSS

the emphasis on examining climate, potential climate change impacts on our resources. have lost some lawsuits where we didn't include what we think is likely to happen in 100 years because of climate change and what that impact may have on rivers, fresh water, and the salt water estuaries. And we didn't consider that, and so we have been required by judges to go back and do that. Well, that is a huge part of ecosystems stuff, the climate change on top if it. And so we have, perhaps, lost some progress in multi-species predatorprey kinds of things.

There club is а Ι go to in Washington, D.C. sometimes. The band that plays there thinks I am in charge of the environment in Alaska. The last time I went there, they asked me if I was still in charge of environment and yes, I am. Does that include the human species as well? sure. And he says, well what is up with Sarah Palin if you are in charge?

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 | (Laughter.) |
|----|--|
| 2 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: And so, that |
| 3 | is the other thing that |
| 4 | (Laughter.) |
| 5 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: So, I think |
| 6 | that Randy is right. MAFAC ought to say here |
| 7 | is what we think we are talking about when we |
| 8 | are doing ecosystem management and here is how |
| 9 | to make some progress on that set of issues, |
| 10 | at least. |
| 11 | MR. CATES: Yes, it helps to have a |
| 12 | definition. |
| 13 | MR. BILLY: Dave Wallace. |
| 14 | MR. WALLACE: Yes, you know, I |
| 15 | guess Tony's right. At least he brought New |
| 16 | England up. New England Fisheries Management |
| 17 | Council happens to have an initiative where |
| 18 | they are going to combine all of their EFH's |
| 19 | into one overarching plan. And it is called |
| 20 | the EFH and Ecosystems Management System. |
| 21 | And I just happen to be on their |
| 22 | advisory committee. I actually happen to be |

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

| 1 | the chairman of that advisory committee. And |
|----|--|
| 2 | I can assure you that they have gone through |
| 3 | the 27 species that are managed by the New |
| 4 | England Fisheries Management Council. And |
| 5 | they have gone through all the right stages. |
| 6 | They have gone through all of the predator- |
| 7 | prey. They have gone through the difficult |
| 8 | issues of the environment, especially the |
| 9 | habitat in state waters and not just fish in |
| 10 | particular. And so, and now they are started, |
| 11 | and phase one is done. That is, we have |
| 12 | accumulated all of this information from all |
| 13 | of these states, the federal government, and |
| 14 | all these academics. And it was a major |
| 15 | undertaking. It is already 1500 or 1600 pages |
| 16 | long, just on basic information. And now we |
| 17 | have started into the how are we going to use |
| 18 | this information with marine protected areas, |
| 19 | a whole myriad of things to try to then take |
| 20 | all of this information, put it into a program |
| 21 | where you are going to have, protect and |
| 22 | rebuild the species that are grossly over- |

NEAL R. GROSS

fished, allow opportunities to fish like haddock, which is in a very abundant It is completely rebuilt. supplies. The problem is that when you catch haddock, you also catch cod. Cod is, you know, in very bad shape. And so there is a 35,000, 37,000 ton haddock quota and they can't catch it because of they might catch a cod and so it becomes a very interesting situation. The real issue is the political issue of how do we, now that we have all of this really wonderful information, what do we do with it. And the answer really is that you have to go to the lowest common denominator to the over fish stocks. And that is what both the recreational and the commercial fishermen are afraid of.

And so, ecosystems management, on the surface from my perspective, is a wonderful idea. How do you implement it?

MR. FLETCHER: Just a comment. I was fascinated by what you said. But I remember a few years back. I might have still

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| been on the Pacific Fishery Management Council |
|--|
| when we first began talking about this. And |
| it started off with a discussion about |
| ecosystem management. And after a year of |
| everyone wondering just how in the world you |
| can get there and what did it mean, the Agency |
| redefined what we were talking about with this |
| new phrase, ecosystem approaches to |
| management, which is a sliding scale, |
| depending on what you are talking about. In |
| California, we have a huge predator called the |
| California Sea Lion, which overwhelms us in a |
| lot of fisheries and yet can't be managed. |
| And so by using this approach to management, |
| we could say well, we'll do what we can to |
| look at these relationships. We will do what |
| we can to try to come up with some kind of an |
| overarching approach |

But the reality is, what you said, which is where we are on the West Coast, is you manage weak stock. And if there is something else, in our case, we have got a

NEAL R. GROSS

deep water complex and we trawl fish with trawls that needs black cod to access that deep water complex that because some of the other fishermen want black cod, they get a quota and, therefore, when they hit that, which is an unavoidable bycatch, they are shut down.

And there is an ecosystem out there you certainly can't truly manage because of all of these other restrictions that come in. So, I think the definition that you talked, Randy, is you use it when you can when it doesn't conflict with some of these other certainties which exist, which is weak stock management, which is protected species or endangered species. We don't manage them, but they are part of the ecosystem. So, we are trying to approach where you can to look at this bigger picture. And 1500 pages, I bet that was a lot of fun to develop that. And then the question is, how do you use Because the other things trump all that good

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 | information about your relationship. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. WALLACE: The law does. |
| 3 | MR. FLETCHER: Yes. |
| 4 | MR. BILLY: Okay, Cathy. |
| 5 | MS. FOY: I have a question for Jim |
| 6 | about the ecosystem approach. |
| 7 | MR. BILLY: You have got to speak a |
| 8 | little louder. |
| 9 | MS. FOY: Sorry. I have a question |
| LO | for Jim about ecosystem approach. Have the |
| L1 | survey assessment methods changed? Are we |
| L2 | using that same, single species assessment and |
| L3 | then trying to incorporate it into an |
| L4 | ecosystem approach or are we doing ecosystem |
| L5 | type surveys? |
| L6 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Well, I think |
| L7 | we have lots more observations systems, |
| L8 | including satellites, including things like |
| L9 | continuous plankton reporters and all of the |
| 20 | at sea processor boats or at least some of |
| 21 | them on ferries across the Gulf of Alaska, |
| | |

Ferries in the Gulf of Mexico. So there is

all kinds of new information. So, I don't think it would be accurate to say we have stayed with the old stuff exclusively.

But probably the basis for setting TACs, which we still set on a species by species basis, largely, are the old surveys that we have done for 25 to 30 years.

But the good news, I guess, is that our author of our ecosystem approaches ideas, definitions moving forward, Dr. Steve Murawski is going to be here tomorrow, I think. So, we should queue these questions up for him. I think that would be a really -- I'm not sure what he has scheduled to talk about it but get rid of that and have him tell you how this is going to --

MS. FOY: Has there been any funding slide within NOAA towards putting more funding on the surveys so that you can get a broader understanding of what is going on out there when the surveys are out?

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Yes, part of

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | the development through our system of out-year |
|----|--|
| 2 | budgets has included the need for more |
| 3 | surveys, different kinds of surveys and even |
| 4 | modeling programs to try to figure out what |
| 5 | would bring them all together. I don't know |
| 6 | whether Gary has information specifically on |
| 7 | the numbers or not. |
| 8 | MR. REISNER: We have asked for |
| 9 | funds for the latest ecosystem approaches to |
| 10 | manage |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: You have got to speak |
| 12 | up. |
| 13 | MR. REISNER: We have asked for |
| 14 | funds related to ecosystem approaches and |
| 15 | integrated ecosystem assessments. In fact, we |
| 16 | are waiting for '09 to see what happens. But |
| 17 | we have gotten and continue to ask for large |
| 18 | increases in our survey lines. And to the |
| 19 | degree those are funded, we will be able to |
| 20 | expand on our ability to do the integrated |
| 21 | ecosystem assessments, even if we don't get a |

called ecosystem,

specific

22

line

integrated

ecosystem assessment. Because the underlying data is really what we need to be able to move forward on it.

MS. FOY: Okay. Well, modelers don't come cheap either.

MR. BILLY: Yes, Jim?

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Listening to this conversation and going back to some of the buildup this morning of who we are and what we do, I think they are saying that the formal chairman of this is the Undersecretary. And we haven't always had the ear of the Undersecretary. It is probably a fairly good guess climate change is going to be the passion of the next Undersecretary and command a lot of attention.

It just seems to me that while the ecosystem subcommittee might have been somewhat dormant, the discussion here about what it is, how it is going, what resources are going to it and not getting lost in the shuffle of climate change and trying to get a

NEAL R. GROSS

hook on the incoming administration would seem to be a Climate Change Ecosystem Approach to Management Subcommittee would be in our best interest, as well as being, I think, beneficial for the incoming administration.

MR. FLETCHER: Do entertain leading the posse or get chased out of town by the posse?

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Okay, Eric?

MR. SCHWAAB: You know, if you think about the role of this committee as looking at sort of some of the big strategic, big picture issues, you know, I don't think there is one more important than this concept of ecosystem based management or ecosystem approaches to management. And I think -- I agree with Jim and it might be that there is some benefit in sort of a labeling opportunity there because climate is just a piece of that.

You know, all of the implications of climate change on our coasts are having, you know, have all kinds of implications for

NEAL R. GROSS

the future of fisheries management. I guess my point is, I think we ought to stay focused on this. The question is you know, how to go forward.

Chris mentioned that You know, report that was done. We came out and I thought it was earlier, you say 2003, that had a series of recommendations. You know the task force that NOAA put together -- okay but the one that preceded that, that where NOAA brought together all of the scientists and they came out with a series of recommendations and I don't know that anybody has paged through that lately. I know I haven't. Ι think I still have a copy around somewhere.

But I suspect that there were a lot of recommendations in there that not only still have relevance but perhaps are more important today than they were then. And if we can play a role in sort of revisiting some of those recommendations and surfacing those issues anew, perhaps under a new packaging

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we ought to not lose sight of the need for that.

BILLY: This subject MR. has certainly triggered a lot of interest in the committee. And that is a good sign that what you just said here we ought to follow up on. And I will remind you all again that we are going to be thinking about new chairs of It would seem that identifying subcommittees. someone that -- not only knowledgeable but interested and willing to lead this area or this subject area would be important. ought to keep that in mind.

We have got about 15 minutes before the coffee break. I think what I would like to do now is have Mark hand out and introduce a listing of potential subject areas, issues and ideas for the existing subcommittees that was put together by he and his staff. And again, these are just ideas and they were meant to trigger our thinking as well. So, if we can before the coffee break sort of learn a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

little bit more about thinking on these items.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, let me clarify a little bit where these ideas came from. These are topics or issues that the fishery service is going to be working on over the next 12 months. So these are -- some of them are more detail-specific management and regulatory actions that are going to important to fisheries but they have potential implications for MAFAC with respect positions on policy, guidance, direction or priorities in the future that you could weigh in on.

So, what we have done is try to bin them into these different subcommittee structures and say, hey, you know, some of these things have implications for the long term that you may want to get involved in or look at it, not necessarily from the specific action perspective but the policy implication of that, or the guidance that one or the direction one might offer on these various

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

things.

| And so it was designed to help |
|--|
| stimulate some thought as opposed to, we |
| propose that you undertake something to do |
| with management of summer flounder. No. |
| Management of summer flounder is triggering |
| questions about inter-jurisdictional |
| management, sharing of management of these |
| inter-jurisdictional fisheries. It crosses |
| over into MRIP. And if we revise statistics |
| in the long term how does it effect our policy |
| decisions in the past for allocations between |
| commercial and recreational fisheries? Those |
| kinds of policy questions are going to be |
| addressed over the next year. Does MAFAC want |
| to help frame some of the discussion about |
| what is fair, what is equitable, what is |
| scientifically defensible, or from whatever |
| perspective you want. |

So, we are not asking you to jump in and say you have an oar in the water on summer flounder but what is the implication of

NEAL R. GROSS

some of these issues we will be addressing that MAFAC could attack from a policy perspective on a higher level integration of different activities. Does that make sense?

So it is not proposing that you become a Regional Council decision-maker but these are issues that are going to be in front of our agency that may have -- that benefit taking look from MAFAC а at broader questions that are going to be of aligned with these five concern and subcommittee structures.

So, it is to stimulate some ideas to help you generate -- and I think if I could just editorialize for a brief moment, follow through of Ecosystem Approach an Committee Protected or а Resource Subcommittee, once the committee is formed, there has got to be some process or objective in mind.

So, for the next year, if you have something for the Ecosystem Approach Committee

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 work on, then there will be a reason for them to meet and to exist. But if there is nothing there that you have chosen to undertake as a topic or an agenda, then of reason for course, there is it to no convened. So it is up to the committee to decide if there are relevant topics that they want to look at. And that helps support the But if there is not, idea of continuing it. then the observation posed earlier, well maybe you can reconstitute it as something else.

There is absolutely no requirement to maintain the subcommittee structures as is. You can have new subcommittees. You have the discretion to form subcommittees new and terminate subcommittees the overall as Committee sees fit. So, just wanted to I reinforce that observation.

MR. CATES: Mark, are you asking for us now to come up with areas of topics for these committees?

DR. HOLLIDAY: My point -- yes. At

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this meeting, I wanted to have at least the beginning of a discussion about issues that these subcommittees might want to undertake in the next 12 months.

MR. CATES: When do we do that, now or later?

DR. HOLLIDAY: This afternoon. I had proposed to do it between now and 5:00. Not necessarily finalized, but we need to start stimulating that discussion and that will then help inform people, "Gee, I am interested in that and I would like to work on that. And therefore, I propose that I support that subcommittee by volunteering to be on it."

It is hard to say you want to be on a subcommittee if you don't know what they are going to do. And all we have now is just the framework that is, in general, the strategic planning subcommittee does these types of things. You have got to put a little bit of flesh on the bone of that structure and say,

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | well, perhaps they could take on these kinds |
|----|--|
| 2 | of issues in the next year. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Yes, Martin. |
| 4 | MR. FISHER: I have a procedural |
| 5 | question. I'm not quite sure. How can you |
| 6 | sit on or participate in one subcommittee at a |
| 7 | time, more than one at a time? Don't they |
| 8 | meet at the same time during the larger group? |
| 9 | MR. BILLY: What we often do is we |
| 10 | will set aside an afternoon for subcommittee |
| 11 | meetings and then we will arrange it so that |
| 12 | let's say three of the subcommittees are going |
| 13 | to meet, we may have two hour sessions in |
| 14 | sequence, so that you can participate in one |
| 15 | and we will get a sense of the committee of |
| 16 | the interests and then try to plan it in a |
| 17 | manner where it optimizes participation by all |
| 18 | of the interested committee members. |
| 19 | MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mr. |
| 20 | Chairman. Because I would like to participate |
| 21 | in more than one. |
| | |

MR. BILLY: Yes.

22

I think most of

| 1 | us feel that way. Yes, so we try to manage |
|----|--|
| 2 | that as best we can. And we even have gone |
| 3 | into the evening and sometimes had another |
| 4 | meeting, you know, right after dinner or over |
| 5 | dinner or that kind of thing. |
| 6 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Or early breakfast |
| 7 | meetings. |
| 8 | MR. BILLY: Or early breakfast |
| 9 | meetings, sometimes. |
| 10 | DR. HOLLIDAY: It depends on the |
| 11 | I'm sorry. |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: Yes, so we try to work |
| 13 | it out so that it is possible. Did you want |
| 14 | to add anything? |
| 15 | DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm good. Sorry. |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Let's say we |
| 17 | take a break now, give you a chance to mull |
| 18 | these over. And then we will come back and |
| 19 | sort of work through these and answer any |
| 20 | questions anyone has about what they mean, |
| 21 | what might be entailed, that kind of thing, so |

we have as clear an understanding of this list

| 1 | as possible. If you have other items you |
|----|--|
| 2 | would want to suggest be added to this list as |
| 3 | well. |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, I think it is |
| 5 | open. I mean, you need to create your own |
| 6 | lists and you can choose from anything that is |
| 7 | on this list or your own ideas or any place |
| 8 | else. So there is nothing concrete about this |
| 9 | list at all. It is just to stimulate your |
| 10 | thought process. We are going to be involved |
| 11 | in these issues over the next year, right. |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: Okay, let's take about |
| 13 | 20 minutes for coffee. |
| 14 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off |
| 15 | the record at 2:54 p.m. and resumed |
| 16 | at 3:16 p.m.) |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: Okay, let's get started |
| 18 | again. Mark, do you want to go through and |
| 19 | DR. HOLLIDAY: You were going to |
| 20 | give Larry a minute to |
| 21 | MR. BILLY: Oh, sorry, Larry. I |
| 22 | forgot. |

| 1 | MR. SIMPSON: One last time for the |
|----|---|
| 2 | reinforcement. For tonight's function, the |
| 3 | lady that did all of this is sitting right |
| 4 | here, Ms. Ginny Herring. She is |
| 5 | (Applause.) |
| 6 | MR. SIMPSON: She is a contracts |
| 7 | officer and executive assistant commissioner. |
| 8 | She has been there six months longer than I |
| 9 | have. And this is the directions. You go out |
| 10 | the front door, take a right and that is |
| 11 | Bienville. |
| 12 | MS. HERRING: Then you take, go |
| 13 | down Bienville, take Dauphine out the front |
| 14 | door |
| 15 | MR. SIMPSON: No, no. Don't |
| 16 | confuse it. I've got it down pat. |
| 17 | MS. HERRING: I just got the |
| 18 | directions again. |
| 19 | MR. SIMPSON: No, no, no. This is |
| 20 | one turn. |
| 21 | MS. HERRING: It's one turn my way, |
| 22 | too. |

| 1 | MR. SIMPSON: Iberville. Take a |
|----|--|
| 2 | right and go to Iberville, you will probably |
| 3 | say eye-ber-ville, but Iberville, and go |
| 4 | straight all the way down |
| 5 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Turn left. Right? |
| 6 | MR. SIMPSON: to the Aquarium of |
| 7 | the Americas. So, use your little map. Okay? |
| 8 | If you didn't get a dining guide, please, |
| 9 | there is a few left here. Ginny brought some |
| LO | extra note cards. I think I put them, some at |
| 11 | everybody's place. If I haven't, please see |
| L2 | me and there is half a dozen left here. I |
| 13 | don't want to take them back home. |
| L4 | 6:00 tonight. It is about five |
| 15 | blocks, six blocks. I think the dress was |
| L6 | business casual, Ginny, which means everybody |
| L7 | here is just perfect. Right? |
| L8 | MS. HERRING: Yes. |
| L9 | MR. SIMPSON: Okay. |
| 20 | MS. HERRING: And if it is |
| 21 | inclement weather and you want a taxi, because |
| 22 | T am wearing heels it is under \$10 |

| 1 | MR. SIMPSON: Okay. And you want |
|----|--|
| 2 | to do the badges there or just bring them? |
| 3 | MS. HERRING: No. I had a badge |
| 4 | mess up. So if anybody if everybody could |
| 5 | just bring their name tags, I would appreciate |
| 6 | it. And Mark, bring the ones that are on the |
| 7 | table just in case they come |
| 8 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Sure. |
| 9 | MS. HERRING: to the meeting. |
| 10 | MR. SIMPSON: Anything else? |
| 11 | MS. HERRING: And make sure your |
| 12 | staff comes. |
| 13 | MR. SIMPSON: Anything else? Enjoy |
| 14 | yourself. Thanks. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Thanks. So I would |
| 16 | like to call on Mark so to highlight any of |
| 17 | these items that he thinks might need a little |
| 18 | further clarification or make sure the |
| 19 | committee understands. Some are obvious but |
| 20 | maybe there are a few that you would like to |
| 21 | just highlight. |

MR. FISHER: Excuse me. Mark, when

| 1 | you do this, are you going to tell us which |
|----|--|
| 2 | are the policy issues versus which are just |
| 3 | things we have got to work on? There is a |
| 4 | difference. |
| 5 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. And I think |
| 6 | some of the things that we are working on are |
| 7 | have policy implication but they are |
| 8 | decisions that are going to be made but they |
| 9 | have perhaps a the decision is regional but |
| 10 | there could be a precedent being set or there |
| 11 | could be a need for some guidance or |
| 12 | instruction. So there is a mix of them here. |
| 13 | Others are obvious policy questions that the |
| 14 | committee has already been undertaking in |
| 15 | terms of eco-labeling, seafood inspection, the |
| 16 | aquaculture issues, transition, out-year |
| 17 | planning. |
| 18 | And so if there is any specific |
| 19 | I think it might be more efficient if there |
| 20 | are specific questions about |
| 21 | MR. FISHER: Okay, that is fine. |

HOLLIDAY: -- something that

DR.

| 1 | piques your interest, I would be glad to |
|----|--|
| 2 | explain it. But if not, I think an effective |
| 3 | way to go about it is, what are the ideas that |
| 4 | you think are important. You know, it doesn't |
| 5 | matter what I think. But policy questions, |
| 6 | directions, guidance, things you want to work |
| 7 | on and some of these things were just designed |
| 8 | to give you the sense of what the range of |
| 9 | actions that we are going to be involved with |
| 10 | over the next year. |
| 11 | Okay, is that fair enough? |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: That's fine. Sure. |
| 13 | DR. HOLLIDAY: You have some hands. |
| 14 | MR. BILLY: Sure. Erika? |
| 15 | MS. FELLER: Just clarifying, Mark, |
| 16 | are there any items on this list that have any |
| 17 | particular priority in terms of timing or |
| 18 | urgency for the Agency that might make some |
| 19 | higher priority projects for MAFAC than |
| 20 | others? |
| 21 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Well certainly, |
| 22 | there are some things that are going to be |

happening sooner versus later. I mean, Bob mentioned earlier some of the policy exchanges that are going to take place with the Marine Recreational Information Program that is a congressional mandate to get things in place by the beginning of next year, the anniversary of the Magnuson Act in February.

But again, even after that deadline occurs, there will be other policy questions with respect to execution of that that could be on the table for that working group to undertake. So, I don't have them listed in chronological order or any type of priority.

I think we were just, again, I am overemphasizing it but I don't want to give too much weight to this. It was just, as I explained to Topher, I wanted to have a plan B in case there was just deadly silence and nobody had any ideas about what to talk about, I would bring this out and suggest that as a stimulus to spark discussion.

MS. FELLER: It just, it struck me,

NEAL R. GROSS

you know, just on that in Jim's comment that either this is helpful because from the Agency's point of view, these are the things you are going to be wrestling with but Jim made the point that it is really hard to kind of figure out how to get ahead of some of these issues.

So, having some kind of sense about when decisions are going to be made and what might be appropriate in timing to pick stuff up, I think would help the priorities for agenda items.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. And just to respond, I think the other confounding factor is because of the way MAFAC is structured to meet twice a year, you have to kind of intersect that opportunity, there may be something that is timely for us but you just can't fit it into the schedule between now and the next meeting and a subcommittee to work on. So, even though you may want to, it may not be feasible to do something.

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | MR. FISHER: Well, can I? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: Eric? |
| 3 | MR. FISHER: It seems to me that on |
| 4 | the, you just look at recreational fisheries |
| 5 | and stuff, my feeling is generally that a lot |
| 6 | of that is done. Now that the law or the reg |
| 7 | is going to be out on the street, there will |
| 8 | be some stuff finished and I can't visualize |
| 9 | there will be a lot of policy stuff left right |
| LO | from what we have already gone through to get |
| 11 | where we are now. |
| L2 | I mean, so, that is my take on that |
| L3 | one. |
| L4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: That's fine. |
| 15 | MR. FISHER: Well, I'm just saying |
| L6 | because these guys get to decide. I don't to |
| L7 | decide. But that is my feeling. |
| L8 | DR. HOLLIDAY: It's up to you. |
| L9 | MR. FISHER: The other thing is, if |
| 20 | we have a meeting, the next big thing that is |
| 21 | going to happen is we are going to have, |
| 22 | obviously, the transition issues. And |

somebody probably is going to be meeting with somebody at some point in time during the transition.

And so it seems to me that they are going to be asking questions like well, what you do you think should be funded, what do you think about this that or the other thing. So, I believe that the planning one, the second group of things is probably going to be very important. And then under those, then you would start to ask questions about whether or not you would change some of the funding priorities of the agency now or what we think is important as a group in the future.

you could talk about Ι guess aquaculture but my personal feeling is if I talk about it much more, I am going to be ill. Because, and the reason why I say that is we had a lot of discussions about bill is already That gone. The new administration will figure out whether are going to pick it up or they are not.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

don't know what else you could do in terms of this committee dealing with aquaculture.

Seafood quality and safety, I think that one is of interest because I think it has huge implications on whether or not the agency is going to pick that up and if so, how the hell they are going to fund it. Is the money going to come from somewhere else or, you know, whatever we think about that.

Fisheries disasters, I don't know what you do about those except for the fact that we are involved with them when they happen. And you know, I guess the only issue there is maybe the policy issue there is whether or not we set up a fund which they have the 75 million and how that could be distributed. But I guess that is a policy issue that we could talk about.

All of those other issues of limited entry and all that stuff are being dealt with by each of the councils within their own framework. I don't think this

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | committee has that much to deal with those. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Protected resources, I think the |
| 3 | discussion we had and Mr. Fletcher's |
| 4 | discussion about how to deal with, this one is |
| 5 | going to be important because there will be |
| 6 | legislation changing what is going on. And I |
| 7 | think that would be something that we could |
| 8 | talk about probably a fair amount. |
| 9 | MS. DOERR: But in general, what is |
| 10 | the committee role when it comes to |
| 11 | legislation, historically? |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: We can provide guidance |
| 13 | in terms of provisions that legislation ought |
| 14 | to include. We don't normally draft |
| 15 | legislation or play any particular role in |
| 16 | that. We can review drafts of legislation and |
| 17 | provide reaction. That is about it, as a |
| 18 | committee. Is there anything else? |
| 19 | MR. DiLERNIA: Well, we're not |
| 20 | supposed to lobby. |
| 21 | MR. BILLY: Yes. |
| 22 | MR. DiLERNIA: So we can provide, |

1 if we are asked to provide comments, we 2 proposed legislation. provide comments on That is our role but sometimes initiating it 3 is a little hinky, there. 4 MR. BILLY: Okay, Heather. 5 MS. McCARTY: On the aquaculture 6 7 bill, for example, we gave extremely detailed advice, or whatever you might want to call it, 8 to NOAA on what that bill should like. And we 9 10 went through it line by line, basically. As I recall, a draft, MR. BILLY: 11 an initial draft, provided that kind of input. 12 13 So, yes. Martin? In terms of LAPPs, I 14 MR. FISHER: 15 think there is room for this committee to weigh in on providing continuity. There don't 16 seem to be any national standards for IFQs at 17 the moment, in terms of how 18 they are 19 implemented and how the user, how the stakeholders can participate in the programs, 20 especially when it comes to determining who is

There are no standards for that.

eligible.

21

There is no standard definition for a substantial participant or substantially fish. Anybody entering into that LAPP would benefit from some input or guidance on those issues. That is of particular interest to me. I would think that that would be more of a policy approach than a micro-management approach.

MR. BILLY: Okay, Dorothy.

MS. LOWMAN: I think also we need some LAPP-related suggestions our transitions. And I think that there are some policy issues, like we say, well, you know, we need to make them cost effective. Well, are there some sort of policies that ought to be changed to help, you know, make them more cost-effective or things that we could invest that would have high returns, in now general, you know, more, rather than as a specific region basis, but in a more national way.

So, I think there are some issues that rise to the higher policy level in LAPPs.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But I do think it belongs more under the strategic planning budget and management subcommittee than the Commerce subcommittee.

MR. JONER: Well, and I think we did a whole-- way back when we did a fairly extensive review of what this committee felt about individual fishing quotas at the time, and we probably should go look at what we said.

MR. BILLY: Okay.

MR. CATES: I have two comments or issues. First is aquaculture. This committee has done a great deal of work on that. And I keep referring to that we are an advisory board. I think what we need to do is refine and advise NOAA and Commerce on how to move it forward. Basically, we said we think it is a good idea, it should be done. But now, how do you implement it? How do you make it happen with a different set of questions?

Secondly, under the Protected Resources Subcommittee, I think one thing we

NEAL R. GROSS

need to look at is how to reinstate species that have been recovered. And there is a resistance going on. And I think it is, in my point of view, coming from NOAA, where we say, "Well, we need to do the science on species first," but there is an unwillingness to do the science because it is not a very popular thing to do. For ten years now, they have been asking to do the science green sea turtle. No, there is an unwillingness to do it.

So, when you do have recovery, how do we de-list it?

MR. BILLY: Okay. Bob?

MR. FLETCHER: I guess I have a bit of a different take on Recreational Fisheries Working Group than Randy does. While much of the policy work is pretty much concluded, I think it is important that this committee, at least those who are interested, be kept apprised of the implementation phase of the amendments to Magnuson Act. And perhaps,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

depending on what we learn at the meeting, there may be some things that we can provide back in of quidance terms or recommendations.

So, while the policy, to a great extent, is about over and implementation is starting, I think MAFAC can still be a valuable sounding board for the Agency. So, I see a short-term reason to have another meeting.

is, The other issue and am unfortunately very intimately involved this, and it is down under Commerce. And it says, "Management of highly migratory species through regional bodies such as the WCPFC." am a U.S. Commissioner on the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and we just had an extraordinary meeting last week that was a total abject failure. And we are now two and a half years into a total abject failure of any conservation and management.

Having said that, there is only

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| international process. And the Agency that is probably more in the middle of it than anybody is the State Department. And there is an old saying, nations don't have friends, they have interests. And it appears to be in the interest of the United States not to really get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | really a limited ability to input that |
|---|--|
| is the State Department. And there is an old saying, nations don't have friends, they have interests. And it appears to be in the interest of the United States not to really get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | international process. And the Agency that is |
| saying, nations don't have friends, they have interests. And it appears to be in the interest of the United States not to really get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | probably more in the middle of it than anybody |
| interests. And it appears to be in the interest of the United States not to really get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | is the State Department. And there is an old |
| interest of the United States not to really get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | saying, nations don't have friends, they have |
| get after a nation that chooses to throw blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | interests. And it appears to be in the |
| blocks into getting anything done. I don't know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | interest of the United States not to really |
| know how to deal with that. But I do know that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | get after a nation that chooses to throw |
| that having this on this agenda does make a lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | blocks into getting anything done. I don't |
| lot of sense because I don't think what we can do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | know how to deal with that. But I do know |
| do is going to have much ability to have an impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | that having this on this agenda does make a |
| impact. But it is a terrible situation. And there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | lot of sense because I don't think what we can |
| there is an entity— the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | do is going to have much ability to have an |
| Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | impact. But it is a terrible situation. And |
| since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | there is an entity the Inter-American |
| the nations who are interested in management have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | Tropical Tuna Commission has been in existence |
| have figured out a way to block any progress. I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | since 1949, ostensibly managing harvest. And |
| I don't know what the solution is. It seems to me that the United States needs to get | the nations who are interested in management |
| to me that the United States needs to get | have figured out a way to block any progress. |
| to me that the United States needs to get | I don't know what the solution is. It seems |
| | |
| - COMMIN WILL BOME OF CHEST HOLLOHS: AND THE THU | tough with some of these nations. And the IUU |

NEAL R. GROSS

process is not the way to get tough with them.

That is an easy way to address a concern, but

it is a real-- it is a crisis because

yellowfin and bigeye are slowly but surely

going down hill and nothing is being done.

Is that an example where we could provide some get tough advice to the Secretary or hopefully through the Secretary to the State Department on options, ideas of how to get the attention of some of these countries and change their practices? Is that an appropriate quote?

MR. FLETCHER: You know, what do you do to get their attention? That is the It is not speak up in support of the problem. science which is very, very good, but which is totally ignored. And I almost think that there must be some other way to get their attention but that gets into that high realm of political influence that I don't know that the United States is ready or willing to get involved maybe this in. Now, new

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

administration might have a new approach. It would be interesting to find out.

But right now it is almost beyond

life support. The Tuna Commission is looked at as just impotent. And something has got to be done if we are going to try to rebuild these stocks. It is a crisis.

MR. BILLY: Okay, Bill.

MR. DEWEY: At the risk of making my friend Randy Fisher ill, I am going to get into aquaculture as well.

MAFAC asked NOAA to develop a tenyear plan. And I for one would like to hear
at least periodic updates from NOAA as to how
they are doing on implementing that. So, I
think that should stay on MAFAC's agenda.
Sorry, Randy.

And a couple other new issues that aren't on the list here that I would like to at least throw out there. Whether they are policy related or not, I am not sure, but areas that maybe MAFAC wants to delve into.

NEAL R. GROSS

One is ocean acidification. There are bills both in the House and the Senate related to that. And our industry thinks we may actually be feeling some of the first effects of that in our recent failures on the West Coast, both in our hatcheries and in the wild. So, it is an area we are keenly aware of. Dr. Feeley with NOAA has been the leading scientist on this issue, and may be someone you ought to think about bringing to NOAA and depending on it to bring people up to speed.

The is, with other this administration, I think there is going to be a big interest in clean energy. And from a biofuel standpoint, we have had a number of companies contacting us recently about biofuel production. That may be another area of opportunity push and if to see Administration is going to help us to do that.

So, I throw those out there. Now I need to apologize and excuse myself. I have to go get on a conference call.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. BILLY: Tony.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DiLERNIA: Thank you, MR. Mr. Chairman. going Ι amto return to the Recreational Fisheries Working Group topics the last bullet because point there illustrates, is a specific issue that I think illustrates а larger policy issue and discussion that would like to I see perhaps committee review and make recommendations.

On the East Coast, summer flounder is managed both by the National Fisheries Service and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Ιt is conceivable, although it doesn't happen, it has happened since real management has once occurred, I mean Fishery Management Plans were in place since the early '80s but effective management didn't occur really on the federal And I guess on the A70C level until '91. level after MAFAC that was passed sometime in So, summer flounder the early '90s also.

NEAL R. GROSS

management really began to develop steam in the early '90s.

And again, I use summer flounder only as a species to illustrate what I think is a larger problem or may be a larger issue. And so what we have on the east coast is we have this species, which is caught by both recreational and commercial fishermen, managed two different agencies, NMFS by and Commission, United States Marine Fisheries And it is possible to have two Commission. different sets of regulations.

This happened in the recreational fishery in the past. It was 1995. The federal regulations and the state regulations were different. And what also happens is a fisherman in the regulated community finds himself having to go to two sets of meetings all the time to apply their input as to the final development and final regulations. You have to go to both council meetings and the commission meetings.

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 often there is a duplication of effort. And the regulated community, as educated as they become over the years, still there is some confusion of time as to how the process should be, or how they could be most effective for the process.

Well the policy issue that I would like to see the committee review and perhaps recommendation to the Secretary on would be to review this concept is Ιt conceivable, Ι management. have actually proposed it in the past in comments the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management to Council, but again when you propose an agency to give something up, it is always easier to take something on than to give something up, there is a natural institutional resistance.

It is conceivable that just to streamline management of summer flounder, that the secretary could, in effect, withdraw summer flounder management plan and actually have a federal management of summer flounder

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

extent out in the EEZ through the provisions of the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Conservation Management Act (ACFMA). And so you wouldn't have, in a sense, two different agencies passing regulations on one regulated community and perhaps have that one regulated community have two different sets of regulations, a federal set of regulations and a state set of regulations.

So, what I would like to see the committee review is the possibility -- and this is the policy decision -- would be examine in 2008, soon to be 2009, is dual the year management still a necessary tool. This dual is something that backed management we ourselves into over the years. And again, if you look at the development of summer flounder plan from the original plan, which was in the early '80s on the federal level and perhaps on the state level, we actually backed ourselves into the position where we are now.

Now in 2009 with MAFAC, perhaps 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

should reexamine that entire management process and perhaps recommend to the Secretary that, hey, listen, you don't need to do this as much anymore. We can do it through perhaps the Commission.

And so I would like to see that to be a discussion item for the -- and I don't know if that situation exists in the Gulf or on the West Coast. I see the West Coast shaking their head no, and I don't know about the Gulf, but-- so it might be just an East Coast issue. So perhaps it may not be within the responsibilities of the Committee. But if possible, I would like to see that discussion occur and perhaps make a recommendation to at least the NOAA administrator.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Heather?

MS. McCARTY: I was just going to comment that I think a number of these things on the list are very regional in nature and probably not necessarily things that this committee should deal with, though it sounds

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | like the larger issue that is behind what you |
|----|---|
| 2 | are talking about might be. I'm not sure. |
| 3 | MR. DiLERNIA: Can I? |
| 4 | MS. McCARTY: That wasn't all I was |
| 5 | going to say but you can speak to that if you |
| 6 | want to. |
| 7 | MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. To that |
| 8 | point? |
| 9 | MR. BILLY: Sure. |
| LO | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes. What we are |
| L1 | looking at there, on this particular you |
| L2 | know, it is the entire East Coast as far as |
| L3 | management. And it is, the Secretary is |
| L4 | pulling the Fishery Management Plan, the FMP. |
| 15 | So, you know, we have precedent for it, |
| L6 | actually, on the East Coast already. It |
| L7 | occurs with lobsters and it occurs with |
| L8 | herring, where the management are proposing, |
| L9 | this management process they are proposing is |
| 20 | ongoing. They are going on. |
| 21 | So, I could see where it is a |
| 22 | regional East Coast issue but then again you |

know, when does it take up the whole country? 1 MS. McCARTY: It might be more than 2 a regional issue. I am just not sure. Ι 3 4 quess what I was going to say was that under protected resources, the list that we were 5 provided, there is a number of regional issues 6 7 for example that I think are not necessarily appropriate, piece by piece for us to take up. 8 you took the Protected 9 But if 10 Resources Subcommittee's Work to mean working on a reauthorization of the Endangered Species 11 Act, for example, that many of these 12 13 issues would be part of that discussion. And I just, could I just go through the list and 14 15 talk about--You know, I agree with Bob that 16 there short-term for 17 is а need the recreational fisheries working group. 18 19 see that really clearly. Going to the next one, Strategic 20 Planning Budget and Program 21 Management, I

think that LAPPS should be in that one, and I

think we should look at the old document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Т don't know about climate services, Climate Research Organization. think that is probably meant to mean formation of a legal element in the management hierarchy of NMFS or NOAA. And so I think it is different than the science issues associated with climate. So maybe that does belong in there.

Under this Commerce Subcommittee, I think seafood safety and quality and aquaculture, I agree with who said it should stay. I think illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing is not something that we would necessarily want to offer advice on. I think that one is -- well, I don't know. I don't know for a fact but I think it is pretty clear cut.

I think the tuna issues are not something that we can have an effect on, but I think for equilibrium should stay there. And then, I already spoke to the Protected

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | Resources Subcommittee, and maybe add the de- |
|--|--|
| 2 | listing/recovery criteria for that one, |
| 3 | because that would be part of any new ESA |
| 4 | anyway, I would think. |
| 5 | I think the Pacific Salmon, again, |
| 6 | is too regional. All the rest of those things |
| 7 | seem to me to be pretty regional, including |
| 8 | the Pacific Salmon stuff and the ocean sound, |
| 9 | I think is maybe not. |
| 10 | Ecosystems, I would say Ecosystem |
| 11 | Approach/Ocean Science Subcommittee, maybe, |
| | |
| 12 | and add some of the things that people have |
| 12 13 | and add some of the things that people have mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, |
| | |
| 13 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, |
| 13 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that |
| 13 14 15 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that one. |
| 13 14 15 16 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that one. Take out NEPA, environmental review |
| 13 14 15 16 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that one. Take out NEPA, environmental review process under the MSRA and put it back under |
| 13 14 15 16 17 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that one. Take out NEPA, environmental review process under the MSRA and put it back under tracking implementation of the MSRA under |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | mentioned like ocean certification, biofuel, and then put climate change issues under that one. Take out NEPA, environmental review process under the MSRA and put it back under tracking implementation of the MSRA under strategic planning budget. |

responding to Tony. I think the closest to issue the West Coast would be on groundfish. And they are kind of both in the federal same laws. And we manage them regionally. We have got management lines under the different regulations up and down the coast because there are different impacts stocks and there are different on those habitat, aggregations, et cetera.

But in the case that you describing, it sounds to me like you have got a real regional problem. It is not something we have had to deal with. And salmon on the West Coast is managed regionally. We have lines up and down from Canada to regular Mexico, divided up in a number of different They are all managed separately, even areas. the beach.

Then the states have management authority in internal waters for that species as it goes up the river. But we have never had a situation.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I do remember when I was at the Department of Fish and Game I tried to assert state management authority, and I got preempted. So, we didn't do that anymore. So, it is not really something that we have had an issue with out there.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Vince?

MR. O'SHEA: Thanks. You know, I think there are, listening to what Tony said and a little bit of what Heather said, the couple of strategic that seems me issues that really come out of this is statefederal alignment. And I think, you know, not only on the East Coast, but I think experience in Alaska, there was also issues there about what the state thought managing fish in state waters and what the North Pacific Council thought.

So, I think those issues are around the country, but I am not sure what particular advice MAFAC would want to give on that. It was a thorny issue and they are tough 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

The other global issue seems to me the commercial-recreation allocation issue, which is embedded in the summer flounder And if people aren't talking about it yet, they are going to be talking about it in the next five years. But and we have other species, you know, halibut charter boat issue is another example of it. And the 2020 Vision talks about this conflict between commercial and rec. But again, I don't-- this process is now with place right the governing in structure to deal with them.

So, I don't know what advice MAFAC would want to give on that. But if I stand back feet and look at the Marine two Recreational System, bycatch, landings reporting system and observers, you know, the meetings that I go to, there is pressing need for all that data and there is no clue as to how to pay for it. And I don't know how the Agency is going to do it. The industry says we can't do it. But on the other hand, these

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 big chunks of data needed to manage the fishery.

This MRIP thing is going to come We are going to have all kinds of fancy out. things on it, and I think one of the big things is who is going to pay for it and how are we going to pay? So maybe there is this strategic issue that MAFAC could weigh in on is to say it has got to come from either the users' pay, or there has got to be a strategy make this а higher priority for the government, or you have got to find somebody else to pay for it.

But I mean, just to give you an example, you guys in the North Pacific, they are talking about five percent observer coverage in New England fisheries saying the industry can't pay for it and the agency doesn't have money to pay for it. They haven't a clue as to what they are getting on bycatch.

So anyway, those are some, to me,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

those are more global than trying to solve the summer flounder problem.

MR. BILLY: Larry?

MR. SIMPSON: Ι was just, Mr. little general Chairman, going to give а comment or two about the Gulf region about this. What you are talking about is statefederal management issues in a broader sense. Flounder is much too small of an issue, I think, for this group.

But in the Gulf we have had kind of good and bad. We have had issues with regard to federal system giving back to the state certain management authority, especially in Florida for some, I believe stone crab and spiny lobster. It is not stated in the whole mess. It is pretty much a state issue.

is And then there some occurrences of some not-so-good management of snapper. Ιf we got а problem with anything, we are red in the Gulf states. are working through snapper-and we 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 | throes of those issues of differential ideas |
|----|--|
| 2 | and philosophies about how best to manage that |
| 3 | species. |
| 4 | So, I am kind of like Vince. I am |
| 5 | not sure what this body could contribute, but |
| 6 | I think, you know, any comments might be |
| 7 | useful. They don't necessarily mean that they |
| 8 | are going to be used, but it might be useful. |
| 9 | But it is a broader sense. |
| 10 | For example, we "manage" shrimp |
| 11 | very well in the Gulf. But it is really the |
| 12 | states setting the seasons and so forth and so |
| 13 | on. That is the true management. |
| 14 | MR. DiLERNIA: It's not? I'm |
| 15 | sorry. |
| 16 | MR. SIMPSON: It is the true |
| 17 | management of the animal. So, I mean, just to |
| 18 | take in the EEZ, there is one issue that is |
| 19 | so-called "Texas option," that you close out |
| 20 | to 200 miles. But other than that one thing, |
| 21 | that is about the only issue that is federal. |
| | |

So anyway, it is a mixed bag.

| 1 | MR. DiLERNIA: It sounds like |
|----|--|
| 2 | something, what I am asking for is something |
| 3 | that you are doing. |
| 4 | MR. SIMPSON: We are doing and not |
| 5 | doing. |
| 6 | MR. DiLERNIA: I am trying to get |
| 7 | the |
| 8 | MR. SIMPSON: We are doing |
| 9 | something sometimes and sometimes we are not. |
| 10 | MR. DiLERNIA: East Coast to the |
| 11 | point that you are at. |
| 12 | MR. SIMPSON: But it is not always |
| 13 | a friendly thing, Tony. Sometimes it is. |
| 14 | MR. DiLERNIA: Welcome to Fisheries |
| 15 | Management. |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: Okay, Tom? |
| 17 | MR. RAFTICAN: Yes, I know a lot of |
| 18 | this has been covered already and touched on. |
| 19 | But when you start looking at a Ecosystem |
| 20 | Approach Subcommittee, I think the first thing |
| 21 | is, climate should be in there. But the |
| 22 | other things as we go down, designation of |

management of marine protected areas, corals—what we are talking about over here is ocean zoning. And maybe it is about time we got the elephant out of the corner of the room and really started looking at it.

time that And maybe it is we should, you know, we are looking at marine instead of marine protected managed areas It covers a number of -areas. energy, development, offshore, alternative energies, ecosystem protection. You also have aquaculture in there. You need to look at commercial corridors. But you know, let's try and take an overall picture. I think where we should be coming from is how do you take the broad-based picture of the entire thing.

And I think there are some real pluses in here when you do that. You know, we were talking about weakest species management before, where you managed the weakest species.

We haven't looked at marine-managed areas or marine-protected areas as an offset to 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

weakest link species. You have got great protections in there for certain species in certain areas. And if you take the broad picture, you don't simply go, you have to manage by catch in one part and nothing there.

And I think it is really important that we take a look, you know, when we start looking at an ecosystem approach, how do you look at the entire picture. And the entire picture includes not only marine-protected areas, marine-managed areas, including the commercial corridors in there and also very important that the human element is also included in that.

MR. BILLY: Randy?

CATES: I was just going to MR. comment we have the same issues going on in Hawaii. State, federal management, big conflicts about what to do. One federal agency wants to do something about sometimes the state doesn't want to control over it. So it is not just 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

East Coast region, it is in our area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: It sounds like it is shaping up into a useful issue for us. Vince? MR. O'SHEA: Well just because there are these problems around the country that all have the same theme, you know, the thing that I am trying to get my head around is, so what sort of universal advice do you give the Agency? It seems to be along the lines of, do you have confidence ability of the local governing structures to deal and resolve with those issues or there is a better way to do it. That to me seems to be the sort of strategic question. But to try to get in there and muck around with a formula of how to solve Randy's problem and solve Tony's problem, you know, generically from a group like this, I am not exactly sure how you would

MR. BILLY: One of the considerations that popped into my head earlier when we were talking about it was the

NEAL R. GROSS

do that.

process, I believe is going to occur looking for ways to reduce federal government spending.

And, you know, if in fact the new administration is serious about addressing that, and it looks at all of the existing programs that have been discussed, it could be one of the driving forces for sorting out how this is approached if there continues to be interest on the part of the states and they are looking for ways to save money at the federal level, maybe that could be one of the considerations. Just a thought that occurred to me.

Tony?

MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, in response to Vince's questions regards what might we come out of the committee with, that is why I would like to have the committee discuss it. If I had an answer as to where we would definitely go in a final decision, I would make that the recommendation and save the committee a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS

| time. There is an issue I see of duplication |
|--|
| of effort on the East Coast. There is an |
| issue there of the possibility of having |
| conflicting regulations on the regulated |
| community. And so I would like to see the |
| committee, if the condition doesn't exist on |
| the other two coasts, I would like to see the |
| committee discuss it. They might be able to |
| come up with a recommendation. They might not |
| be able to. But the fact that there is some |
| uncertainty I think is all the more reason why |
| the committee should examine the issue. And |
| again, it is not specific to summer flounder. |
| There is a larger issue. I used summer |
| flounder as an example. But I believe that it |
| really could be expanded to many other |
| species. And the management policy if not for |
| the entire country, definitely for the East |
| Coast. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |

MR. BILLY: Okay. Steve?

MR. JONER: I think I would agree that we leave these in there for now,

NEAL R. GROSS

Heather's wise comments notwithstanding. But these are federal policies and laws that are driving these local issues and it is our problem with sea lions and salmon on the West Coast. But guess what? You are next. And it is not a local law or policy that is driving it. It is federal. And you know, this has to be addressed on a national basis.

And I think these regional issues are the examples we use to develop the recommendations. Without them, you know, what would be the problem?

I guess my vote is for leaving them in rather than tearing them out, because they are just local.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. Mark, where would you like to go from here? I don't mean-- per the discussion. Should we consider all of this and come back with something at the next meeting?

Heather?

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | MS. McCARTY: What if we go through |
|----|--|
| 2 | these and just agree, number one, if there is |
| 3 | going to be a subcommittee for each of these |
| 4 | areas. And then just say the top three things |
| 5 | or whatever for each one of those areas. See |
| 6 | if we can agree on that and just be done with |
| 7 | it, and then people can give their names to |
| 8 | Mark if they want to chair or they want to be |
| 9 | on it. |
| 10 | MR. BILLY: We can certainly do |
| 11 | that. I don't know that we have a uniform |
| 12 | list at this time. |
| 13 | MS. McCARTY: Okay, well, I have |
| 14 | been writing everything down. |
| 15 | DR. HOLLIDAY: Do we want to do |
| 16 | that, or do we want just to let the |
| 17 | subcommittees decide? Maybe have top three |
| 18 | issues that the full committee wants addressed |
| 19 | and then the subcommittee come up with |
| 20 | additional issues. |
| 21 | MS. McCARTY: Okay, that will do. |
| 22 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |

1 MR. FISHER: But once again, 2 intent here is to give policy direction. Isn't that what this is all about? 3 4 MS. McCARTY: Yes. I just wanted to make 5 MR. FISHER: sure we remembered that. 6 Okay. Well, let's run 7 MR. BILLY: through them, then. And the first question 8 then for the first area, which is Recreational 9 10 Fisheries Working Group is to continue having that working group, at least through the next 11 meeting, and have a briefing as was suggested 12 13 by Bob, and then see where we go from here. Yes, Bob. 14 FLETCHER: Clearly the first 15 MR. two items on this one page that Mark handed 16 out are going to be the topic of discussion 17 and some updates. And I am of the assumption 18 19 that we will be closer to Washington, D.C. at that next meeting. So, it will be easier for 20

NEAL R. GROSS

and provide us an update.

people from the Agency to be able to drop by

21

And then the subcommittee can discuss these other items, as well as any others they think might be the subject of future discussion or not, and come back to the full committee after the subcommittee meets and make a recommendation to the full committee.

So, I think for now I would just suggest that all four of these be left there. And any others that any members of the working group have can be the topic of the future meetings— the next MAFAC meeting— and then report back with those. Is there a need for this working group to continue? If so, what are the items, such as identified.

MR. BILLY: Okay. One of the -last bullet item there, management the of summer flounder, seemed to evolve in our discussion to а broader question the respective management roles of the federal government and the states.

MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 2 | should necessarily stand. They are |
|----|--|
| 3 | recreational fisheries. I understand why it |
| 4 | is there, but I don't know where else. We |
| 5 | don't have any I guess that is the all- |
| 6 | inclusive ecosystem approach would encompass |
| 7 | it. |
| 8 | I don't have any objection to |
| 9 | MR. DiLERNIA: Strategic planning. |
| 10 | I would put it with Strategic Planning and |
| 11 | Budget |
| 12 | MR. BILLY: Strategic Planning? |
| 13 | MR. DiLERNIA: because one of |
| 14 | the things that you mentioned, Tom, was the |
| 15 | fact that the duplication effort and how you |
| 16 | could probably save money on the federal level |
| 17 | if you just limited it to one set of |
| 18 | management. |
| 19 | MR. DORSETT: I was thinking |
| 20 | Commerce Subcommittee |
| 21 | (Laughter.) |
| 22 | MR. DORSETT: Mr. Chairman. |
| | |

MR. BILLY: And I am not sure that

| 1 | With all due respect, Mr. Chairman. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FLETCHER: But then he might |
| 3 | have handed that off anyway. So, he doesn't |
| 4 | mind. He'll go with that. |
| 5 | MR. BILLY: Yes. Dave? |
| 6 | MR. WALLACE: I understand where |
| 7 | Tony is coming from and we can make a |
| 8 | recommendation to the Secretary of Commerce. |
| 9 | However, I really think that it would require |
| 10 | legislation to do that. It would almost have |
| 11 | to go to Congress. You know, you would say, |
| 12 | "Hey, Congress, this is what we recommend." |
| 13 | And I think that you would find a number of |
| 14 | states that might support it and a number of |
| 15 | states who said they are very much against it. |
| 16 | But I see this as it flies right in the |
| 17 | face of the Magnuson Act. |
| 18 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Yes, Tony? |
| 19 | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes. No, you don't |
| 20 | have to go to Congress. |
| 21 | MR. WALLACE: Oh, okay. Good you |
| 22 | practice law. |

| 1 | MR. DiLERNIA: No, I'm just using |
|----|--|
| 2 | the |
| 3 | MR. O'SHEA: Red drum. They just |
| 4 | did it in red drum. |
| 5 | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, you did it. |
| 6 | You didn't have to go to Congress on that, did |
| 7 | you? |
| 8 | MR. WALLACE: But South Atlantic |
| 9 | withdrew the red drum one. |
| LO | MR. DiLERNIA: And you didn't have |
| L1 | to do it with lobster. |
| L2 | MR. WALLACE: No, there was |
| L3 | legislation on lobster. |
| L4 | MR. DiLERNIA: There was. How |
| L5 | about herring? |
| L6 | MR. WALLACE: There is joint |
| L7 | management of herring. |
| L8 | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, but it is |
| L9 | mostly Commission now? |
| 20 | MR. WALLACE: No. |
| 21 | MR. DiLERNIA: All right. I know |
| 22 | during not the last administration, the |

| 1 | Clinton administration they wanted to pull a |
|----|--|
| 2 | number of plans. As a matter of fact, I think |
| 3 | this originally originated from it. They |
| 4 | wanted to pull the Fishery Management Plan for |
| 5 | bluefish. And the concept was you could still |
| 6 | have federal management for MAFMC. There was |
| 7 | another species. |
| 8 | But there was like proposal on the |
| 9 | part of the administration to pull those plans |
| 10 | for the management. |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: Chris? |
| 12 | MR. WALLACE: You know |
| 13 | MR. BILLY: Oh, sorry, Dave. Go |
| 14 | ahead if it is on the point. |
| 15 | MR. WALLACE: Yes. You know, I |
| 16 | don't see any reason why this committee could |
| 17 | not recommend to the secretary that they go to |
| 18 | Congress to change the law. You know, you can |
| 19 | request that they do that. The administration |
| 20 | proposes changes in all the laws all the time. |
| 21 | So that is not an issue. I think that it is |

a very, very broad policy issue and Congress

would want to be involved in that also.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, if you are going to do it, just remember that we will be doing this five or six or ten years from now.

MR. BILLY: Chris?

MR. DORSETT: I was curious about the first two bullets and if things are going to take effect in January and we don't meet until the spring, as Randy said, then what do we do other than get maybe an update? I mean, are there some activities beyond that that we would be engaged in and provide assistance?

MR. FLETCHER: Just-- my view on this is that there is a number of states that aren't excited about the registry and implementation of new surveys that may require participation by financially. the states There is a number of issues that while they are in the reauthorization of Magnuson Act, it is not at all clear how they are going to be implemented, when they going are implemented. This is a moving target.

NEAL R. GROSS

think that until we have a better sense of just how the federal government plans implementing this, we need to keep this on our radar, at least for one more meeting, to find out from them where they are. What have you done? What is your plan? And if we see a member of the subcommittee, there might some things that we might be able to recommend to them to help them more smoothly move past this so we get to the goal of having all anglers identified, and get to the goal of having a better data collection system. Maybe we can, in fact, be involved in the policy, a new direction, once we see what is going on.

So, I just felt like one more meeting was important for the working group to just see where are, now that January first has come and gone, where we are five months or six months later. So that was why I felt like these two items should definitely be topics, and some of the NMFS people who are involved, whether it be Gordon Coleman or Pres Pate who

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 key players, might be able to come back and tell us what is going on, so that we have an idea after all that we were involved in, that it is going in the right direction.

DORSETT: And then MR. Ι just wanted to put a plug in for this third bullet. I think this is a critical issue, especially the, I guess accounting probably is referring accountability measures to the and the accountability amongst various sectors managing fisheries to the extent it is not incorporated in the emirate. This is one that is going to be a real challenge, and I think it will be useful for this committee to engage on advice to the secretary.

MR. BILLY: Okay, good. Thanks.

Okay, we still have bullet item number four. Jim Gilmore, the chair of the Strategic Planning, Budget, and Program Management Committee, has chosen not to step out of the room. It doesn't matter to me where it is, but I think it is logically

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

placed there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. LOWMAN: I'm not sure it fits to -- in my mind, it may not be one of the top three priorities for this committee. I mean, think obviously the transition, hopefully we will be able to figure out the way to interact with the transition team prior to our next meeting, our document and our And it may be recommendations on transition. that that is going to be an iterative process. be feedback important to There will this subcommittee then to work on at the meeting.

So, that seems to me that we actually want the high ones. You know, I would like to see some of the issues, they were big ones, that we put in under LAPPS continue. I mean, how do we actually make these cost effective reasonable things that work?

And then in my mind what Vince brought up is in an even broader sense that we

NEAL R. GROSS

1 have a lot of things that cost a lot of money 2 but how are we going to pay for them. And are there new ways, maybe there are some creative 3 new ways that have been possible for funding 4 and so on and so forth in partnerships that we 5 might be able to come up with here, too, that 6 7 could help. But you know, obviously, we want to 8 be sure that as that scaffold is being put 9 10 here, let me know if this vacancy survives. MR. BILLY: Bob? 11 MR. FLETCHER: Just 12 13 clarification. Mark, up on the Recreational Fisheries Working talk 14 Group, you about 15 challenges of applying allowable catch limits. 16 Isn't that annual catch limits? Because you have got it down under strategic planning, 17 annual catch limit rule. Isn't that what it 18 19 is, ACL? So, shouldn't that logically just 20

NEAL R. GROSS

working group and covered under that third or

erased from the recreational

21

22

fisheries

fourth bullet?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. HOLLIDAY: There is no science behind putting it in one bin versus another. They are talking about the same issue. there was a particular issue associated with sector ACL for the recreational and the accountability measures associated with them that we thought perhaps that the ad hoc working group might be best suited to address that specific question to the more general policy question about ACLs in general was what was more of a strategic, broader guestion.

So, as we said earlier, a lot of these things cross the jurisdiction, if you will, of different committees. And since there was particular emphasis on that ACL for the sectors and how do we choose appropriate accountability measures. But it could be one versus the other. Again, there is no hard and fast rule.

MR. FLETCHER: Yes, and it kind of ties into the MRIP in a way. The better catch

NEAL R. GROSS

1 data that you have, the better you will be 2 able to determine when those limits have been reached and you can take appropriate action. 3 4 DR. HOLLIDAY: Sure. MR. FLETCHER: But it just felt to 5 me like one might be better served by having 6 7 it all in the same place, the whole issue, even though there was some recreational 8 component that maybe stands out more. 9 10 DR. HOLLIDAY: Right. And I am having second thoughts about having done this 11 because people are paying 12 too 13 attention to sort of the words and the bins. It was really just an aid to help stimulate 14 15 some brainstorming as opposed to --MR. FLETCHER: Well, you did it. 16 DR. HOLLIDAY: -- voting on it as, you 17 know, do we want this one or that one. 18 19 are just things that are issues that 20 important to NMFS because we are decisions on these issues over the next 12 21

Some of them have very big policy

months.

implications. Some of them taken together will have some policy implications or precedent or would be better informed by having some guidance from a group like MAFAC, but there is nothing sacred about any of them or which bin they have been placed.

So, I know I said it already, but I just don't want to get too caught up in it. It is what you think is important and what you think MAFAC can contribute in providing advice, prioritization, guidance, instruction to NOAA, to the administration, that has to do with budget, that has to do with policy decisions, that has to legislation, things that will help the organization fulfill its responsibilities for Living Marine Resource.

MR. BILLY: Okay. So, we will keep the first three and move the fourth bullet under Strategic Planning, Budget, and Program Management? Okay? That is summer flounder, but really it is the broader issue.

MS. McCARTY: It is the broader

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 | issue. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: Yes. Dual management |
| 3 | issues. State-federal. |
| 4 | MR. FISHER: State-federal |
| 5 | alignment. |
| 6 | MR. BILLY: Yes, that is good. |
| 7 | Okay. Then let's move on. Strategic |
| 8 | Planning, Budget, and Program Management. |
| 9 | There seems to be an obvious need to continue |
| LO | that subcommittee. |
| 11 | MS. McCARTY: Add LAPPS to that. |
| L2 | MR. BILLY: Add LAPPS to that? |
| L3 | MS. McCARTY: Take it out of |
| L4 | Commerce and put it up there. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Yes, go ahead. |
| L6 | MS. McCARTY: If you are talking |
| L7 | about implementation of the Magnuson-Stevens, |
| 18 | maybe that is just a subtopic. If you had |
| L9 | that whole implementation, it could include a |
| 20 | number of things, including LAPPS. |
| 21 | MR. GILMORE: Yes, I had from my |
| 22 | notes, NEPA, the catch limit and LAPPS. |

| 1 | MS. McCARTY: Bringing NEPA from |
|----|--|
| 2 | the last category up into that one. Right? |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Okay. How about this |
| 4 | climate services, climate research |
| 5 | organization item? |
| 6 | MR. GILMORE: We are going to say |
| 7 | the same thing. I think we are going to say |
| 8 | the same thing. |
| 9 | MR. BILLY: Go ahead. |
| 10 | MR. GILMORE: Well, I guess my only |
| 11 | thought on that is I understand from an |
| 12 | organizational chart standpoint within NOAA |
| 13 | that this falls neatly in here. And so I |
| 14 | think as long as we would be clear in our |
| 15 | subcommittee as to what aspect of it we were |
| 16 | looking at. But you know, clearly over here |
| 17 | would be ecosystem, climate change, ocean |
| 18 | situation. I mean, I think that is where |
| 19 | MR. BILLY: Shall we scratch it out |
| 20 | here? |
| 21 | MS. McCARTY: It seems to be part |
| 22 | of the transition planning at NMFS or lower. |

| 1 | And it seems to have a life in that sense in |
|----|--|
| 2 | that there may be another, I don't know what |
| 3 | you call it, line office or whatever that |
| 4 | might be dedicated to that. |
| 5 | And, if NMFS NOAA we could be |
| 6 | doing that, then perhaps it would be useful to |
| 7 | have advice from us on that. Just that part |
| 8 | of it, not the science. |
| 9 | MS. LOWMAN: In sort of how they |
| 10 | are integrated into the whole picture. |
| 11 | MS. McCARTY: Yes, and how the |
| 12 | fisheries might be involved. |
| 13 | MS. LOWMAN: Right. |
| 14 | MS. McCARTY: How it fits. |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |
| 16 | MS. McCARTY: I'm assuming though. |
| 17 | MR. BILLY: Okay, MAFAC advice on |
| 18 | how fisheries fits into it. Okay. |
| 19 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: We make sure |
| 20 | we fit into it. |
| 21 | MS. LOWMAN: We make sure you do. |
| 22 | We should have. |

VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: We want to be their number one client.

MS. LOWMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. BILLY: Okay. How about the next item under it, the performance metrics and sub-bullets?

Well, I think I DR. HOLLIDAY: heard someone they are not clear what it meant. But the program management aspect of this subcommittee is looking at performance of programs over time. was getting to how do we measure the program accountability of things like habitat conservation. I mean, for the things that we do in fisheries management, there are metrics that we use in annual performance, you know, Government Performance Results Act. But for some of these other issues in program management, how do we know if they are successful and is their advice about improving or increasing programs when we don't have good metrics for them. So, is there something 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

MAFAC wanted to say about performance program management of things management or having do with these non-sustainable to fisheries office-type programs. So, there are questions that are important to us, as we are being asked to look at the accountability and performance of our programs. Is it something that MAFAC is interested in weighing in on? If not, that is fine. If so, that is fine, too.

You had a question?

MR. REISNER: Yes, on this performance metrics, I have to tell you that in terms of the budget and justifications for either changes or increases in our funding, they are critical. And to the degree that you guys look at them and decide these don't make sense or they could be better or they are fine, it would be helpful.

MR. BILLY: Your druthers. Something we should keep on the list?

MR. GILMORE: We have out-year

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

| 1 | programming budgeting that we can kind of roll |
|----|--|
| 2 | those all in with the performance metrics. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: All right. The |
| 4 | Commerce Subcommittee? |
| 5 | We have heard endorsements for the |
| 6 | Seafood Safety and Quality, the ongoing |
| 7 | effort. Continue to be involved in |
| 8 | aquaculture, at least in the form of updates, |
| 9 | eco-labeling. The fishery disasters, I think |
| 10 | we might have a better sense of that, after |
| 11 | the discussions in the next couple of days. |
| 12 | Seeing, particularly from a national |
| 13 | perspective, there is gaps or, you know, |
| 14 | recommendations you want to make in terms of |
| 15 | how that is handled or is being handled. |
| 16 | So, I would say it is okay to keep |
| 17 | it on the list but it is not one of the top |
| 18 | priorities at this point. We have moved |
| 19 | LAPPS. |
| 20 | Illegal, unregulated, and |
| 21 | unreported fishing there is a particular |
| 22 | part of that that relates to the European |

| 1 | Commission and some requirements that they are |
|----|--|
| 2 | imposing, which could affect Commerce. But I |
| 3 | don't know if anyone wants to speak to that, |
| 4 | if that is broad enough to include I think |
| 5 | it is being addressed by the Agency. So, I |
| 6 | scratch that one for now? |
| 7 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Management of |
| 8 | highly migratory species. I just find that |
| 9 | idea of the problems challenging. And I am |
| 10 | not sure what this committee could do, but |
| 11 | maybe it is a future topic where we could get |
| 12 | a more detailed briefing on. |
| 13 | MR. FISHER: Why is it not working |
| 14 | now? |
| 15 | MR. BILLY: Why and why. Put our |
| 16 | selves in a stronger position to consider what |
| 17 | the real issues are and decide whether we are |
| 18 | in a position to make recommendations, and |
| 19 | what they might be. |
| 20 | Okay? All right. Next |
| 21 | subcommittee, Protected Resources |
| 22 | Subcommittee. Should the Marine Mammal Act be |

| 1 | included under that? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. McCARTY: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Okay. And then how to |
| 4 | deal with recovered species? |
| 5 | MR. FLETCHER: Maybe those |
| 6 | populations of marine mammals should |
| 7 | MR. BILLY: Yes, all of those cover |
| 8 | words. |
| 9 | MR. SIMPSON: We are, Mr. |
| 10 | Chairman, looking at a good thing and that is |
| 11 | how do you take something off of an endangered |
| 12 | species list? We are approaching a good |
| 13 | milestone. And how do we do that? All we |
| 14 | have ever done is make a list. I think grey |
| 15 | whales. |
| 16 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: And the |
| 17 | Caribbean monk seals. |
| 18 | MR. SIMPSON: But I mean, those are |
| 19 | the |
| 20 | MR. FLETCHER: Don't think cars |
| 21 | wouldn't kill them. |
| 22 | MR. JONER: Twenty-five were killed, |

| 1 | and that was a problem in whales. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. JONER: I mean, there is |
| 3 | another law coming in. It was de-listed, and |
| 4 | then the court said "Well, wait a minute. You |
| 5 | have got the Marine Mammal Protection Act that |
| 6 | supersedes your treaty." That is just kind of |
| 7 | the first time we heard that. So, now it is |
| 8 | back in Jim's lap. Not the LAP here but |
| 9 | MR. SIMPSON: Unusual |
| 10 | circumstances. |
| 11 | MR. CATES: In Hawaii we have this |
| 12 | issue for years and years and years, where |
| 13 | there is an overabundance of turtles creating |
| 14 | many other problems, like a significant |
| 15 | increase in shark attacks. It is their main |
| 16 | source of food. All of a sudden, we have a |
| 17 | little problem in Hawaii right now. A lot of |
| 18 | people eat them, where we once didn't have |
| 19 | that. |
| 20 | MR. DiLERNIA: Who is eating them? |
| 21 | MR. CATES: Tigers. I mean, my own |
| 22 | back yard, I haven't seen a tiger in my entire |

| 1 | life in this bay. And you can't go there |
|----|--|
| 2 | without seeing them now. |
| 3 | MR. DiLERNIA: Because they are |
| 4 | eating turtles? |
| 5 | MR. CATES: Oh, yes, it is their |
| 6 | main diet. |
| 7 | MS. FOY: So they are hanging out |
| 8 | where the turtles are. |
| 9 | MR. CATES: So that is why an |
| 10 | ecosystem-based approach, you can create other |
| 11 | problems by protecting one species, and it |
| 12 | becomes overabundant. |
| 13 | MS. FOY: So what I think I am |
| 14 | hearing, Mr. Chairman, is we need to talk |
| 15 | about some de-listing standards and some |
| 16 | protocol to help NOAA go through that process. |
| 17 | Larry is right. This is a good thing. And I |
| 18 | think that |
| 19 | MR. JONER: You want to de-listing |
| 20 | into management of these things. Because that |
| 21 | is going to be the big challenge. You can get |
| 22 | it de-listed, but it is still there. |

| 1 | MR. BILLY: Okay. We have got a |
|----|--|
| 2 | lot of items on this list. Are there two or |
| 3 | three that are the most important? |
| 4 | MS. LOWMAN: I mean, I like |
| 5 | Heather's idea about the larger issues, the |
| 6 | issues related to the ESA and the |
| 7 | authorization of those, and this issue of de- |
| 8 | listing and covering in management. And then |
| 9 | these are all sort of examples that all relate |
| 10 | to that, and they can be kept on there sort of |
| 11 | under these umbrellas. |
| 12 | MR. JONER: They could be sub- |
| 13 | bullets. |
| 14 | MS. LOWMAN: Yes, because they are |
| 15 | sort of regional aspects and examples. |
| 16 | MR. BILLY: It sounds like a good |
| 17 | way to approach that. Comments? Okay. |
| 18 | And then finally, the ecosystems |
| 19 | approach subcommittee. Beyond the, we have |
| 20 | struck out the NEPA, discovered previously. |
| 21 | And we have got climate change. This idea of |
| 22 | acidification issue. Commercial-recreational |

| 1 | conflicts. At least that is what I wrote as I |
|----|--|
| 2 | heard it. The state-federal jurisdiction, |
| 3 | although I think that is now covered under Jim |
| 4 | Gilmore. |
| 5 | MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, Jim. |
| 6 | MR. BILLY: That's good. No? |
| 7 | MR. GILMORE: I heard he was a |
| 8 | crappy chair anyway. |
| 9 | MR. BILLY: And this idea of ocean |
| 10 | zoning, which is a big idea. And wasn't there |
| 11 | a recent issue about the declaration of |
| 12 | monuments? |
| 13 | MR. SIMPSON: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. BILLY: Is that ocean zoning? |
| 15 | Anyway, that broad issue, however, ought to be |
| 16 | kept on the list, I think, at least. Yes, |
| 17 | Tom? |
| 18 | MR. WALLACE: Well, I think if you |
| 19 | do that, you have to look at number one, |
| 20 | number two, number three and number four |
| 21 | there, are really basically subtopics of that. |
| | |

So, you could actually cut the list down.

| 1 | MR. BILLY: Okay. Okay, yes, |
|----|--|
| 2 | Vince? Oh, sorry. |
| 3 | MR. O'SHEA: Thanks. On the |
| 4 | commercial-recreational, it is not clear to me |
| 5 | why that ends up in the ecosystem thing. It |
| 6 | seems to me that it is either going to be |
| 7 | whose dollars are bigger than the other |
| 8 | dollars or it is going to be part of a broader |
| 9 | strategic policy issue for the Agency. |
| 10 | So, I think that might be one to |
| 11 | move, Mr. Chairman. I think it would fit |
| 12 | either under Commerce or the Strategic Policy. |
| 13 | MR. BILLY: I feel obligated. |
| 14 | All right. And then, oh, Patty. |
| 15 | Sorry. |
| 16 | MS. DOERR: Since Steven and I we |
| 17 | operate reauthorization down there, how about |
| 18 | a discussion about authorization of the |
| 19 | Sanctuaries Act? There is potential that they |
| 20 | might tinker with how they manage fisheries |
| 21 | within the sanctuaries. |

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. BILLY: Okay. Yes?

22

| 1 | MS. FOY: Tom, I don't know if I am |
|----|--|
| 2 | speaking out of context here, but I really |
| 3 | think we ought to move the ocean acidification |
| 4 | into a full discussion, briefing and |
| 5 | discussion. I think that is going to be a |
| 6 | monster issue. |
| 7 | MR. BILLY: Maybe start out with a |
| 8 | full briefing by appropriate people at our |
| 9 | next meeting. |
| 10 | MS. FOY: Dr. Feeley, yes. |
| 11 | MR. BILLY: Okay. |
| 12 | MS. FOY: And then move to a |
| 13 | subcommittee, if it is necessary. |
| 14 | MR. BILLY: Sounds all right to me. |
| 15 | Okay. All right, good. |
| 16 | Okay, any other thoughts on this? |
| 17 | I think we have got a good working list. I |
| 18 | appreciate all of your input. Thank you. |
| 19 | I think we have pretty well covered |
| 20 | the agenda for today. |
| 21 | MR. DiLERNIA: Are we on time? |
| 22 | MR. BILLY: We're early. |

| 1 | MR. DiLERNIA: Ahead of time. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. BILLY: As I promised. |
| 3 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: Well let's |
| 4 | see, we were going to get more explicit or |
| 5 | repeat the directions to the event. So maybe |
| 6 | we can do that. |
| 7 | MR. SIMPSON: Out the front door. |
| 8 | Turn right. Iberville all the way, five |
| 9 | blocks. |
| 10 | MR. BILLY: Which way do you turn |
| 11 | on Iberville? |
| 12 | MR. SIMPSON: You turn left. |
| 13 | MR. BILLY: Left on Iberville. |
| 14 | MR. SIMPSON: Right on the river. |
| 15 | Aquarium of Americas 6:00. Bring your name |
| 16 | tag. Something happened to the first page, |
| 17 | Jim, and yours didn't get, Ginny didn't bring |
| 18 | yours. So somebody needs to know who you are. |
| 19 | MR. BILLY: We'll get you in. |
| 20 | MR. SIMPSON: I'm just repeating |
| 21 | what she said. |
| 22 | VICE CHAIR BALSIGER: If I can't |

| 1 | get in, I'm going to go to a blues band |
|----|--|
| 2 | someplace. |
| 3 | MR. BILLY: Just see Mark. Tell |
| 4 | Mark what you would like to do. |
| 5 | So they are going to come to you if |
| 6 | they want to be on one or more of the |
| 7 | subcommittees. |
| 8 | MR. SIMPSON: If anybody wants |
| 9 | extra of these things, come get them. |
| LO | MR. DiLERNIA: Are those the |
| 11 | directions to the aquarium? |
| L2 | MR. BILLY: Turn the machine off. |
| L3 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off |
| L4 | the record at 4:36 p.m., to |
| L5 | reconvene Thursday, November 13, |
| L6 | 2008 at 8:30 a.m.) |
| L7 | |
| 18 | |
| L9 | |