#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

# NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

#### MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

Friday, November 14, 2008

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee met in the Bienville Room in the Hotel Chateau LeMoyne, 301 Rue Dauphine, New Orleans, Louisiana, at 8:30 a.m., Tom Billy, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

SAM RAUCH (For VICE-CHAIR BALSIGER)
TOM BILLY
MARK HOLLIDAY, Director, Office of Policy
RANDY CATES
BILL DEWEY
PATTY DOERR
CHRIS DORSETT
ERIKA FELLER

RANDY FISHER, PSMFC ROB FLETCHER

CATHERINE FOY JIM GILMORE

MARTIN FISHER

STEVE JONER

DOROTHY LOWMAN

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 HEATHER McCARTY
VINCE O'SHEA, ASMFC
TOM RAFTICAN
ERIC SCHWAAB
LARRY SIMPSON, GSMFC
DAVE WALLACE

## ALSO PRESENT:

RITA CURTIS
RALPH CANTRAL
TOPHER HOLMES
PETER JONES
HARLON PEARCE
SAM RAUCH
GARY REISNER
ALAN RISENHOOVER
MICHAEL RUBINO
PHIL STEELE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
Discussion of Committee Membership on Fishery Management Councils4
Impact of 2005 Hurricanes on Gulf of Mexico Marine Resources:
Phil Steele
Community Sustainability, Rita Curtis89
Conclusions and Recommendations Re: Fisheries Infrastructure123
Discussion of Future Meeting Dates172
Sustainable Fishing Communities189
Presentation of Ralph Cantral189
Industry Assistance, Gary Reisner215
Presentation by Alan Risenhoover 242

## PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

(8:32 a.m.)

MR. BILLY: Okay. One of the things we'd like to start out with before we get into the specific agenda is Mark looked at the committee membership as it relates to the various fishery management councils, as well as people that live in and around Washington, for purposes of following up D.C., as discussed with the 2020 document, and so I'd like to call on Mark to share with you both how it looks and then we're going to ask for you to talk among yourselves and decide which several of will take the one or you

responsibility for the different councils.

16 So Mark.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you, Tom.

It's interesting. There's a well, not interesting -- but it's comforting to know that we have а good regional representation across regional councils our since that's of intents in one our our

selection of members, and so the distribution looks pretty good that we can probably cover all of the regional council areas with one of our members.

And so I'd like you to during a break or at lunchtime today look at the other members that are within the regional council areas, and so as an example, for the three councils, England, Mid-East Coast New Atlantic, and South Atlantic among Tony, who unfortunately just had to leave, Eric, Dave Wallace, and John Graves, they should agree on a division of labor as to who would be willing and able to brief the council on the 2020 paper.

And so as we go through the different councils, I'd like to have you self-select who you think would be available and capable of and interested in doing that on behalf of MAFAC.

The Fisheries Service would write a letter on your behalf to the Council Executive

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Directors explaining the purpose and serving as the introduction to invite ourselves to get on their agenda, and it may be a couple of meetings before they actually have the time and ability to squeeze us in since they're usually pretty full agendas planned well in advance. Nonetheless, we'll help to facilitate getting you to those meetings.

The other criteria that we're looking at is to try to minimize the cost to MAFAC, and so if you're local and we look at the council meetings that are online, you can look at the Websites and see if it's going to be particularly close to you. That might be a factor in deciding who among your little peer group would be best to serve there.

We're also fortunate that for the briefings that might be done on a short notice in the D.C. area for transition, recall Jim's comment yesterday about being flexible. We have a number of people, including Tom, Jim Gilmore, John Connelly, Patty and Eric that,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

again, are within car striking distance of D.C. to help represent the committee as you select who among that group would be ready and available to help with those transition team briefings and new administration briefings.

So the charge to the committee for the morning is to check among the different groups from your region about who might be able to best cover these council briefings on 2020 and get that information back to me, and if you need some help, I'm here to provide you information about council meeting dates or any other of the mechanics about how to do that.

But by the time we leave today, I'd like to have at least a first order representation and we can get started on getting the invite letters and request letters prepared.

Any questions? Is that okay? Sound reasonable?

MR. BILLY: I think we would include the Commission folks as well. So

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

we're not limiting it at all. Okay? All right.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So over beignets at the first break (if you haven't had one, you can go for a hike down since I bought some beignets for everybody to make sure you had a taste of the true Cafe du Monde New Orleans experience) and make your decisions about where to go next for those council members.

Thank you, Tom.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Today is sort of dedicated to an examination of the policies influencing U.S. fisheries' infrastructure, and we're going to look at it from several perspectives, and in particular, we're taking advantage again of being present here in the Gulf, but we urge the Committee to not limit your thinking just to the Gulf.

Obviously there have been some very significant events here, and we can learn a

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	lot from that, but events occur all around the
2	United States, and the broader question we're
3	looking at is are the existing policies that
4	relate to infrastructure, support, emergency
5	response or disaster assistance, are those
6	policies adequate? Are there gaps? Are there
7	other things that should be done or a change
8	of emphasis with a view that then the
9	Committee would make some recommendations to
10	the Secretary in that regard?
11	So I think it's a good opportunity
12	and timely to look at that area, particularly
13	as we're moving into a new administration.
14	So to start off this morning Phil
15	Steele, who you met yesterday, is going to
16	share with us from the regional perspective
17	the experience and response to the hurricane
18	events that have occurred here.
19	Phil.
20	MR. STEELE: Thank you, Mr.
21	Chairman.
22	Good morning, everyone. I trust

everyone had a good night in New Orleans and were in bed by nine. I know I was.

(Laughter.)

MR. STEELE: Му report this morning, presentation, is going to deal with impact of the horrific 2005 hurricane the season on marine resources in the Gulf of This is one of two congressionally Mexico. mandated reports developed, that we looking at the impact of marine resources. The other one was on habitat. I won't deal too much with habitat today, but strictly on

Both of these reports are available online if you care to get them.

To take a minute just to thank some of the people in this room who were helpful, responsible for getting this report together, we had about six months to do it.

Larry Simpson's staff, Larry.

The state directors, certainly our NOAA Fisheries folks.

#### **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

marine resources.

I was basically the herder of cats on this report. So it was a very good, cooperative effort and turned out to be a pretty good product.

Some of this information in this report is a little dated because it came out in 2007, but I'm sure Larry and Harlon will bring us up on some more recent information and certainly some impacts of the more recent storms.

I think all of us in fisheries management will acknowledge the fact that we try to use the best available science in managing our fisheries and developing our fisheries management plans. However, I think Mother Nature sometimes has its own fisheries management plan in mind, and this is one of them right here.

Let me read from my notes here for a minute so I can remember all of this stuff.

This is Hurricane Katrina. It first damaged southern Florida when it moved

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

across the Florida Keys as a Category 1 hurricane on the Saffir-Simpson scale. After strengthening to a Cat. 5, which is pretty tremendous, over the central Gulf, Katrina weakened slightly to a Cat. 4 and then a Cat. 3 before making landfall on August 29th near Buras, Louisiana and again on the Louisiana-Mississippi coast.

This was the most severe of the 2005 hurricanes and probably one of the worst natural disasters to ever hit the United States in living memory.

Right behind her came her sister,
Rita. This is the hurricane tidal damage
done. You can see where this story came up.
That's Buras and this storm came up, and the
storm surge came up over 20 feet pushing into
New Orleans, but most of the flooding came
from all the way up the Mississippi.

I got ahead of myself here.

We had the opportunity -- this is a motley crew right here, but right after the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

storm, this is people from the regional office, from IRA, Dr. Crabtree. We had the opportunity to fly with the hurricane hunters, to go up and assess some of this damage.

I've flown lot of а military aircraft in my life, but I'll tell you these hurricane hunters are something to see. think they're all frustrated fighter jocks. You can always tell when Dr. Crabtree flew up in the flight engineer seat and wanted to go see something because they would put the -we're at 500 feet in this big, old P-3 -- put that airplane on its wing like this and just It's really something to see, but we've whew. all seen these pictures on TV of the damage caused by these hurricanes, but to see this from the air at very, very low altitude was really something to see. Indescribable.

Next came Rita about a month after Katrina. Landfall on the northern Gulf coast; came ashore near Sabine Pass, Texas, also as a Cat. 3 storm; inflicted major flooding 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

fisheries infrastructure damage on coastal communities in Texas and Louisiana. It just compounded the damage that was done by Katrina.

And last but not least, here came Wilma across the southern coast of Florida. Enough of that reading.

after these Now, storms, fisheries made determination, which Larry will talk little bit more about later Secretary Carlos Gutierrez made two formal fisheries failure determinations, and determinations, of course, authorized Congress to allocate some money to support fisheries disaster relief funds.

Since then the National Marine Fisheries Service and our partners across the Gulf states have attempted to assess the damage, look at debris, and try to rebuild and restore some of these infrastructures that were damaged during the storm.

Impacts. This is derived from 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

report to Congress. In some of the stuff I'm going to tell you about today, you need to be a little cautious in making some informal inferences about hurricane damage and what happened to fisheries. Basically the impacts on marine resource in the Gulf of Mexico were minimal, with the exception of oysters. Cause and effects are a little different.

The report as mandated has four areas. We look at trends in fishery status, types of debris which were horrific in the Gulf, how the funds Congress provided to the emergency bill were utilized, and then some new recommendations that NMFS developed on how to address additional resource needs.

Data sources. We did not go and mine any new data. We didn't create any new studies. We tried, because of the short amount of time that we had, we tried to use, we had to use the available data that was there. Remember all of the Gulf states have follow-up assessments on the impacts of their

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

marine resources that I used, also Southeast Fisheries Science Center data.

There was also a very nice assessment done by Impact Assessments, which is also available if you folks would like to take a look at it.

The overview. Like I said earlier, with the exception of oysters, the available information we had, the impact of these three hurricanes on marine resources, our fin fish, our shrimp, our vertebrates, crabs and lobsters and stuff, was minimal.

However, as you can see, commercial landings, recreational fisheries landings and all of these declined naturally because the infrastructure was gone. I mean basically There was nothing left out there. gone. Ιt seemed gone, flowing across this area. We flew up the coast and went the across Mississippi. It looked like someone had just taken a giant backhoe and cleared everything for a half a mile. All you could see was just

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

slab after slab after slab. So all of the icehouses, the bait houses, the marinas, the docks, gone.

So you can imagine what impact this would have on fisheries landings, not the resources themselves, but the ability to land and processes.

It caused extensive damage to the fisheries' infrastructure in all of the Gulf states, particularly Alabama and Louisiana. In some areas the destruction is still there. Although rebuilding is certainly underway, you can still go to some of these areas, and they have not recovered. You can see areas like this in Louisiana. Some of these areas may never recover.

I think this is Sulphur City. Does that look right? This is some of the pictures we took from the P-3. It's just unbelievable. You can see houses and the oil spills, and the oil in the water was just unbelievable. You see houses with oil up to their eaves, on

the roofs, these giant 100 foot slab shrimp boats up on the docks. It was just an amazing thing to witness the power of these hurricanes.

Here's some of these big slab boats up there. Some of them are still there. It costs thousands and thousands of dollars to

remove these craft and put them back in the

9

water.

it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

20

19

21

22

I like this picture. What's wrong with this picture?

Some people will never be able to do

(Laughter.)

MR. STEELE: This is not a put-on.

This is one I took on purpose. I was going
to send this picture to FEMA and say, "What's
that out there?" That's a good picture.

As I said, most of the infrastructure, especially to the east of this red line is just gone, just absolutely gone. We took some surveys right after when we were doing some of this work shortly after these

things, and it still gives me chills to think about it.

Here's a little bit more of a quantitative look at facilities counts, offloading facilities before and after. You can see offloading processing. Ice plants are one of the biggest things. It's hard to process seafood without ice or gasoline.

As I say, with the exception of the oysters, most of the resources were impacted that much. Our surveys from our Pascagoula science centers at our labs indicated basically shrimp, fin fish basically the same, maybe slightly high to pre-Katrina levels, but there were declines as you would expect in the estuarine shellfish species. It detected some of that in recent studies.

Oysters, very typically the animal that's most impacted by this kind of storm as you can imagine. There are huge amounts of water and silt that are brought across 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

It has a severe impact on our oyster beds.

Alabama was just coming back from Iran when Katrina struck, and it damaged almost 80 percent of their Alabama oyster resources when it made its landfall. Katrina came back in and did the rest of it. So pretty severe damage to the Alabama oyster fisheries as they were in all of the other Gulf states.

I'll concentrate on oysters a little bit because it's basically the only impact on marine resources we had, and you can see Louisiana's commercial oyster landings were down in 2000-2004, and they looked like they were coming back a little bit until Katrina hit. Again, it had its severe impact on it.

It looks like it was resounding a little bit, and again, the storms that have come through in the last year or two probably has some more impact. I'm sure Harlon and Eric can speak to that a little bit more.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Florida, didn't have a lot in
2	Florida that I can see, and also I think some
3	of their trips and landings were down a little
4	bit, and when I talked to some of these guys
5	though, because of some of the impacts on the
6	other areas in the Gulf Coast, they got a
7	little bit better price and a little bit
8	better production because of the impacts on
9	the Mississippi and in Texas and so forth.
10	As you can see, and I won't belabor
11	the point, all of the Gulf states had severe
12	impacts on their oyster.
13	Shrimp.
14	MR. DEWEY: Phil, on the oysters,
15	my understanding was that the hurricane also
16	stimulated a terrific spawn.
17	MR. STEELE: Larry, is that true?
18	MR. SIMPSON: I'm sorry. I was
19	answering a question.
20	MR. STEELE: The impact on oysters,
21	increased spawning.
22	MR. SIMPSON: No.

1	MR. DEWEY: I thought I had
2	understood that it had triggered increased
3	spawning.
4	MR. SIMPSON: It may have. I don't
5	know.
6	MR. STEELE: Well, to see that you
7	get the true value of the impacts on oysters,
8	the next time you guys went down there and
9	order a dozen you'll see they're about eight
10	or nine dollars.
11	The shrimp, not too much. You can
12	take a look at some of the trend analysis.
13	This is just the prawn shrimp. As you can
14	see, it probably is a pretty good line.
15	Actually it has kind of increased a little
16	bit.
17	We'll see the same kind of trends
18	in our fin fish. Not a lot going on there.
19	A little survey coming back on
20	here, another trend analysis of fin fish
21	biomass basically, you know, kind of going
22	back up, not a lot of impact there.

And crabs, lobsters, can't really do too much to blue crabs. You can't hurt them.

where So but here's the real This is on our infrastructures. impacts came. You can see that right after Katrina, the commercial lands in 2005 right after Katrina was the lowest during the 30-year period from '77 to 2006. Dockside revenues, of course, correspondingly, were down also. A little trend analysis on that to give you an idea of millions of pounds, dollars on this.

You can just skip that and kind of do it yourself and get an idea that Katrina had some severe because there was no processing houses out there to be able to process the product that's coming on board the docks.

Recreational undoubtedly really took it in the shorts, too. We looked at this, declines in the five-year averages, some 57 percent, although the number of trips taken

#### **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 weren't that much, but the number of trips in shore and offshore decreased while the number of trips near shore, which makes sense, kind of increased.

The recreational landings, that little dip for 2005, as you see a lot of people were out fishing. There's a lot of debris in the water. People had a hard time getting gasoline. A lot of the boats were up in somebody else's backyard. So it's hard to go fishing without a boat.

Recreational trips are kind of flat, as you can see. A little dip there in 2005, abut you know, to see a lot of these vessels, Larry was just showing me some pictures a few minutes ago. Looking at the charter boat loss, they really, really took a beating on this thing.

This is one that Bobby Walker put together, one of our council members, charter fleet loss of almost \$125 million. Almost 500 vessels were impacted during the storms. Not

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

a lot of places to hide.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Here is probably one of the bigger impacts here, was marine debris. Larry has got some great pictures of this. It was just unbelievable: bridges, barges, shrimp boats, docks, houses. All of the stuff wound up in the water, millions of millions of tons of this. There's a picture of some of it right there.

Right after the storm our Office of Coast Surveys in started came and we partnering with the other Gulf states local fishermen to collect some of the largest shore and coastal base serving efforts near ever implemented by NOAA. We did a lot of marine mapping, and we've also spent a lot of money implementing or giving force to this to clean up some of this.

This is the idea of the marine debris densities along the Gulf coast. As you can see from Bay St. Louis on over, the darker it gets the worse it was. A lot of stuff out

there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And our marine debris removal, which is still ongoing by the way.

Okay. This is another segment of the report that we looked at, the impacts of the force emergency supplemental. Larry can probably give a little bit more updated information on this.

In June the President signed the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, the appropriations bill, the natural hurricane, since all authorities in 2005. Through the act, Congress -- I think it's 188 million; is that correct, Larry? I'll ask you on that -to assist the Gulf states in the ongoing recoveries, rehabilitation of oyster beds, debris, and building mapping the rebuilding our Pascagoula laboratory, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, which was totally destroyed during the storm. I hear it is up and running again.

And the recovery plan, this is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

worked with the something that we Four primary objectives, you can directors. read them yourselves: providing short-term relief; building more sustainable, profitable and commercial recreational fisheries. improving the quality of nursery areas, rebuilding the central fisheries related facilities throughout the Gulf of Mexico.

The recovery plan focused on four major areas, providing short-term financial assistance; restoring infrastructure which I said is still going on; developing funding capacity reduction. I think that hurricane probably took care of a lot of that by itself.

And the number four in red, like I said, it's recovering the essential fish habitats. I'm not going to go into too much of that. They have their own little separate report.

And we start again. I think this is Hurricane Ike. So the saga begins again, and that's it.

Questions?

#### **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. BILLY: Peter.
2	MR. JONER: On the oil rigs, was
3	there any damage to the resources?
4	MR. STEELE: Oh, absolutely. There
5	were a number of rigs that broke loose, sank.
6	Like I said earlier, flying over Louisiana,
7	there was a tremendous amount of leakage from
8	storage tanks, and you could just fly over
9	some of these bayous and they were just black
LO	with oil.
L1	MR. JONER: Storage tanks on shore?
L2	MR. STEELE: On shore.
L3	MR. JONER: But I'm worried about
L4	what about the rigs?
L5	MR. STEELE: There were a number of
L6	rigs that broke loose and sank. There were a
L7	number of old capped oil rigs, pipelines that
L8	blow that the capping came off and you could
L9	see the oil was bubbling up out of the ground.
20	So it was pretty horrific.
21	MR. JONER: So what was the impact
22	of that?

1 MR. STEELE: We're still feeling 2 it. JONER: So it was a major 3 MR. 4 component. MR. STEELE: Absolutely. 5 MR. SIMPSON: Let's see. One 6 7 hundred percent of the 1.5 million barrels per day was down from Katrina. 8 MR. STEELE: Wow. 9 10 MR. SIMPSON: Ninety-four percent of the gas, that's ten billion cubic feet per 11 second, was down. Ninety percent of 12 13 manned platforms were impacted. Eight-five percent of the rigs -- excuse me -- 85 percent 14 of the rigs were evacuated; 90 percent of the 15 16 manned platforms were evacuated. Probably at a minimum, two, three weeks; in actuality, 17 some several months. 18 19 The price of gasoline in Atlanta, Georgia jumped two dollars a gallon. 20 temporary. All total loss, I don't know the 21

actual number, Steve. Probably half a dozen

1	rigs out of hundreds.
2	MR. JONER: So was that typical?
3	MR. SIMPSON: The time frame of
4	getting those guys off, coming back and
5	redoing.
6	MR. JONER: I'm curious about how
7	well they withstood the Category 5.
8	MR. SIMPSON: Like I say, three,
9	four, five six, half a dozen, Harlon, would
10	you guess? Something like that.
11	MR. PEARCE: They got some of them.
12	MR. SIMPSON: Yes.
13	MR. JONER: Four or five out of how
14	many?
15	MR. SIMPSON: Hundreds.
16	MR. PEARCE: A couple hundred, yes.
17	MR. JONER: Okay. So they're built
18	to survive that. Some of them just got hit a
19	little too hard; is that it?
20	MR. PEARCE: They survived it. The
21	real loss is just the loss of effort and work.
22	MR. JONER: Right.

1	MR. PEARCE: When the storm comes,
2	the oil rigs have to be very ahead of it.
3	They've got to get back and cap it after the
4	storm.
5	MR. SIMPSON: I mean, I can't
6	remember. I've dealt with my senses here over
7	time, but the 40, 50 foot wave. They had
8	these buoys offshore. That's unreal, I mean,
9	and that's not just one wave. On and on and
LO	on.
L1	Okay. Thank you. Phil's I'm
L2	going to put a little clothes on the body that
L3	Phil kind of laid out, and we're glad to have
L4	Phil and appreciate having Phil as one of our
L5	Assistant Regional Directors.
L6	Of course, now he got his training
L7	back in the States. So that's why he's so
L8	good. He's a Florida employee.
L9	I'm going to have to push this back
20	and forth.
21	All right. Fisheries are
22	important. Okay. Now, what Phil was talking

about is true. You can get these three storms. In 2005 it was not a fun year, but you've got to remember one thing about a hurricane. From 12 o'clock to three o'clock is the killing zone. That's the northeast quadrant. So whenever you see something hit shore, these folks take the brunt.

Now, the only thing that wasn't Phil, said it right bу went up the Mississippi-Louisiana line. Okay? So it got half of the State of Louisiana. Rita that came about a month or so later got the other half of the State of Louisiana, and then Wilma came across down there, and they had some pot loss and some trap loss and disruptions and so forth.

One other point is this storm was like 300 miles wide. That's unheard of. I've been through these storms since I was a kid, with Betsy in '64 to Camille to all of them, and usually they're very compact. What kills me is when the Weather Channel says, "Now,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	don't worry about exactly where this thing is
2	going to hit land."
3	I laugh at that. If you lived down
4	here, and Harlon and I do, 40 miles makes a
5	big difference, makes a big difference. Now,
6	you've got to make plans to get out and
7	everything, but this one was so wide it was
8	unbelievable. Camille in my aunt's house came
9	right up to the floor. It didn't get inside
10	on River Road and Moss Point. My trunk, when
11	I was in college, floated and I lost a few
12	things on the back porch.
13	In Katrina, the same house
14	that's 1969, Camille 2005, Katrina, there
15	was a glass and the water was this high.
16	That's just one house.
17	MR. FLETCHER: You said the killing
18	zone is 12 to three.
19	MR. SIMPSON: Northeast quadrant.
20	MR. FLETCHER: Is that the surge?
21	Is that the wind? Is that the rain?
22	MR. SIMPSON: Wind.

1	MR. FLETCHER: Everything?
2	MR. SIMPSON: The "baddest" part of
3	the deal because once it gets on shore, now,
4	it's bad. Everything is relative. I'm just
5	saying that's the bad zone.
6	MR. FLETCHER: Is that where a lot
7	of rain falls and it gets you
8	MR. SIMPSON: Man, it rains
9	everywhere, but I mean, it's the worst zone.
10	MR. O'SHEA: Bob, what happens, the
11	hurricane is moving forward. So in that
12	corner, if you look at the circular thing, the
13	forward velocity of the hurricane gets added
14	to the wind of the hurricane. So it's 15 or
15	20 miles an hour higher wind.
16	MR. SIMPSON: It's bad. You want
17	to be out of the northeast quadrant.
18	MR. JONER: Bob, I'll translate to
19	a Californian: Dude, surf's up.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MR. SIMPSON: Okay. So we have
22	these different time things here. You know,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

in September 2005, disaster; September the 29th we did some testing. Steve Murawski and the National Marine Fisheries Service paired with some inside charters and outside charters and all that hydrocarbon was a big worry, and we found that overall there was no elevated levels of contamination in seafood.

In October, Rita came in. Some more testing after that. E. coli, which is a human sewage and so forth, no higher levels of contamination. No negative impacts on seafood quality in January 2006. Congress in June approves an emergency disaster program, 128 million. In June of '07, EDRP II, 85 million, and the latest one, September 30th, '08, we just got a new disaster for Ike and Gustav, 75 million. That's yet to be determined about how that's going to be distributed.

Bring the people back. Help out the fishermen. They've lost their jobs. Keep them. The biggest thing that I'm concerned about and some of the guys were concerned

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

about is you lose these fishermen and you can't just put anybody back in there and say, "This is how you do it." It's an art. Much of it is an art, and if you lose that art, you just can't replace it. So we were real concerned and want to get them back.

A little wrinkle. It doesn't mean a whole lot, but 38 million of the first EDRP I must be spent on oysters. The reason was that the first appropriation was done under agriculture. My good friend Senator Cochran is the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. He wanted that money to get over there, but Agriculture and Commerce deal with natural disasters entirely different. They didn't have rules and regulations to fit oysters, and without getting technical, there's about 50 percent in public grounds and 50 percent in private grounds in Louisiana, and they were going to give you a certain amount of money to do private grounds for each individual lease, you know, and then they were going to give 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	entire public grounds in Louisiana the same
2	amount as one single lease.
3	Well, that don't work. So we had
4	to transfer the 38 million into the Department
5	of Commerce which deals with fisheries and
6	blah, blah, blah.
7	So the first 38 million, and it
8	must be documented, which came through
9	Agriculture, must be spent on oysters. Don't
10	worry about it. We'll spend 60, 80 million.
11	We have probably already satisfied that.
12	MR. SCHWAAB: What was the major
13	impact? Was it sedimentation?
14	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, yes. They get
15	silted over.
16	MR. SCHWAAB: Was removal of that
17	sediment or
18	MR. SIMPSON: You just get mudded
19	over. They suffocate.
20	MR. SCHWAAB: Right. So the money
21	was spent to?
22	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, I can show you.

1	Don't worry.
2	MR. SCHWAAB: You're going to get
3	to that?
4	MR. SIMPSON: Yes, I'll get to
5	that.
6	MR. SCHWAAB: All right. Thank
7	you.
8	MR. SIMPSON: This is how the EDRP
9	I, emergency disaster recovery program, EDRP
10	I, was split up. Texas, about two and a half
11	percent, three million; Louisiana, 53 million;
12	Mississippi, 37 million; Alabama, 29 million;
13	Florida, four million, and some administrative
14	money.
15	We intentionally kept this low, 128
16	million. I'm telling you if I had known what
17	it has involved in handling this program, it's
18	amazing at how much reporting they wanted. As
19	a matter of fact, Lautenbacher was interested
20	and so forth, and he wanted these specific
21	reports, and the reports that he required in

this cooperative agreement are illegal they're

so fast. The process cannot even accept the reports.

We volunteered to do it because you all said we needed to.

Anyway, about 50 million who wished to reap out of that 127 about shellfish, fin fish. Debris removal, about 50 million. Cooperative research, which has to do with shrimp or larval eggs and basic species, about 30 million out of that 128 million. That's how it was supposed to go.

Here we go. EDRP II, not less than two percent, turtle excluded device, bycatch reduction device compliant. In other words, if you had an enforcement action against you and you're a shrimper, you don't get that money. But if you're a clean shrimper and you did good things, then you got some money. All right. That was right off the top.

Ballots were provided to assist fishermen, business, industry, marketing and so forth, oyster relays, et cetera, et cetera.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay. Here's how EDRP broke out. You know, 1.2 detects is 41. This is all in addition to the other numbers. Louisiana, 41 million; Mississippi, 25; Alabama, 50; and Florida and administration.

Here's how we were going to initially lay out all the work: about two million for this, assistance to fishermen, business and industry, domestic marketing, testing, and so forth.

Okay. This is the latest one for the 2009, the one that the President just signed, and it's in process about how to split it up. Disaster money from this one is nationwide. It's not specific just to the Gulf. So they've got some issues on the East Coast and they've got some issues on the West Coast, and we've got Ike and Gustav down in the Gulf. So Gary and them are going to make all of those wonderful decisions, and then they'll tell us how it's going to come about.

It came out under

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act. first came to work, most all of the disasters were under an old program called 88-309 and Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act superseded that, changed that. John Breaux wanted to change it, and so it comes under Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act and Both of these laws Magnuson Act. disaster provisions in them.

That's just September the 1st was Gustav. September the 13 was Ike, and now I'm going to just try to put a little clothes on it, give you a story. Okay? That's all the other stuff.

This is Cocodrie, Louisiana. It's a sport fishing area in South Louisiana, which I went and took these pictures immediately after the storm, and see, I was very much surprised that it wasn't as bad as I thought. It was just Gustav now, but most of them made it, but there was some damage, and so forth.

This is Ike, and this is over in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Texas. Now, watch this spot right here. This is pre-storm.

Now, before you say, "Oh, that guy's lucky," I mean, that whole house is ruined. It's undermined and everything just from the air.

Okay. Here's some accomplishments, things that we've done now. We've had a bunch of these limestone pyramids, sports fishing enhancements, culvert materials, vessels. You know, we're about a third completed, low profile reefs, thousands of cubic yards of concrete trying to recycle things. Limestone reef, 60 percent done here in shore. Used some of these old culverts and so forth.

These things are great. I went out and these prefab limestone and concrete that put in a specific spot. Artificial reefs, they don't move, enhancing the resource again.

Trip reports, and that EDRP II and others that we're trying to get the fishermen.

You know, we pay them and they give us

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

information, so to speak. Okay? We've got about 20,000 in shrimp, about 5,000 in fin fish, and charter boat reports, about 10,000, about 6,000 in oysters. We've got about 50,000 of these reports of where, when, et cetera. So you get a good catch for effort and so forth. We'll be able to use them.

Here's the form that they filled out. We paid them to do that.

Removal, 500 square miles of debris, crab traps, a bunch of crap traps everywhere in the world. We spent about that much.

All right. Here's a crab trap removal. This is a crab trap fisherman. These are lightweight things, and they get strewn everywhere, and we recycled them. The states when I say "we" were cooperative.

Then we get into debris. That's an automobile and this is a beach, I think, in Biloxi. It looks like a war zone. It looks like somebody set off a bomb. Just try go

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

looking at it, cars coming out of the water, trash. You can't see this with these lights very well.

Oyster ground restoration. The issue is you have probably 100 percent, 90 percent mortality in Mississippi on oysters. Okay. That was probably the worst thing. Now, there's infrastructure damage and so forth. So the key part is not the spawning. The key part is to give them culch, give them something to set on, and so that's what you do, is you put down culch material.

I don't know what it is. Ten to one? You put a dollar in and you get ten dollars back? It's a historical thing. So we know what we're doing about this. We've done this before. Those many acres, seed oysters, you know, \$20 million.

What they do is they get this mined oyster shell or limestone or crushed concrete of the specific size. I mean it's down to an art, and they blow it back over into an area

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that this clean culch will accept 1 2 spat, and it's a big operation and costs a lot of money. 3 Now, they don't just throw it out 4 This is an oyster area that's GPS, and 5 there. 6 you can see. If these lights were down, you 7 could see the little lines that he follows, and he stays in a certain pattern. 8 take 9 then you these 10 oysters and you dredge them up unapproved areas, and this is a dredge, oyster 11 dredge, and they put them over the top of all 12 13 of that to help, you know, jump start it. Then you've got this. It's called 14 15 It's like a big, huge steel rake at a tonger. 16 the bottom. It's a historical thing. Have you ever seen a guy that's an oyster tonger? 17 He ain't got no net. Don't mess with him in a 18 19 bar. (Laughter.) 20 MS. FOY: Larry, why are they doing 21

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

this?

1	MR. SIMPSON: By hand. They get
2	the oysters and bring them up.
3	MS. FOY: Oh, they're bringing them
4	up.
5	MR. SIMPSON: Yes. I mean, that's
6	sacks of oysters.
7	Okay. Date is important and they
8	work it all, keep track of it, and so forth.
9	Cost recovery, this is three years
10	after Katrina. This is Gulf Coast Research
11	Laboratory. One of the facilities at Tom
12	McIlwain's aquarium and so forth. That's a
13	symbol for the University of Southern
14	Mississippi.
15	And this was an office in GCRL.
16	Now here it is. This was a bridge between
17	Ocean Springs and Biloxi. We got on it, still
18	working on it, still working on it, and that's
19	what it is today. It's back.
20	I've walked that bridge. This
21	thing they added to it, this walking track, do
22	you see these people? That's a nice walk.

PARTICIPANT: That bridge needed to be replaced.

SIMPSON: Biq. Let me tell MR. When Camille hit, that bridge was brand new when Camille hit, in 1969, and it's a long story, but anyway, they had some bad materials, and that thing plates. They didn't tear it down, but the plates were like this. So they had to put it back. You could go across that bridge after it was brand new until this and it went like this, bo-boom, boboom, bo-boom.

Anyway, historical sites, this is Beauvoir. They've come back. Marinas, this guy went around, you know. You had to have one of these GPSes or you couldn't figure out where you were. You lost all of your landmarks.

Anyway, this was a marina, a big marina. This was a yacht club. There's a swimming pool. That was all that was left of the yacht club. Now the yacht club is back.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That's the swimming pool.

This was a little bait place and a fishing place down in South Louisiana. I forget just where. It doesn't look like much, but that guy is selling bait to recreational fishermen so they could go do their thing. You know, the infrastructure is just horrible.

Bay St. Louis, Long Beach. This was a little processing plant. Now he's back, that processing plant.

This is part of the National Marine Fisheries Service Lab in Pascagoula. There's where it's coming back to now.

Trainer Marine, boats all up in there everywhere. These are menhaden, dead fish who had suffocation with oxygen and so forth, birds, et cetera. This is what we really want. We want these people out here fishing. We want that shrimper and so forth going out and doing his thing. We want these kids to enjoy themselves.

This one I couldn't resist. This

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

is a school of red fish feeding on some sari and mullet right off the Texas coast. That's what we want right there, and I want to be right there.

(Laughter.)

MR. SIMPSON: Menhaden plant. Back during Katrina water inundated and so forth. Remember this little alleyway right here. That's us touring the facility after he's got this thing back. Spent millions. That's his net shed. That's what it's supposed to look like, when he takes his nets and he dips them and so forth to protect them.

The Iberville over in Biloxi, cold storage. You can't do business like that. He's back. This one was so bad and messed up he just had to rebuild. Gollott, he's one of my Commissioners, Senator Gollott, his family. Put some money back in these places.

There's an interface. I keep trying to tell people by necessity the seafood industry has to have that land-water

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

interface. So you're always going to have these problems. You've got shrimpers with land. You've got oil and gas shipyards, you know. You can't bring these things in 20 miles in shore and work on them. You've got to work on them right there.

So this land-water interface is where all of the activity and the problems occur, and we want to get back to commerce and selling the product and so forth, not only shrimp, but there are some other issues that you have to deal with.

This is the kind of thing that you come back to sometimes and you don't think about it. Now, how in the world are you going to figure out where this thing belongs? I don't know how they did it, but they did it, you know. This is in Biloxi and they came back. They found a home and got them all back, but there are still a few. There are still a few.

There was three after Camille, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

they named them Hope, Charity, Faith, Hope and Charity, and they never did figure out who they were.

You know, this kind of stuff right here, this is what we want, you know. When the storms come, they run and hide in the intercoastal, you know, and these boats go back there in hurricane holes and try to save themselves.

After it's all over, both recreational and commercial, you've got this kind of thing even though this was over with, you know.

There's a little old place down in Breton Sound. This is east of the river in Louisiana. Came back and he's going to launch his boats and selling stuff, and he's back.

This lady right here, this is Ocean Springs, Mississippi. I wish you could really see this. It's a beautiful house up here, and that was hurt. It was high up on the hill, but look at all of the mess she had in her

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

front yard.

Now, this woman got really incensed when they came in and got all of that stuff, and they had to get it out of her front yard, but they tore that woman's yard up, and she was so mad because she didn't have any of the damage, but the boats were all -- and they tore up all of this beautiful landscaping. She was all mad.

All right. Here's some more habitat stuff. I think it's kind of interesting to see. this is some of the things you have to deal with after storms. See the difference. See the difference.

Now, I don't know what idiot took this.

MR. JONER: Well, Larry, will those come back eventually?

MR. SIMPSON: Not all of them, but they will regenerate to some degree, but you can't have that much loss.

A quick story. They tell me that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

for every mile of marsh it makes a difference in one foot of storm surge, something like that, for every mile of marsh. So you're losing marsh. Your storm surge, think about my aunt's house, you know, and the storm surge is what gets you.

I don't know what idiot took this in the middle of the storm. This is Philip Horn's place in Pascagoula. Somebody was standing up on this high-rise bridge Pascagoula with his Red Snapper and other That's his business. Took the places. picture, and that's what happened afterwards. It floated back and Philip said if they could have just got through off of this thing, when that post stuck a hole right through the middle.

That's his office.

A little personal story. This person came back to her house right there. She works for me. this is Madeline Travis' house. She works for me, and this is what she

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

came back to after Camille. There's nothing there. Her house used to sit right there, and she had to live in one of these things, which is better than a little FEMA trailer. She got this from a church and so forth. She had to live there while she was getting this done.

Now I'm happy to say that everything is fine, but after two years and a half year she took off a day to move in, and she called the office, and she was ecstatic. She said, Larry, since two years I have finally washed clothes in my own house.

Now, you think about that. She had to go down to the washateria for two years to wash her clothes. Little things. In the middle of the storm, afterwards; she's back in business.

What I like about this one is it blew through and there's all of that damage, but look at them boats up at the top. Usually the top ones are the cheaper ones. You know, the expensive ones are down here, but anyway,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

these poor guys, they made it all right. Now it's back.

This was a casino barge, and it used to be a hotel under it. It was pushed over and squashed that hotel. Now they took the barge off, built hotels and stuff back.

This kind of stuff you've got to deal with. It just kind of takes time. This is what you want. This is bad.

This is good. We're seeing these guys, shrimpers, brushmen come in and they offload their stuff, and then we put it on a barge and then seed those oyster beds.

This kind of house, you know, it was a beautiful yard, nice, residential area, and then he's got to live in this for two or three years, and that's a good one. That's called a Katrina cottage. That's not a FEMA trailer.

Your life changes, and I can't explain to you how bad it really is. This is what it looks like, you know, a few days

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	later. This is what we want. To get from
2	here to here is a lot of work.
3	Here, now, trees. Had two million
4	trees in the State of Mississippi alone
5	upended. Now, we're talking about Tupelo,
6	Memphis. You know, we've got a lot of timber
7	industry, and two million trees in one little
8	old state, and these things took a beating.
9	So I thought this was great.
10	People came along on the beach and they carved
11	these beautiful things, you know. They're
12	gorgeous. You know, you might as well use
13	them, but I love this shot. Here's when you
14	think you're down and nothing is going to
15	happen. This tree started growing again.
16	So that's the little story. I hope
17	that that helps you understand it a little bit
18	and provides you a little clothing.
19	MR. JONER: I have a question about
20	the house that your co-worker built there.
21	MR. SIMPSON: Yeah.
22	MR. JONER: Will that survive the

1	next one? Is that up high enough?
2	MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, it will survive
3	a storm surge like came in before. Now,
4	whether it will survive the wind, that's
5	something else. The elevation codes were
6	make them raise them higher, and they do
7	everything they can to
8	MR. JONER: So what is the code?
9	MR. SIMPSON: One of the most
10	beautiful places down there.
11	MR. JONER: What is the code for
12	how high?
13	MR. SIMPSON: It depends on the
14	area, Steve, but generally, you know, it may
15	be it went from like 15 to 20. It's amazing
16	how high you can get.
17	MR. BILLY: Heather.
18	MS. McCARTY: Larry, I don't know
19	whether Tim is going to talk about this in a
20	minute, but the cost of doing, say, individual
21	homes, completely rebuilding them, did the
22	government help pay for that or was it private

1 insurance? happened with 2 private What insurance with all of these different 3 categories? 4 SIMPSON: Private insurance. 5 MR. The government doesn't have anything to do 6 7 with that. MS. McCARTY: So it's all private 8 insurance. 9 10 MR. SIMPSON: It's either private insurance, and you've got flood insurance and 11 you've got wind and hail and upland, but if 12 13 you're on that coastal zone right there, that band, you're put into what's called a wind 14 15 pool. They charge you whatever they want to 16 charge you. Now, the difference in economics of 17 living on the coast has changed completely, 18 19 completely. Now, that's not to say that the big, beautiful homes -- and I didn't show you 20 all of those mansions because those people 21

have resources. They're being built back just

as fast as they can build them back, but that's coming right out of that person's back pocket, and he's not even insuring it. That's him.

But, no, that's private insurance, and in most cases what happened, you saw a lot of the lawsuits and everything. The big one was State Farm, and I'm not taking sides, but State Farm came in and said it's all flood, just unilaterally it's all flood.

You know and I know all of it wasn't flood. Some of it was torn down before the flood ever hit. So that has worked its way out and so forth.

But insurance and cost of living on the coast is different.

MR. CATES: Larry, a couple of questions. You know, I've been through a couple of hurricanes in Hawaii, and actually I was in one in Florida. The last one in Hawaii was, I think, a Category 4. It hit Kauai, and I remember running ice with my fish boat 90

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

miles away, four trips in a day. It was the most brutal.

Is the money that you guys receive in your opinion well spent? That would be the first question.

And did the fishermen and the seafood industry take preparative action or was it kind of lackadaisical?

MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, they have to take action. This isn't the first calf roping that these guys have ever been to. So, you know, you saw the hurricane holes and so forth. You lash them down, but I mean, you have to be on the land water interface. Okay? They were pouring, you know, a big part of --you know, the guy took the picture in front of that big thing. It was his ice plant. Okay?

Well, when it was all over, he had a refrigerated truck and there was no electricity, and so the county morgue rented his trucks and he had a refrigerated truck sitting there with about 19 or 20 bodies in it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	for I don't know how long.
2	Is the money well spent?
3	Absolutely. The resource will ultimately be
4	back. The shrimp resource will ultimately
5	I mean the oyster resource will ultimately
6	be back better than it was before unless we
7	have another one. I think it has been well
8	spent.
9	If you can't keep these guys and
10	Harlon will talk about the fishermen and the
11	heritage and the history if you can't keep
12	these guys back in it, because they'll go and
13	every carpenter and they'll go offshore and
14	everything, and they won't come back.
15	MR. CATES: So are they coming
16	back?
17	MR. SIMPSON: I'll let Harlon talk
18	to that. Mostly. The ones that just got it
19	in here and they can't get it out of them,
20	they'll come back.
21	MR. BILLY: Okay. I think we'll

The next presenter, Harlon Pearce,

move on.

the commercial fisherman, member of the Gulf 1 2 Council, and the Louisiana Seafood Marketing and Promotion Board. 3 Harlon. 4 5 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. My name is 6 Harlon Pearce. I know some of you. I don't 7 know all of you. Chairman of the Louisiana 8 Seafood Promotion Marketing Board. 9 I am on 10 the Gulf Council. I co-chaired the Louisiana Fishing Community Recovery Coalition which 11 developed after Katrina and Rita. If you put 12 13 all of that and put it in a big paper bag and shake it, I'm just a coon-ass fish peddler. 14 15 That's about all I am. 16 (Laughter.) MR. PEARCE: But I think I've got a 17 little bit of all of us in this room, a little 18 19 of that in this room. amazes me today is that I 20 guess I take for granted what happened in 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

these storms, that everybody knew about it,

that you guys knew a lot about it, but I can see that you really don't know as much about what happened in that storm as I think you should or did, and I guess we lived through it and we go through it, and the things I'm going to talk about today are sort of what happened, but things I think have to happen for the future because it will happen again.

The Barrier Islands you saw there that aren't there, that's the problem. Larry talked about one foot of marsh and the difference it makes in the surge is important, and the last two storms we had thoroughly proved that.

So I really think we need to be proactive and not reactive in all of our thought processes, definitely not reactive. We need to -- and I know you're going to laugh at this one -- but we need to be able to work at the speed of business, not of government, not at the speed of government. When you work at the speed of government, we really don't

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

get our industries back the way they need to be, and we don't get them back in the right form.

When you have a problem like these storms, you want to grow from it. You want to have a fishery that comes back in a better way. You want a more professional fishery. You want to develop your processing facilities out of harm's way. You want safe harbors. You want these things.

But when the money comes as slow as it does come, and I'll give you an idea of how slow it comes. It comes. You don't have the time to do that. You're chasing your tail getting your businesses back up. You can't develop or redevelop in the ways I think that are important for the future of our fisheries in the State of Louisiana and in this country.

I don't need to talk about Katrina or Rita and the time, August 29th. It happened. September 15th we developed the Louisiana Fishing Community Recovery

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Coalition, which is about 20 different groups within the state, with Sea Grant, LSU, Department of Economic Development, Wildlife and Fisheries, and all of the fisheries we had within the state to try to develop a quick master plan on what we needed to do to go to Washington with, to find out infrastructure damage we had, what damage we had financially to the fishermen and what we needed to do.

That group did a lot of work, and we had a comprehensive report within a month or two that we went to Washington with to try to get money. It really didn't work. We got busted out of that one. We got some monies. I'd like to talk about this first supplemental and second supplemental because that's how our monies came down.

Our first supplemental was like 50-something million dollars, I believe, but most of that was already guaranteed to us through an agriculture supplemental, agriculture bill

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for oysters that was \$38 million anyway. So we really didn't get much out of that. So the first one came down, and the bad part of it was that it was dedicated to oyster and shrimp ground rehabilitation. So we couldn't give any direct monies to the fishermen, period.

How these supplementals come down and how we write into how we can use it is very important. If it can't get written into it that it's going to be directly going to the fishermen, it doesn't happen, and all of you guys who are involved with government, you know all the checks and balances you have to have. So you've got to make sure that it gets to the right people and that it gets to the right agencies to spend it.

Wildlife and Fisheries in Louisiana was the agency that did it. Now, this is a resource agency that's given the job of spending money or giving money out. They did a yeoman's job doing it, but that's not really what they're there for. They're there to do

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

resource management, not to give money to fishermen. And they took a lot of beatings because of what happened. Even though they did their job the right way, there's ways to solve a lot of their problems.

You saw the picture. You saw everything. Some of the crises within the what I call the toxic crisis was soup The seafood industry in the Gulf syndrome. went through, of course, the sensationalism of the media. They have to have a story to tell and it's always a negative story, and so we soup battles where they fought the toxic thought everything coming out of the Gulf was bad product.

We have restaurants in Washington,
D.C. that were advertising that they weren't
going to sell Louisiana product. They didn't
sell it because of that. You know, we really
took beatings. We were on conference calls
with every initial agency in the world to try
to make sure we were updated on what 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

quality levels in our water was and what was going on, and some of the water, the alcohol coming out of the water was actually drinking water quality. It wasn't as bad as it was made out to be.

By September 29th, I think, as Larry said, we got a clear bill of health on the oysters to go ahead and do it -- not the oysters, but the fishery. Fin fish, crab, shrimp, these guys get out of the way. You don't have a problem ever with those guys. There's no tissue damage. There's nothing in the tissue.

Oysters are filter feeders on the bottom. So you have to close your oyster beds to get them cleaned out, to get them going, but that's a regular thing in the oyster industry, not just because of these storms. We do it all the time. You get a heavy rain. Certain areas are shut down and certain areas are closed and then opened again.

What we did in Louisiana prior to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

any major federal help is we went out to industry and to different industry to get things done. We got a travel lift from Alaska, from the Affirm group in Alaska. It helped us get some of these boats you see back in the water or get where they need to be fixed.

Shell Oil came up with \$600,000 for three ice machines that we put into place right away, and the thing I've got to impress on you is that we got the money for the ice machines and in two months they were in place, not two years, not three years, not six months. They were working, these fishermen.

One of the most emotional times I had during the storm was when we put that ice machine in Cameron Parish, and when these people were just so ecstatic about having ice to go fishing again, I mean, it was just an experience that gives me chills every time I think about it right now, and the kids and everybody thanking you on what you could do,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

something as simple as ice we take for granted, but when these storms come around, we can't.

Shell Oil also gave me -- well, we had a small loan and grant program from the Louisiana Recovery Authority in Louisiana that was developed. It had like a \$100 million program that was for all of the industries in the state, but we did. We energized our industry, and it had a lot of outreach through Sea Grant, with help from the Promotion Board, with the help of a lot of the fisheries. We got 15 million out of the 60 million they gave out, which was 30 percent of it, for the fishermen by our outreach work and the stuff that we did.

We also got a quarter million from Shell Oil Company, again, to grease the wheels of that program so that we got our application together for the fishermen, trying to help them get ready to go so when that small loan or grant came down, we were ready to go. We

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

gave out that quarter million in \$5,000 increments to needy fishermen at the time.

Again, when we got to a quarter within two million, months it was gone. That's not the when it case comes to It doesn't ever get out government money. that quick.

Let me go to that one while I'm thinking about it. The storm -- let's see. Where's my notes here?

' 05 Katrina in August was basically. When Ι called the first supplemental was okayed in Congress by June of It was okayed in Louisiana to spend in '06. The monies were spent October of '06. August of '07. So two years later; two years later before even the monies that the oyster guys needed to spend, and this was money that was already guaranteed from the Agriculture that ended up being bulked back into this supplemental.

The second supplemental I call it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

was where we got \$41 million for direct aid to fishermen. It was in August '07. Louisiana okayed it in December of '07. It was spent in June of '08, a lot quicker. Six, seven months we got that one out because we had our systems pretty much in place to get it done.

But another part of the problem when it comes to this, and I know Larry got right in the middle of this particular situation, is politics can get in the way of what needs to be done correctly, and we need to figure out how to change the way we allocate these funds to the states that need it the most.

You all saw Katrina pictures. You all know where it hit in Louisiana. Well, the 41 million that went to the fishermen because of that storm, and I will use values and volumes of the fishery in that state. All right?

Louisiana, which got hit the hardest, got 14 cents on the dollar as far as

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

value goes. Mississippi got 59 cents on the dollar. Alabama got 39 cents on the dollar. Politics.

As far as volume, Louisiana got four cents on the dollar for that money, for the volumes that we put up in our state. We're one-third of the fisheries in the United States comes out of Louisiana.

A dollar, thirteen of the volume went to Mississippi as related to the dollar volume, and 60 cents went to Alabama. And I don't blame Larry's group for that. how it came out. The politics were stronger in other states, but we need to set a system in place that says, hey, LSU Sea Florida Sea Grant, Texas Sea Grant, give us your assessments, your economic assessment of damage and your infrastructure assessment. Let's use those as guidelines to dish the money out to the states accordingly that are needing it.

Right now Texas is going to need it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

hard. We want to make sure that they get the money, but what happens is that when we get through this political quagmire that we have to go through to get this stuff done, and it is a quagmire, it doesn't get to the right place all the time. Most of the time it doesn't, and that's sad.

And we have to make sure that, again, by being proactive and not reactive. We need to be prepared for this for the future because it's going to happen.

Ike hit Texas. All of Louisiana flooded. No Barrier Islands; we're going to flood again. With a tropical storm we're going to flood. New Orleans had six foot tide surges in the city. You know, we've got to be ready to do things in a different way than we've done them in the past, and we cannot worry about the mistakes we've made or what we did or didn't do. Let's think about what we need to do to create something better for the future because the future is what we have to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

worry about now. What's done is done.

We wanted to create safe harbors. We wanted to create clustering of industries with generation of power, water and fuel. We couldn't do it. Time wouldn't permit. So we need to think now about how do we do that now. How do we have monies in place to begin to start that process before we have our problems?

So if we have a safe harbor where these boats you see are piled up or moved out quick and go to safe harbors, sure, you're going to have your interface damage. As Larry, we've got to have the interface with the water, but that's not the same. We can fix that. We can handle that.

Let's find places to put our boats.

Let's find places so that the day after the storm comes we're processing shrimp. We're doing what we've got to do to get that industry back up and running.

Ike showed us a really different

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

problem this last one with the floods. We lost one month out of our economic life during Ike. Business in southern Louisiana came to a standstill for a month, and it's hard for me to even believe. It didn't do that in Katrina and Rita. It did it in Ike, and so one month out of everybody's life economically, you know what that means, you guys in business. That's a killer. It means nobody in this state is going to make money this year.

So we have to prepare differently for that for that storm, type of Things as simple as we've got our shrimpers ready to go, we've got no damage to that area, but they can't make ice because they don't have potable water or they can't do this because they don't generators. They can't do Simple things that can be talked about and thought about on a Gulf-wide program to bring something together so that when these storms come we have portable ice machines on wheels. We generation have of power,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

generators. We have potable water. We have fuel that goes directly to where we need that problem solved, and then in two days you're up; you're running, and your industry is back going.

The votes were there after Ike, but we couldn't get anything done. Everything shut down. When I tell you it was a month, it was a month, much, much, much different than Katrina and Rita. Α different different effects, but it clearly showed what no Barrier Islands will do. The storm surge is here and it's coming every time we have a No doubt. When a Texas storm floods storm. the entire State of Louisiana, and I mean floods it not just a little bit; floods it, a place that has never been flooded before even during Katrina, you know, it's important that we think that way and we think in a different way.

It's important that we find ways to make sure the money is allocated correctly

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because, like I say, it's going to happen again, and it's important that we get this money out quicker or by being proactive, we've already done our job in a lot of respects so that when that storm comes we can react quickly to what we've got to do.

How do we act at the speed of business and not the speed of government? Exactly what I just said. Have portable ice machines ready to go. Have generation power ready to go. Have these things set up or in place and spend the money ahead, not after to get it done.

Develop crop insurance for our industry that the farmers have had for years and years. The oyster industry in Louisiana is close to doing that now, but thanks to like in Louisiana we have trip tickets, and in a lot of the other states if you have trip tickets where a commercial fisherman comes in, commercial harvester, we know what that guy caught last year. We know what he did our

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

didn't do, and there's a way to insure that for him for the future. We need to look to that. We need to look to the ways to take the models of agriculture and mold them and shape them a little different so that after a storm if you've got that in place, that fisherman has got money to get back going again.

You don't have to worry about federal help all of a sudden. You've got that insurance that steps up to the plate, and if we're proactive without thinking, you know, getting the ice machine and everything else ready to go, then we've got lots of things in motion right away and we don't have to go fight for money in Washington. We don't have to fight for allocation of the funds. We don't have to worry about how we spend it.

Our wallets in fisheries took a hit on the way they gave money out because they were fair in the way that they did it, but anybody that had a commercial license and a harvesting license got money. That doesn't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

mean they were really a harvester or a fisherman.

One of the things we have to do industry with our is to begin to professionalize. Ι all had mean, we discussions on buy-backs yesterday. I'm not a buy-back fan at all. I'm professionalization fan. I think that we have to grow a stronger, better industry from the ground up and allow access to that fishery to anybody that wants to get in it, but he's got to go to school, got to learn about the law. He's got to learn about food safety. He's got to learn about everything.

You know, you can jump in a 50 foot boat in Louisiana and drive off without anything. You can't sell flowers unless you went to college first. There's something wrong with that picture, but not only what that does. I'm not a fan of somebody in the oil industry that's out of work jumping in a flat boat and getting in the seafood industry.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It's not good for anybody. It's not good for him or us.

I want that guy that's in our business serious so you solve a lot of problem, and then the guys that are serious are getting the funds that they need and not people that don't deserve the funding is getting the funding.

We had 16,000 fishermen in the State of Louisiana before the storm. We're down to ten or 12,000 now. It shows you the loss we've had. Good and bad. Good in that the fishermen that are out there are catching and making a living, and a lot of that was peripheral edge fishermen that we didn't need anyway. So we've got to protect the ones we have now and we have to begin to grow the ones coming up.

The charter boat industry and the recreational sector, it's time that they stood up for their fishery, that they became responsible for their fishery. They need to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

look at trip tickets and electronic log books. If the charter boat industry had had the same things that we had in the harvesting sector, their funding would have been a lot stronger than it is now. They would have been able to show what they did then and didn't do now.

So I know that the Gulf Council is working very hard to get that done, and in Louisiana we're going to work very hard to make sure the charter boat sector begins to step up to the plate and give us the data that we need to manage our fisheries as well as the data we need to help them when a storm comes, not if; when it comes.

We need to look at everything we're doing in a very different way for the future and try to learn from what happened in the past. We can't change what happened in the past, and get that done.

Gustav and Ike really showed me a lot more than I wanted to see. We've got a cluster. We've got safe harbors. We've got

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to do all of these things, and we've got to understand that we've got to work at the speed of business and not the speed of government, and to do that, we've got to get ahead of it, not behind it.

And if we do that, we will have solved a lot of the problems that we faced after Katrina and Rita and Ike and Gustav now.

You know, I could give you story after story after story about the storm but you've seen some already. You don't need to know that.

What we need to focus on is to be proactive, not reactive and working a lot faster and getting in place the tools of the trade and the fishermen that they need right away. And I'm not just talking they have to have it in Louisiana. Find some place where we can move to any state in that Gulf that has that problem and get it moving and get it going. And then we will have done something. Then we will have spent our money wiser than we spent it this time.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'm not saying we didn't spend it I'm just saying that that would be wisely. the way to get people back up and running. Our fishermen in Louisiana did not receive a penny other than the monies that we got from Shell Oil and some monies from we got Department of Economic Development until two Two months ago from Katrina, months ago. something is wrong with that picture.

And it's all the bureaucratic stumbling blocks that we have to go through in order to get that money out and to do our job right. So we have to change that thought do something differently process and figure out ways that we get it to our industry a lot quicker and ways to grow our industry as we do it and change it from what it's evolving into the future and evolve it into the global economy that we all have to be involved in now and take us out of the small minded businesses that we have today and do something different way.

### **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 that's all I've got to say.

I hope I've enlightened you a little.

Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FLETCHER: You talked about the importance of safe harbors. Is there a blueprint for what that is? And do the fishermen know where to go to get into that place?

We don't have them MR. PEARCE: That's what I'm trying to say. meetings in the beginning we talked about getting that done, but the funding sources dripped and drabbed in, and we couldn't get it We couldn't get the financing to get done. the right spots. We had people that were going to donate land for this, that were safe harbors where we could put the boats in, put the processing facilities. Unless you got all of that pot of money in one spot to get it done, you're not going to do it.

We had \$19 million that we secured for our fishermen right after the storm that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

hadn't been spent yet for infrastructure, for harbors in New Orleans, harbors in other states, oyster plants, oyster processing facilities. It hadn't been spent yet because of this, you know.

So we have to think now about how to find those safe harbors and where to put them. We have to think now about where we might want to cluster our industries.

When I say cluster, I don't just mean our seafood industry, but things that we're late to see value added. When I sav value added, we now find that oysters cure cancer, some of them. We know that. So let's have the facility that has met that oyster processing plant doing whatever it has got to do to get that drug ready, or we know that we can get collagen from fish waste. Let's have that pharmaceutical company right there where we can process the product, where they can do Let's do more than just see-through it. Let's cluster industries around that cluster.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

can help our seafood industry grow and do things in a different way.

It's not done now. We wanted it to be done after Katrina, but there was no way to get it done after Katrina, but now let's look to the future. Let's think about across the whole Gulf. How do we do these things?

Yes, sir.

MR. O'SHEA: Harlon, listening to what you're saying suggests a two-part problem to me. One is immediate disbursement of aid, but the other thing you're really talking about is the need to have an in place infrastructure plan. Make an assumption the whole place is going to get wiped out.

What I hear you saying is there should be a plan in place if that happens. If only half of it gets wiped out, then use half the plan. But it's not going to be a FEMA or the state emergency action guys to do the long-term infrastructure thing.

And the flip side is you need a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

special organization to quickly put the money on the ground short term. So my question is who do you think is the appropriate group to be doing this long-term planning. The Coastal Zone Management Act people within the states?

I work for the state. So I would say it's not really the function of the federal government to do that.

MR. PEARCE: I can tell you right off the bat we're doing it through Wildlife right now. We're already developing some -- taking some of the monies from Katrina-Rita and we're rechanneling it into that type of thought process. We're going to try to take the three ice machines that we have that we got from Shell Oil and make them mobile as a beginning thought process.

In the state we're working on generators for everybody. So we're going to try to do that already through what the state can have done right now, and I don't know which guy should do it. I just know where we

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 got the money that we're going to grab and try 2 to run with right now to create the beginnings of that process. 3 MR. O'SHEA: But if you have a plan 4 in place, you're going to deploy that money a 5 6 lot more effectively and a lot quicker than 7 if you have to start from scratch. MR. PEARCE: Right. 8 O'SHEA: And I think that's 9 MR. 10 your point. Right. MR. PEARCE: That is. 11 We have to have that. We have to have it ready. 12 13 We have to have these things somewhere stored ready to go when this happens because it's 14 15 going to happen. So let's plan on that, 16 especially ice water, fuel, power, stuff like that, simple necessities that we can get into 17 an area and get it done. 18 19 To me that's the easiest thing for The safe harbors, the clustering, 20 us to do. that's the toughest thing to do. That's going 21

lot long term plan,

22

take

long

thought process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But the other thing is we've got to get some barrier islands. Some kind of way we've got to get some protection from the storm surge in the Gulf. If we don't, it's going to get worse and worse, no doubt about it.

MR. O'SHEA: Thanks.

MR. PEARCE: And, Heather, to answer your question about housing, Heather.

MS. McCARTY: Yeah.

MR. PEARCE: To answer your question about housing, in Louisiana we have the Louisiana Recovery Authority with a home program that supplemented insurance payments for people to help try to get them back up to 150,000 for their houses. Some cases it. works; some cases it didn't work. If they don't want their house, we bought it back in the state and we'll sell it to other people, or clean the lots off and make some green space, whatever.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 There's some things working in that 2 respect. It didn't work perfect, but at least it was there as an effort. 3 MS. McCARTY: Can I ask a question? 4 MR. BILLY: Sure. 5 MS. McCARTY: I don't understand 6 the insurance thing down here, but were these 7 businesses also like not insured for flood? 8 Is that the same as a house? 9 10 MR. PEARCE: I think everybody, -- well, you've businesses I'm 11 sure different zones down here for flood insurance. 12 13 Some zones are out of flood. You know, you don't have to worry about it supposedly, but 14 15 those still got hit. So maybe those people 16 didn't get flood insurance. But the ones that are in the heavy 17 flood zones all had flood insurance, but then 18 19 what Larry was saying, some of it was denied. So that flood insurance, some say it was wind 20 Some say it was flood damage. So you 21 damage.

have to fight with insurance companies from

1	day one to get it done.
2	MR. SIMPSON: They redrew all of
3	the maps.
4	MR. PEARCE: Right.
5	MR. SIMPSON: They redrew all of
6	the maps. What was the mark in Camille is a
7	new mark now.
8	MR. PEARCE: My insurance and my
9	business quadrupled the next year just on the
10	regular insurance.
11	MR. SIMPSON: And then when you
12	apply that to private loan.
13	MS. McCARTY: And there's no
14	regulatory system that curbs that sort of
15	abuse?
16	MR. PEARCE: There is, but it's not
17	going to do any good right now. We were
18	scrambling just to find companies to insure
19	us. The state actually set up a program to
20	insure the citizens in the state, but we
21	didn't have companies left in the state.

MR. CATES: We had the same problem

in Hawaii.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SIMPSON: You're in good hands until the crisis. As long as you're paying in everything is fine.

MR. BILLY: We've got time for a collective discussion. Let's get the last speaker this morning. Rita, Rita Curtis from our Office of Science and Technology.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Just as part of the further introduction, Rita is the chief of the Economics Social Science Division and it's in the Office Headquarters, and of Science and Technology, and I asked her to speak to us this morning about getting back to this national perspective on research and data with associated identifying issues and policies and problems with respect to sustainable fishing communities.

And so we've taken these case studies that we've heard about in the Gulf with respect to hurricane events, and we're moving back towards generalizing these issues

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

and problems, and part of that is what do we know about fishing communities across the nation, what kind of research programs, big needs that are out there, and what our capacity is right now to try to fulfill that.

And so I didn't mean to steal your thunder. I just wanted to help; a little bit of a segue way. We're trying to move now towards our afternoon session, and this is sort of this intermediate step.

MS. CURTIS: Thank you, Mark.

The outline for my talk is first I'm going to discuss some concepts that are relevant for community sustainability. These include sources of risk to coastal communities, community sustainability, community resiliency, and then look at what NMFS is currently doing with our community profiles.

And actually, whenever I say NMFS, I should say this is often NMFS in partnership with its state partners and the commissions,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

so giving credit where credit is due, and then look at some of the work that's being done on economic research on fishing communities and introducing here some economic concepts of economies of scale and scope and economies of agglomeration, and I'll get into that in my talk.

So risk to coastal communities. These are probably just a handful of the risks to coastal communities, but climate change, that has a lot of potential to effect coastal communities certainly in terms of increasing the intensity or number of severe storms as you heard about this morning.

And then changing the distribution, spatial distribution and abundance of species. So through marine ocean acidification, changes in surface sea temperature, loss of sea ice, and then fuel fishing communities price change. For obviously this has been a big factor, and it has left a lot of boats tied up at the docks

### **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 past year, and changes in energy policy, such as drilling, is often a concern in coastal areas.

And then a couple of things that I'11 just under qlobalization: put aquaculture, trade, seafood markets. All of these are factors that are changing, that are putting а lot of pressure on coastal communities, fishing communities in particular, and then population growth.

We know that coastal areas have seen rapid expansion in population and housing development, and so that also puts pressure on coastal communities.

So the Magnuson-Stevens definition of community sustainability is at first blush somewhat narrow in that it's really looking at just the regulatory effects of fishing communities, and it tells NMFS that we should minimize practicable to the extent economic social impacts fishing and on communities provide for the and SO 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

sustained participation of these fishing communities in fishing.

Actually, I'm sorry, I lost my train of thought for a moment.

The challenges here are that the data for looking at community sustainability is quite limited, other than the port landings information, permit data, and in some cases license data and the census data, which comes out every ten years, which at this point is pretty dated, there's very little data available at the community level. have a lot of information on the other industries and fishing communities. We don't know about, to a large extent the dealers, the processors, the marinas, the repair shops, all of the -- ice factories, all of these other industries, auxiliary industries that necessary to have a fishing industry.

And what also makes it challenging is sustainability is a long-term concept, and a lot of our data that we've begun to collect,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

well, we've just begun to collect it. So we really can't look at long-term trends and say much about it.

And what we need to be looking at are really more of the fishery dynamics, the seafood market dynamics, the human dynamics of what's going on in these fishing communities so that we can say more about, you know, what will be the impact of climate change, what will be the impact of trade or fuel prices. All of these other issues will effect communities' sustainability.

So community resiliency, slightly different. It's broader concept а than fishing or community sustainability, and it's really looking at a community's ability to adapt to or prepare for changes, and the factors effecting resiliency include lack of economic diversification, geographic and isolation, poverty, unemployment, social educational attainment levels, and environmental risks, such natural as

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

disasters, hurricanes obviously, and human induced disaster, such as oil spills and community apathy and lack of participation is another issue we don't see that often in fisheries, I think.

And this is actually community resiliency, is a really important factor in our fishing communities, and I'll give you an example from the Alaska community profiles.

Now, Alaska, you can imagine their fishing communities, geographically, they're remote.

Many are inaccessible by boat, and they have high levels of poverty and unemployment.

Almost 50 percent of the fishing communities have unemployment rates that are two times the national average and poverty rates that are 30 percent higher than the national average.

So these are real concerns, and these issues play out differentially across fishing communities, and even within a state they play out very differently. But these are the things that we need to be looking at.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So the NMFS community profiling, it has really been a three-step process that we've been engaged upon. The first step was identifying the fishing communities. Deciding you know, and setting up criteria for what is a fishing community and what is not.

We've been through that phase, and then the next phase was, we call them Tier 1 community profiles, and that was just gathering a lot of the secondary data on fishing communities. So those would be the landings, the licenses, the census demographics that tell us a lot about fishing communities.

And we are wrapping that phase up this year. We'll have community profiles completed in all of our states.

The Tier 2 are more detailed community profiles, and so they have more information on the fishermen, the institutions, the fishing industry, and the history. Now, for the Gulf, we've actually --

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

we completed the Tier 2 community profiles in August of 2005 right before Katrina struck, and what was quite -- which was great because had was inventories of all of the what we all seafood processors, of the dealers, marinas, bait shops, all of the auxiliary industries. We had inventories of how many were there prior to the storm and then after the storm, we sent people back out -- Larry is nodding -- and they were able to show what was the impact on these industries, and they were staggering.

Т think in Louisiana and in Mississippi there were towns that lost 90 of their fishing related percent or more industries, just gone. And the numbers remain quite high three months later, six months later in eastern Louisiana and Mississippi.

So they're very useful not just for fishery management, but also for these disaster assessments. And so I would say for the disaster assessments, as well as for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

talking about community resiliency, our Tier 1, quite good; Tier 2, obviously better.

They don't tell us a lot about sustainability in fishing. We're using our community profiles in our social impact assessments for fishery management actions, but ideally we'd be able to do more. I think we're hitting kind of the lowest level of what we need to do, but we need to do more.

And so I'd say the biggest problem is that they're not predictive. We weren't able to really say prior to the Bering Sea, Aleutian Island, crab rationalization, how the fishing industry would be changed by this rationalization.

And there were by all reports, and we don't have all of the information to say this conclusively, but there were a lot of impacts on the fishing related industries because of crab lack. So under this economies of agglomeration, which is -- economies of agglomeration is when you get geographic

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

concentrations of industries, different types of industries in a particular area, and they locate there because it just makes sense. They support one another. You know, it's the

people that they do business with.

And so what they found in an Alaska crew study was that the rationalization had large but proportional effects on crew size, which sounds good, proportional effects, but what happened was that in some areas you no longer have a sufficient size to support some of these other related industries, and so you heard about a lot of the fishing communities, lot of the industries in these fishing communities literally just shutting down, and so that's something that we -- is a hole that we need to be addressing, and we're starting to address, looking at what's happening in Alaska with these support industries and how be effected by rationalization they might programs.

And then another thing that we

# **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

don't really have a good handle on is I'll say economies of scope, and here economies in scope is when the fishing vessel produces multiple types of products, and so they could do that on a single fishing trip or they may participate in multiple fisheries at different times of year.

And so because they're mobile, they may not operate, and the fisheries may be in different areas. They don't really -- they're not tied to one particular port, and this is important because your regulation may effect one fishery and particular ports, but then you have to look at what would be the spillover effects on other fishing communities and other fisheries.

And so some research that we're doing on the West Coast is looking at Cindy Thompson who -- with Southwest Fisheries Science Center has put together over 20 years of data, and she's looking at how the fleets -- how the individual vessels in the fleet, how

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	many fisheries do they participate in and what
2	is the geographic distribution of their
3	fishing effort.
4	Now, what this particular graphic
5	shows is 22 of the 35 fisheries along the West
6	Coast, and it shows the interconnectedness of
7	these different groups. I'm not sure if you
8	guys can read it that well, but just starting
9	with shrimp trawl, so there's six, 26 1
10	don't want to go too far on this 26 vessels
11	involved in I guess there's a typo there.
12	It probably should be 28 in shrimp
13	trawling, but 28 are also involved in the
14	ground fish trawl. So it just shows the
15	linkages across all of these different
16	MR. DEWEY: So the numbers between
17	the boxes are the number of vessels that are
18	involved in both of those fisheries?
19	MR. FISHER: There's black lines up
20	there. We just can't see them.
21	MR. DEWEY: Oh, okay.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. CURTIS: Thank you.

other

little bit

the

very

shows

It's

on

And so this is just an average for

2002 to 2006, and so this is important from a

fishery management perspective because it can

show you, when you have a regulation, say, on

the salmon trawl fishery, which happened, what

fisheries? Where are they likely to move to?

well, you can also see what are going to be

the impacts on those fishing ports,

this,

so just to

so

distribution of boats within each region, and

on average, 57 percent of the boats fish out

of one port for the whole year, which sounds,

you know -- that's the majority, but that

means 43 percent dumped, and so you really

need to be looking at those linkages across

fisheries.

spillover effects

And by doing it by fishing port, as

go a

this

1

2

3

5

6

will

further

be

the

fishing communities.

with

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

What this one also shows is that,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

ports

important.

and

across

by region or by state, Oregon has the most boats fishing out of one port. In contrast, when we look at fishery diversification, we see that Washington has the most vessels participating in one fishery.

So just looking at these dynamics is going to be really quite fruitful. At this point, we've just mapped the trend. She's just mapped the trend, but this would be a very fruitful area for modeling impacts on communities and spatial distribution of fishing effort.

So continuing with that, economies of agglomeration, Eric Steinberg has done this really neat study looking at industry concentrations in the Northeast. That's New England and the Mid-Atlantic, and it tracks fishing related industries over actually an 18-year period, and what's neat about this is it differences study that shows concentrations across counties, not level, because the community data isn't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

available that way, across counties, across states, by industry, obviously, and it also demonstrates changing patterns of concentration over time.

So the paper itself has a number of really kind of interesting descriptions of, you know, what's going on in the seafood industry, what's going on in the fishing industry. What they showed was that there's been a lot of concentration in the harvester, in the fleets, that the number of vessels landing in the Northeast has decreased from 3100 in the '94 to '97 period down to about 2400 in the 2000 to 2004 period.

So there's been a lot of concentration there. There's been considerable concentration in the processing industry, as well, but not in the dealer. So it's really quite interesting.

What I like about this paper even more, though, is that it brought from economics literature these concepts 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

concentration of industries, market power, and so it took concepts that were already existing and applied them to the marine sector. It also used -- their study's limited to the Northeast, but the data is available for all regions.

So this is something that we could actually extend to all of the regions, and come out with good indices for looking at industry concentrations, and I think that that information would be very useful for future modeling, as well as for describing what's going on in these industries.

I went fast. So some of the upcoming research that we have going on, we have a number of economic surveys of fishing related businesses in the Gulf and in Alaska, and we have some pilot studies that are going on in Washington and Oregon. The work that we did in the Gulf, it created inventories of fishing firms, but it didn't give us a lot of information on the firms themselves, how many

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

people they employed, their revenues, and so you didn't really -- you know number of plants that were affected, but you don't really know the scale of the operations. So you really can't say a lot about the industry overall.

But it didn't give us this great frame for identifying the firms, and being able to contact these people.

In Alaska, their data collections are in two regions of Alaska, and then we just have some pilot studies going on in Washington and Oregon of a few communities.

The West Coast port study that I showed you, and the Northeast agglomeration study are well positioned to be extended to other regions. Cindy's port study, she worked to compile all of the data and track these trends. Clearly, the other regions could be working with their commissions and sign centers to compile comparable data and look at these trends.

The Alaska Science Center has been

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

doing a number of studies on the effects of climate on ports and fisher location choice, and this is some of our best modeling, I think, on looking at climate effects, working with the biologists to see how the stocks will shift over time, how they're expected to shift, and then tracing that through the fleets and then back to the community level.

So this will be some early research coming out, and then we have some limited ethnographic studies in Alaska, Hawaii and the Northeast, and so that's finding out more about the crews, where they're going, how they're affected by various trends in the industry.

Hawaii and Alaska, you're looking at native populations, Pacific Islanders. So just providing more industry on social networks and so forth.

Research needs, we really need to expand our data collections on fishing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

communities. We need to know a lot more about these shore side firms, a lot more about crew, a lot more about the fishermen, and then we need to establish better research program priorities.

I think you guys can see that we've created a critical mass of research. We've completed this Tier 1 community profiles, and we're on to our Tier 2, but we haven't laid out a research agenda beyond that. So we're kind of at a good point. We've got a few studies that we can build from, a few really good studies that we can build from, and I think now we're kind of positioned well to take this more to a national level, and decide what's relevant in each region, and how to appropriately expand outward.

I think developing community resiliency indicators, we're well positioned. We've compiled a lot of the data necessary for that, and with the 2010 census not that far away, I think developing those now, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

then later after the 2010 census, would be 1 2 really quite interesting and useful to do. And then developing this addenda 3 for undertaking research to look at climate 4 change, population growth, real estate trends, 5 housing market trends, energy, trade, 6 7 regulation, I think that's kind of where we're positioned right now. 8 And that's all I have. 9 10 MR. BILLY: Thank you very much. Are you going to be around after 11 the coffee break? 12 13 MS. CURTIS: Yes, I am. MR. BILLY: Okay. Any immediate 14 questions? 15 Yes. 16 MR. O'SHEA: Some of the things that you mentioned towards the end here seem 17 to track with some presentations I've seen by 18 19 NOS to the CZM community that are also looking at climate change, areas that are going to be 20 impacted by change in sea level, that type of 21 stuff.

1	So my question is how much linkage
2	is there between what you're doing and what
3	those folks might be doing over at NOS and
4	CZM.
5	MS. CURTIS: Well, I think that a
6	lot of the data will likely be that we'll
7	share data or be looking at, you know, the
8	same data set. I'm not sure if we're
9	answering different questions. So I think the
10	research will actually tend to splinter. I
11	think what they're looking at for coastal
12	resiliency is, and I guess we'll find out more
13	about this this afternoon, is looking more at
14	storm related activities and other types of
15	activities.
16	I think we're trying to maintain
17	that fisheries focus.
18	MR. BILLY: Okay. Heather.
19	MS. McCARTY: Do you find that the
20	lack of understanding and information about
21	these coastal community aspects is because of

a lack of data? Is it the data collection

1	that's sparse, or is it money to do the
2	research and modeling, or what is it that
3	keeps that information from being available?
4	MS. CURTIS: It's both. You know,
5	the community profiles, we did the long form,
6	you know, the more detailed community profiles
7	in the Gulf of Mexico, very fortunately,
8	because that positioned us well for looking at
9	Katrina, but we didn't have money to do long
10	forms in all regions. So we're doing, you
11	know, kind of a more satisfying approach, is
12	that Tier 1 of getting a lot of low level
13	information quickly.
14	MR. BILLY: Okay. Randy.
15	MR. CATES: I noticed you had
16	aquaculture as a risk, but have you guys
17	looked at how aquaculture can support coastal
18	communities and support the fisheries like
19	keeping processing plants open year round?
20	MS. CURTIS: Right. No, that's a
21	good point. That's a really good point. So
22	for some, aquaculture creates a change. It's

a change, so people have to adapt to that, and some groups will be positively impacted, and others will be negatively impacted, and so that's something we need to be looking at more carefully, and not just lump something that's bad for one group as bad, and understanding how they interact.

MR. CATES: Or as a follow-up, how we could change the fishing rules to support the communities better. In other words, if you have a short fishing season, it may not be the best thing for your community to keep the businesses open.

MS. CURTIS: Right, and so that would just require more information on, you know, what are those crew doing during the off season. We actually got some really interesting data from the IRS that shows many household, fishing households, income is drawn from multiple sources, but we don't know what those other sources are.

It could be, as you suggest, from

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

aquaculture, or it could be, you know, maybe the spouse is a teacher, a banker. You know, we don't really know.

MR. BILLY: Larry.

just MR. SIMPSON: I want support the kind of work that Rita and them are doing. It's non-sexy, you know. It's not save the world. It's the long-term picture that's the baseline for all of the decisions that you try to make. The very first thing that you're going to do after a storm is try to quantify it in some fashion, to get it down to numbers. And if you don't have this kind of information, I mean, you're going to be - I don't want to use the old Southern term - but anyway, you're going to be behind the eight ball.

(Laughter.)

MR. SIMPSON: And you've got to have this kind of information. That's the first thing that you want to know is how bad was it, and what's it going to take, so forth

## **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	and so on. Just a small, tangential thing
2	about some of the data that we need for
3	fisheries. We don't have enough money to do
4	all that we need to do in biology, and we
5	don't have enough money to do the economics
6	and so forth, but the new wave and the new era
7	of fisheries is how does it affect you and
8	when.
9	You know, if you have this bag
10	limit, how does that affect you? How does it
11	affect this community. I mean, it's just
12	important.
13	MR. BILLY: Okay. Tom.
14	MR. RAFTICAN: Yeah. You do an
15	awful lot of work on fishing communities. How
16	do you define a fishing community? Is this
17	strictly geographic terms?
18	MS. CURTIS: It's place based.
19	It's place based, and that's one that we
20	struggled for for a bit, but they decided
21	that's the appropriate definition.
22	And then the criteria that was set

1	is, you know, you're looking at a host of
2	factors in terms of engagement in fishing,
3	where do people live, where do they land fish,
4	the other industries, looking at those as
5	well.
6	So I know for the West Coast
7	fisheries, we've got fishing communities over
8	in Virginia that are impacted by they're
9	included in the West Coast fishing community
10	profiles because they're that impacted by what
11	goes on.
12	MR. RAFTICAN: I was thinking in
13	terms of recreational fishing, too.
14	MS. CURTIS: Yeah, they're part of
15	it.
16	MR. BILLY: Jim.
17	MR. GILMORE: I hope this doesn't
18	seem frivolous after talking about natural
19	disasters, but thinking about all of these
20	species from the seafood cards that are being
21	put out now, swordfish boycotts, Greenpeace's
22	press release about the pollock fishery

collapsing, don't eat pollock, I'm kind of curious whether NMFS has -- anecdotally, I'd have to say that I don't know, because there have been impacts on the fishing community from all of these don't eat this species kind of campaigns that are out there, I'm just curious whether the agency has looked at that at all.

MS. CURTIS: I would say we haven't looked at it at the community level. that there has been some research done. Like on the -- there was one for swordfish some years ago, you know, save the swordfish, and the impact of that was to bring down prices, NGO's campaign and so the was highly successful in reducing demand for swordfish, but that was not traced back to the community level.

So again, it's kind of going the extra step to look at how those impacts are distributed that's important.

MR. BILLY: Dorothy.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. LOWMAN: Well, I started my career 30-some years ago as an associate, and every year, you know, we always say we need more of this kind of information, and it never hardly ever raises above that line to get some funding. You know, I mean, it's good to see you doing some of these community profiles, lot of that work also but seems verv snapshot in nature, and I mean a lot of the allocation hypes are always couched in terms of, well, I need this because I provide more benefit to the community than you do.

And so, you know, it is nice to see you starting to look at how can we do some more predictive modeling, and do things that are more dynamic in nature, too, than sort of snapshots because it is a crying need, you know, but it's been a crying need for 30 years, and it seems like we haven't made too much progress in that area.

MR. BILLY: Bill.

MR. DEWEY: Thank you, Mr.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I just wanted to follow on to that point, and say that, to complement the fishing community data, I think there would be some real value in NOAA, as you're trying encourage the development of aquaculture, to go in and contrast some of the communities the country that founded around are aquaculture.

You certainly have that in Washington State, we've got some counties that shellfish aquaculture is the major employer in those counties, or in Maine, with the salmon farming industry, or in Cedar Creek, Florida, with the clam farming industry. Just to have those as a comparison, or to complement the data from the fishing communities. You know, I think what you'll see, and Randy alluded to that, you know, is more stability in your infrastructure and so on when you have that to complement your live fisheries.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Mark.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

DR. HOLLIDAY: Rita, just following
up with a comment, Heather and Dorothy
followed up on the same thread, two capacity
issues. One is sort of a leading question,
but if commercial fisheries are worth \$4
billion ex vessel, and a value added of \$30
billion to the economy, and the NMFS budget is
\$728 million, what investment are we currently
making in these economic research and data
elements?
My last calculation was less than
one cent of every dollar of the NMFS budget
goes towards collecting this kind of
information. (This is a rhetorical question.)
(Laughter.)
DR. HOLLIDAY: But the real
question is - is given the importance of the
data that you provided after Katrina with

data that you provided after Katrina with respect to these community profiles and demonstrating the importance of it, has there been any significant increase in the investment, or the agency's response to that,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

recognizing the value to this? Are we getting more money to do these things, or is it still the same pot of money, even though it's proved itself as being critical to policy making?

MS. CURTIS: At the time of Katrina, we were spending only about a million dollars a year in our community profiling work, and most of that was eaten up by staff. We have seven FTEs funded out of that, which doesn't leave much for data collection.

And I'd say they've been very good at using students, and just squeezing blood from a stone to get to where they got to. 2007, received emergency funding, we or relief funding for the Gulf disaster of Mexico, and we funded quite a bit so of social research, economic and hired an economist out of Gulf states to help us run all of these data collection activities, and that increase was essentially made permanent. a comparable increase, permanent got increase in 2008.

### **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	And so that's where a lot of the
2	new economic data collections on the shore
3	side firms, where that increase is going, is
4	looking more broadly at the fishing industry.
5	That is soon going to be eaten up
6	by FTEs, getting more economists on board. So
7	we've got a bit more funding, but you know,
8	that needs to go for ecosystem research, the
9	community research, other economic issues,
10	fishery management issues, LAPP issues.
11	So it gets spread really thin.
12	We're not talking a lot more money for data
13	collection, probably a couple hundred K once
14	you pay for those FTEs.
15	MR. BILLY: Okay. Heather.
16	MS. McCARTY: No, I was just
17	thinking we should have a coffee break.
18	(Laughter.)
19	MR. BILLY: Okay. One more.
20	Patty.
21	MS. DOERR: Can you expand a little
22	bit more on the recreational aspect of the

profiles, and, you know, what you're looking at there, and also, if you go a little bit further into the local economy in terms of both the commercial and recreational impact on local businesses in terms of restaurants, and hotels, and gas stations and stuff like that, do you go further?

So the baseline MS. CURTIS: studies that we do, the Tier 1, use whatever recreational data that we have available. if there's a license frame in the state, we obviously to the track that fishing communities. Not all states have recreational So you can be stymied there. licenses.

We don't -- the recreational fishing effort estimates that we do, they're not available at the community level. We don't have sufficient resolution to be able to do community level trip estimates. So we're kind of limited there.

For the longer form, Tier 2 assessments, we definitely looked at 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	recreational support industries, firms, as
2	well.
3	MS. DOERR: So you take into
4	account the bait and tackle shops, or turtle
5	landings, and all of that that might exist?
6	MS. CURTIS: Yes, in the longer
7	forms that we did. You know, it was great
8	that we had for the Gulf that we had the
9	2005 assessments just completed in August of
10	2005, but Katrina kind of made everything
11	obsolete that we did. So we had to go back
12	out after Katrina and redo everything that we
13	had just completed.
14	So it was great that we had it, but
15	then suddenly, you know, you had to feel like,
16	well, now we don't have it, and we had to
17	start from square one. So that's kind of our
18	frustration.
19	You know, I believe somebody said
20	that, you know, they're kind of snapshots in
21	time, and I think that's our main shortcoming
22	is that we've got snapshots, but we're not

1	able to project outward, or look at issues and
2	be able to see the linkages across multiple
3	industries.
4	MR. BILLY: Okay, Gary. You have
5	the last word.
6	MR. REISNER: Well, I just wanted
7	to say, in our economic and social science
8	programs, we've had an increase on the order
9	of \$6 million that we've been asking for for,
10	gosh, going on four or five years now that we
11	haven't gotten.
12	Again, if you look at the '09
13	President's request, if you look at the House
14	and Senate, that increase is there, but again,
15	it's not enacted yet. So that won't
16	necessarily specifically address the community
17	based information, but it will be a big shot
18	of money, increase in our economic activities.
19	MS. CURTIS: Yeah, and with that
20	kind of increase, for sure, we would do a lot
21	more for the fishing community.

MR. BILLY: Okay. We're going to

1	take about a 15 minute break. I remind
2	everyone about checkout, working out
3	arrangements there, and we'll get back here in
4	about 15 minutes, about a quarter to 11:00.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
6	the record at 10:32 a.m. and
7	resumed at 10:51 a.m.)
8	MR. BILLY: Okay. We're going to
9	modify the agenda just a little. There are
10	several people that will be leaving over the
11	course of the afternoon to make various
12	flights. So the last half hour of this
13	morning we're going to shift and focus on
14	scheduling the next meeting, and see if we can
15	work that out, and that way, we can get that
16	done when the vast majority of you are here.
17	So if that's okay, we'll do that.
18	Okay? Good.
19	All right. Well let's get back to
20	a broader discussion now. We've heard some of
21	the experiences here in the Gulf, and others

have shared similar experiences in other parts

of the country, and the idea was to see if, based on what we've heard, there are some conclusions, recommendations that we should consider with regard to this important area of addressing the fisheries infrastructure, and particularly in times of adverse events.

So let me open the floor. And Larry?

MR. SIMPSON: We had a conference call to all of the state directors and federal partners, and so forth, and it was unusual. We had a Senate appropriations staffer when we were getting this stuff done, and we begged her to make it more flexible so that we could deal with infrastructure rather than just resource stuff.

And that happened in II, but it's in I, as you can see, and you heard Harlon speak to that. He's a fisherman, and he wants some things to happen immediately. He doesn't realize accountability and accounting, and so forth and so on.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

anything you can do to make this kind of declaration, this kind process, program allowable, more flexible, is Now with that comes risk, and you know and I know that with that comes risk, but some of what Harlon says is real good, and we need to take to heart. Some of fishermen - and I don't mean this in a bad way - fishermen, if you had a pile of fish, again, in the wharf, they'd gripe because you didn't have a front end loader for them to put it into the truck, you know.

So anything you can do more flexible is good. That's my general comment, and speed and the data to make your case, and tried and true partners, it's not something you want to go and get some entity other than the state or a commission to play with.

In other words, do not ever go in and take some association and say, okay, you're in charge all the time. You'd better stick with the players that have been around

### **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 done this before. 1 2 That's my general comment. BILLY: I noted that Harlon MR. 3 4 mentioned the crop insurance program as example of 5 one of the programs in the Department of Agriculture. Has anyone looked 6 7 at the other emergency assistance programs that are available to farmers, as one example, 8 or perhaps other sectors? 9 MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, it just 10 I mean, it's Christmas trees doesn't work. 11 and fence posts, and we tried to get them to 12 13 do rules just in case Agriculture was ever pulled in this thing again, and they don't 14 15 have a clue as to how to make this thing work. 16 It's got to be Department of Commerce. Well, let me be clear. 17 MR. BILLY: It's not doing it there. It's using some of 18 19 their programs as а model that could be designed specifically for fisheries. 20

SIMPSON: Well, they need to

write rules and --

21

1	MR. BILLY: You know, that would be
2	done at Commerce.
3	MR. SIMPSON: That could be done.
4	MR. BILLY: I'm thinking Commerce.
5	MR. SIMPSON: And they still
6	haven't done it. I kept encouraging them,
7	trying to work through this issue to write
8	them down, but it's still not done, to my
9	knowledge.
10	MR. BILLY: Others? Randy.
11	MR. CATES: One thing that struck
12	me this morning was how the data is collected.
13	I know fishermen are not the most honest
14	people reporting data, particularly in my
15	region, because usually it meant something was
16	going to get taken away from you later on if
17	you reported it accurately.
18	But the lesson learned was the
19	people that reported data or had violations
20	didn't receive assistance, and that message
21	should get out to our fishermen nationwide
22	that the more accurate you report the data,

and the more of a good player you are, in a time of emergency, you're going to get the assistance, and those that aren't aren't going to get the assistance, and that will benefit our fishers. So somehow we've got to get that message out before the disaster occurs.

The Gulf Coast fishermen now realize that, but we need to get that out to the rest of the nation.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Sam?

MR. RAUCH: So one of the problems single pool is that there's of а resources that deals with both these hurricane and natural disasters, which are sudden, and can they deal with these other fishery kind of disasters that we'll talk about this afternoon.

One of the problems to getting prepared, you can't be flexible if you're starting from zero when the hurricane hits. So the best way to be flexible is to have plans in place ahead of time, to theoretically

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have a pool of money in place ahead of time, but if it is subject, in my opinion, if it is subject to being siphoned off for these other disasters we'll talk of about this afternoon, there won't be any money left when the disaster happens, and so if you're going to make a recommendation about -- you know, standing. There's the there is no \$75 million, at least for the moment, but other than that, there's no standing pool of money for which we can say, we will use this money in these ways as a contingency fund.

So it's probably going to be gone very soon. When it's gone, there's very little incentive for us to come out and say how we're going to spend money that we don't have, that Congress hasn't given us.

And my perspective of the problem is is that there needs to be two separate plans, one to deal with hurricanes, which everybody agrees is a big problem, and the other, though, to deal with these other kinds

### **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 things, and then we would group them together. The hurricane one is going to get siphoned off, and won't be there when we need it.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Randy? Mark?

MR. FISHER: Yes, thank you, Mr.

In the State of Florida, the people of Florida just passed a constitutional amendment to create a tax shelter for -- or a deferred tax on, or reduced -- excuse me -- a reduced military compared to other properties around the working waterfront, and any supporting marine infrastructure.

And I know this doesn't relate to the emergency aspect, but it might be nice if the federal government could somehow support that effort. And teeing off of what Randy was saying, the whole thing comes down to data, and in the Gulf region, we're really deficient in data relating to fishermen and the resource itself.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Chairman.

1	And if we could support the
2	budgeting to create more data stream, that
3	would be excellent.
4	MR. BILLY: Okay.
5	MR. SIMPSON: I wanted to bring in
6	that working waterfront issue, but there were
7	too many other things going on, and Martin's
8	right. I mean, competition for a marina or a
9	place to do business, unless you own it like
10	Martin does, and the Bells and other folks
11	MR. FISHER: No, I don't, but thank
12	you.
13	MR. SIMPSON: Well, I mean it's
14	people like that that have a history and have
15	it, they're the ones that are going to be able
16	to handle it, but competing between fisheries
17	and condos, and fisheries and casinos, and
18	fisheries and big time marinas, you're going
19	to lose, and it's just going to keep
20	contracting, and contracting, and contracting.
21	So Martin's state in Florida has a
22	working waterfront kind of issue. In

Mississippi, they're trying to come away from the front beach and go into the Back Bay of Biloxi and buy up that land, you know, while they get a chance, and dedicate that to commercial and recreational marinas.

I mean, in Orange Beach, you've got tourism and so forth, and I'm talking about some huge marinas that you cannot pass the money up that they offer these guys that own this land, and you're spaced for your boats. I mean, commercial as well as cargo. I mean, you're in bad shape, and it's the same way all over the country, and if we don't do something as a policy to keep that, we're going to be in big trouble, because there's only so much of this land, and it requires that interface, and everybody and their brother wants to get here. That's a real issue, working waterfront, land access, and it's both commercial and recreational.

MR. BILLY: Martin.

MR. FISHER: Well, just to further

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that idea, infrastructure is the backbone of
2	both the commercial and the recreational
3	fishery. Without the infrastructure, you
4	don't have it. We saw that in testimony
5	today, and I believe that Mr. Simpson's right.
6	Maybe Larry's right that this Committee could
7	get some support from NOAA to work on the
8	working waterfront.
9	Isn't there something currently
10	happening on that level?
11	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. We're going to
12	hear a little bit about working waterfronts
13	from our NOS, National Ocean Service
14	representative on this afternoon's agenda.
15	MR. BILLY: We can maybe hold that
16	until we hear that discussion.
17	Dave?
18	MR. WALLACE: You know, this is a
19	true quandary, and as Larry said, it's
20	happening everywhere, and many states I
21	know more about the East Coast than I do about
22	anything else, but if you go up in Maine,

there were a whole series of oystermen who had these little houses on the water, and had a little pier, and made lobster traps. And somebody from New York came along and offered him \$2 million for his house, and you know, he paid 20,000 for it, he just couldn't say no.

But he immediately then complains that he doesn't have any place to conduct his fishery out of, which is, you know, it's the other side of that coin. So you see, in Maine, you know, initiatives to set up areas that the state would buy, et cetera, and I guess I'm going to say clearly, you know, individual fishermen can't have it both ways.

But all that said, there are two obvious things that need to be done. First of all, fishermen need to be profitable enough to be able to afford expensive property, because they have to compete with everybody else who wants to do it.

And second, fishermen have to work together to form cooperatives in some way so

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that they, if they are small scale fishermen, so that they can justify the expense of expensive property.

One of the companies that Ι represent operates very large vessels, a large They have fleet of large vessels. two unloading docks right in the middle Atlantic City, which are very, very valuable, but then the other side of the coin is, if you allow consolidation under IFOs or IPOs, or other forms of LAPPS, where then companies can become big enough so they can compete for that land to operate their businesses out of, that is the other way to do it.

The menhaden industry can spend the money necessary to own the land that they need to build the plants on. The clam industry can do that. So if you get economies of scale from an independent company, an individual company, where economies of scale are very cooperative or collective, those are the kinds of things that NMFS and NOS must support 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

1	advocate to give these folks the ability to
2	compete with developers.
3	Now the developers are beat down
4	right at the moment, but they'll be back.
5	They'll be back soon.
6	MR. BILLY: Okay. Heather.
7	MS. McCARTY: Interesting. Thank
8	you, Mr. Chairman.
9	To get back to the Gulf, the other
10	issues here, what I heard from industry, and
11	Harlon in particular, were a couple of things.
12	One of them was the barrier islands. You
13	know, that seems like such a huge issue, I'm
14	not sure how anyone can deal with that. Can
15	you rebuild barrier islands?
16	Harlon said it, and Larry said it.
17	That's one thing.
18	The second is this preparation
19	before the disaster, and I think you addressed
20	that a little bit. I think that's obviously
21	something that we should draw from this.
22	And the third thing that I heard

him say was that you need a different way of both allocating and distributing whatever money does come down the pike for disaster relief, and he referred to politicization of that process, and I'm sure that's a pretty sensitive subject, but it seems to me that those were the three messages that he had.

MR. RAUCH: Can I address the barrier island issue?

NMFS, in working with the Corps and the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, and undoubtedly other partners, does have a very aggressive program to build barrier islands just south of here in the Bay. They cost about 20 to 30 to \$40 million a piece, but we take dredge sand out of the Gulf and put it down there, and they do all of the material designs, and they're designed to wash away within 20 years, because that's what barrier islands do, but the idea is they'll provide sediments, and build it up, and so actively engaged in a massive program to try

### **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 recreate these barrier islands. 1 2 It's difficult to do, but you can build barrier islands, and we do that with the 3 I've been on them. It's phenomenal. 4 Corps. MR. BILLY: Larry? 5 MR. SIMPSON: I can't remember what 6 7 I was going to speak to. MR. BILLY: Okay. Randy? 8 MR. FISHER: We have quite a bit of 9 10 experience with disaster relief over the last couple of years. When the Klamath disaster 11 happened, we handed out 60 million, and now 12 we're handing out 170 million. We've handed 13 out 68 million since October 1st. 14 15 The interesting thing is, to me, is 16 the attitude by the fishermen, number one, and that is they now think this is going to happen 17 every year, and they won't be able to figure 18 19 it out when it doesn't happen why it isn't happening. 20 We've heard every excuse known to 21

and really what it comes down to,

mankind,

when we designed the program, we ended up with the last one going to the governors, and I told everyone when we were involved with this that we needed to have somebody to blame, because it always comes down to that.

And NMFS actually wasn't involved in really the design of the program at all, which was good. The commissions, I believe, in my mind are set up really well to distribute money, because we can do it fast.

I think the only advantage in the disaster relief is that it at least keeps some people going for a year or two. I don't think it's a particularly good thing. I think they should have a pot set up somewhere, and then have а lot of have lot of not flexibility, because I believe in each area these are going to be different, but you've got to get the governors' offices involved somehow, because ultimately, it does come down that you're not going to make everybody happy, then they're going to blame and want 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	somebody, and you need to be able to figure
2	that out.
3	MR. BILLY: Okay. Go ahead.
4	MR. SIMPSON: You know, the
5	flexibility I was talking about was what you
6	can spend without spending it on resource
7	stuff, you know, oysters, shrimp, et cetera,
8	but what we really wanted to do immediately
9	was build some of these docks back, and ice
10	houses and so on. You couldn't do that until
11	the second. That's what I was talking about
12	flexibility.
13	MR. CATES: Larry, is that because
14	you had a resource for the fishermen to go to,
15	but they just couldn't get to it?
16	MR. SIMPSON: Well, yeah. We
17	begged them on a conference call to let us do
18	infrastructure stuff. And they said, no, we
19	want just resource related. I knew what was
20	going to happen.
21	MR. BILLY: Who's they?
22	MR. SIMPSON: Senate Commerce

1	Committee. Gary, you were on that.
2	MR. REISNER: Well, the issue for
3	those were that the language was explicit
4	about what it could be used for. So we were
5	hamstrung by that. MR. BILLY: And
6	that speaks also a little bit to the
7	flexibility in the sense of
8	MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, I'm looking
9	ahead.
10	MR. BILLY: Yeah.
11	MR. SIMPSON: Not back.
12	MR. BILLY: Right, correct. Okay.
13	Steve?
14	MR. JONER: I want to say, when
15	Randy hands that money out, I don't think it's
16	a good thing. Don't quote me on that around
17	the fishermen, but
18	MR. SIMPSON: I know you've tried
19	to get a bunch of it.
20	MR. JONER: I know, and I look at
21	that, and I think, well, define money, but you
22	know, I mean, it's not - what should I say

here - it's not really helping the fishery, and you know, I think this is where something like an active demonstration project for, you know, fishing communities doing aquaculture, you know, when you talk aquaculture around fishermen, it's bad because it's competition, but if they get beyond that, and look at maybe what's happening in places like Japan, where they came in where, you know, the industry was dead, and revived it through aquaculture and stock enhancements.

And I remember the first time I ever met Randy was at Manchester back during the Penny Dalton era, and you gave a slide presentation, and you know, we asked them, would NMFS do a demonstration project with the community, because in the State of Washington, seems like the money always it goes to something like developing tourism. it So started with when the spotted owl situation shut down logging. It was they'd turn all the guides, and loggers into tour then when

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

disaster hit with fishing, we'll turn 1 2 fishing community into tourist destinations, and so you're just really undermining the 3 4 industry. And somehow we need to step forward 5 and say, here's a better way. 6 7 MR. BILLY: Randy. I'm trying to figure MR. CATES: 8 out on all of these hard issues. I'm glad you 9 10 said that, Steve. Where's MAFAC's role in this, number one? 11 And federal fisheries money. A lot 12 13 of issues we're talking about are state state zoning. It's a kind 14 issues, of correlation. I can see rebuilding fisheries, 15 but I can't make that gap there. How do you 16 go from federal money for federal fisheries, 17 and then you're putting it in for basically, 18 19 if I understand right, state infrastructures? Is there a conflict there? 20 MR. BILLY: Sam? 21 I think that MAFAC's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

RAUCH:

rule is broader than looking at any disaster, but trying to figure out what we should be doing if money was available, and the issue is fishermen, nationally, are often under attack, particularly when we have overfished fisheries, and when in we put regulations to put them on a more manageable tact, then there's going to be economic dislocations.

You can't take an over-fished fishery, and bring it to a sustainably fished fishery without economic harm. Then the fishermen in and ask for disaster come assistance because it's a disaster, and they suffer. People are suffering because of that.

We get a lot of skepticism about whether or not we should be doing that, and what should be the goal to do. Should we try to restore the fishing communities to the way that they were before, which in some instances were unsustainable? Should we take advantage of either our own creation of regulatory

## **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, or a hurricane, which has, you know, created capacity reduction, and not try to restore it?

And if we're not restoring what was there before the disaster, then what should be the goal? Should we really use fisheries policy to maintain the full breadth of what was there before, to maintain the status quo, which we get a lot of pressure to do?

After Katrina, we got a lot of pressure to restore the status quo, when in fact, it turns out that we needed to reduce shrimp effort because of red snapper bycatch in the Gulf, and the combination of fuel prices and Katrina and a lot of shrimp boats had the effect, although I don't think anybody would have wanted to go there in that way, but had the effect of decreasing shrimp efforts, which solved some of the red snapper bycatch problems.

So should it be the policy of the government to be flexible and do everything we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

can to restore people to what they were, or do
you take advantages of situations like that
and try to achieve broader economic goals?
And then how are you going to do it?
So I mean it's a complicated
question, but that seems to me what MAFAC is,
rather than focusing on what could we do
better in Katrina, or what could we do better
in the West Coast, is how should we be
spending any federal monies that became
available? What policies should we try to
achieve with that?
MR. CATES: I'm glad you brought
that up.
MR. BILLY: Okay. Eric?
MR. SCHWAAB: Yeah, I was kind of
MR. SCHWAAB: Yeah, I was kind of thinking the same thing, which is what's the -
thinking the same thing, which is what's the -

we're not thinking ahead to some of

the current system is very reactive.

know,

21

22

You

these issues, which creates kind of fertile soil for a politically driven response.

So it's very difficult to come in and say, you know, in the midst of a Katrina disaster and say, well, we shouldn't really rebuild this the way that it was, because it wasn't sustainable the way it was, when in fact, if we had a more sort of planned response, better sort of а regulatory а framework going in, that there would be some more rational, preplanned approach to the use of, you know, these disaster funds.

The other thing that I think is a bit problematic, and you know, I think to some it's unfortunate we're having degree this discussion without the benefit of the afternoon session, because they really both feed into the same set of questions, but you can't necessarily equate the kind of disaster that's relief needed in а Katrina type circumstance with the kind of, quote, disaster relief that might be needed in response 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

you know, some kind of a long-term decline in habitat quality or, you know, in the midst of some kind of regime shift.

And it seems to me that we need to be -- I mean, there's one pot of disaster money, and the rules that might apply in those circumstances are going to vary dramatically depending upon, you know, sort of the acuteness of the event.

The last thing that I would say, and I think, Tom, you sort of already touched on this already, is that back, to the first point, you know, we don't really have a plan, and there are models out there, and we've heard of them alluded to already, some particularly in the agriculture arena, that run the gamut from, you know, things like crop insurance to, you know, sustaining the infrastructure necessary to support that, you know, economic activity.

And I think there are some lessons that could be drawn from the agriculture

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

world, and perhaps transferred in some fashion into NOAA to sort of establish a framework for longer term, more proactive planning around some of these challenges, and that maybe that's the role that MAFAC can sort of help facilitate.

MR. BILLY: Thanks.

Dorothy?

MS. LOWMAN: Well, I mean, I guess I do think that just trying to rebuild something that's going to be unsustainable, again, is not a good government investment. One thing I know, there was some attempt to look at capacity reduction as part of this, but I don't think, maybe I slept through it, but I don't think we really talked about it this morning at all.

And I'd be interested just in hearing, how did you structure that a little bit, and what were the work at all, and, you know, if you were going to do it again, you know, what were the lessons learned from that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that might be useful in thinking of a more national policy as you go forward?

And you know that there are certain things in a fishery that you don't want to just rebuild an unsustainable system. I don't know who's the right person to ask.

MR. BILLY: Larry?

MR. SIMPSON: It's a conflicts issue, and you're starting it, and I'll get to this. In my opinion, if I was a dictator, then I would be a -- I have a finite, short period of time and money in which I would infuse money to the fishermen themselves, not because they're special, but because you want to keep that expertise. Okay?

But I would make them do something for it, like give you a report, clean up debris. Then after that, I would make it flexible enough to allow you to do something like Harlon said, put these floating ice plants and mobile ice plants, have them set up and ready to go.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Then I would, as somebody talked about, make them whole. I don't think you should ever make anybody whole after a storm back to where they were, but I think you should look at docks and things of that nature just like you look at roads to your houses. That's where you should go, but it should never make them 100 percent whole, and it certainly hasn't.

So that's that thing, and then the issue of over capitalized, putting it in, making it like it was before, and again, I said I don't think personally that you should make it like it was before. You should bring it to a point, but that's about as far as you should go.

We have done limited permits on the shrimp issue, and economics has weathered the storm, and heaven forbid that is the hardest and long way to ever have to do this, but it did have some benefits.

Where is the level when you bring

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

it back? We've kept it, and it's down, I don't know, under 60 percent. Sixty percent. It's nothing like it used to be. Shrimp was king. Where is that percent that you let it get back to? Because there's economies of scale, okay, and you can get down to lower than a critical mass, and then where are you? And I don't know where that is. I don't know where that line is, but it's no lower than where we are right now, let me tell you that.

So those are some general thoughts, I think, that kind of addresses some of these things, you know. Flexibility in the sense of getting them back working, it's like roads. You know, working waterfront, keeping them in, not making them 100 percent whole, but helping them, you know.

And Steve was a sage here. I don't like that give away directly to the fisherman, except in that first, initial, finite way, because in the long run, that doesn't help the fisheries. In the long run, which of course

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	fishermen don't like, you heard Harlon, is
2	that replanting those oysters, do debris
3	removal so they can actually fish, things like
4	infrastructure, so they can get their product
5	out. Those are the kind of long-term things
6	that you need to address.
7	Habitat, that's a big ticket item,
8	but I mean, those are the kind of things that
9	you should have the policy to deal with, and
10	we should listen to everybody, try to
11	incorporate everything we can. That's what I
12	would do.
13	MR. BILLY: Should we capture some
14	of this on paper as sort of MAFAC, some
15	guidance to the Secretary?
16	MR. SIMPSON: I don't know how to
17	use the
18	MR. BILLY: No, I understand, but
19	we can look at it in the context of some of
20	our other experiences around the country.
21	Cathy.

FOY: At some point in the

MS.

future that may be a good idea, but I personally would like to chew on this for a while first before I could be content with anything put down on paper and feel like I have really thought about it quite a bit. Every disaster is different.

I really thought that Eric was well spoken when he said that the disaster of Hurricane Katrina is completely different than, you know, the salmon stocks not coming back, and you shouldn't just throw money at a problem that it's not going to help it.

Exxon-Valdez was monstrous disaster, and because it was not a government thing, there wasn't immediate government relief, and there is not going to be any oil relief, but you know what? Fishermen are resilient. They are some of the most vocal in their disappointment and their angst, but if you just let them wallow in it for a while, they restructure, and they then do what needs So I really think we need to to be done.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consider what type of disasters we're talking about and whether or not it will help the long-term economic focus of the nation to have a fishery in place.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Dave and then Eric.

Well, I think that's MR. WALLACE: a really good point. I'll just frame it a little differently. What is a disaster? me suggest that I know a lot of people who think that the collapse of the New England groundfish is a disaster. Now, if you look at who collapsed the groundfish fishery, the same people who now say it's a disaster and want to be bailed out, and so I think if you're going to get into public policy, you need to be very careful on the semantics, you know. Senator Snow has already asked for monies to support her fishermen because there's a disaster that fisheries has collapsed.

So I think that we need to be careful when we get into it. I do think that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we ought to draft a policy document that talks about major, major catastrophes like these hurricanes that have hit the Gulf states and hurricanes that have hit Florida, but I think that it needs to be a very carefully drafted document.

I'll be happy to work on it with other people if we want to go down that path to see if we can make a non-financial policy statement to NMFS, you know, or to because I don't know where we're going to go find money in the future. You know, I agree with Larry. It would be great if we have portable plants wheels and stored on in trailers, a hundred different stainless door tank trailers that were sterilized to put potable water in, and you have a disaster and you fill them up with water, you hook a tractor to them, and you pull them down to wherever they need to go. That's all going good.

I don't see the federal government

## **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

funding that at this time, you know, and so now we need to have a broader policy statement on things that they can look into.

Thank you.

MR. BILLY: Vince.

MR. O'SHEA: Mr. Chairman, maybe one thing that I'm sort of hearing is a set of principles might be a way to start because there's a lot of overarching themes, what everybody has said so far this morning, and I think that might be a way to start and get this thing because you're absolutely right. There's all kinds of different things, but there are, I think, some central themes here that would lend themselves to principles that MAFAC might consider giving advice, and that would be helpful.

MR. BILLY: Randy.

MR. CATES: I have a question for Sam. In disaster relief if we develop a plan, how much flexibility do you have or is this a pure political thing where you're directed to

spend it on fishermen or oysters or whatever?

I mean, what's the experience?

MR. RAUCH: Well, it's mixed experience. Our disaster declaration has basically been meaningless. We've spent a lot of time on it, and try to make rational, sound decisions, and in the end Congress will choose not to fund them, and then they will fund the ones where we say no.

So we really are influenced here by the language of the appropriations bill. Even so, there's still a lot of flexibility with what we could do, and the way I view it, is there has been no group that has come in like MAFAC, clearly, and tried to figure out what a sound policy was that the Secretary could then take to Congress and say, Look. In doing these kinds of things you should look at these, sort of principles.

It has been very political, and I think ultimately it has not been particularly helpful. We have spent a lot of money on

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

things that have done no good, and we have missed opportunities to spend money on things that would. So I do think MAFAC's involvement if they did a broad set of principles that we could use, that we could go to Congress appropriators and we're working on a disaster rule that will help our disaster guideline.

The sounder basis we have, I think, the more chance that we will do good in the long run. There will always be political decisions, and frankly, you know, Katrina we came out, we rushed out with this disaster declaration before we knew the damage, and ultimately became -- even if we proved the truth, and we did the same thing with Gustav and Ike.

When Ike came, like two days later, we came up with the disaster -- we knew nothing about what it was and, frankly, it had some political overtones to it.

So it would be better to have -- the declaration aside, how we conceptually

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

should allocate any money to Congress, what kind of money we should seek. That's seems something the MAFAC gives, and it would be quite useful to help steer the political powers that be into a constructive force.

MR. CATES: I think what Larry stated was really telling. There are certain steps.

MR. BILLY: Well, should this be an assignment for one of our subcommittees, providing time meeting at our next investigate it further as appropriate and then take drafting principles run at and quidance? Does that sound like a -- I mean, I like the idea and I introduced it, but I'd like to learn more about not only Aq. perhaps, but how this has been done in other federal and maybe state programs and what we could draw from there, even of a policy nature, not the specifics so much, but we could learn more and then do what Sam just suggested.

Go ahead, Eric.

## **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. SCHWAAB: Yes, Ι completely. I mean, I think Vince said it exactly right. You know, we could articulate some of them, the beginnings of which could be drawn from the conversation that we've had over the last 45 minutes or so. We could articulate a series of principles and, Chairman, the idea that there would be a work group tasked with going back through the notes from this meeting and starting to frame that out I think could be for consideration, and actually would be very useful.

And it sounds from what Sam has to say that it's ground that really hasn't been addressed by anybody else very effectively.

On the other substantive point that I would make in addition to looking at, you know, some lessons from other places is some lessons that might draw from we past expenditure of disaster money. You know, what kind of expenditures have yielded, you know, long term benefits what kind and 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	expenditures have just basically been, you
2	know, mindless throwing to the wind?
3	You know, there might be some
4	history in working with staff we could inform
5	some future principles.
6	MR. BILLY: Dorothy.
7	MS. LOWMAN: we'll probably
8	encompass a lot of this afternoon in the same
9	broader
10	MR. BILLY: Heather.
11	MS. McCARTY: I think also
12	something that we haven't talked about very
13	much except maybe the Barrier Islands and the
14	rebuilding habitat. I think that we need to
15	make sure that we have a biological component
16	to the list of principles. The idea of
17	restoration, of habitat restoration of
18	coastline and so forth, I think that's a huge
19	issue.
20	MR. BILLY: Okay.
21	MR. JONER: I just have a question
22	very fast. All upon this? I don't know if

1	Sam is the one to answer it, but you know,
2	there's all this money, millions of dollars
3	thrown at whatever disasters, such as the
4	hurricane, salmon failures. Is there any kind
5	of follow-up to what was done and what were
6	the results?
7	We just see the money spent. Those
8	programs have to be accountable to the
9	taxpayers, I would think as a taxpayer.
10	(Laughter.)
11	MR. JONER: So who's doing that
12	right now? We may as well start. Let's
13	start, and we could maybe see if there has
14	been any evaluation so that we get an idea of
15	what works and what doesn't because I can tell
16	you what hasn't worked in our area.
17	MR. BILLY: And that's one of the
18	principles.
19	Chris.
20	MR. DORSETT: And to that point,
21	our NMFS folks might know better, but when we

geared up after the hurricane to look at how

1	to best utilize the money for Gulf fisheries,
2	there were some reports on buy back programs
3	especially, and what results you got out of
4	those, and I think they were commissioned
5	opposed to single fisheries acts. I think
6	there are some reports that can give you some
7	good results to look at.
8	MR. FISHER: It's kind of an
9	interesting question if you think about it
10	because, I mean, you could go around the
11	United States and figure out what fishery we
12	need to have a disaster in in order to fix
13	them. So then the question is, well, why
14	don't we fix them to start with so we don't
15	have to have a disaster for Christ's sake.
16	You know, this is ridiculous.
17	MR. BILLY: I hear you.
18	MR. FISHER: I mean, if you don't
19	think it's political, you're nuttier than a
20	fruitcake.
21	(Laughter.)

MR. BILLY: Erika.

MS. FELLER: Well, I tend to think things get a lot more political that closer you are to the actual event, but one theme that kind of came up during this whole conversation kind of is the community stability or community sustainability resilience in advance, and I think it would be great if this group could also look. Because I know that like FEMA, you know, under the previous administration did a lot of work on community resilience planning and trying to sort of think about how you think ahead, and it would be really interesting to look at how those lessons can be brought or applied to, you know, fishing communities.

know, in the Because, you presentation the thing that struck me was that the disaster was the loss of a shore-based infrastructure. You know, the marine resources are going to bounce back and really in a lot of cases weren't that impacted, but it's that human loss. So really it's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Τ	community planning is, I think, at the heart
2	of it.
3	MR. BILLY: Randy.
4	MR. CATES: What Steve brought up,
5	I think, is real important. I think one of
6	the things for us to make an informed document
7	is going to get more information from NMFS on
8	what has worked and what hasn't. It's not
9	going to be a very quick thing. I think it's
10	going to take some time to get that
11	information.
12	So I would ask to start looking at
13	the next meeting or even the following
14	meeting, start bringing us those sets of
15	information.
16	MR. BILLY: Okay. Martin.
17	MR. FISHER: It seems to me there's
18	two different things happening here. There's
19	a response to disaster, and then there's a
20	policy that needs to be made to shore up or do
21	what Randy says. Let's fix it before it's

broken.

But no matter how many times we fix it before it's broken, if there's a natural disaster, it's going to get broken again. So there's two different policies here.

MR. FISHER: Yes, I mean, it's like if success walked through the door, what does it look like. I mean that's kind of what we're talking about here. I mean, there will be natural disasters based on hurricanes and those sorts of things.

There are other disasters that are declared because of stock problems, and those are different issues, and the results are different. And so then you do have to figure out the short-term fix on some of these things which I believe is important because you've got to get money into those communities, and then you've got to figure out, well, as a result of this can you fix it for the long run. And I think that's another issue.

And you almost have to go through each fishery and figure out what is the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	problem in that area. I mean, the best thing
2	that happened probably in the Gulf was the
3	fact that we had a big ass hurricane that
4	wiped out half of a fishery and they never
5	came back. I mean, you know, you wouldn't
6	have got there if it weren't for that.
7	You know, and the same on the West
8	Coast. We've got a lot of people salmon
9	fishing that's a joke, they shouldn't be
10	fishing. But are you going to buy them out?
11	No, you're not going to buy them out because
12	buy-backs don't work usually. So
13	MS. LOWMAN: And if you keep giving
14	them disaster relief and they're staying in
15	just for the
16	MR. FISHER: Oh, absolutely. Now
17	we've created a whole a damned mess of people
18	that are sitting around waiting for the next
19	cap, you know, and what is this all about?
20	MR. BILLY: I'm going to wrap this
21	up.
22	(Laughter.)

MR. BILLY: So the take-away from this discussion is that we will spend additional time further developing our understanding and views on this to the point of targeting the development of а principles that we would recommend to the Secretary and NOAA Fisheries, obviously, to guide the approach on natural disasters and I'm assuming also fishery disasters. I'll say it that way.

And part of preparation for doing plan the next meeting, that allocate a certain amount of the meeting time, either assign it to a subcommittee or a new group, but it will working be open for participation. We'll invite some people perhaps from Ag., perhaps from other places to provide more information about best practices, what's worked, what hasn't, that kind of then ultimately leading thing, and specific of recommendations to the set department.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Does that sound like okay. Yes,
2	Eric.
3	MR. SCHWAAB: For clarification,
4	you're suggesting that some kind of a work
5	group would not begin until after the next
6	meeting?
7	MR. BILLY: Well, I was thinking at
8	the next meeting, but we could start before
9	that.
10	MR. SCHWAAB: I mean, it would seem
11	to me that we would benefit from at least
12	asking some small group from the minutes of
13	this meeting and this discussion to start
14	laying out those principles in advance, and I
15	don't know to what degree that NOAA staff
16	could help with, you know, some of the other
17	investigations that were, you know,
18	identified.
19	And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman,
20	that maybe we should form that work group
21	later this afternoon so that we can find a
22	chairman among somebody who leaves early.

1	(Laughter.)
2	MR. BILLY: I was just thinking
3	those that speak
4	MR. SCHWAAB: That's why I added
5	that last point.
6	MR. BILLY: Yes, I'm sure it is. I
7	think that's a great idea.
8	Vince.
9	MR. O'SHEA: Yes, I think my
10	experience with this group is it has always
11	been a lot more productive when we had some
12	paper in front of us, to begin with, and I
13	think to take this at the next meeting and
14	have somebody have some words in front of the
15	entire group is going to use your time a lot
16	more productively. So I think that's going in
17	the right direction.
18	All it is is a strawman to frame
19	the issues for the discussion.
20	MR. CATES: Sounds like the Vice
21	Chair.

MR. BILLY: Eric?

1	(Laughter.)
2	MR. SCHWAAB: I would be willing to
3	help in some fashion.
4	MR. BILLY: Thank you.
5	MR. SCHWAAB: Sam and Mark have to
6	help me out and not get me cross-wise with
7	Senator Mikulski in this process.
8	MR. RAUCH: In a long-term view, I
9	think you'll be okay.
10	MR. BILLY: So, Chris, you're
11	willing to I'm sorry Eric, you're
12	willing to lead this group. Are there other
13	volunteers? Okay. Dave, Harlon. Okay.
14	Bill, and then the three Commissioners. Yes.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: Put your hands back
16	up. Sorry.
17	MR. BILLY: And the three
18	Commissioners?
19	MR. FISHER: Oh, yes. We'll be
20	happy to.
21	MR. BILLY: In your interest.
22	Okay.

1	(Laughter.)
2	MR. BILLY: That's fine. Bill.
3	MR. DEWEY: I just wanted to make
4	the pitch that this same working group also
5	try to address what's being talked about this
6	afternoon.
7	MR. BILLY: I'm assuming that.
8	Dorothy.
9	MS. LOWMAN: One presentation we
LO	have heard today that I'd like not to fall
11	through the cracks is a little bit different,
L2	sort of on the socioeconomic data that's
L3	needed maybe to help create some indicators or
L4	some of the things that might help in either
L5	disaster or you know, I'm assuming what's
L6	going to happen with a change in regulation,
L7	and I don't know if it's useful for MAFAC to
L8	go on record saying that, you know, the \$6
L9	million that hasn't ever been funded really
20	should be a priority.
21	But also I also think, you know,

this has always been -- I mean, this has not

changed, you know, the fact that the \$6
million never gets there, for years, but I do
think we have Heather and I were talking
we do have some opportunities as we move
toward LAPPs to get more information like
this, and I can't remember what the language
is in the Magnuson Act, but I really think
there could be a role in MAFAC saying that,
you know, really there's resistance from the
industry to provide some of the additional
information that would be useful. But, if
you're also getting the right to use a public
resource in the way that you're going to have
some asset value also, I think you have an
obligation to provide some of this information
that will help and then provide, you know, as
we have more that we can maybe have some more
predictiveness of what another LAPP might do.

So I would like to see us go on record saying that, you know, in the situations that there be an active economic information requirement for LAPPs as part of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BILLY: Would that be part of the working principles?

MS. LOWMAN: I mean, it could be, you know, as well.

MS. McCARTY: It kind of goes beyond just the disaster. It speaks as well to Randy's other point, which was, let's see if we can understand what needs to be done before we get a disaster, and the only way we're going to understand it is to have the data.

We were talking about the programs that are being put in place, including the cod The cod program is the only one I program. could think of right that has now а requirement for data collection right in the It's a requirement that's program. resisted currently for whatever reason. Maybe because it's not designed right, but there may need to be a funding aspect to that as well, and I can't remember when we were talking, Jim

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and I, about whether the three percent or whatever percentage it is for cost recovery that's built into some of these programs, whether that covers that data collection.

Maybe some of these folks know.

But, obviously there is a funding issue as well as a direction issue, but I agree with Dorothy.

MR. BILLY: Could you over lunch have the language?

All right. I'd like to shift now and have the discussion regarding the next meeting. We've talked about targeting it for Washington, D.C., potentially moving it from our typical schedule of June or July to the spring, perhaps earlier than that if it's appropriate in terms of the transition and other events or developments. It's not clear when we'll have an Under Secretary or Administrator or a new head of Fisheries. So those are all factors to be considered.

Mark.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. HOLLIDAY: Let me just add my two cents to this. It would be good to try to plan out for the 2009 meetings, both of them.

MR. BILLY: Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: And so if that's not too insurmountable, I think that would give us enough time to think through, and if we're concerned about East Coast/West Coast splits and that sort of thing, we can accommodate that.

Just one comment about moving up earlier in Washington, D.C. as the location. I think that has been the discussion since our last meeting, but in talking with a number of people, we started thinking about, well, if we get together as MAFAC and we're going to have 24 people in a room talking around a table, does that really provide us any competitive advantage in helping to brief people. We're not going to go all en masse necessarily to the Secretary's office to brief people. about who have our strategy we want 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

represent MAFAC and we have our game plan out with respect to meeting with there the appropriate Hill staff and meeting with the Commerce Secretary or representatives, I don't necessarily required that think it's entire committee meet and will convene for our three days. There's a convenience factor to with their after а subset want meet representatives on the Hill, but it's not a requirement, I think, if we do our planning and have our representation out.

It's an option for you to think about, but I think we've heard Jim yesterday say about being nimble and be prepared. All of this could happen within the next five weeks, these windows of opportunity, and it's hard to plan a target, a date, if we don't know exactly when these opportunities will arrive, and we could be a little bit on the short end if we defer even out to March and April.

MR. BILLY: So let's confine it

## **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

right now to the next meeting, and then we'll talk about the subsequent meeting.

Heather.

MS. McCARTY: I think you're right,
Mark, about meeting with the transition team
and that sort of thing needs to be done almost
immediately, I think, and then after that, if
there's an opportunity to bring people to D.C.
who may not otherwise have the resources to
come on their own.

I mean, I hate to say that, but it's a good opportunity for people who may not have those kind of resources or work for a big organization or come there anyway. And so during that time, people could go to their own representatives on the Hill and the staff for those folks and use that as an opportunity and then be able to discuss what their reactions were and how people responded to the messages and sort of maybe refined things and worked together in that way rather than 24 people going to every office.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1		DR.	HOLLIDAY:	Sure
---	--	-----	-----------	------

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. McCARTY: It's a good opportunity, I think, still even though it's too late for the transition element.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Right, and I agree with that 100 percent. I think that's always a positive sort of side benefit of being in town that you can take advantage of those opportunities to make those calls.

But someone made the point that, you know, when the Vice Admiral was appointed it was almost a year later, and so if we're targeting to talk to new administration people, there will be a Secretary of Commerce, but there's no guarantee at what point in time. We'll have a NOAA Administration, but there's a new NMFS Administrator. So it's hard to lock yourself into having a meeting to coincide with that when we don't know exactly when that will play out.

But whenever you have that meeting, whether it's in March or June, I mean,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	congressional representatives will be in place
2	obviously, and you can schedule those things
3	whenever that next meeting is proposed.
4	MR. BILLY: Other comments?
5	MS. LOWMAN: Well, just a follow-
6	up, because, again, on a congressional thing I
7	do think we do know we're losing some of the
8	or are potentially losing some of the
9	advocates for fisheries, and we need to
10	develop some new ones. So at some point,
11	whenever it is, I think that's going to be
12	important.
13	MR. BILLY: Okay. Randy.
14	MR. CATES: If we have a meeting in
15	D.C., I would suggest just allowing an extra
16	day either prior, preferably prior to our
17	MAFAC meeting to travel, and that way whatever
18	we learn we can share at the meeting.
19	I think the big question is going
20	to be in strategy, whether we should have the
21	next meeting in D.C. or following D.C., and
	1

that's really what we ought to figure out.

1	agree it might be too soon.
2	PARTICIPANT: Too late for some,
3	too soon for others.
4	MR. BILLY: Other thoughts?
5	Anyone? Martin.
6	MR. FISHER: If the Committee
7	decides not to go to D.C., I would like to
8	recommend Monterey.
9	MR. BILLY: Okay.
10	MR. CATES: Anywhere on the West
11	Coast.
12	MR. BILLY: All right.
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: Just to be fair, the
14	last four meetings have been East Coast
15	centric. I mean, the Gulf is not the East
16	Coast, but New York, D.C. and St. Pete. It
17	has been a haul for people coming from West to
18	East and so
19	MR. SIMPSON: I kind of liked it.
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: I can see why.
21	MR. JONER: I hope this wasn't
22	inconvenient for you.

# (Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FISHER: That's another reason why Monterey makes sense, but somebody who is more familiar with Monterey, like Topher, would be a good person to speak to the really good reasons to go there.

There is a national MR. HOLMES: marine sanctuary there. If you guys want to your discussions about continue protected There is also one of -- the National Marine Fisheries Service has one of their labs Pacific Grove. There's National in а Estuarine Research Reserve in the area. It's a historical fishing port. It's active an fishing port, and it can be quite gorgeous at times.

MR. BILLY: Having listened to everyone, and monitoring the time, --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Topher also has the regional council schedule for the rest of the year. You can put them up there in terms of windows.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. BILLY: One of the thoughts
2	that occurs to me is we can be flexible, I
3	assume with the scheduling of both of the
4	meetings, such that if there's some advantage
5	to not think only about the second meeting
6	next year being towards the end of the year,
7	but if there was some advantage to move it up
8	a little bit we could do that.
9	Our fiscal year comes into play.
10	So I don't know financially if that makes a
11	difference or not.
12	MR. CATES: Sam, can I get your
13	opinion on D.C. and planning? What do you
14	think?
15	MR. RAUCH: I think if you go to
16	D.C. in March and April you might could talk
17	to the Secretary's representatives if they're
18	willing, because there will be a Secretary
19	a spike in past years. There really won't be
20	many people to talk to at the NOAA level.
21	MR. CATES: So should it be the
22	following?

MR. RAUCH: You know, I agree with
what Mark said. It's unlikely that this
entire group is going to be talking to them,
and it's potentially likely that a new NOAA
administrator will come to this group when
it's in if it's in D.C. I think that's a
legitimate possibility, and that would be a
goal. To meet that goal you might want to
have it a little bit later to make sure we get
one. I don't think the Secretary is going to
come to you, but maybe, but just realistically
I think it's more likely that some people will
go to the Secretary.
MR. BILLY: So talking about June

MR. BILLY: So talking about June in D.C. and then late in the year on the West Coast somewhere? I see several heads nodding. Heather?

MS. McCARTY: I was thinking spring in Monterey and October-November in D.C. I don't know. Just to make sure, if you really do want to target the new NOAA people, I think you need to leave it maybe a little bit longer

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 judging on history. I don't know, longer than 2 June. MR. CATES: What do you think, Sam? 3 That would make sense. 4 MR. RAUCH: I mean, you could always, as I said, if 5 6 you're -- I think it's important that you guys 7 figure out the location and you flexible the dates 8 on to get NOAA а administration. You could always try to move 9 10 it up if it works. MR. CATES: I second that thought. 11 I think it's wiser to go that way. 12 13 going to miss our opportunity if we go to D.C. too soon, at least with NOAA. 14 15 DR. HOLLIDAY: I think we talked a 16 little bit about it yesterday. In terms of supporting travel of one or two individuals to 17 represent MAFAC from out of the Washington 18 19 area to address transition people, or other people in the administration is feasible, but 20 not a third meeting of 24 people coming to 21

D.C..

1	PARTICIPANTS: Right.
2	MR. BILLY: So April-May in
3	Monterey and late fall, Washington.
4	MR. CATES: Second.
5	MR. BILLY: Well, we don't have all
6	
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: To go back to August
8	so we look at the April-May thing, make
9	that bigger if you could?
10	MS. McCARTY: Yes, do you have the
11	North Pacific in there? It's at the very end
12	of March and goes into the first week of
13	April.
14	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, March 30th.
15	MR. BILLY: So that May period
16	between the 7th and the 18th?
17	MS. McCARTY: North Pacific Council
18	starts March 30th and goes through the first
19	week of April, and then the next one is June.
20	MR. SIMPSON: We can do it the week
21	before the CCC meeting and some of us can
22	extend if we want to stay the weekend and go

1	on to the next.
2	MR. BILLY: And that's the 18th to
3	the 22nd?
4	MR. SIMPSON: The week before.
5	MR. BILLY: That's in Boston.
6	PARTICIPANT: That's not near
7	Monterey.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry. We
10	could have all of our meetings in Wade,
11	Mississippi for all I'm concerned.
12	MR. BILLY: That time period, any
13	major conflicts?
14	MR. DEWEY: What's the date range
15	you're looking at?
16	MR. BILLY: Well, between the 7th
17	and the 18th of May. That's Monterey. Yes,
18	go ahead.
19	MR. O'SHEA: I don't have a
20	calendar, but I'm thinking the 7th is a
21	Thursday.
22	MR. BILLY: Okay. So it would be

1	the following week?
2	MR. O'SHEA: Yes, that would be
3	fine. I mean it works for me.
4	MR. BILLY: Okay.
5	MR. DEWEY: Later that following
6	week would be better for me.
7	PARTICIPANT: The week of the 17th?
8	MR. BILLY: No, it's the week of
9	the 12th.
10	DR. HOLLIDAY: May 2009?
11	MR. BILLY: Yes.
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: Sunday is the 10th.
13	PARTICIPANT: So May 11th is
14	Monday.
15	MS. McCARTY: We might put out the
16	dates, and then
17	MR. BILLY: We will. We will.
18	DR. HOLLIDAY: We're trying to
19	narrow it down to at least a month.
20	MR. BILLY: Okay. All right. So
21	we've got an approximate time, and we'll
22	follow up and suggest the specific time and

1	location. We know Monterey, but I need more
2	detailed information. Okay?
3	All right. The following meeting,
4	Washington, D.C. Can we get the fall
5	schedule?
6	MS. McCARTY: And you need to put
7	the North Pacific in there, too.
8	DR. HOLLIDAY: That's October 1st;
9	is that what that is?
10	MS. McCARTY: The first week of
11	October. I don't know
12	DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm looking on the
13	Website.
14	MS. McCARTY: Yes, okay.
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: One October,
16	Anchorage open.
17	PARTICIPANT: The second week of
18	
10	November.
19	November.  MR. BILLY: The second week of
19	MR. BILLY: The second week of

1	MR. BILLY: So the second week of
2	November? So the latter part of that week?
3	The second week of November going once? Yes,
4	Vince.
5	MR. O'SHEA: I'm pretty sure that
6	week will have Veterans Day in it again.
7	MR. BILLY: Right.
8	PARTICIPANT: That's, yes, the
9	11th. Wednesday is Veterans Day.
10	MR. BILLY: That's a problem. Yes,
11	Vince.
12	MR. O'SHEA: I wasn't raising that
13	as a show stopper. I just wanted to make
14	people I wasn't objecting to that. I was
15	just making people aware of it.
16	MR. BILLY: Martin.
17	MR. FISHER: I'm just concerned
18	that Heather and Dorothy both had a really
19	good point that we should be able to utilize
20	that time to speak with our state
21	representatives. If we bump it up to the week
22	before Thanksgiving, are they going to be

1	there?
2	MR. BILLY: They'll be there the
3	week we're talking about, I think.
4	MR. FISHER: They will be?
5	MR. BILLY: Yes.
6	MS. McCARTY: They won't be there
7	right up against Thanksgiving, no.
8	MR. BILLY: They won't be there
9	Thanksgiving week.
10	End of September?
11	(Simultaneous speakers.)
12	MR. WALLACE: You have the week
13	between October 22nd and October 31st is open.
14	MS. McCARTY: So the very end of
15	September is what you're suggesting, Sam?
16	DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, Monday is the
17	28th of September. So the 29th and 30th.
18	MR. BILLY: Twenty-ninth, 30th and
19	1st.
20	MS. McCARTY: And when did you say
21	the North Pacific Council was?
22	DR. HOLLIDAY: October 1st.

1	MR. BILLY: All right. I'm going
2	to shoot for that week.
3	MS. McCARTY: The earlier the
4	better because it sounds like it's going to
5	butt right up against
6	MR. BILLY: All right.
7	All right. Let's take an hour for
8	lunch.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
10	matter went off the record at 12:08 p.m. and
11	resumed at 1:18 p.m.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(1:18 p.m.)

MR. BILLY: Okay. I know there are a lot of people who are very interested in meeting their flight schedules, and I'm going to do my best to move things along.

In that regard, we're going to shift the sequence a little bit this afternoon and invite Ralph Cantral to speak first. He's the senior advisory for NOS Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. He's going to share with us one perspective in terms of the policies influencing U.S. Fisheries' infrastructure.

So Ralph.

MR. CANTRAL: Yes. Thanks for inviting me today.

I've been in the ocean and coastal resource management business for a long time, I guess, and I started out in local government working on local planning and zoning and all of those types of things, and then went to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

work for state government, worked in North Carolina for many years, and I was the Director of the Florida Coastal Management Program .

So I got to NOAA just a few years ago, but hopefully we're working on some things that you'll find interesting and maybe you can figure out some ways to help us.

So with that, let me just say that two and a half years ago or three, I guess, by now, Jack Dunnigan became head of the National Ocean Service, looked around and said, Gee, an awful lot of the things that happened in the Ocean Service are related to coastal zone management, and the Coastal Zone Management Act, in And so I'm going to particular. just very quickly tell you about how the Coastal Zone Management Act works, and then talk a little bit about how it relates to waterfront uses, and then conclude with some comments about where we're headed with and conclude with 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

comments about where we're headed with the new vision for coastal management that Jack has really marched us down the path towards.

So the Coastal Zone Management Act dates from 1972. The only state that doesn't participate at this point is Illinois. So we have all of the other coastal states territories. have estuarine We research reserves, which are locally based programs to actually try out things on the ground and also monitoring that's helping coastal do some managers understand their areas better.

We have two other programs or three actually, a coastal estuarine land conservation program. In its biggest year it got about \$60 million for land acquisition for habitat and other types of areas.

We have a non-point pollution control program jointly with EPA, and we have something called the National Marine Protected Area Center, which I'm sure you'd know about as well.

## **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 objectives of the CZMA, just very quickly, there was an overall theme to preserve, protect, and develop and, where possible restore or enhance the resources of the coastal zone. It was also to encourage and assist states. Our management is done through state programs, and looking at programs to achieve the wise use of the land and water resources of the coastal zone.

And then the third one is really to look at the public and make sure the public is involved and quiding us in our activities.

It's a comprehensive approach that looks at resource protection and looks a water quality, public access, coastal hazards, and then two that I think you talked about earlier today, the whole idea of community development and coastal dependent uses.

Working waterfronts, we have something called special area management planning specifically written into the Coastal Zone Act, which enables us to work with a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

variety of federal agencies and state and local governments to focus on some key areas where we can focus our management activities.

Two of the programs I just want to touch on briefly. When I was in Florida we started something called Waterfronts Florida. It's an effort to work with a small number of communities over a two-year period, to focus on how they can better integrate environmental protection hazard mitigation, public revitalization economic into their and That started in the late '90s, waterfronts. and by now more than 20 communities have participated in that program.

New York's Waterfronts Program has been going on for an even longer period of time. Sixty-nine communities from New York State from Lake Ontario to Long Island Sound, the Hudson River, 69 communities have waterfront plans.

And then we have a couple of specialized areas that we're working on.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Something called Portfields, it was an effort to address brownfields in port communities. EPA had an existing brownfields program. They joined with us and the Corps of Engineers and the Economic Development Administration to really look at several pilot communities of how we might focus on the waterfront in terms of brownfields, and the three pilot communities were Bellingham, New Bedford, and

We ran out of money, and so there are no more pilot projects, but we think we learned a lot. We learned that it really takes a concerted effort by all three levels of government to actually achieve anything in terms of trying to look at the ways that the community port can, not going into greenfields, as they say, but reuse the areas in the community that were already devoted to some type of other use, whether existing ports or industrial areas.

And then Representative Allen from

## **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

22

Tampa.

Maine who will no longer be in the House this year because he lost a Senate rate, but in 2007 he introduced the Keep Our Waterfronts Working Act. It basically established a grant program for insuring access for commercial and recreational fishermen. It was focused, once again on the states, and the states developing plans, and that's why it was tied directly to the Coastal Zone Management Act.

One of the things that we looked at with that was trying to really expand that recreational beyond just and commercial fishing to look at other public access uses in We think that it was a good bill. the area. We think that in discussions just a couple of weeks ago with the House Resources Committee the staff, anyway, maybe not the members, but the staff is very interested in reintroducing this in the new legislative session January.

And then we have Smart Growth, which a project between the Ocean Service, Sea

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Grant, EPA, and the City Managers Association
-- International City Managers Association, to
really look at what are some principles for
redevelopment in coastal areas and
waterfronts. And just some of these points
here focusing on mixed uses, including water
dependent uses, protecting waterfront access,
preserving a sense of place based on the
waterfront's heritage, and providing land and
water-based transportation alternatives.

So those are the types of things that the several agencies and organization are looking at how we can incorporate those principles into the rest of our programs.

Okay. Then I mentioned that when Jack Dunnigan became the AA, the Assistant Administrator, of the Ocean Service, he sent us down a path with the Coastal States Organization to go around the country and learn more about what had been successful over the 35 years of coastal zone management and where we could improve the processes.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

There was a white paper. There were interviews. There were regional stakeholder meetings. All in all, more than 500 people participated, and we also met with many federal agencies and non-governmental organizations.

The major findings were that the areas where people thought we needed to focus increased attention were controlling development, a very difficult thing for either the federal or state governments to do since most land use in the United States is dealt with by local government. Also, looking at improving water quality, protecting habitat and making coastal communities more resilient, and I'll come back to resilient in a minute.

The emerging issue is climate change. I think it was on everybody's mind, and looking at how do we adapt to climate change, but in some of our recent activities at the Ocean Service, we've also started looking at mitigation and how we can work with

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

other federal agencies to reduce carbon emissions in the coastal area.

Major needs for legislation identified through visioning process. of all, they feel that the state programs should be performance based. At this point they're really programmatic. It's if you have a program established that has all of the right parts in it you get funding, but there's requirement for performance, and really no funding is tied to a formula that Congress came up with many years ago and really doesn't focus on where people have the need or where they could actually achieve results.

Prioritized and strategic, accountable and coordinated, really looking at, as I mentioned if land use is one of the big issues in the coastal zone, how do we really get all three levels of government to work together?

We've come up with recommending two goals for the Coastal Zone Management Act. 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

didn't have a slide that said this, but this the first slide in really what NOAA's is going to be to Coastal Zone approach Management Act reauthorization, switching from the visioning to what our response will hopefully be, and we're currently developing an administration bill for introduction soon after the first of the year.

Anyway, the first one, the first goal is sustaining health ecosystems, looking at doing that in a number of ways, including land acquisition, and then avoiding minimizing or mitigating impacts resources from on development, pollution, nutrient loading and climate change, really a broad wealth of of problems well as potential causes as solutions for maintaining healthy ecosystems.

I think since Hurricane Katrina everybody has been trying to figure out what is a way that we can actually contribute to this, and the goal of the Coastal Zone Management Act as we propose to amend it would

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be to minimize impacts from hazards and foster adaptation climate change, to direct developments to more suitable lands, reduced conflicts among coastal and ocean uses, protect and enhance working waterfronts water dependent uses, improve the siting of energy and aquaculture, and preserve improve public access.

We feel that there's a real need to look up the watershed. Many of the coastal states have very narrow coastal zones in their states. Other states, Florida, for instance, the entire state is the coastal zone. So we need to look upstream, look at new techniques and new partners, including non-coastal states.

One of the things that we've talked about is how do we really look at the Mississippi River basin if we're dealing with hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico and things like that. Is there a way for the Coastal Zone Act to actually provide funding or assistance 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

inland states to deal with these issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Also, the idea of working with environmental property owners, groups, industries and in businesses and farmers addition just dealing with to local governments and state governments.

And then the idea of looking out to sea with especially offshore energy issues these days, many of the states are trying to figure out how they can respond and so we hope to, through the Coastal Zone Management Act encourage them to do better planning to look at their interests in the extra territorial areas of the United States out in the sea.

The idea of conflict resolution is central to this. When I was in Florida we did some GIS work that discovered that there were fishing, there were military, there were oil leases, there were all of these things in exactly the same area, and different groups looking at their individual interests were placing high priorities on the same areas. So

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

how do we resolve some of those conflicts through better planning?

Achieving local participation as I mentioned earlier, most land use decisions are made there at the local level, and local governments better reflect the needs of their citizens for specialized efforts, such as redeveloping waterfronts. You know, not every community may be interested in expending a lot of energy on improving their waterfronts, but those that are ought to get help to do it so that we can really make improvements where the communities are eager to get that done.

And one of the key things that really learned is especially we've that dealing with local governments, but also some states, there really isn't a lot of technical expertise, a lot of background in trying to manage their resources better, and staying up in to date on the latest science technology, and so what we hope to do and one central pieces of the of legislative 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

package would be to develop an integrated national program that would range all the way from research to helping local governments with capacity building and looking at synthesizing and translating information from the scientific community into words that common people can understand so that they can actually make better decisions both as individuals and as communities.

The next steps, we've got draft legislation. The Coastal States Organization has just developed their own bill that's been shared around on Capitol Hill, and as I said earlier, we hope to have a bill soon after the first of the year, and so that's my contact information and that's kind of the end of my prepared remarks, but I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have as well.

MR. BILLY: Very good. Thank you.

So the act is up for reauthorization, and this is in anticipation of 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

1	MR. CANTRAL: Yes, the act
2	actually, the authorization expired in 1999 or
3	something like that. The last time it was
4	reauthorized was 1996. The last major
5	comprehensive reauthorization of the act was
6	1990. So kind of like the Clean Water Act
7	hasn't been reauthorized since the '70s, we're
8	at about that same stage with Coastal Zone
9	Management.
10	MR. BILLY: Eric.
11	MR. SCHWAAB: Thanks.
12	I agree with your comments about
13	local governments, but I didn't hear at all
14	anything about coordination across the other
15	federal resource agencies, and I just wondered
16	to what degree you all are now or envision
17	working with, you know, and when you talk
18	about the watershed with like USDA or the EPA
19	to deal with some of these coordination
20	opportunities at the federal level.

know, putting this together I didn't put those

MR. CANTRAL:

21

22

Thanks, because you

slides in, and that's a really good question.

What we've been trying to do is work with a number of federal agencies ranging from EPA whom we have a built in partnership with on non-point source pollution, but also sitting down with USDA, working with the Corps of Engineers, working with the Defense Department on a lot of dealing with their excellent installations, and USDA is an example, and I mentioned the watershed.

they The that fund their way projects, I was really surprised to learn this and maybe I'm naive, but the way they fund their projects is really a first farmer in the door type of process, and so if a farmer who is not even living near a stream that has a problem wants to do some improvements on their land, if they're the first one in the door, they get funding for improvements before farmers who live in an area where there's, you know, high interest and a big problem.

And so we've been working with them

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to talk about how can NOAA through some of our
water quality and monitoring efforts help to
identify areas where there should be some key
funding. Governor O'Malley in Maryland has
really stepped forward in the Chesapeake Bay
area to say the State Department of
Agriculture will start to do things based on
priority watersheds and needs, but we've got
to get that in other areas where there are
problems. We need to get that same type of
thinking going on.
So we're working with USDA. They
just have a new farm bill which gives us some
opportunities, but it also sets some other old
practices more in concrete.
So hopefully there are ways that we
can do that, but one of my responsibilities is
getting out to other agencies and trying to
find better ways to do things.
MR. SCHWAAB: So I can just push

MR. CANTRAL: Sure.

for a little bit on that?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

21

MR. SCHWAAB: And ask if you being envision that codified any of for codification in the proposed reauthorization of Coastal Zone Act, Ι appreciate the commercial for my boss, but I work for Governor O'Malley.

MR. CANTRAL: Do you really?
That's hilarious. Gee, I wish everybody had a
little name tag that says what you do.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHWAAB: But, you know, it seems to me that USDA, in particular, is not going to change unless somebody pushes. So you know.

MR. CANTRAL: What we are saying in our proposed legislation is something that was actually brought it up at one of our regional stakeholder meetings. It was actually a person from the Corps of Engineers who was about to retire. So he said, "Well, I'm going to say this even though my bosses may not like the fact that I'm saying it."

# **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	And that is that he wants to put
2	something in our act that places right at the
3	very start of our act that it is the duty of
4	all federal agencies to support the mission of
5	this act. We're not saying that it's going to
6	be a huge consultation process like Endangered
7	Species Act or something like that, but the
8	same concept.
9	And so we can at least have some
10	leverage, we hope, to sit down with agencies
11	and work with them on these issues.
12	MR. BILLY: Okay. Randy.
13	MR. CATES: I had a quick question.
14	Offshore energy, what's out there now
15	generally speaking? Are there established
16	projects?
17	MR. CANTRAL: Well, there's a
18	number of applications in the mill ranging
19	from on the East Coast it's primarily wind
20	energy. We've seen applications in Delaware -
21	- I'm trying to think Massachusetts, a

number of states. There are active proposals

1 that the states are trying to respond to. 2 has been such a big deal in Massachusetts that they've just passed an Ocean Resources Act in 3 4 the state and are developing a plan for ocean 5 resources. Oregon, we've seen applications for 6 7 tidal energy, which would involve placing machines in the water offshore to deal with 8 both tide and wave. There's two different 9 10 types of applications, one for tide and one for wave. 11 So basically planning MR. CATES: 12 13 stages right now. MR. CANTRAL: Yes, trying to figure 14 out how we even react to it. 15 One of the other things that's 16 interesting about the Coastal Zone Act is that 17 lot of these energy issues 18 on 19 responsibility is placed with the Minerals Management Service because they already have 20

leasing and regulatory programs in place on

the outer continental shelf, but one of the

21

things that remains with NOAA is the idea of OTE, ocean thermal energy, where we actually have had interest. Lockheed Martin Corporation is interested in developing a project off of Hawaii dealing with taking warm water from way down in and letting it come up and spin turbines.

So, you know, there's all sorts of things out there that aren't really to the stage of development, but they're to the stage of planning and permit applications.

MR. RAFTICAN: Desal the same?

MR. CANTRAL: Desal is -- pretty much all of those are in state waters, and so we've already seen a lot of permitting and activities by the various states, but you know, they haven't been well planned in a lot of instances. I know when I was in Florida there were a lot of issues related to brine discharge and fisheries, nursery areas, things like that.

So you know, we're trying to get a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

better handle on planning for that.

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. Erika.

MS. FELLER: On the vision stuff, I'm curious if any suggestions kind of came up in that, you know, as part of the picture for re-envisioning coastal zones that you find that we can implement the existing ordinances.

MR. CANTRAL: Yes, a lot of things. think that lot of the We а planning activities can actually be done today, but one of the things that we found, and this has been found by independent studies as well as our vision process, is that Coastal Zone Management has been drastically under funded over the years for the broad goals of the act, and that's especially true of non-point source pollution, that some years the budget given zero for non-point source pollution.

And so you know, in looking at any number of types of planning or even regulatory programs. We think that they can be done today, but the states really don't have the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

ability without some sort of matching money to develop new programs to do that, and so we feel that, you know, specific authorities helps, and additional funding would help.

And, yes, we realize that there is limited money out there in the world today, but something to talk about performance based doesn't really require new money. Talking about really focusing on national priorities instead of the states all focusing different things, and so how can we really accomplish some things with better focus of money as well as if there were additional funding.

MS. FELLER: A follow-up question.

So are there friends in OCRM to start trying to comment on these measures kind of at the same time you're working on legislation?

MR. CANTRAL: Yes. Actually working with OMB they've asked us several times now to fine tune our approach to what can we do today in terms of prioritizing, 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

even though Congress keeps giving us funding and says, "Deal with a formula," we're trying to figure out are there ways that we can bend that a bit to really get some national priorities in the focus of all of the programs as opposed to just giving a lump sum to a state and saying, "Go off and do your state cards."

MR. BILLY: Bill.

MR. DEWEY: I'm Bill Dewey, and I work for Taylor Shellfish in Washington State.

MR. CANTRAL: Right.

MR. DEWEY: And we had this before as actually CZMA reauthorization of course back in December. At the MAFAC meeting we looked at the top ten concepts papers that came from the listening sessions, and actually asked Bill Hogarth to weigh in on our behalf on concept number six, which was trying to get states to develop plans that would show how they're going to accomplish some of the national priorities.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

And we asked specifically aquaculture be called out as one of those priorities. It's I'm keenly an area We're challenged in Washington interested in. State as we try to grow our industry with use conflicts. So I was pleased to see in your earlier slide that you had something specific to that. You went by pretty quickly. just wondering if you could elaborate at all on that.

Well, in essence, CANTRAL: MR. done is raise the level what we've of aquaculture in the plan so that it's an element that would have to be dealt with by all of the states in terms of the plan.

And you know, placing it in the same area as energy facilities which are already in the act, it's a requirement that the states have to address.

And something that I didn't mention is that we're really looking at each of the -- we currently have programs which some of them

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

date back to the mid-'70s and actually Washington State is one of the oldest, but there isn't any requirement that the states ever look at, well, what are the tools that the state has to really address coastal issues and to update those programs.

And so what we're hoping to institute is the idea of each state has to do an assessment; that NOAA would actually lead, do an assessment of coastal resources in all of the states, and then each of the states would have to develop a plan based on those assessments to talk about what their priorities and have measurable are some objectives for those plans.

And then each of those plans, each assessment and each plan, would be required to be updated every five years, and so I think it will make it a much more active process, especially for the public to get involved in the states where there will at least once every five years be a concerted effort 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	reach out and figure out what the issues are
2	or what the states should be focusing on.
3	And in looking at not only
4	aquaculture, but a number of other issues,
5	such as climate change, you know, in 1972 when
6	the act was originally approved, those really
7	weren't even thought about, and so how do we
8	keep it moving, keep it up to date is where
9	we're headed.
10	MR. DEWEY: Just a quick follow up.
11	I mean, I'm excited to hear that aquaculture
12	has been elevated up. Thank you for that, and
13	also I'm just curious if it's possible to get
14	MAFAC a copy of the CSO draft bill you're
15	circulating.
16	MR. CANTRAL: Yes, I can get you
17	the CSO bill. I can't get you ours.
18	MR. DEWEY: I understand that, but
19	that would be good. Thank you.
20	MR. CANTRAL: Okay.
21	MR. BILLY: Okay. Thank you.
22	MR. CANTRAL: Sure. Glad to.

MR. BILLY: Okay. Let's move on. Gary, industry assistance.

MR. REISNER: Okay. I'm going to try to go through this quickly. You'll have the slides as a resource. So I won't spend that much time on these. I'm going to cover essentially four programs that we currently have available: disaster assistance, capacity programs, fishery finance loan reduction program that we have, and the capital construction fund program, which is sort of a different kind of animal than the other ones.

So disaster assistance, we do disaster assistance under two different laws. One is the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Section 312(a). That's been in placed since '96. It was revised in -- the latest revisions, they actually added the Section 315 there.

They also added language that expanded the eligibility for disaster determinations to include, in addition to natural and determined manmade causes. It

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

also includes regulatory restrictions including those imposed as a result of judicial action, imposed to protect human health of the marine environment.

And we're struggling with that a little bit in trying to develop some guidelines around that. I'll talk a little bit more about that in a second.

The other authorization we have is in the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act. This act actually is older than the other one. I think the first language was in '92, and then we got some funding in '94, and it authorizes a commercial fishery failure or serious disruption affecting future production due to a fishery resource disaster.

So quickly, if you look at Magnuson-Stevens, it requires a commercial fishery failure due to a fishery resource disaster. So you sort of have to have both of them. You have to have a fishery resource disaster and then a commercial fishery failure

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

associated with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act, it's a commercial fishery failure or a serious disruption due to a fishery resource disaster. So you can actually have a disaster determination just based on a fishery resource disaster, and in fact, if you look at Gustav and Ike, we made those determinations under Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act because we didn't have the information. I mean, it was that there fairly evident serious was commercial fishery failure, but we didn't have the data. So we made it under this.

But you'll hear both of these acts.

In many ways they're the same, but they do have a nuanced difference.

These are a list of the fishery disasters that we've made over the years since ' 94 to 2008. Actually just today Secretary made announcements for a fishery disaster determinations in Red Tide, England and Sockeye Salmon in Washington in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Puget Sound tribes. So that was announced today.

We have pending still disaster requests that have come in on Florida shark, highly migratory species, hard shell clams off of Long Island, and a request to reconsider our denial of the New England groundfish disaster request from last year. The State of Maine came in and asked us to reconsider that.

On those three we haven't made a determination yet. Anyway, out of all of these we have about \$800 million that has been appropriated associated with the determined disasters, but in addition to that, since 2000, Congress has appropriated about \$175 million for 16 disasters that they decided were disasters even though we didn't make the determination on them.

So you can see there's getting more visibility, higher visibility, and I mentioned, you know, in the past we used to get one, two, maybe three a year. Then we'd

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	go with none and then a couple more. Well, in
2	2008 we've made five of them already and we've
3	got three pending. So it's exponential.
4	MR. RAUCH: We got a new one from
5	Alabama yesterday.
6	MR. REISNER: Excuse me. That's
7	right. It's before my notes were done
8	after my notes were done.
9	So that's the history of the
10	disasters. So because of that and because of
11	those changes in the MSRA that created this
12	sort of new category to include regulatory
13	restrictions, we felt we needed to get a
14	regulation out. We actually have guidelines
15	that we use, but we don't have codified
16	regulations that are out there for the public.
17	So we're in the process of developing those
18	regulations, and hopefully we can get them out
19	relatively shortly, at least in a draft form.
20	But they will provide a little more
21	transparency.

And it would establish procedures

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

and requirements for initiating an evaluation, who's authorized to request it, what we expect in terms of information that we'll need.

We also establish some definitions characteristics that and are more clear, particularly, you know, this phrase of impact marine environment and how do define marine environment the and its relationship to regulatory changes.

So we're in the process of working on that and hopefully in the near term we can get something out.

I think that was all I was going to say on disasters. Why don't I run through this quickly and we can ask questions?

Let me talk about fishery Okay. capacity reduction programs. So Magnuson-Stevens 312(a) was the disaster assistance There's also a component of that program. that authorizes capacity reduction programs, they're available assist and to in rationalization and create instability 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

fishery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We need to receive a request from the governor or a fishery management council. They have to reduce capacity and make sure that that capacity can't be replaced in the future on the programs associated with loans.

When we run these capacity reductions, there's two ways to do Congress can appropriate money and use that money to do a direct buyout. In fact, they've done that in components of New England where they bought out a number of permits. a high level of latent capacity there, and so actual capacity reduction didn't really occur.

But the other way of doing this is to have a loan program where components of the industry develop a plan within the industry that comes into us that would authorize the federal government to make a loan to the industry to actually buy out vessels.

And so we create a plan with the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

industry. We then do a referendum that requires a vote of all the eligible permit holders in that fishery, and assuming that's successful, we go through the process accepting bids evaluating and from vessel owners and permit holders in the fishery.

We use in general reverse auction. So the most capacity for the least cost would be the first one that would be bought out and so on until we run out of money. And the way this works is we buy out the permit holders and their vessels, and then we institute a on the remaining landings in that charge fishery until the loan is repaid. And that loan can be anywhere from, you know, percent up to five percent of the value of the landings in any given year.

We currently have in place and operating four buyouts. The first one was the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island pollock, and we removed nine large catcher processors, 17 permits.

# **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 one actually the -- let me back up a second. Magnuson-Stevens Act 312 sets up a framework for councils to develop buy-back plans. It's fairly cumbersome. It has actually never been used. All of the buyouts that I'm talking about here have been implemented through special legislation.

special legislation Now, that of tended incorporate components to the Magnuson-Stevens requirements, but not all of them, and so each of these was done under a separate piece of legislative authority. back to the Bering Sea/Aleutian Tsland pollock, we removed these nine vessels. Ιt was about ten percent of the capacity in the fishery. In general, we would remove from either ten to 40 percent of the capacity in the vessels in each of these fisheries.

Total financing is about \$286 million, of which those balances are going down and most of these are amortized over 30 years, but frankly, if landings go down 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

don't cover the amortized amount, the loan just keep going until it gets paid back.

On the other hand, if you have a really good year, you can actually pay back more in a year, and I think in the '98 and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island pollock we're ahead of schedule on the payback of that loan.

This is a list of pending requests for buy-backs, and again, on each of these there's actually legislative language that's been enacted either through an appropriation or an authorization bill that's provided this.

On the southeast Alaska purse seine fishery, that's unique salmon а animal. That's actually a state fishery that they've asked for federal assistance in running a buyback on, and so we're working with the purse seine community now in the state to whether can fashion а buy-back that's we consistent with, you know, our requirements of being cost effective, most capacity with the least cost, and also making sure 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

permanently retired that capacity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

They have a draft plan, and we are reviewing that now, and we're working with them and go back and forth, and ultimately then we'll go out with a regulatory published stuff in the <a href="Federal Register">Federal Register</a> and go out with a referendum, and if it passes, we'll implement it. If it doesn't, it dies.

Additional authority for Bering Sea/Aleutian Island pollock, there were four sections, and I don't remember what they were offhand, in the Bering Sea non-pollock groundfish buy-back authority. We've implemented one buy-back in the long line fleet.

The other sectors have not requested a buy-back, and starting next year the money that wasn't used in the first buy-back is available for anybody, any of the sectors to use, and the long liners have indicated that they may come back in to get additional money to do additional buyouts.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Mexico reef-fish The Gulf of fishery, you heard a little bit about that yesterday. This one did not come to fruition. It was shot down. However, it sounds as the transferable though because of quota system that it addressed a lot of the issues that buyouts have.

One other thing about these buybacks. There wasn't very much excess capacity in this. So there weren't very many -- what's the term? -- latent permits. Okay? degree issue some in the reef-fish to fishery. It's certainly an issue in the multi-species groundfish fishery northeast where they had a couple of starts to try to get a buy-back, and those have sort of fallen away, probably won't go anywhere.

And the New England lobster fishery, we've got no interest in that. Nobody has expressed an interest in that. At one time I guess there was a small group that was interested. They got legislation passed,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

but there has been no action on it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So that's it for capacity reduction programs that we use our loan authorities for.

But, again, I mean, it's not chump change.

There's \$286 million in loan value out there that's being repaid in these fisheries.

Fishery finance programs, these are our more traditional loan programs. talk about them a little bit. We have a traditional loan program that was authorized in the Merchant Marine Act. It has been around for a while. It was originally created and expanded to fisheries back, I think, in the '70s because of when we kicked the foreign fleets and the federal government wanted to build up fleets, this authority. created We were more successful than we thought.

In the '90s, they put a prohibition on the program to prohibit any loans that would increase capacity in a fishery. So all of the loans that we have made since then have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

been capacity neutral. I'll get into the vessel components.

There are three different types of loans that we make under this program. One is aquaculture facilities where we'll make loans for purchase of equipment, purchase of whole plant improvements, construction and refinancing of existing debt. The same with shore side processing facilities to expand processing capacity.

These you can expand capacity on. It's the fishing vessels that you can't expand capacity on, but you can loan to get purchase a used vessel, to buy some vessel equipment for safety purposes, and equipment that's going to be permanently attached to the vessel for reconstruction, and we do do refinancing.

And with the new bill, there were some provisions on loans for sustainable purposes as authorized, and we're working on defining them and making some regulatory

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

changes. They would be things like reducing bycatch, improved safety, assisting transition to reduce capacity and upgrades in design to target your catch more effectively.

But we don't have in place yet the regulatory language to entertain that.

MR. FISHER: When are you going to have that in line?

MR. REISNER: It won't be until the next administration. We'll probably get some regulations over there early in the administration, but then they'll have to go through the process.

of the issues with One our traditional loan program and one of the things I'm working with folks are even though we're not expanding capacity, should we make loans owners and fisheries vessel t.hat. to currently over capitalized? There's no prohibition as long as it's not increasing hand, it capacity, and on the one fishermen in those fisheries if you extend

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

their amortization schedule so that their annual payments are less. They can sustain some of the reductions, say, in New England in fishing days at sea.

On the other hand, are you keeping people in the fishery longer than what would otherwise happen? That's actually some questions that I'd be looking to you guys for some assistance on.

Let me go to the other type of loan program that we have as part of Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization also, and for the two that are currently ongoing, it was in that created them, language an IFQ loan had in place program. We one for the halibut/sablefish fishery, and then we're putting in place as we speak а Bering Sea/Aleutian Island crab IFQ loan program, and the idea is that these loans would available to address new entrants and there will be criteria around that, either, you know, making loans only to those who have 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

entrants or have minimum income or maybe only to individuals who have less than a certain percent of your quota share to them.

We have about \$50 million. Annually we have about eight million now in loan authority that's created, and in total we have loans of -- we have made loans of about \$58 million.

There's program that а new was created that we don't have up and running yet. It's the community development quota system, development community loan program for communities in Alaska. I think there are six CDQ groups that would be eligible. The money it up and running would be we get available for them to acquire fishing vessels, processing vessels, shoreside facilities. They could use the funds to buy permits and quotas, and actually have about \$200 we million in loan authority, and we're in the process of working with communities. met with them on developing criteria for 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

so in total, this is our loan activity. There's about \$785 million in total on there of loans that we've approved. About \$400 million are related to the first three categories, the traditional program. All of our buy-backs, as you saw earlier, at least the current buy-backs that are in place are on the West Coast and Alaska. And so it's a substantial amount of money and assets that's out there on loan.

Now, when I say it's on loan, it is There's not appropriated BA. actually a loan. There is an amount that's appropriated associated with the subsidy related to this, essentially the expected default which is level and it's а present value so net calculation that's fairly arcane, but so this loan authority is not dollars appropriated like yesterday when I said our budget is about \$800 million a year, we're not getting \$862 million in budget authority every year That's different kind of animal. loans.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Talk for a couple of minutes on our capital construction fund program. is another program that was created back in It's called the fishing vessel '70s. capital construction fund. It's an income tax deferral program, and it's available to fishing vessel operators. You either have to own the vessel or have a long-term lease in the vessel to be able to participate, and what you do is essentially set aside a portion of your income that you've earned into a separate account, equivalent to an IRA essentially, and you develop a plan for, okay, I'm going to buy a vessel in ten years. So I'm going to put aside so much money every year and you do it pre-tax, and then you can withdraw that money to acquire or reconstruct the vessels as you move forward in time.

We currently have about 2800 active agreements throughout the country, and again, \$227 million in assets, and we don't actually hold that money. That money is held in bank

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

accounts, but every year with fishermen who have these agreements report to us, and on their income taxes they give us that and then we can report to the IRS along with them who can compare to make sure that the money is being held properly and properly segregated, and when it's drawn down, used for the purposes for which it was put in the account.

There are some issues with this, and in fact, Senator Smith before he lost was working on some legislation that was going to change this. So we have \$227 million in savings accounts, fishermen do out there, and they can't use them in the fisheries that they would want to use them for.

Frankly, we would prefer people not invest in over capitalized fisheries. However, there are limitations on what they can do with the money, and there's severe consequences if you don't use it for qualified purposes. So in some degree it just sits there, and your plant, your money has to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

used within ten years. So if it hasn't been used within ten years, it's automatically considered a non-qualified withdrawal, and you can be penalized.

And so what has happened over time, as fisheries have become over capitalized or stocks have fallen, all of a sudden you had thoughts of, well, I was going to buy a new vessel or whatever, and it's no longer a good idea from a fishery management perspective or a personal business perspective.

So Senator Smith and others were looking at some legislation. I don't know where that will go, whether it will be revisited, in expanding the uses for the capital construction fund so that you could use it to acquire or invest in aquaculture facilities, shoreside facilities or use it to purchase limited access permits, IFQs, if they're available.

Another option was to allow transfer to an IRA. So the fisherman would

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

just take it out and put it in an IRA, and then it would be subject to the conditions of the IRA.

And a third alternative was to have a window in which fishermen can actually close out their accounts, withdraw the money, and not be subject to the penalties associated.

They would still have to pay taxes on it, but not the penalties. Right now if you make a non-qualified withdrawal, you have to pay income taxes at the highest marginal rate of taxation available. Whether your actual income would put you in that bracket didn't So if you were in the 28 matter. bracket normally and you percent withdrew money, you would still have to pay in a 35 percent tax bracket for these funds. Plus you'd have to pay interest back to the time when that tax would have actually been due when you made the deposit.

So fairly severe penalties for nonqualified withdrawals and some serious

# **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	restrictions on it.
2	So in the interest of time, Topher
3	put these slides. I don't know if they're
4	available on the Website yet or not.
5	MR. HOLMES: I can send them out to
6	the group.
7	MR. REISNER: Okay, but those are
8	sort of the three main program areas which my
9	folks are responsible for in this process, in
10	developing the regs. for the disaster
11	assistance programs, which by the way I'm
12	hoping Alan is going to take over here
13	shortly, and I won't be responsible for that.
14	And then the loan programs and the
15	capacity reduction programs and the capital
16	construction.
17	Any questions?
18	MR. BILLY: Okay. Dave.
19	MR. WALLACE: I guess, we came up
20	with an idea that we would write a document to
21	the Secretary talking about, you know, what
22	constituted a disaster, and then you know, you

tell us that you have almost completed that. Should we just not do that and wait until you finish and then we critique your proposed regulation?

MR. REISNER: I don't know exactly when we're going to get regulations out, but if it's in the short run that might not be a bad idea. I'm looking to Sam.

MR. RAUCH: I think that there's a significant possibility that the whole thing is going to be delayed or the disaster regulations are going to be delayed and not come out. They're still proposed rules. Even if they do come out, there's no chance we're going to before the next administration.

Even if those come out, they are dealing with some of these existing issues, and I don't think that they're going to be well suited to dealing with the kind of policy discussions that you're talking about here. They're more mechanical, and this, this, and this is required as opposed to if Congress

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

gives the money what should they do with it or 1 2 what kind of things would we look for. So Т don't think that the two 3 efforts will compete with each other. 4 MR. BILLY: Randy. 5 MR. CATES: Regarding your loan 6 7 program, which I'm real familiar with, seems like MAFAC has a role maybe to play in 8 helping you guys draft new language and rules 9 10 that is not working very well. It's very for aquaculture, especially with difficult 11 qualifying requirements, and the level 12 13 capital that you've got to put up, it's really problematic. 14 15 MR. REISNER: Yes, let me talk to 16 that. So on the loan program there are two components to it. There's the loan ceiling, 17 the actual how much you're going to make the 18 19 loan for, and then there's the subsidy associated with that loan ceiling. 20 So, for example, in our buy-back 21

loans we have a standard rule of thumb of a

one percent subsidy. So if I have a \$200 million loan program for a buy-back, you would need to appropriate \$2 million for that.

traditional loan program The least within the administration, we have not been requesting a loan subsidy for that. Ιt has been enacted or, well, we haven't requested loan subsidy or ceiling for them. The subsidy is calculated based on the net present value of the expected return on the So if it's a 25-year loan or 20-year loan. loan, you do a net present value on that, and you build into that any expected defaults, and you come up with a current number, and that's what needs to be appropriated.

Well, our loan programs, all of them charge right now two percent over the cost of borrowing money for a relevant time frame. So if it's a 20-year loan, we go into federal market and get the rate for their 20-year bonds. We tack on two percent, and that becomes the loan rate.

## **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 you can see net present value, unless, you know, inflation and stuff change significantly, loans have our а negative actually don't subsidy. So we need appropriation of the subsidy amount to make them, but we do need authority for the loan ceiling to make them. If we were to make more risky loans, we would need subsidy because the loans would default more. So since we don't have any money appropriated for the subsidy, the qualification criteria for our loans is fairly high.

And so when you have a new industry come in, aquaculture being an example, it makes it hard because you don't have a history that we can use to do an evaluation, and we don't have a lot of collateral associated with the facilities themselves or a lot of experience on that collateral.

So at one time actually a couple of years ago, and Mike Rubino is not here, we had proposed getting some subsidy associated with

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aquaculture so we could reduce or increase the risk aquaculture loans with our the expectation that some of them would fail. Ι mean, that's what the loan program is for in federal and the government, that wasn't approved and Congress didn't enact it. So we didn't have that authority.

We still have a priority to aquaculture loans if they come in, but because we don't have any subsidy we have to keep the standards fairly high. It is a problem.

MR. CATES: Just to follow up on that real quick, down on our level what that means is, for example, we were approved for an \$8 million loan. It's not really a loan. The company has to go and spend the money first, then request 80 percent of it back. So you don't get the money up front to go build your facility. You have to have \$8 million to spend and then request to get it back.

Once we were approved, it took a year to get the funds in. The other 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

1	the problem is the legal documentation is
2	extremely heavy, and so I would like to
3	support you in trying to make it more flexible
4	or where more companies can utilize it.
5	MR. REISNER: Yes, I don't know the
6	specifics on your loan, but certainly to the
7	degree that we can make it easier for shore
8	side facilities and aquaculture, I think there
9	would be support in the administration for
10	that, this one and the next one.
11	MR. BILLY: I'm ready to stop us
12	right here and invite Alan to share his
13	remarks. I know he's on a flight pretty soon.
14	MR. RISENHOOVER: Okay. What could
15	be more exciting than ending with a report on
16	capacity building?
17	(Laughter.)
18	MR. BILLY: Two reports on
19	capacity.
20	MR. RISENHOOVER: It's about 58
21	pages long. So we're going to go through it
22	more or less line by line.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. RISENHOOVER: It was really one of my first exposures to some really deep economics, not economies of agglomeration or whatever, but close. And so I'm very glad that Rita is still here so when I get stuck on what the economy or the economics of this are we can turn to her.

But the full report is up on your I suggest you do take a look at it, like the executive summary at the beginning, the summary at the end, and then some of the tables, and I'll point those out because there's a lot of data and there are a lot of things to consider, and I don't want to get too wrapped up in the specifics of which fishery and how much capacity, all of that, but the overview because I think it fits more into what we're talking about here when you're looking at, you know, how do you react to a disaster or how do you react to capacity reduction. of the larger Here's some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

principles, but sometimes the details we could get lost in pretty easily there.

So let's just start going through.

So the Magnuson Act required us to do a report that had two main components to it.

First was to identify those fisheries with the most severe cases of capacity, over capacity in them, and then second, to look at some cost effective methods, that is, that the government didn't have to fund, that would solve those problems.

So if you think of the disaster side and do you rebuild or not, what happens to the disaster that's declared? You know, how do you handle that disaster? Do you reduce capacity? Or do you pay fishermen or what? These are some of the considerations we address in the report.

So real quick on definitions. Instead of using an output, we did use the output based model or definition instead of input. I'm not going to go into that because

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I couldn't explain it twice the same.

So we did choose it for three reasons, that a lot of what we do deals with the management side of things and not the capacity of the individual vessels, but then also try and compare it to all other economic sectors as well.

So our definition here is that harvesting capacity is the maximum amount of fish the fishing fleets can reasonably be expected to catch, "reasonably" meaning under current circumstances, regulations, maintenance, fuel prices. Fuels prices, see? I knew that.

So simply stated, we're defining excess harvesting capacity as too much harvesting capacity given the current situations, and we were only able to look at about 25 specific fisheries because of data limitations, and then an additional 60 what we call fleets in the report, which were similar vessels using similar gear in similar areas

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and generally catching the same type of fish.

So it's not a very specific report on that, and then the final caveat I'm going to use was the best data we had was from 2004. So it's a little old and it's a little I don't know if the word is loose, but it's not the detailed, analytical look that I think that folks would probably want, and it's based on a series of three other reports on capacity that the science and technology folks coordinated.

So if you're really into this, there's a history you can read up on. So let's go just to the definitions here. Excess capacity, that's harvesting capacity in excess of the recent harvests, that is, you have the physical ability to harvest more of the current harvest.

I'm reading that off the slide. I try not to read off the slides, but that's an important concept if you get into this.

The second one is over capacity,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and that's capacity in the excess of a management target or the quota. So you're going over quota.

So there's an example there of how these rates were calculated. I'm not going to go into that. I think it's probably better if we go into a little bit on the findings because that's what is important.

So the report to Congress looked at these or Congress required us to look at excess capacity, over capacity. We added a third measure in there to look at as well, and that is the over harvests because you may have over capacity and excess capacity, but you're not over harvesting. Well, is that a problem?

Probably from economic an So that's another standpoint of the fishery. part we looked at in the report, but we found that of the 25 fisheries we looked at, almost half did show levels of them of capacity, which is what? Who remembers what excess capacity 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

(Laughter.)

MR. RISENHOOVER: Excess capacity is harvesting capacity in excess of recent harvests, that is, the physical ability to harvest more than the current harvests. So you were limited for some reason, fuel prices or a quota, but you had the capacity to harvest more.

Additionally, and this isn't in the slide, but of the 60 fisheries, 60 fleets we looked at, 18 of those had excess capacity above 50 percent. So there were problems there or issues there as well.

I think that's probably all I'm going to say about that.

So as I mentioned what the report said was the Congress asked us to highlight those 20 fisheries with the worst capacity problems, and so any time you show those, people are going to want to know, well, why is my fishery there or why is it not there. So here's the list.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And there goes the list, right?
(Laughter.)

MR. RISENHOOVER: We don't want to spend a lot of time on that, but no, to go back, so this was one thing when the staff first drafted the report, and I went through the first draft of the report, you know, you look at the language, what was required to be there. They had no list of the 20 worst. So we went back and we put that in.

This is the list of the 20 worst those characteristics Ι based had on mentioned. So what is interesting about this is what's on the list, and so, you know, kind in our minds we think of fisheries that are, you know, kind of managed well and they are not having over fishing problems and the economics of them are well. You don't really associate capacity problems with that, but Atlantic sea scallops. at The valuable fishery in the nation right now is on the list. Of course, that's from 2004.

## **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 may have changed.

So that's something in reading the reports and the results of this we have got to be very careful and kind of finish every sentence with "but things may have changed," because the data is from 2004.

So you see, you know, some of the fisheries we think as being better managed, sea scallops. Another interesting one is surf clam/ocean quahogs. That's interesting because it's under an IFQ. So we've talked about IFQs reducing capacity or matching capacity with the harvest. It's on the list.

So we may have some problems. Again, this is from 2004, but what I think it highlights to me is capacity isn't the only thing at work here. It's one of a number of variables that contribute to the health of the fishery or the detriment of the fishery or contribute to pressure where if you have a lot of capacity to harvest above your harvest level, that may lead to over fishing. It

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

leads to pressure on the management system to manage right up at those lines.

And then, of course, there are some fisheries in there that we know there are problems. The first one, the northeast multispecies, there are some problems in there. Is capacity the only problem there? Probably not. There's probably some other things.

So we need to be careful just looking at this list and saying, well, these are the fisheries that need capacity reduced because the data is from 2004. Things may have changed, and there may be other things at play as well. So that's important.

So if we compare those and the table I really like best in the report -- I know folks probably don't want to go look at that right now -- is the one where we ranked things. We did look at the capacity measures. We talked about excess capacity, over capacity and looked at those, but also is over fishing occurring in the fishery? Because

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that's kind of the result. You have excess capacity and you're not over fishing the stock. Does it matter? We'll vote on that later.

little bit on some of the problems here. So there's no one size fits all, as I've been talking about here. got the conditions I've mentioned here. 2004 data. Resources may have changed. Characteristics of the fisheries may have changed. There may be new management measures in place.

And then kind of the bottom line is the Magnuson Act doesn't require us to manage capacity. There's nothing in the Magnuson Act that says that Secretary shall. So capacity is part of what we take into account when we're doing things. It should be a planning part of it.

But as it says here at the bottom, nonetheless, the rates of over capacity and excess capacity do show us that there are 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

management problems that we probably should look at, and that was the second thing Congress mentioned, was what are some of the cures. What are some of the ways to address these capacity issues?

While I mentioned that the MSA doesn't mandate, you know, specific actions related to capacity, we do have a national plan of action on capacity that NMFS put out, I think, in 2004. It's in the policy directive system that says NMFS is going to work on capacity, and our goal is by 2009 to reduce capacity significantly in 25 percent of the fisheries.

So over the next year we'll be looking between 2004 and where we are in that goal, and I think we're probably in pretty good shape because of the management measures put into place since 2004 probably have reduced capacity problems in about a quarter of the fishery. So, again, it's something to look at as we go through.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And then probably the one I want to spend a little more time in is the "so what?"

So we've got this data. Yes, there are some limits to the data. Yes, we can see that, you know, northeast groundfish is on that list and sea scallops and ocean quahogs are on that list. You know, are there problems? What's the difference? How do we compare those?

And what we found in the report was, in fact, that limited access privilege programs are good at helping with capacity, helping match it as opposed to the second one, which will be Congress specifically asked us to look at industry funded buyouts. I don't know that there has really been any industry funded buyouts, but buyouts in general, you know. Are you buying out the active capacity? Are you buying out latent capacity? Some of the issues Gary mentioned with buyouts.

License limitation programs, yes, help, but they a start in the right direction of reducing capacity over time.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

And then the conventional think of, management know, we you closures, seasonal closures, gear restrictions probably don't do that much for capacity. again, the excess and the over capacity rates themselves don't determine, you know, again, if capacity should be reduced or by how much; rather, that it's just a consideration that we need to make in management.

And so the fishery specifics are very important. What are the bycatch? How many fisheries do they operate in? If you're measuring the capacity in one fishery, well, maybe that boat participates in two different fisheries. Therefore, you know, they're using two different stocks. They may need more capacity. So there's a lot to look at there.

Are the stocks in a rebuilding program? Are they over fished? Is over fishing occurring? How is the capacity related to them?

And we have seen if you look on

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that list, and, again, there's a table in there, where we look at those where the capacity rates, the over capacity rates are higher, and you'll notice those with the higher rates have more over fishing occurring. So it may not be a one for one connection, but again, it's another connection that we need to look at.

kind of a So this is common management problem, is, you know, are you reducing the capacity or is your management just working around it? In other words, you do seasonal closures, but the same capacity is out there and now you start creating races for fish during certain periods of time, and once you start creating those races for fish, incentive there's an to increase your capacity, bigger and faster boats to haul things in quicker.

So I think the bottom line of this is not so much the specifics but the over arching things. Yes, capacity is something we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	need to look at. It needs to be considered.
2	It's not the root of all evil. It's not the
3	root of all fishing, but it is something that
4	can lead to those things that we need to look
5	at as we move forward in the larger context of
6	fisheries management, but then also in any
7	buyouts or disaster type assistance programs
8	we pursue in the future.
9	And unless you do want to go
10	through the report line by line, I'll stop.
11	MR. BILLY: Okay. Thank you.
12	MR. RISENHOOVER: And hopefully
13	answer Jim Gilmore's questions. He's just
14	taking notes.
15	MR. BILLY: Okay. Larry.
16	MR. SIMPSON: You know, the
17	industry funded buy-back, it's state, not
18	industry. In Texas they bought back in shore
19	shrimp licenses and bay ship licenses.
20	MR. RISENHOOVER: When we get into
21	some of this we need to look at how it is
22	reduced in some fisheries that were affected

1	and then see if we can apply those tools
2	elsewhere.
3	MR. BILLY: Mark.
4	DR. HOLLIDAY: You said the report
5	was based on information from 2004.
6	MR. RISENHOOVER: Yes.
7	DR. HOLLIDAY: So is there an
8	effort underway that periodically will give
9	you another snapshot of this in the future or
10	is that just a one time event?
11	MR. RISENHOOVER: We've talked a
12	little bit about following this up. What I've
13	mainly talked to folks about is, you know,
14	this 2009 goal we kind of said for reducing.
15	We need to have some sort of update or
16	something to look specifically at that. I
17	guess we'll have to explain how we met our
18	goal or at least I would like to know.
19	But this report just came out in
20	April. I don't know if there's any there
21	was a similar, not a similar, but another
22	complementary report that S&T put out in 2008.

1	The title escapes me, but I think that was
2	the third of the series. So, yes, there needs
3	to be additional work on capacity. No, we
4	haven't planned exactly what that is.
5	MR. BILLY: Jim.
6	MR. RISENHOOVER: I was joking,
7	Jim.
8	MR. GILMORE: Yeah, I know. You
9	woke me up though.
10	(Laughter.)
11	MR. GILMORE: You know, thinking
12	back from the way the pollock industry was
13	back in the mid-1990s when we had excess
14	capacity, we had over capacity, we had
15	abundant capacity, we had irrational capacity.
16	We had every kind of
17	MR. RISENHOOVER: How about
18	exuberant capacity?
19	MR. GILMORE: Exuberant capacity,
20	but we had a conservative TAC and we stayed
21	within that. Monitoring enforcement wasn't an

that sector, and it was interesting kind of listening to sort of trying to measure the excess capacity and the over capacity and then trying to correlate that to over fishing. I wonder if you have sort of a third category there that can somehow say, "And here's the relative socioeconomic health of the industry."

In the RISENHOOVER: right. report we also did look at the values at the fishery. We didn't try to measure any kind of economic health, but we also tried to look at some of the ex vessel values of these fisheries as well. So there's a lot of kind data in there and tables, you different ways of looking at things because we wanted to have kind of an alternative to there's the list - go fix it. And have some modifiers on that that, well, you know, maybe in ocean quahog, surf clam a little excess capacities is fine. There's no reason to reduce it.

## **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. BILLY: Chris.
2	MR. DORSETT: I'm just curious in
3	looking at the fisheries if there was just
4	limited to commercial fisheries or did you
5	explore, for example, the for-hire sector in
6	the Gulf o Mexico to see if it might fit.
7	MR. RISENHOOVER: I don't believe
8	that we did. I think it was all commercial,
9	although I think there was one category of a
10	diving fishery. I don't know, but I would
11	think that was probably a commercial one, as
12	far as I know.
13	Somebody else had mentioned earlier
14	in the week how do you measure capacity in
15	recreational fisheries. I meant to mention
16	that. That's something we do need to address.
17	MR. BILLY: Okay. Dave.
18	MR. WALLACE: Yeah. I guess I
19	would hope that Congress would not say fix all
20	of the fisheries that you say are over
21	capacity because I just happen to know a

little bit about certain co-ops, and I can

1	assure you that the capacity in that fleet is
2	just what the owners want it to be, and since
3	it's a year found fishery, but there is a high
4	demand time in the fall, and so they tie up
5	vessels through the summer during the low
6	demand period and bring them back just so that
7	instead of putting product in inventory, they
8	let their products be inventoried in the ocean
9	and captured when they need it.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, right.
11	And that's why I try to, you know, always go
12	right by that 21, because it just says it
13	exists.
14	MR. WALLACE: Right.
15	MR. RISENHOOVER: It doesn't say
16	why or it doesn't say if it's good or bad. It
17	just says when you do the math, you know,
18	through that one example, it exists.
19	MR. WALLACE: When you have ITQs
20	with unlimited transferability and the good
21	thing about the clam fishery which some IFQs
l	

don't have is that if they need to add

capacity they can. A lot of the IFQ programs put a cap on it, and so they're going to have to have a new management plan to allow additional capacity as the stocks grow.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right.

MR. WALLACE: And so the clam fishery should just be ignored as far as capacity is concerned because the participants get to set the level, whichever, but their company.

MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, and that's something, again, this is a slice in time here. If the stock is severely over fished and we're saying there's excess capacity, we didn't try to figure out, well, when it rebuilds to its full, you know, BMSY, what is it. We didn't do that. We just said at this time in 2004, this is what it is.

We did submit this report to Congress. Once it was submitted I started sweating, figuring, you know, the briefings, the calls, the legislative proposals would

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	start rolling in, and they haven't.
2	So you know, I think instead of a
3	report to Congress, it's something we can use
4	a little bit more internally to kind of guide
5	what we do in the future.
6	MR. BILLY: Cathy.
7	MS. FOY: I'm going to pass.
8	MR. BILLY: Okay.
9	MR. RISENHOOVER: Before you leave,
LO	you've got to tell me what over capacity
L1	means.
L2	MR. BILLY: Bob.
L3	MR. RISENHOOVER: I don't have to
L4	day that before I leave.
L5	MR. FLETCHER: Alan, West Coast
L6	Highly Migratory Species is a curious one on
L7	there because they're a minor player in the
L8	international fishery for, say, albacore which
L9	is probably one of the key species that West
20	Coast Highly Migratory target. How can you
21	consider that being excess capacity when
22	they're taking such a minor share of the

1	overall resource?
2	MR. RISENHOOVER: Again, I can't
3	speak to the individual ones. I just know
4	that based on the data they used, they did
5	that little equation, and it's look like that
6	one is about at 12 percent. So, yeah, I could
7	find out for you, Bob, but I don't know off
8	the top of my head the specifics that led to
9	that calculation that put it on the evil
10	slide.
11	MR. BILLY: I think Cathy has
12	something.
13	MS. FOY: I can't stand it. I have
14	some more.
15	MR. RISENHOOVER: Can I answer the

question?

MS. FOY: I don't know, maybe you

MS. FOY: I don't know, maybe you can, and maybe it's just that I'm just not really getting the whole socioeconomic part of this, but we have ecosystem management, and we're going towards fluctuating TACs so that we can account for shifts in stock and climate

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	change, and if we overly control our fleet,
2	how are we going to rapidly change to reach
3	maximum sustainable yield with the stocks.
4	MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. That's
5	why you can't look at this as the only thing
6	saying you should match your capacity to
7	exactly what the harvest level is now.
8	MS. FOY: So that's not really the
9	goal, is to pare back the fleet.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: No, the goal of
11	this was to show where there may be some
12	capacity issues, and that's why we added that
13	third category Congress didn't really require.
14	MS. FOY: Right.
15	MR. RISENHOOVER: Isn't subject to
16	over fishing, and there was really no way to
17	show that on a slide of, you know, which ones
18	are fishery or other than picking them out,
19	which ones are subject to over fishing or just
20	stocks over fished or have they been over
21	harvesting their quota.

We tried to pull that in to mute

1	some of those things that were just, you know,
2	an example of something that may be
3	meaningless. So you've got to look at the
4	specifics for each fishery and say in this
5	case, yes, maybe some excess or over capacity
6	is fine because the stock is rebuilding or
7	it's at a high level or it may be at a higher
8	level or prices have changed.
9	I don't know if there was an
10	answer.
11	MS. FOY: It was good enough to
12	confuse me further.
13	MR. RISENHOOVER: Then I'll be
14	quiet.
15	MR. BILLY: Okay. Tom.
16	MR. RAFTICAN: I'm intrigued by
17	Chris' question about over capacity at a
18	recreational fishery, and we're looking at
19	Southwest Coastal pelagics, West Coast HMS,
20	Pacific Coast groundfish. It brings up an
21	interesting quandary for us on the West Coast.

I don't know how you define that. You know,

1	a lot of what we do is on opportunity and not
2	necessarily take.
3	Have you done anything on that or
4	has anybody looked at things like that? I
5	would just like to see what you've got on it.
6	MR. RISENHOOVER: We didn't do
7	anything as part of this report. I don't know
8	if that exists or not. Off the top of your
9	head?
10	MS. CURTIS: No. The NMFS
11	economists, the recreational economists
12	actually don't think it's a useful method for
13	the recreational fisheries. It's a useful
14	method for the commercial fisheries, but it's
15	limited in some ways, but it's just not a
16	useful method for looking at recreational.
17	MR. RISENHOOVER: You know, after
18	you read the report tonight, and I'm sure you
19	will, if you have other questions let me know
20	and I'll find somebody smart enough to answer
21	because it ain't me.

MR. BILLY: Okay.

22

Thank you.

1 MR. RISENHOOVER: Thanks. 2 MR. BILLY: All right. So where do we stand here? 3 DR. HOLLIDAY: I think a question 4 to ask from this afternoon is does anything 5 6 that we've heard change the terms of reference 7 for the group that was discussed prior to lunch. 8 MR. BILLY: Okay. 9 10 DR. HOLLIDAY: Or are we happy that that charge we defined would be changed by 11 this information about 12 CZMA capacity or 13 implications the **NMFS** programs orspecifically? That question just to pose. 14 15 MR. BILLY: Yeah. We've heard now about the CZMA and capacity and the various 16 NMFS programs. 17 assistance I quess the question to you is: is there anything we 18 19 heard that ought to change the terms of

reference that we set up this morning for the

disaster assistance

follow-up on

approach there?

20

21

1	I mean, we're free to consider
2	these aspects as part of that. Is there
3	anything, any adjustment anyone thinks we
4	should make?
5	(No response.)
6	MR. BILLY: I guess not. Okay.
7	MR. CATES: I guess I'm confused
8	what you're asking. What we've heard so far
9	relating to the disaster relief?
10	MR. BILLY: We're going to follow
11	up along the lines that we talked about this
12	morning. We can also incorporate into our
13	thinking and analysis these other
14	considerations as appropriate. So do we need
15	to change the approach we've decided on this
16	morning?
17	MR. DEWEY: Can we hear again? Did
18	someone capture in writing our direction from
19	this morning?
20	DR. HOLLIDAY: Not verbatim. The
21	motion that was made was we'll go back to the
22	tapes and synthesize from the discussion of

the morning what this working group of 11 or 12 people would be looking at with the goal of developing a work plan with an ultimate product of а set of principles for department with respect to policies affecting fisheries disaster assistance and other federal policies that influence fisheries, sustainability of fisheries long-term communities and infrastructure.

So we heard all of these different presentations. We go back with this group and we look at that transcript and develop a terms of reference, what the group would be looking at, but we had some basic ideas or principles based on what the speaker said this morning that we'd look out for with respect to, you know, roles and responsibilities, what NOAA was looking for as far as direction.

So I don't have a verbatim motion.

We didn't have a formal motion. We just said

MR. DEWEY: Well, I think you've

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	captured it.
2	DR. HOLLIDAY: we'd assemble
3	this group.
4	MR. DEWEY: Captured it pretty well
5	with your summary right there, but at least
6	from this afternoon I know Randy and the
7	capital construction account there, the
8	capital construction funds, you had an
9	interest in interacting more with NOAA and
10	trying to make those more applicable
11	throughout the culture.
12	And for myself, on CZMA
13	reauthorization, I'm very interested in
14	pursuing the ability for states to do
15	aquaculture planning. You know, whether we do
16	that through MAFAC or individually, I fully
17	intend to.
18	MR. BILLY: Randy.
19	MR. CATES: Having heard what you
20	just said, it's my firm belief that if we're
21	going to have resilient coastal communities,

it's going to involve aquaculture. It seems

to me we just haven't really accepted it yet, but it's just a fact of reality if you look at the seafood industry.

you're going to do that Ιf less, we have to redo the loan program. I'm here to tell you from personal experience it will not work the way it's set up now. loan program themselves are asking for help from us to give them a new set of rules. think MAFAC will play a really important role in that because the rules that they have to play by right now, it's a square peg trying to put in a round hole. It just doesn't fit, and they don't know how to. They can't lobby. They can't change things. We have to change them.

So I think definitely we're going to have a vibrant industry if we have to look at that loan program to make it work.

MR. JONER: This is related to the sustainable communities, and I was thinking about what Dave said this morning about 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

lobstermen selling their palace for a million dollars or whatever. You know, the hot thing where we live, where I live on the peninsula, there's an area in the rain shadow of the Olympics, squid dungeness valley, and there's a few farms left. It used to be all farms not long ago.

groups So they got these like Friends of the Fields, and what they're trying to do is buy up the development rights of the remaining farms, and the community is really behind it because then you have locally grown produce, and don't have truck you to everything in from California, even though they are trucking in Californians to buy up the -- and Alaskans.

(Laughter.)

MR. JONER: I can't believe the number of Alaskans that move there.

So is there any kind of program anywhere along the coast that has a similar program in place where the development rights

## **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 these fish plants, rather than selling it for multi-millions of dollars for a condo, you sell the development rights and then that can't be developed into something other than what it's intended for? Fish processing, fishing boats, yachts.

And if not, I think that's something worth pursuing. Are you looking at some of these safe the farms, save the fields programs that could be applied to the fishing communities?

MS. FELLER: Well, I think that's an interesting idea. A lot of state have established PDR programs for transfer of development rights to compensate land owners, you know, for putting these restrictions on their land voluntarily.

I mean, I know how they're used for conservation to kind of keep low impact uses on the land and help farmers recoup some of the asset value of their properties. It might be real interesting to get somebody maybe from

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the Land Trust Alliance to come in and talk about PDR with MAFAC, maybe come up with something to explore how that might be relevant to working waterfront.

Trust for Public Land has done some

Trust for Public Land has done some work on working waterfront issues, too. They are more intentional kind of urban issues.

MR. JONER: You know, what Randy said about trying to diversify and save the communities by aquaculture. I think Bill can tell you once there's million dollar homes up along the waterfront, nobody is going to even be able to put a net down out there. So, you know, that's the thing we're up against.

MR. DEWEY: There are some programs around this where development rights on fishing docks have been purchased. There are some models out there, some examples.

MR. JONER: I would just like to see when this group gathers again to have some information like that that we could adopt or do something with.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. CATES: One thing we need to try and get, I think, too, is the idea that industry represents the consumer. We our always talk about our fishing industry, what we're really doing I heard it mentioned yesterday. We're supporting a product for the consumer. Now, we really don't have that consumer's voice. So that should mean to our community that the fishing dock has a greater importance because we're providing healthy seafood for the community and the bigger public.

We're kind of missing that link.

MR. BILLY: Martin.

MR. FISHER: I just wanted to offer again you could approach your Steve state representatives and ask them to put something on the state constitutional ballot to where working waterfront is taxed at a different surrounding than the comparable It certainly wouldn't take care of estate. restriction, but deed it would allow 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	existing enterprises to continue in the face
2	of development around them without, you know,
3	having a two-face about the same tax rate.
4	Because that's what we did in Florida, and it
5	worked. I know 69 percent of the vote was in
6	favor of it.
7	MR. JONER: When was that?
8	MR. FISHER: Just on the national
9	election, November 4th.
10	MR. JONER: But what was the
11	initiative or whatever, referendum, whatever
12	it was? Do you know the number of it?
13	MR. FISHER: It was a
14	constitutional amendment.
15	MR. JONER: Oh, constitutional
16	amendment. Okay. I'll just look it up.
17	MR. BILLY: Okay. Is there any
18	other business? Yes, Dorothy.
19	MS. LOWMAN: Well, before lunch I
20	brought up several little different points on
21	this economic research. I wrote up something
22	for the Committee's consideration as a motion.

1	MAFAC believes that socioeconomic
2	data collection is essential to understand the
3	impacts on communities and appropriate
4	responses to both fishery disasters and
5	changes to fisheries management. We support
6	the NOAA fisheries budget request for
7	increased appropriations for socioeconomic
8	research.
9	In addition, we recommend that NOAA
10	fisheries develop a policy that LAPP programs
11	include a requirement that quota shareholders
12	provide basic socioeconomic information that
13	could assist evaluating the impacts of the
14	program. This data submission requirement
15	should be mandatory, but at the same time cost
16	effective and not overly burdensome.
17	So that's it.
18	MR. BILLY: Is that in the form of
19	a motion?
20	MS. LOWMAN: That's in the form of
21	a motion.

MR. BILLY: Second?

1	PARTICIPANTS: Second.
2	MR. RAFTICAN: Would you read the
3	last part of the sentence? I couldn't hear.
4	MR. BILLY: Read it all again.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: Do you want us to
6	put it up?
7	MS. LOWMAN: Do you want to put it
8	up there?
9	MR. CATES: Tom, while we're doing
10	that, is this the time where you'll take the
11	other for future agenda, future ideas?
12	MR. BILLY: Yes.
13	MR. CATES: One thing I would like
14	to hear is since it's an intricate part of
15	fisheries is the councils and are they working
16	properly? Is each area working differently?
17	I mean if we're an advisory
18	committee, that seems to be an area that
19	should be looked at.
20	MS. FOY: Is there a standardized
21	approach?
22	MR. REISNER: You're advising us on

1	all of our programs.
2	MR. CATES: I mean, it seems from
3	what I do know each area acts or governs
4	differently in what's working and what's not
5	working.
6	MR. BILLY: Is there a review? I
7	thought I read that there's a review of the
8	council process, councils. Does anyone know?
9	MR. REISNER: Alan is gone. We are
10	going through redevelopment of the grants
11	associated with the councils. They have five-
12	year grants, and they're being renewed this
13	next year, and in those grants we're asking
14	them to develop some performance metrics to
15	say what are you going to accomplish and how
16	is it helping the mission and so we can
17	essentially document that, in fact, they're
18	working towards the goal and they're meeting
19	metrics.
20	We don't really have them in place
21	right now. So that's one area.
22	I think, and I'm sort of looking at

1	Martha, I know there are some reports that are
2	being done related to council membership, and
3	I don't know what the status of those are
4	either.
5	MR. CATES: I think that is
6	something that I view is worth reading about.
7	MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman.
8	MR. BILLY: Yes.
9	MR. SIMPSON: I mean, it's somewhat
10	subjective. Even metrics, you know, Council
11	A, B, C, D says I'm going to do this, and they
12	did it. What they did may be off or not
13	order. You heard how hard we worked on red
14	snapper and everything but drilling a hole in
15	the bottom of the boat. It somewhat didn't
16	work. As far as metrics was concerned, it
17	would be great. In the long run we've kind of
18	gotten there. It's real subjective.
19	MR. REISNER: Tom, if I can follow
20	up.
21	MR. BILLY: Yes.
22	MR. REISNER: You've heard the

discussion on CZMA and part of the issue was
the program was giving grants to individual
states, but there was really no coherent
effort to say, well, what are we accomplishing
today, and so part of what we're trying to do
is to say to get some coherent essence of what
we're accomplishing, yes, it may be different
for each council because each council has
different needs and priorities, but at the end
of the day handing over fishing or
sustainability are going to resonate
throughout all of them, and getting some
metrics associated with that even though there
may be some specific ones for individuals I
think would be worthwhile

MR. CATES: Sure. I mean it might be something as simple as asking the councils, if we ask them how can you improve this.

MR. SIMPSON: It's easy to do, but if you ask Chris' opinion, the Gulf Council, and my opinion, you might get two different answers. I mean, as long as you're doing

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

something that's fine, but if somebody wants you to be doing it this fast, that's two different opinions.

MR. BILLY: Maybe what we could consider is given the work that's being done now in terms of renewal of five-year grants and adding these criteria, at our next meeting we could learn more about that and where that stands and then have a further discussion, maybe some additional briefing on the councils and how they're working, you know, if there are different approaches. I'm not sure, but something that would start to inform us more about a council and how it's functioning, and then we can talk about where we go from there.

How does that sound? Yes, Chris.

The councils do so MR. DORSETT: many things. Do to look you want particular aspects of the things they're Because it would probably be a mixed doing? review.

MR. BILLY: Yeah. That makes

## **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	sense, but I don't know how to do that right
2	now.
3	MR. SIMPSON: Just start and let's
4	see.
5	MR. DORSETT: Then maybe narrow it
6	down.
7	MR. BILLY: And then narrow it down
8	or maybe sequence and look at different
9	aspects over a series of meetings.
LO	DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, why don't we
L1	and staff take a crack at trying to define
L2	what we've heard and send that back out for
L3	your consideration
L4	MR. BILLY: Okay.
L5	DR. HOLLIDAY: as something to
L6	chew on?
L7	MR. BILLY: Okay. That sounds
L8	good.
L9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Along these lines.
20	MR. BILLY: Okay. Now you can see
21	the language. We have a motion and a second.
22	Any further discussion?

1 | (No response.)

MR. BILLY: No? Okay. All in favor say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. BILLY: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. BILLY: Pass.

MR. FLETCHER: I had a question for Gary, Tom, and it might be the subject of some future discussion. You know, it seemed to be a no-brainer that something has got to be done about capital construction funds, and yet it just goes on and on and nothing ever gets accomplished, and people are suffering, people who put money in their accounts with all the right intentions of building an abode or upgrading their abode and then were told you can't do that. Basically they were screwed.

And yet every year we hear about bills that are introduced that don't go anywhere. I don't have an answer, but I'm frustrated because it should be an issue that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

gets addressed.

MR. REISNER: I don't want to say it's quite that simple. I mean, again, without saying that the administration has a position because it really doesn't, I can tell you in Treasury Department and where IRS is, they object to changes in this. They view it as, you know, people made business decisions to put this money here, and if you expand the uses of the money, then you reduce the federal revenues that are going to be the tax base that is going to come in.

You know, in fact, that's what would happen. If you got more uses that you can use it, there's going to be less tax revenue associated with it. Is that a good societal use of our tax expenditures? I'm not saying that. I'm just saying there are issues here that are just bigger than what appears to be a no-brainer because sometimes it appears to be a no-brainer to me.

MR. FLETCHER: Just a follow-up.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Fishermen made business decisions with the
2	understanding that they were going to be able
3	to use the money for specific purposes. Now
4	they can't do that.
5	MR. REISNER: Well, no. There's no
6	prohibition for using this money the way it
7	was originally put in those accounts for us.
8	Somebody in northeast fisheries can take their
9	money out and construct a new vessel for
10	fishing in the northeast groundfish fishery if
11	they want to. I understand from a business
12	perspective that doesn't make sense.
13	But I'm commenting, Bob, on your
14	term they "can't" do it. They can, but it
15	doesn't make business sense and from a fishery
16	management perspective it's not something we
17	would necessarily like to see.
18	MR. BILLY: Is this an item that we
19	would like to delve into further at our next
20	meeting or one of our next meetings?
21	MR. FLETCHER: I mean this affects

all sectors of the nation, Tom.

1	DR. HOLLIDAY: If you want to
2	express an opinion on a legislative priority
3	or solution for the next administration, but I
4	don't think there's a there's not going to
5	be a lot of debate and further discussion.
6	The issue is pretty well presented.
7	MR. DORSETT: This falls into that
8	larger umbrella associate principle that may
9	be something that might come up in that
10	discussion.
11	MR. FLETCHER: The group part of
12	this.
13	MR. BILLY: Could, yeah. Martin.
14	MR. FISHER: With the amount of
15	money that the capital construction fund in
16	terms of what's actually in it represents,
17	it's close to a third of the annual budget of
18	NOAA. It's no chump change. It's a big deal.
19	I think Bob's impassioned remarks are quite
20	appropriate. We should send a message or give
21	some guidance to rewrite the legislation so

that people that are stuck in this development

will get some relief.

mean, to me it's a no-brainer. It's sort of a slam dunk situation. Even Gary is sort of supporting the notion that this is antiquated legislation and this is a change, and that some Senator who just got replaced was working on it. So if it has the recommendation of MAFAC through the next administration to make it a priority to take care of it.

PARTICIPANT: The views expressed were my own.

(Laughter.)

#### MR. BILLY:

Would proposed language, whatever, be, in terms of is it a recommendation to the Secretary?

DR. HOLLIDAY: You can convey as one of the recommendations the results of this meeting and the action items that you want to inform the Secretary of MAFAC's concern on this issue with the recommendation that some

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	legislative relief that the department work
2	with respective members on the Hill to seek a
3	solution to this issue.
4	MR. FLETCHER: I like it.
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: That's a perfectly
6	legitimate thing for MAFAC to do.
7	MR. BILLY: Okay. Did everyone
8	hear that? No? Can you say it?
9	DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, I was just
10	giving the example. It 's perfectly
11	legitimate for MAFAC to make as part of a
12	recommendation or an action coming out of this
13	meeting that this item as discussed and that
14	MAFAC is advising the Secretary to work
15	collaboratively with the legislature to try to
16	find a remedy for this problem that has these
17	kinds of consequences, and you know, the
18	Committee would strongly endorse taking action
19	to fix it.
20	Not those exact words, but that's
21	the gist of it. It's an action recommendation
22	coming out of the deliberations of your

1	November meeting. That would be sent forward
2	specifically to the department.
3	MR. WALLACE: Do you need some help
4	to do that?
5	MR. BILLY: Yes.
6	MR. FISHER: I would move for
7	everyone to march outside.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MR. BILLY: Second? Okay.
10	Seconded.
11	Any further discussion?
12	(No response.)
13	MR. BILLY: No? Okay. All those
14	in favor say "aye."
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	MR. BILLY: Opposed?
17	(No response.)
18	MR. BILLY: We have it. Good.
19	MR. CATES: One last issue I would
20	think that we need to look at is how we
21	deliver our advice. I know we touched on it
22	the last meeting and this meeting, but we

1	haven't really refined that yet. I hope we
2	don't forget about that. We shouldn't be just
3	talking to ourselves. We've got to deliver
4	part of this.
5	MR. BILLY: That certainly could be
6	a component of a discussion with the new
7	Secretary, highlighting two or three of the
8	key recommendations in addition to the other
9	things we talked about.
10	MR. JONER: Or it would be helpful
11	to have, you know, two or three of these
12	subjects have bullets prepared so that we go
13	in, you know, at least all with the same
14	message and then we could give our personal
15	perspective on it.
16	MR. BILLY: Very good.
17	MR. JONER: That would be helpful.
18	We're at least going to be hearing the same
19	song, our own rendition of it.
20	MR. BILLY: Okay.
21	DR. HOLLIDAY: For the benefit of
22	the new members as well as the old, you know,

days after the end of the meeting we're supposed to prepare a written summary of the actions and recommendations coming out of the which Committee, Ι forward to you for approval, and that becomes the record then goes forward to NOAA and to the department, and our FACA obligation posted to the FACA Website as well for public findings to see what and recommendations.

And within that, the bullets will be identified by action and recommendations. So there is a mechanism. I think Randy has talked in the past about in addition to making a paper report, do we want to have someone orally present that from the membership to higher leadership as a new way of doing business. But you should note or remember that we do this report on a routine basis.

MR. BILLY: We started to do that, and 2020 is a good example where we hand carried it and made sure that the hierarchy

### **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	was aware of it.
2	Okay. With that unless anyone has
3	any other matters to raise?
4	(No response.)
5	MR. BILLY: No? Then I am pleased
6	to call this meeting adjourned.
7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
8	matter was concluded at 3:15 p.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	