MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday,

July 25, 2006

Courtyard Marriott - Downtown

Lake Union

Seattle, Washington

MEETING ROSTER

CHAIRMAN:

DR. WILLIAM HOGARTH, Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries Service, and MAFAC Vice Chair (Telephonically)

DR. JIM BALSIGER, Senior Policy Advisor, NOAA Fisheries Service, (Acting for Dr. Hogarth)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TOM J. BILLY

LAUREL G. BRYANT Federal Officer

BILL DEWEY

CAPTAIN ANTHONY D. DiLERNIA (Committee Liaison)

CHRIS DORSETT

ROBERT FLETCHER

JOHN FORSTER

CATHERINE L. FOY

STEVE JONER

PETER P. LEIPZIG

DOROTHY M. LOWMAN

HEATHER D. McCARTY

MARY BETH NICKELL-TOOLEY

TOM RAFTICAN

RALPH RAYBURN

DR. KENNETH J. ROBERTS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. www.nealrgross.com

ERIC C. SCHWAAB

CONSULTANTS TO MAFAC - Non-Voting Members:

RANDY FISHER, Ex. Director, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

CAPTAIN JOHN V. O'SHEA, Ex. Director, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries commission

LARRY SIMPSON, Ex. Director, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission

NOAA STAFF:

RACHEL BUTZLER, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Intern

LINDA CHAVES, Senior Advisor, Seafood Industry Issues

WALT DICKHOFF, Northwest Fisheries Science Center

KERRY GRIFFIN, Office of Habitat Conservation

BOB IWAMOTO, Northwest Fisheries Science Center

REBECCA LENT, International Affairs, NOAA Fisheries Service

FRANK LOCKHART, Northwest Regional Office

MIRIAM McCALL, Office of General Counsel

RICK METHOT, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

CHRIS MOORE, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

KATE NAUGHTEN, NOAA'S Aquaculture Program

RACHEL O'MALLEY, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

SAMUEL RAUCH, Deputy A.A. for Regulatory Programs

MICHAEL RUBINO, Director, NOAA's Aquaculture Program

DR. MIKE RUST, Northwest Fisheries Science Center -Manchester Lab

ATTENDING GUESTS AND PUBLIC:

BRIAN ATLEE, Alaska Sea Grant

SHANNON DAVIES, The Research Group

MARY HOPE KATSOUROS, President, Fish for the Future Foundation

TERRY KLINGER, University of Washington and Chair of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council

MICAH McCARTY, Makah Tribal Council

DON McISAAC, Pacific Fishery Management Council

BRUCE MOREHEAD, Ocean Associates

ANNE MOSNESS, Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy

SEAN NEPPER, Troutlodge IWC

AGENDA

Page

Introductions, Updates & Agenda Review (Dr. Bill Hogarth, Jim Balsiger, Chris Moore, Samuel Rauch)
6
United Nations High Seas Bottom Trawling (Rebecca Lent)
Budget Review Summary (Jim Balsiger)
National Outreach Plan (Christopher Moore) 64
Aquaculture:
Stock Enhancement Research (Dr. Mike Rust)
Draft Business Strategy (Mike Rubino)
"FishWatch" Web Page Development Project (Rachel Butzler)
NRC Recreational Fishing Data Review (Richard Methot)
<pre>Improving Endangered Species Act Implementation (Sam Rauch)</pre>
NOAA Fisheries Service "Vision 2020" Document Strategy - Overview of Concept and Purpose (Tony DiLernia)

1	SEATTLE, WASHINGTON TUES., JULY 25, 2006
2	8:10 A.M.
3	000
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Good morning.
5	Thanks for showing up right on time. Bill Hogarth,
6	who wanted to be here, was unable to. He's
7	standing by with only ten minutes before he has to
8	go see the Secretary of Commerce, so we're going to
9	dial him up right away. We have a few little
10	introductory things to do, to go around the table.
11	But just since Bill has such a short period of
12	time, as soon as we get him on the phone, we'll
13	skip right to his initial remarks.
14	And well, Laurel said she was going
15	to dial the number, but she went in the hall, so I
16	don't know if that's how you dial it or if she lost
17	track of the assignment already.
18	(Pause.)
19	While they're dialing, I'll mention
20	that these microphones are to record things.
21	They're not amplifying. So if they don't seem like
22	they're working, don't touch them because they'll
23	get unconnected. They're just recording your
24	voice. We have to speak up.
25	(Pause.)
26	Good morning, Bill.
27	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Good morning.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: It's a full crowd
2	here, so we're standing by for your words of
3	wisdom.
4	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Well, I hope you can
5	hear me because I'm having a hard time hearing you.
6	MR. FLETCHER: Loud and clear, Bill.
7	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: All right. Well,
8	look. First off, I really apologize for not being
9	there because I take MAFAC very seriously and I
10	think this meeting is one that I really wanted to
11	be out on account of things that we're undertaking.
12	But I spent most of yesterday dealing
13	with the Secretary and the West Coast Delegation or
14	Salmon, and it looks like that will continue on the
15	Hill most of tomorrow. And then Thursday we have a
16	hearing on striped bass. So it ended up being a
17	week of full activity on the Hill before the House
18	leaves Friday night. So I really do apologize, but
19	I think you're in capable hands with Jim and Laurel
20	and Sam Rauch.
21	And we all I think are on the same page
22	before they left to come out as to, you know, what
23	we need to do.
24	I do want to say that this the
25	what we're going to do with the 2020 the
26	"Vision" is extremely important in the fact that

1	well, for lots of reasons, but particularly the
2	commercial industry right now feels like that I
3	think everybody has sort of given up on them. They
4	don't see much of a future. And, you know, just
5	everything they feel like is on the down trend for
6	them and don't see much of a future, and I think we
7	have to really work very hard to get them to
8	participate and come to the regional meetings and
9	to provide input.
10	I did ask Mary Hope, who will be
11	staffing this, along with Laurel from us, to try to
12	set up a website that we could put out to the
13	public to give us comments and so Mary Hope has
14	agreed to do that. I plan to put out a news
15	release next week after you all meet and go over
16	we're going to go forward with this to get this out
17	so that the public will know what we're doing, the
18	time frame, and how they can be involved in the
19	process.
20	I know the Admiral is very happy that
21	we're doing this and feels like this is one of the
22	things we need to do.
23	I know you're also discussing
24	aquaculture. It continues to be one of our top
25	priorities. It just appears from everything going
26	on right now that I'm not sure that aquaculture's

1	going to even be introduced this year. In fact, I
2	would probably bet my year's salary that it won't
3	be introduced because the House is leaving Friday,
4	they'll be back for 12 days in September, and
5	everything is uncertain after September as to what
6	may be done or not be done. Even if they meet, it
7	may be for a very few days.
8	So but we need to keep moving and
9	keep getting ourselves in line for aquaculture and
L O	how we'll move forward.
1	And so also I think the other
L2	important issue for you all to discuss is the
L3	recreational fishing data review. We have got to
_4	move forward with the NRC's (National Research
15	Council's) report, how we implement this and how we
L6	can improve the collection of recreational data.
.7	We've asked for the NRC report, we've
18	got it, we've got to review, we've got a lot of
_9	recreational fishermen who are not happy with the
20	process, and so we've got to make sure that we can,
21	you know, find a system that we can use. And I
22	think the sooner solved, the better, but we don't
23	need to do it without getting good input and making
24	sure that whatever we put in place does the job and
25	we have buy-in. And I think it's going to be very
26	difficult to get the buy-in that we need. So

1	but we have to work hard on that.
2	So there are a lot of big issues.
3	There are, I think, a lot of possibilities for
4	MAFAC and you all's involvement, and we do value
5	your involvement and your and your help on these
6	issues and your advice on these issues.
7	And so I'd just like to say I'm sorry
8	I'm not there. I look forward to talking to Tony
9	when you all get through from his perspective and
10	as we move forward.
11	So if there are any questions, I'll try
12	to answer them, but I just did want to take time to
13	just say to apologize and not much I can do
14	about it but, you know, just let you know that I'm
15	I'd rather be there than what I'm doing. I can
16	tell you that. But it doesn't seem to work. You
17	have to do what they tell you to do.
18	So if there are any questions I know
19	like I say, we talked at length before Jim and
20	Sam left and Laurel left, and so but we're just
21	ready to hear from you.
22	MR. RAYBURN: We've never had beer this
23	early in the morning, Bill. It's good you're not
24	here.
25	(Laughter.)
26	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Lord help us. But I

1	don't know I think the agenda's pretty
2	straightforward. Aquaculture I think you've got
3	the business report, the business strategy, and
4	that's something that we need to really make sure
5	that we've got the best foot forward we can put.
6	You know, like I say, the Vision I think is
7	extremely important because, you know, the
8	recreational is growing, the recreational is
9	concerned about a lot of the quotas and the
10	allocation issues and, you know, commercial is
11	concerned about do they have a future. Then when
12	you put aquaculture in the middle of it, they
13	continue to look at imports in our trade deficit, I
14	think we do have some real challenges and I think
15	it's important to sort of have a game plan for the
16	future as to where we and the public see us going
17	in fisheries. And it's too important, as you all
18	well you've heard me say so many times it's
19	too important to this country and to the economy
20	not to have a real plan to move forward.
21	Okay?
22	MR. RAYBURN: Bill, could I ask a
23	question? It's Ralph.
24	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Yeah.
25	MR. RAYBURN: I've been trying to
26	figure out how to frame the question. It's on the

1	Vision 2020. And what I'm trying to and maybe
2	we'll get to that in our discussion, but I just
3	are we supposed to be in that projecting under the
4	current climate, the current situation, the current
5	regulatory regime what the fisheries will look like
6	in, you know, 15 years out, in 2020? Are we
7	supposed to develop what we would what we think
8	would be the best position for the fisheries to be
9	at in 2020 and some recommendations on how to
10	achieve that vision?
11	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: That's the latter.
12	I think we need the climate we're in now, I
13	think if you talk to most people, are not real
14	happy. I think they feel the commercial guys
15	feel like that they do not make can't make a
16	living; they don't see a future. I think we need
17	to look at what is the best climate. How can we,
18	you know how do we envision fisheries in the
19	U.S. being operated, managed, or whatever? You
20	know, I keep saying we need to operate as a
21	business, but most actual fishermen are not making
22	much money, you know. I think our processors do
23	much better but our, you know, rank and file
24	fishermen are not making a living.
25	Is there any way we need to look
26	forward as to how we can make this a business, how

1	these people can have more control over how they
2	fish, so to speak, how can we make it sustainable,
3	how can we make it so that they can control the
4	markets better rather than flood the market eight
5	days out of the month like we do red snapper.
6	We're moving it through now but, rather than
7	flooding it with eight days and then it's shut
8	down.
9	We need to try to look at how we keep
10	the markets open, how we keep, you know, the
11	charter boats operating, you know, nine or ten
12	months out of the year rather than in some
13	instances four or five months. We need to look at
14	it as a business. You know, what changes need to
15	take place? If we need to change things we have in
16	place here that we control, it's one thing. We
17	tried to look at some of this in Magnuson, you
18	know. If we need to go back to the Hill, then I
19	think we go back to the Hill. I think we need to
20	have a game plan that we can sell and whatever it
21	takes to implement that, we need to do it.
22	By the way, Magnuson is also not going
23	anywhere. The House we're still working and
24	there's a slight chance that the House well, I
25	don't think there's any chance of it now 'cause
26	they're leaving Friday. We were trying to get it

1	back on the calendar for this week. It's not on.
2	Now it looks like we may have a slim chance of
3	getting it back on the agenda for September. But
4	being there for 12 days, it's and they haven't
5	done budgets and several other things, whether
6	we'll get it through or not, I I have talked to
7	Senator Stevens a little bit and will talk to him I
8	guess Friday again to see if there's any way we
9	could attach it to something else and see if we
10	could get it through without having to have a
11	separate House bill. But I'm really concerned that
12	Magnuson is not going where it needs to go and it's
13	extremely important I think to have the Magnuson
14	bill and we need to try to do what we can to get
15	the House people to let it move. But it appears
16	that the environmental groups have pretty much
17	bogged that down, not liking the rebuilding time
18	frame, and so we're trying to see if there's any
19	way we can get it off in the House, but at least
20	get it to a conference because we think the Senate
21	bill is good and parts of the House is good, but
22	right now we don't even have a Magnuson.
23	And if it doesn't get done this year,
24	then we have to start all over next year, which
25	will not be very good. So, you know, if this
26	doesn't go through, one of the options, I guess, is

1	to go back and look at National Standard 1, which I
2	dropped because I thought the House was going I
3	mean, the Senate and House was going to do a
4	Magnuson.
5	So we'll have to see where we go. But
6	now back to your original your question, Ralph,
7	we need to look out of the box, so to speak, and,
8	you know, how would you have if you were a CEO
9	of fisheries for the U.S., how would you manage
10	this as a business and how would you operate it is
11	really what I'm looking at.
12	MR. RAYBURN: If I could follow up.
13	What the other aspect of that, Bill this is
14	Ralph again is what relation does the business
15	aspect of the fisheries and the preservation of the
16	coastal fisheries' community, how do those two
17	things weigh into what you see that's the vision
18	of the Agency should be? Because it seems like,
19	you know, response to coastal disasters and stuff
20	is more of a coastal community, fishing community
21	resiliency issue and not so much the actual
22	fisheries.
23	So how do you balance business and
24	coastal community, fishery community in light of
25	the objectives of the Agency?
26	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Well, I think

1	Raipii, I tillik, you know, I guess we look at the
2	fishing community, because we think that is the
3	infrastructure that's necessary to advise both
4	recreational and commercial fishing. If we lose
5	the infrastructure of the communities, I think we -
6	- you know, we'll have a tough time.
7	And so I think I think my
8	personal opinion is all of that is sort of part of
9	being the CEO who's going to operate fisheries.
10	How do we maintain an infrastructure, how do we
11	maintain the community structure with, you know,
12	ice houses. I heard last week, for example, on the
13	West Coast they can't even afford to have ice
14	anymore. The last ice plant went out because it
15	didn't make enough money to operate with the small
16	fisheries that we have anymore.
17	So, you know, I think it goes through -
18	- the marine supply companies were saying, Fifty
19	percent of my business is coming from commercial
20	fishing and I've lost, you know of that 50
21	percent, I've lost 45 percent of it.
22	So I think it's a big the big
23	picture that we really have to look at, but one
24	the main aspect that we operate would be, you know,
25	the fishing but I think, in looking at it, we
26	have to be recognize that these other parts of

1	the infrastructure are extremely important and I
2	think have to sort of talk about that and make some
3	type of recommendations on the importance and the
4	needs.
5	But I think disasters have come a
6	little tough right now. I think we I don't know
7	how we're going to deal with disasters in the
8	future because I think what's happening is that the
9	fishermen are hanging on by threads and so far in
10	debt, most of them, that when a disaster comes,
11	they have no way out and, you know, they're just
12	that's just sort of the straw that breaks.
13	And that's one of the big issues that
14	we have is if there are more if you're operating
15	a business and there are more making money, can
16	they keep you know, keep their boats in repair,
17	keep insurance, build a little nest egg so if they
18	have a small disaster, it doesn't, you know, break
19	them totally. And I think that's what we're seeing
20	now that you can't hang on by a shoe string in
21	this business that's pretty costly.
22	I mean, most of these vessels probably
23	pay 5- to \$10,000 a year just for insurance and
24	maintenance type things, and they're not being
25	maintained and that's what bothers me, I guess.
26	The day I left Newport, Coos Bay last

1	week, I think the next day three fishermen on one
2	boat had given up on salmon trying to go way
3	offshore to fish for tuna in a 38-foot boat, had to
4	be rescued. So the safety aspect is something else
5	I think we really have to become more recognize
6	more as we manage.
7	MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Bill. This
10	is Jim. Can you hear me?
11	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Yeah.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I'm not sure how
13	much time you have, but I before you leave, we'd
14	as a group in your presence like to recognize the
15	trip to the shellfish farms yesterday. Bill Dewey
16	put on a fabulous show and a very hospitable lunch,
17	and I missed it and you missed it, but I think we
18	ought to pat him on the back.
19	(Applause.)
20	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: I think those guys
21	have really shown here what you can do with
22	aquaculture and I think, you know, I was impressed
23	when I went there several years ago, before I even
24	left North Carolina, trying to learn what they were
25	doing to see if we could utilize some of it in
26	North Carolina. And I think they really they're

1	doing a lot of good work.
2	Folks, I do have to run. I'm supposed
3	to be at 11:30 at another place that's about 15
4	minutes from here, so if you need me during the
5	week, holler. I look forward to getting the report
6	from when you get back, and Tony hasn't said
7	anything. I hope he's there and in rare form
8	because he's got a lot of work to do this week.
9	MR. DiLERNIA: Oh, yeah. We'll take
10	care of it.
11	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: Okay. All right.
12	And I'd like to say Mary Hope is there. She's
13	staffing the 2020 and also we look to her to
14	when you talk about the sustainable fisheries
15	leadership awards, we will probably we'd like to
16	use her foundation to go out and advertise and so
17	we can make sure that it looks like it's make
18	sure that it is impartial and unbiased. We want to
19	make sure that it does and we can have what NOS did
20	with the Sanctuaries, that a law will still be
21	involved and doing the videos and making sure it
22	comes off. But we want to make sure that we get
23	wide support for it, wide distribution, and then
24	that MAFAC has a lot of people to review when we
25	look at the awards.
26	So thanks a lot and, please, if you

1	need anything, give me a holler.
2	MR. RAYBURN: Thanks, Bill.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Bill.
4	CHAIRMAN HOGARTH: All right. Bye-bye.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. With that
6	start, at the very front here, before we do
7	introductions, I'd like to mention Steve Joner, who
8	works with the Makah Tribe has a few words to say
9	and introduce a man.
10	MR. JONER: Sure. Well, I'm one of the
11	I guess three-host members, along with Bill and
12	John, although I think I live farthest away. I
13	live about seven miles west of you, so you should
14	be doing this. Anyway, it's traditional
15	for the tribe, the host tribe of the area, to give
16	a welcome and the host tribe for the City of
17	Seattle is Mukelshoot (ph), and I checked with them
18	and they said no. You guys do it. Go ahead.
19	That's part of the protocol.
20	So I asked Micah McCarty Micah is
21	here this morning he's on the Makah Tribal
22	Council, and he's going to give a welcome and
23	blessing to our time this week and then you all
24	probably know we're going to visit Manchester
25	tomorrow where we hope to have a good time around a
26	sockeye salmon dinner and some traditional Makah

1	songs and dances and it's going to be a tough act
2	to follow Bill, but we'll do our best.
3	Micah.
4	MR. McCARTY: Thank you, Steve. Well,
5	I was thinking a lot about what I'd say, but I
6	think I'm just going to go ahead and share a little
7	bit of what I've been thinking about most
8	importantly.
9	As a treaty tribe, we often are
10	reiterating and sounding like broken records among
11	ourselves about what it means to be a treaty tribe.
12	And, first of all, I'd like to thank you all for
13	the important work that you're doing because, in my
14	view, it's an important aspect of maintaining
15	treaty rights. I'd like to first share with you a
16	perspective on American democracy that the founding
17	fathers of the United States of America had entered
18	into negotiations with the Iroquois confederacy and
19	those negotiations were apparently aimed at
20	articles of the confederation. So a lot of the
21	words of the founding documents of this nation have
22	been in part influenced by the American philosophy.
23	And so just with that in mind, I'd like
24	to share a little bit more about how this whole
25	American democracy came to this area. And with the
26	United States being very young and having a destiny

1	to manifest, being the manifest destiny, there was
2	important interest in securing title to the land
3	out here, particularly with competition from
4	foreign powers. It was in 1790, there was a
5	Spanish fort in Neah Bay and that Spanish fort was
6	put there to monitor the British trading activity
7	in the vicinity.
8	The Spanish had a much stronger
9	presence on Vancouver Island and they were doing a
10	lot of trade there and what the British were up to
11	in the area, to the back door of this trading post
12	was very important, so there was a Spanish port
13	placed in Neah Bay. Russians had come down. The
14	French, obviously the British were around. And so
15	for a fledgling United States Department of or
16	State Department, securing the title out here and
17	safeguarding a settlement was very important.
18	And so among some of the things in
19	preparation to gain title was the recognition of
20	preexisting rights to the Natives, particularly
21	with title to the land. And then, therefore, once
22	successful treaty negotiations were taken care of,
23	then the United States could turn to the
24	international interest and say, We have legitimate
25	title from the original occupants.
26	And, you know, it was a very strong

1	message that the United States was able to achieve
2	and, therefore, the current foundries that we have
3	out here on the West Coast are a major part of that
4	act.
5	So oftentimes I hear rhetoric about
6	treaty rights and how they're archaic and how we
7	need to move on and some of the things about
8	special rights of Native American peoples, but I
9	think it's often done with some of these
LO	comments are often coming from an ignorant
1	perspective on things that were not necessarily put
12	into the history books that we grew up with.
L3	So, with that in mind, I just wanted to
4	let you know that there's an aspect of history and
15	a relevance to treaty rights that I think is
16	important to understand and share with people that
17	may not have already understood that.
18	So thank you for that. And also would
19	like to share with you the namesake of this town.
20	The City of Seattle is named after a chief named
21	Seatt (ph) and, along with Muckleshoot, Seatt's
22	parents were Duwamish and Suquamish. Seatt's
23	mother was from the Duwamish Tribe, which is at the
24	south end of Elliott Bay here where the Duwamish
25	River comes out, and his father was from Suquamish,
26	which is a ferry boat ride over across to

1	Bainbridge Island and behind there is the Suquamish
2	Reservation.
3	And the Chairman of the Suquamish Tribe
4	had asked me at another conference he wasn't able
5	to make to just reiterate that Seattle has always
6	been a very international location with several
7	tribes in the city having overlapping territories
8	and, through intermarriages, there is sort of a
9	melting pot, if you will, of local tribal interest
10	and language groups.
11	So with that in mind, I'd like to share
12	with you a prayer song that is consistent with our
13	ancestors and, with that in mind, I'd also just
14	want to share that the oral history that we pass on
15	in the songs and the dances that you'll be
16	witnessing tomorrow, those are all connected with
17	what we consider the spiritual interconnectivity
18	with our treaty rights.
19	The treaty rights are traditional
20	resources and our culture is based on the
21	relationship that we've always had with these
22	resources. And the the longevity of all this
23	and what I would call the integrity of our oral
24	history is the living breath of our ancestors. And
25	so it's only fitting that this song is a homage to
26	our ancestors.

1	(Prayer song performed by Mr. McCarty.)
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you very
4	much. Thank you. That was good.
5	Let's see. Just a few comments and
6	we'll perhaps go on and introduce ourselves.
7	This is Frank Lockhart, who's here on
8	behalf of Bob Lohn, who is the Regional
9	Administrator for NOAA Fisheries in this region.
10	Bob's busy but Frank's here, so we've got lots of
11	hosts and help here.
12	MR. LOCKHART: I have just a quick
13	welcome to Seattle. This is where the Northwest
14	Region is headquartered and I'm the Assistant
15	Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries
16	and work with the Council a lot on salmon harvest
17	management and groundfish harvest management and we
18	this is a unique region in that we do have the
19	treaty tribes and, as co-managers, we work with
20	them quite a bit. And so I'm very glad that the
21	Makah are here and giving you an idea of kind of
22	the unique nature of fisheries here.
23	And so, with that, I think I'll just
24	say welcome again. Bob wishes he could be here,
25	but there were some other things that he couldn't
26	get out of. There's a lot of salmon litigation

1	going on and there were a couple of things that he
2	had to be present for down in Portland.
3	So, anyway, welcome and I look forward
4	to meeting people here that I haven't met yet and
5	reacquainting myself with a few that I haven't seen
6	for a few years. So, anyway, welcome again and
7	thanks for coming.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Frank. And
9	in terms of us guys up here at the end of the
10	table, we've got a couple of staff changes in
11	fisheries since the last MAFAC meeting. Where were
12	we?
13	MS. BRYANT: In Fort Lauderdale.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Fort Lauderdale.
15	That's where we were. I was at that time acting as
16	the Deputy for Regulatory Affairs. Since that
17	time, Sam Rauch has been become our permanent
18	Fishery Service Deputy for Regulatory Affairs, so
19	he'll be in that position for a while.
20	Dr. Rebecca Lent had been the previous
21	deputy. I filled in for six months or so and now
22	Sam's in charge of that. And so until next March
23	or April or so when I intend to go back to Juneau,
24	I have a different title which I'm still working
25	on. It's probably like the sacrilegious potentate
26	for all things domestic in the absence of Vuldar

1	(ph). And so it doesn't exactly roll off the
2	tongue or I'd give you the acronym.
3	But, anyway, I'm pleased to be able to
4	help out here as much as I can. Bill's pretty
5	busy, as you can tell, and so I'm just trying to
6	pick up some pieces
7	We've also if you've looked through
8	the agenda this morning, at the last MAFAC meeting,
9	there was a conscious effort to try to narrow the
10	focus of MAFAC agendas so we'd get more done on
11	fewer issues. And this agenda, I'll just mention,
12	has two main focuses. One is aquaculture and the
13	other is the 2020 Vision document.
14	Nonetheless, there's a whole bunch of
15	other pieces on here which we don't intend to take
16	a lot of time but they're sort of head's up issues
17	that have come up in the past couple of weeks,
18	things that I think that MAFAC may be interested in
19	and, if they are, we can put them on the agenda for
20	future meetings and spend some time on them. But
21	for right now, they tend to be 15- or 20-minute or
22	sometimes half an hour introductions of different
23	topics that have come to our attention that may
24	pique your interest.
25	We think there will be time you
26	know, but the main two issues are aquaculture and

1	the 2020 document. We'll have a lot of time to
2	in the subcommittees that we call them
3	subcommittee groups to work on those things.
4	I think I probably won't mention much
5	more right now. Let's see. Let's go around the
6	room and introduce ourselves first since there are
7	few new people and one brand new MAFAC member,
8	looking forward to working with her.
9	So I'm Jim Balsiger. We met Frank
10	Lockhart, so let's go over here.
11	MR. JONER: Well, again, I'm Steve
12	Joner with the Makah Tribe. I live in Port
13	Angeles, Washington. And I don't want to exceed my
14	limit here, but Mike Rust is here from the
15	Northwest Science Center and he's going to talk
16	today about stock enhancement. We saw a brilliant
17	example of shellfish aquaculture yesterday down in
18	the Shelton area, and one of the other aspects of
19	the general term "aquaculture" is stock enhancement
20	of wild populations, which is sorely and
21	desperately needed here on the West Coast.
22	We're really walking a tightrope.
23	We're trying to manage our fisheries around some of
24	these overfished populations, some of which would
25	take over a hundred years to rebuild with the very
26	restrictive fisheries we now have. So, anyway, I'm

1	very happy to see Mike here this morning and have
2	that on the agenda because that's something that
3	the Makah Tribe as well as many other parties here
4	in the Northwest have done successfully with
5	conservation and hatcheries for salmon and so this
6	is a big event for us this morning to have this on
7	the agenda.
8	MR. SCHWAAB: Eric Schwaab with the
9	Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies out of
10	Washington, D.C. I guess I've sort of dropped the
11	ball in not alerting Laurel to the fact that we
12	have gone through a name change over the last few
13	months and we dropped the "International" from our
14	name, although it doesn't affect our mission at
15	all. We represent state Fish & Wildlife agencies
16	all across the country. All 50 states are members.
17	MS. LOWMAN: Dorothy Lowman. I'm a
18	consultant based in Portland, Oregon and I do a
19	variety of projects, but they tend to have the
20	theme of dedicated access privileges. I've been
21	working on for environmental defense on these
22	kinds of issues off the West Coast and I've been
23	working with a non-pollock, non-AFA catcher
24	processors in Alaska on those also.
25	MR. O'SHEA: Good morning. Vince
26	O'Shea, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries

Τ	Commission, and I'm an advisor to MAFAC. Indik
2	you.
3	MR. ROBERTS: Ken Roberts, Louisiana
4	State University. Resource economics is my
5	background and I'm proud to say I've turned in my
6	retirement papers. October 31st and I'm very
7	proud to say that my university chancellor who I
8	work for still thinks fisheries is important in an
9	Ag. school. My new vice chancellor replacement
10	will be Secretary of Department of Wildlife &
11	Fisheries, Dwight Langer, Northern Louisiana, so
12	we've got a Cajun in charge and he's a fisheries
13	person in the vice chancellor's slot, so I'm very
14	proud of the fact that my university thinks that
15	highly about fisheries.
16	MR. LEIPZIG: I'm Pete Leipzig with the
17	Fishermen's Marketing Association. I represent
18	groundfish and shrimp trawl fishermen in Washington
19	and Oregon and California, and I'm based out of
20	Eureka, California.
21	MS. TOOLEY: My name is Mary Beth
22	Tooley and I'm from Camden, Maine, East Coast
23	Ecologic Association. Our vessels are fishing in
24	the Northeast for herring and mackerel.
25	MR. BILLY: Tom Billy. I'm President
26	of International Food Safety Consultants, and a

1	long-time federal career here, been 23 years with
2	NOAA.
3	MR. RAYBURN: I'm Ralph Rayburn. I'm
4	the Associate Director of the Texas Sea-Grant
5	Program and operate the Sea-Grant Extinction
6	Program for Texas.
7	MR. FISHER: I'm Randy Fisher with
8	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission out of
9	Portland, Oregon.
10	MR. RAFTICAN: Tom Raftican with the
11	United Anglers of Southern California and United
12	Anglers representing recreational anglers in
13	California.
14	MR. MOORE: I am Chris Moore. I work
15	for NOAA Fisheries in Silver Spring. I'm the Chief
16	of the Partnerships and Communications Division.
17	MR. RUST: I'm Mike Rust with the
18	Northwest Fisheries Science Center where I'm
19	assigned. Steve's already talked about me, so I
20	don't need to say any more.
21	MR. RUBINO: Michael Rubino. I'm the
22	Manager of NOAA'S Aquaculture Program. You'll hear
23	more from me later this morning.
24	MR. SIMPSON: Larry Simpson, Executive
25	Director of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries
26	Commission, and I'm one of your advisors.

1	MR. FLETCHER: I'm Bob Fletcher, the
2	President of Sportfishing Association of
3	California. I represent about 150 commercial
4	passenger fishing vessels in Southern California
5	and the live bait harvesting industry in Southern
6	California.
7	MR. FORSTER: I'm John Forster. I've
8	worked in the aquaculture industry all my life, and
9	the last 21 years of that have been spent here in
10	Washington.
11	MS. FOY: I am your new member. I'm
12	Catherine Foy. I was busy last time you were in
13	Fort Lauderdale, having a baby boy, so please
14	forgive my absence. You probably wouldn't have
15	wanted me there anyway. I am a marine ecologist by
16	training and more recently a marine mammal
17	biologist. I'm the Steller Sea Lion Project
18	Manager for the Aleutians East Borough. There's a
19	very, very commercial fishery area of the world
20	that's almost exclusively there. Their entire
21	income comes from commercial fisheries in that
22	area.
23	So most recently, I have started
24	working on coordinating an EIS because we have an
25	oil and gas lease coming up in the borough, so they
26	want to make sure that their commercial fishery and

1	subsistence fishery interests are protected.
2	MS. O'MALLEY: Hi. I'm Rachel O'Malley
3	from NOAA's Office of Sustainable Fisheries.
4	MR. DORSETT: I'm Chris Dorsett with
5	the Ocean Conservancy's Gulf of Mexico Regional
6	Office in Austin, Texas.
7	MS. McCARTY: I'm Heather McCarty. I'm
8	from Juneau, Alaska. I'm a consultant with
9	commercial fisheries, but I also work with the
10	University of Alaska School of Fisheries and Ocean
11	Sciences running a research program that's funded
12	by industry, by the At Sea Processors Association.
13	One of my major clients is a large
14	processor in Kodiak. I also work with fishermen's
15	groups and I also represent a CDQ group, community
16	development quota group, in the middle of the
17	Bering Sea.
18	MR. DEWEY: And good morning. I'm Bill
19	Dewey with Taylor Shellfish Company here in
20	Washington State, another new MAFAC member.
21	Looking forward to that involvement. I got my
22	degree in shellfish biology and fisheries
23	management, Bachelor's degree, from UW here in
24	Seattle back in 1981 and have worked in the
25	shellfish industry since. And welcome to Seattle
26	and sorry to those who couldn't make yesterday's

1	tour and hope everyone that did has recovered. It
2	was a long day I think for everybody.
3	Thank you.
4	MR. RAUCH: I'm Sam Rauch. I'm the, as
5	Jim said, the new Deputy Assistant Administrator
6	for Regulatory Programs.
7	MR. DiLERNIA: And I'm Tony DiLernia.
8	I'm a faculty member with the City University of
9	New York, Kingsborough Community College. I run
10	their Maritime Program and I also have been
11	doing charter boat business in New York for about
12	30 years.
13	MR. BRYANT: And I'm Laurel Bryant,
14	Executive Director for MAFAC, and I'm also from
15	Seattle, born and raised, and a UW alumni, so it's
16	great to always be home, so I get to welcome
17	everybody to my hometown, too.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Dr. McIsaac.
19	MR. McISAAC: I'm Don McIsaac. I'm the
20	Executive Director of the Pacific Council. Our
21	office is in Portland, Oregon.
22	MS. BUTZLER: I'm Rachel Butzler and
23	I'm with Sustainable Fisheries in Silver Spring,
24	Maryland.
25	MR. GRIFFIN: I'm Kerry Griffin. I
26	work for NOAA's Office of Habitat Conservation and

1	I staff aquaculture issues for that office, which
2	is why I'm here.
3	MR. McCARTY: And I'm Micah McCarty.
4	Couple of things. My dad's out fishing right now
5	for salmon and we think there's a lot of important
6	work coming up and we're watching closely with what
7	Mike Rust has been able to achieve, and we're
8	hopeful that as our reliance on salmon shifts to
9	more marine fish, that we're also able to come up
10	with ways of being responsible stewards.
11	MS. KLINGER: I'm Terri Klinger from
12	the University of Washington. I'm also the Chair
13	of the Olympic Coastal National Marine Sanctuary
14	Advisory Council, and Steve invited me I think in
15	that capacity. The Advisory Council is interested
16	in just learning more about how fisheries are
17	managed within the sanctuary and, as you know, the
18	sanctuary is fully within the treaty drives. We
19	have the pleasure of working with Steve and Mike
20	and other travel biologists. So thank you for
21	coming here.
22	MS. CHAVES: Linda Chaves. I'm Senior
23	Advisor on secret industry issues to Bill Hogarth,
24	and I worked in Silver Spring for many, many years
25	but I've gone back to Seattle.
26	MR. MOOREHEAD: Good morning. Bruce

T	Moorenead. I'm a consultant with Aquaculture
2	Program.
3	MR. LEE: Good morning. I'm Brian Lee,
4	Alaska Sea-Grant. I'm a director there as part of
5	the college program, the NOAA program, and Ralph
6	Rayburn asked me to come and it's a pleasure to be
7	a guest here and I enjoyed the field trip yesterday
8	and looking forward to discussions of aquaculture
9	and fisheries. I'm (indiscernible) Sea-Grant on
10	seafood science and technology. Ralph is in
11	fisheries. We have an aquaculture group and we've
12	aggregated that into a important sustainable
13	fisheries and safety food safety initiative on
14	behalf of Sea-Grant. So we are looking forward to
15	kind of coordinating and talking and networking
16	here.
17	So thank you for having me.
18	MS. KATSOUROS: I'm Mary Hope
19	Katsouros. I'm President of Fish For the Future
20	Foundation, which is dedicated to re-educating the
21	American public for the importance of and the need
22	for a vibrant, healthy, sustainable fishing
23	industry.
24	I also have a (indiscernible).
25	MR. DAVIS: Shannon Davis from a
26	consulting firm called the Research Group out of

1	Corvalis. We do fishery description projects.
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. I think
3	that's it. Laurel, do you have any words of wisdom
4	before we kick off?
5	MS. BRYANT: Only thing I want to
6	remind folks that if you're not a MAFAC member,
7	whether that means you're staff, visiting public,
8	guests, please make certain that you sign in during
9	this. This is a public meeting and we want to make
10	certain that we keep those records straight. So
1	I'd appreciate that.
12	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where is the sign-in
L3	sheet?
4	MS. BRYANT: It's actually out front on
15	that table. So at breaks or whatever, but I just
16	want to make certain that we get everyone's name
.7	and affiliation down. It would be great.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. I don't know
19	if you have any control over this, but does
20	everyone like the temperature in here? Too cold?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sounds like it's
22	just right.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Is there a
24	consensus? Do we like it? Okay. I guess we like
25	it.
26	MR. JONER: We're making up for

1	yesterday. We're still trying to
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. So now what?
3	MS. BRYANT: We're going to need to get
4	Rebecca on line for your bottom
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Do you want me to
6	go up there?
7	MS. BRYANT: And I think you're going
8	to need to go up there because Rebecca couldn't
9	hear. They just can't hear anything and there's no
10	phone jack. That's the only thing we've got.
11	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay.
12	(Pause.)
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So we're going to
14	get Rebecca Lent on line and we're going to quickly
15	do this United Nations high sea bottom trawling
16	issue.
17	(Pause.)
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Everybody ready to
19	hear bottom trawling. Rebecca, do you want to say
20	some words about background on this before we
21	quickly go through the PowerPoint?
22	MS. LENT: Well, I think as a number of
23	folks probably know, United Nations bottom trawling
24	has been a big issue. We've been trying to follow
25	that closely and make sure that any commitments we
26	make internationally are consistent with what we

1	are doing domestically. And Jim was able to sit in
2	on a briefing the other day with State Department,
3	who has the lead on U.N. issues, and we suggested
4	that Jim give you all an update so that we have a
5	good a good opportunity there with MAFAC to
6	share this with you.
7	So take it away, Jim.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Thanks. As
9	Rebecca said, I sort of well, Rebecca invited me
10	to a meeting that she had with the State Department
11	when they were talking about this and I don't know
12	much about State Department issues but I spent 30
13	years in the council system and I know the
14	stakeholders don't like to be surprised. So I said
15	we should start involving people and it just
16	coincidentally happened that MAFAC was meeting this
17	week. So this is just a head's up informational
18	thing and, again, questions if you want to
19	pursue it more, we can talk about it more, but
20	let's look quickly at these slides.
21	I think that you all have copies of
22	this, I understand, but you can turn them off, I
23	guess, unless well, other people want can you
24	take notes? Do you care? You have it.
25	Okay. This slide points out that in
26	2004 there was a United Nations General Assembly

1	resolution where the states agree to review within
2	two years progress taken in response to the request
3	looking at fishing on the high seas, to put it very
4	briefly.
5	The United States has been an
6	international leader in protecting vulnerable
7	marine ecosystems within the EEZs, and I think most
8	people probably are familiar with the work that's
9	been done in the North Pacific Council, the Pacific
10	Council, and the New England Council where
11	vulnerable bottom types such as corals have been
12	protected under the Magnuson Act under EFH and the
13	HAPCs and it's sort of a model for what the United
14	States would like to push through the United
15	Nations.
16	So fishers beyond the EEZs now must be
17	U.S. fishermen must be permitted under the High
18	Seas Compliance Act they have to have High Seas
19	Fisheries Compliance Act permits and they're
20	subject to conditions under both the Endangered
21	Species Act and under NEPA.
22	Internationally, the inter-agency
23	processes work with the State Department and the
24	NOAA international offices and the NOAA Fisheries
25	International Office, which is where Rebecca Lent
26	sits. So we have this potential proposal that

1	would include freezing the footprint of bottom
2	trawling on the high seas where there are no
3	management agencies in place.
4	It would require environmental
5	assessments for new bottom trawling activity. This
6	would not impact U.S. fishers in the U.S. fishing
7	zones because all of the U.S. EEZs are subject to
8	management by regional fishery management
9	organizations, which everyone knows here in this
10	country are the councils working with the Secretary
11	of Commerce.
12	MS. LENT: Again, this is Rebecca. Let
13	me just clarify that all of this U.N. stuff only
14	applies to high seas and there's slight differences
15	whether it's an area or a fishery covered by an
16	RFMO or not. Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: That's thank
18	you, Rebecca. And so just to clarify that, we're
19	only talking about high seas beyond the EEZs of
20	every country and where there are high seas areas
21	that are managed by some organization, the idea
22	would be to have those managing organizations set
23	the management rules. But on the high seas, where
24	there are no management organizations in place,
25	this is where this would apply should it go through
26	the United Nations Assembly.

1	So we're
2	MR. SIMPSON: Jim, can you give me an
3	example of a bottom trawling fishery in the high
4	seas?
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think that
6	Rebecca, is it accurate that we believe that there
7	are no bottom trawling fisheries operating in the
8	high seas right now?
9	MS. LENT: By the United States, yes.
10	That's what we have understood from our regional
11	administrators and our fishing industry.
12	MR. SIMPSON: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: And do we have
14	other are we aware of other nationalities with
15	bottom trawling operations in the high seas right
16	now?
17	MS. LENT: Yes, sir. One example would
18	be some of the orange roughy type fisheries that
19	are outside the CAMLR (ph?) area.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So
21	MR. SIMPSON: This doesn't apply to
22	things like mining; right?
23	MS. LENT: No. This is just bottom
24	trawling fishing.
25	MR. DiLERNIA: Rebecca, Tony DiLernia.
26	MS. LENT: Hi, Tony.

1	MR. DiLERNIA: Hi, Rebecca. What about
2	some of the activities in the New England area on
3	the NAFO? Would isn't there a I think
4	there's a squid fishery that goes on, a U.S.
5	fishery, although I think that's big water but
6	there was some I thought there was also some
7	bottom trawl activity outside of 200 miles that was
8	regulated by the NAFO group.
9	MS. LENT: Yes, but our understanding
10	is there wouldn't be any U.S. folks involved in
11	that but, Tony, if you have other information or
12	others there, we'd appreciate hearing about that.
13	And, in any case, that would be regulated under
14	NAFO.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So I think the
16	premise here is that outside of the EEZs of any
17	country and in areas where there is no management
18	body,
19	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: that's where
21	we'd have this work. So if NAFO is regulating some
22	area, then we're not worried about that. The
23	response we'll work with that responsible group
24	to try to have that international management agency
25	also protect vulnerable bottom types if they exist
26	there, but this particular through the United

1	Nations program wouldn't apply there.
2	MS. LENT: Well, Jim, let me just
3	clarify. I think in some cases such as NAFO and
4	NEAFC, there has indeed been some analyses and some
5	control which would be consistent with what this
6	proposal calls for. Even where there are RFMOs,
7	the idea is don't go beyond where you're bottom
8	trawling now unless you have good evidence that it
9	wouldn't have an impact.
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Anything else?
11	MS. LENT: Thank you. Go ahead. I'll
12	try not to interrupt you again.
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: No, please do. But
14	that's the end of my that's the end of your
15	presentation you gave me, so, again, it was a
16	head's up. We wanted to make sure that people knew
17	that, through the United Nations I think that's
18	starting next month, is it not, Rebecca, that the
19	U.S. will be pursuing this?
20	MS. LENT: Early October and late
21	October, November will be the U.N. General Assembly
22	Fisheries part of the discussion.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Any other
24	questions? If not
25	MR. DiLERNIA: Rebecca, will you be in
26	New York at that time?

1	MS. LENT: Actually, this is headed up
2	by the State Department and Liz English and Pat
3	Moran of my staff will be there, Tony.
4	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Thank you.
5	Okay. We have some questions, Rebecca.
6	I see first Pete Leipzig and then Ralph Rayburn.
7	Pete.
8	MR. LEIPZIG: Well, you mentioned an
9	orange roughy fishery and I'm just curious as to
10	any attempt to do an inventory of the fisheries
11	that where this is occurring?
12	MS. LENT: The U.N. did prepare a
13	report on bottom trawling that sort of globally
14	what the different countries were doing within
15	their EEZs and beyond. Liz, can you comment on
16	that?
17	MS. ENGLISH: Yes. That was that
18	was state submissions on actions they've taken to
19	protect marine ecosystems from bottom fishing. Are
20	you talking about an inventory of the orange roughy
21	stocks themselves?
22	MR. LEIPZIG: No. I'm talking about an
23	inventory of where bottom trawling is occurring
24	outside of any EEZ and outside the authority of any
25	management organization.
26	MS. ENGLISH: Yeah. That was the

1	report that was just put out by the Secretary
2	General. You can find that report and I can
3	pass that website on on the "Law of the Sea."
4	If you just type in Google "Law of the Sea," you'll
5	find that's the U.N. site and the report's
6	there.
7	MS. LENT: But we'll get that to you
8	all at MAFAC so Rachel or Laurel can write that up
9	on the board.
10	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Thank you.
11	MS. LENT: Thank you, Pete.
12	MR. DiLERNIA: We have a second
13	question, Ralph Rayburn. Ralph.
14	MS. LENT: Hi, Ralph.
15	MR. RAYBURN: Hi, Rebecca. How are
16	you?
17	MS. LENT: Rockin' and rollin'.
18	MR. RAYBURN: I bet you are. It seems
19	like there's more and more emphasis on the
20	international aspect of it. I was wondering
21	whether it would be of interest for you all at
22	MAFAC to consider a working group or maybe an ad
23	hoc subcommittee on the international field to give
24	you more direct contact with the subcommittee and
25	work with MAFAC that way, or have you all
26	thought about that?

1	MS. LENT: As the International Office
2	Director, I would welcome that. I think that would
3	be a fabulous idea. We'll leave it up to the folks
4	who run MAFAC to see if they're willing to consider
5	that.
6	MR. RAYBURN: Okay. Thanks.
7	MS. LENT: Thanks, Ralph.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: By the way, you
9	guys run MAFAC.
10	MR. RAYBURN: Oh, no. I just was
11	curious from Rebecca 'cause it seems more and more
12	that that's there's some emphasis there and so
13	if MAFAC could establish some kind of a knowledge
14	base, it might help in the process.
15	MS. LENT: That would be great.
16	MR. RAYBURN: Absent another advisory
17	group that you make.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Are there any other
19	questions for Rebecca? Jim?
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: No. We're good.
21	MR. DiLERNIA: Thanks.
22	MS. LENT: Well, Jim, as the U.N.
23	meeting progresses, we'll be happy to provide
24	updates to MAFAC.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you.
26	MS. LENT: Thank you, folks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	MR. DiLERNIA: Thanks a lot.
2	MS. LENT: Thanks, Jim.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Next is budget
4	summary.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. We have just
6	a few slides on the budget here. Both the '06
7	supplemental from our perspective is all hurricane
8	stuff for the Gulf of Mexico that we'll page
9	through at a very high level.
10	So the next slide, please. That's hard
11	to see. So the top part of this table here is the
12	hurricane supplemental I think everyone can see
13	those numbers. It's not a dark problem, is it?
14	MS. BRYANT: This is in the pocket of
15	your binder, in the front pocket.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: And you have copies
17	of this.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Just came in this
19	morning, so it's not hasn't been three-hole-
20	punched.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So the top table
22	look at the last column on the right. After
23	working through the requests from the President and
24	what the House and the Senate did, this is how much
25	money we ended up with. For a while, we were
26	hoping, as you can see under the '06 Senate mark,

1	we might be getting as much as a billion dollars
2	for this, but it ended up being \$118 million, some
3	money from agriculture, some construction funds,
4	which is what the PAC part is. ORF is operations
5	and research, basically, and some facilities. PAC
6	is a construction fund. So we got a total of \$188
7	million run through the fisheries budget for the
8	hurricane supplemental.
9	On the next can we go to the next
10	slide before we look at that bottom part. This
11	shows basically where the 118 million or 188
12	million for the hurricane supplemental went.
13	Hundred and eighteen million in ORF was 90 million
14	oyster, shrimp, survey. You can read those
15	numbers. Five million for industry assistance, 20
16	million went to NOAA NOS, National Ocean Survey for
17	Maps, updated charts because of changes in
18	(indiscernible) and that kind of stuff, two million
19	for ports, a million dollars for NOS tide gauges,
20	and a \$38 million transfer from agriculture went
21	largely to oyster receding rehabilitation and
22	restoration, and the construction account, the \$32
23	million, 20 million of that for Pascagula Lab
24	reconstruction, which was wiped out by the
25	hurricanes and 12 million for let's see NMAO
26	is our group that runs the ships and the planes.

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Marine & Navy
2	Aviation Operation.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: That's it Marine
4	& Aviation Ops.
5	Okay. The next slide shows the
6	fisheries component a little bit more specifically,
7	the \$132 million in the supplemental went to the
8	Gulf States Marine Fish Commission. Laurel may
9	want to talk about that. Otherwise, it's divided
10	up largely by the states in that manner.
.1	And then we got a little bit of that
.2	money went to Maine and Massachusetts for red tide
13	research and a little bit for cooperative our
_4	end of the cooperative research.
L5	Any questions on that supplemental
16	part? Yes, please, Chris.
L7	MR. DORSETT: Chris Dorsett. I was
8	wondering about the timing of the distribution of
_9	funds and, Larry, is this, are the states did
20	you just hand the money over to the states or are
21	they applying for essentially submitting a
22	proposal, We're going to do these things with it?
23	MR. SIMPSON: Yeah. It's, first,
24	timing. As of last Tuesday, we finalized the
25	cooperative agreement, the large package which
26	includes all five of the Gulf states, in the

1	Commission's activities. Also, the .8 million that
2	the Commission's getting, which is spread out
3	this is all spread out in the five years is not
4	part of the disaster money that's coming out of
5	Memphis. So there's no
6	All right. So that Tuesday, we
7	finalized it. As of last Friday, I think, Chris,
8	the package left the Southeast Regional Office to
9	go to Headquarters. It's being reviewed now for
10	legal and grants and, when that award occurs, it
11	will then allow the release of money by the
12	Commission to each of the five states through sub-
13	awards. The sub-awards are definitive work,
14	outlined with detailed cost element breakdowns and
15	budget.
16	MR. DORSETT: Thank you.
17	MR. SIMPSON: When the money will
18	actually go to an event in the state, there are
19	some pre-award costs which have been which are
20	allowed up to 90 days prior to approval. I know
21	that in the State of Mississippi, they've already
22	contracted to purchase culture material for oyster
23	rehabilitation, so some of the money in
24	technicality is already being spent, but gonna be
25	paid at a later date. When it actually is awarded
26	and occurs, I'll know about it probably a day

1	before.	Ιt	will	be	in	the	paper	and	some	several

- 2 Senators will announce it. Then we'll go about and
- do our work.
- It's probably -- it's going to be
- spread out over five years, though, Chris.
- 6 MR. FISHER: That's a typo on Florida,
- 7 isn't it?
- MR. SIMPSON: Yes.
- 9 MR. FISHER: What are they getting? --
- 10 about four, five?
- MR. SIMPSON: Well, the numbers are not
- precisely correct. Florida, four million; Alabama,
- 28 million; Mississippi, 35 million; Louisiana, 50
- million; Texas, three million.
- MR. FISHER: That's before the
- 16 cooperative search entity; right?
- MR. SIMPSON: Yeah. This is just
- 18 fishery stuff. That's -- that totals 128 million.
- 19 Put -- the 128 million is made up of 90 million and
- 38 on the oysters, so that's 128. The other stuff
- is red tide and other stuff.
- MR. FISHER: So Florida is more like
- about four?
- MR. SIMPSON: Four.
- 25 CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think Florida is
- four or five. I looked at those and it didn't

1	register that they're way off.
2	MR. SIMPSON: I was looking at them
3	when I was called on and that's not exactly they
4	may
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: They obviously
6	total way more than 128 there, so we can get we
7	can get those correct numbers to you. We'll get
8	back to our budget shop. Thanks, Larry. Ken?
9	MR. ROBERTS: Can you give us a few
10	comments on what the history of the (indiscernible)
11	was from USDA in the Fishery Service? The last
12	experience we had in the Gulf with Hurricane
13	Andrew, which was massive on the oyster industry -
14	most people felt USDA did a tremendous job in the
15	disaster money program that they had. And I'm just
16	wondering why they're not a player this time, that
17	they're just a conduit? Has anybody got any
18	background there?
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you.
20	MR. SIMPSON: They are. And in
21	Louisiana, that was well stated, that they did a
22	great job. The issue here has to do with the
23	regulations within Department of Agriculture. Some
24	of you may not know this, but in the State of
25	Louisiana, there's an extensive leasing situation;
26	they actually lease water bottoms rather than own

1	them, Bill. They lease to the state.
2	Now, the production is let's just say
3	approximately 50/50. Private leases produce about
4	50 percent of the oysters. Public grounds produce
5	about 50 percent of the oysters. If the you
6	went the agriculture route solely for the 38
7	million, then all of that money would be utilized
8	for public for private leases. The state would
9	be considered an entity and, therefore, only
10	allowed to receive about \$200,000. Two hundred
11	thousand dollars for half of the production in
12	Louisiana? I mean, when everybody had the equal
13	loss? So that's why it was transferred from
14	Department of Ag. so they wouldn't have to go by
15	strict regulations of public and private
16	limitations. Each entity is limited to \$200,000.
17	So the state would be considered one
18	entity for public grounds and, therefore, all of
19	the public grounds would be limited to 200,000, so
20	that's why it was transferred to allow that
21	opening.
22	MR. ROBERTS: Does the transfer then
23	mean that the private industry people are left out
24	now?
25	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, no.
26	MR. ROBERTS: No. They

1	MR. SIMPSON: No. They can they can
2	and will be given money as well as the public
3	grounds. It was more a matter of not of
4	excluding the public grounds than it was the
5	private.
6	MR. RAYBURN: Larry, do you recall
7	right off what the value of oysters are in the Gulf
8	of Mexico?
9	MR. SIMPSON: I've heard it. I just
10	can't I can't
11	MR. RAYBURN: I mean, that 38 million
12	represents a pretty good chunk of that.
13	MR. SIMPSON: Well, Louisiana's
14	production of oysters is probably 85 percent of the
15	entire Gulf of Mexico.
16	MR. ROBERTS: I think we're about \$60
17	million roughly in Louisiana, roughly.
18	MR. SIMPSON: And that's 85 percent
19	75, 85 percent of the entire Gulf production.
20	MR. RAYBURN: And you said 60?
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Rachel, can you
22	back up to that summary table, the first slide.
23	Thank you. So the bottom half of this then is the
24	'07 budget that we're looking forward to. It
25	the columns also show what we had in fiscal year
26	'05, fiscal year '06, what was asked for by the

1	Administration for fiscal year '07 by the President
2	and it's got the House and the Senate mark, and you
3	can see there's a long distance between the last
4	two columns. The House mark was 539 million for
5	NOAA Fisheries. The Senate mark is 813 million.
6	So last year, we had 667 million. So it all
7	depends on the conference report. You guys all
8	know how that game is played. Most of that money's
9	in actually, all the money in Senate and House
10	mark is in the OR&Fs. There's nothing in the PAC
11	that come up right now.
12	I actually don't know what's in the
13	other column, unless Sam knows some of those
14	things. There's 106 million other, which adds up
15	to a big range between the '07 House mark and the
16	'07 Senate mark.
17	And then go forward to the that
18	mark, which shows basically the breakdown by major
19	categories. Because there's a lot of work yet to
20	be done in conference, I don't have any slides that
21	show all of the couple hundred lines that NOAA
22	Fisheries guess, but this is the major categories.
23	You can see that the Senate mark would give
24	basically increases in every one of these
25	categories. Notably, I guess, the Pacific Coast
26	Salmon Recovery Fund would go back to \$90 million

2	Another interesting thing on the Senate
3	mark is that a lot of earmarks have been condensed
4	so that there's fairly significant amounts of non-
5	designated money that would be for the Fisheries
6	Service to divide up. So if that stays that way in
7	the final appropriation bill, I think there would
8	be a lot more central control over how the money is
9	distributed to the different regions and centers
10	than there has been in the past where most of the
11	money has been identified and earmarked in the
12	account.
13	Next slide, please. Very quick
14	summary. '07 House mark would be quite painful, 28
15	percent below what we had last year in the
16	Fisheries Service. The '07 Senate mark is above
17	a similar increase over last year, so in conference
18	it will be interesting to see where we come out.
19	Next slide. These are our talking
20	points, trying to convince trying to point out
21	the impacts. Should we be funded at the House
22	mark, the Ocean Action Plan implementation would
23	not be supported. Bill mentioned this morning the
24	Magnuson-Stevens Act. It's the timing is
25	critical] for it but, should this budget come
26	through, there wouldn't be much support for it and

under the Senate mark.

1	you can see that the bottom line said that, under
2	the House mark, the regional councils and
3	commissions would be funded only at 25 million,
4	which is a reduction from what the President asked
5	for.
6	Bob?
7	MR. FLETCHER: Just curious, Jim.
8	What's the level funded number there for the
9	regional councils and commissions?
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: It's around \$15
11	million. I don't
12	MR. FLETCHER: So under either
13	scenario, there is an increase
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: That's correct, for
15	the councils and commissions, but but as this
16	bottom line says, the President's request
17	recognized that the councils and commissions were
18	underfunded, so the President's request the
19	Administration's request was was 26.3 million.
20	The House mark would be below what we requested,
21	but it would be an increase over last year of a
22	little bit.
23	And then the next slide shows the or
24	continues to show House impacts. You have those,
25	so you can read through them. Under "Fisheries
26	Research and Management Programs," we'd have

2	problems collecting fisheries data. We'd probably
3	eliminate a lot of economic and social science
4	programs in the Fisheries Service, and it goes
5	through to talk about the impacts on enforcement
6	and observers.
7	The next slide shows some of the
8	impacts of the Senate mark. Of course, if that
9	came through, it would be a 28 percent increase
10	over last year. That obviously would support the
11	U.S. Ocean Action Plan and implementation of
12	Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection
13	Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Act. It's supported all
14	the President's requests. It's higher on every
15	line item. And then the bottom one is probably of
16	interest to you. The regional councils and
17	commissions would be funded at \$40 million, which
18	is quite a large increase over last year.
19	Next slide, please. And these are
20	mostly positive stories that counteract the
21	negative ones we hit under the House mark.
22	Affected species, fisheries research, habitat,
23	enforcement, and observers actually, absent
24	enforcement and observers, they all show fairly
25	significant increases. Enforcement and observers
26	show some small reduction in enforcement funding

problems with stock assessments. We'd have

1

1	over the '06 enacted. We'd probably have to work
2	in-house to make sure that we didn't lose the
3	cooperative agreements we have with the states
4	because that's pretty valuable and the VMS coverage
5	we have, but it's not identified there.
6	Please, John.
7	MR. FORSTER: Just a question. I know
8	this is not the sort of the budget and the whole
9	structure of the thing but, given that the priority
10	of the people talking about aquaculture is so
11	important and we've got to do something about
12	aquaculture, I mean, I don't see the word
13	aquaculture mentioned anywhere in here. And so I'm
14	just wondering, I guess, where it fits in this
15	thinking on either side, Senate or House or the
16	Administration.
17	I mean, how and where is it going to
18	fit into that structure of things?
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, that's a
20	concern for us and when Mike Rubino gives his talk,
21	I think we should ask him to talk about that quite
22	a bit. I actually have gone through there's a
23	reasonable amount of not a reasonable there's
24	some money in OAR rather than the Fisheries Service
25	for aquaculture. That's where the bulk of the
26	aquaculture money is. There is some money that we

1	have in the Fisheries Service as well, but maybe
2	Mike can go into those details.
3	I think that's a very good point. It's
4	in the Ocean Action Plan the President's
5	adoption of that plan, it emphasizes the need for
6	aquaculture but yet it doesn't it isn't
7	represented very well in either the House or the
8	Senate, but Mike's been working hard on that and I
9	think he's got some comments on it. But that's a
10	good observation.
11	Please.
12	MR. ROBERTS: Is there any information
13	as to the origin of the House mark? I mean, why
14	are they dissatisfied or is this political
15	posturing or what's happening?
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well,
17	MR. ROBERTS: Does anybody know?
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I don't know if any
19	politician would care to comment on that.
20	MS. KATSOUROS: You know, Congressman
21	Wolfe and his I don't think that they are, you
22	know, enamored with NOAA. I don't think we've made
23	a, you know a case because each year this
24	year, the mark wasn't as low as last year.
25	MR. JONER: So is this something NOAA's
26	done or not done?

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, I think that
2	they can point to things that NOAA has failed to do
3	and they in fact do in the language that the
4	core language that accompanies appropriation bill
5	each year. Even the Senate mark has noted that
6	they aren't real happy with the way NOAA has
7	responded to some of their requests in the past, so
8	we're working hard on those as much as we can. A
9	lot of them, the current comments attached to the
10	Senate bill take issue with the size of of our
11	headquarters contingent of NOAA people, I guess.
12	And so we're trying to explain as much as we can
13	why the personnel we have in Washington, D.C. is
14	the right number. They take issue and they point
15	out some of the things they don't like and you can
16	read I didn't bring the appropriation bill along
17	but, if you can read that if you would like to -
18	- and we can get it to you if you would want to see
19	that.
20	Did you have a comment down there?
21	Okay. Well, that's just a quick
22	overview of the budget, and I guess the bottom
23	line, there's a lot of room between the House and
24	the Senate mark, so we need to keep on top of it as
25	much as we can.
26	Vince has a question or a comment.

26

1	MR. O'SHEA: Yeah. Thanks, Jim. I
2	notice on the President's the difference between
3	the President's request and the Senate mark is
4	almost \$200 million. You know, and I'm just
5	wondering if you all have had discussions about
6	concerns about being able to spend that if in fact
7	you get it.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I have heard no
9	concerns over our ability to spend our funds.
10	MR. O'SHEA: Well, I mean, the reason
11	I'm raising it in the past, you have had
12	problems getting money out on some of these on
13	these line items in a timely way so that they could
14	be spent before two weeks before the end of the
15	fiscal year type thing. So I think through the
16	grants process.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Yes. That's a good
18	observation. Maybe two years ago, perhaps three
19	years ago, we came to the realization that all the
20	grants processes had to comply more closely with
21	NEPA and we may not have been doing that right. So
22	that did slow things down.
23	I think we're finally sort of caught up
24	with the NEPA requirements to most of the grants,
25	so it's going better, but I think there is a
26	it's not an ability to identify projects in order

1	to spend the money but it's how to get it out in a
2	timely
3	MR. O'SHEA: Right.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: manner and comply
5	with all of the steps.
6	MR. O'SHEA: And I'm bringing it up
7	it's a sore point with us. We fell in that trap and
8	it's you know, funds that we were expecting
9	because of that NEPA thing took you know, got in
10	the way of us trying to carry out the work.
11	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Sam, did you have a
12	comment?
13	MR. RAUCH: Well, two comments. One is
14	a lot of those are dedicated earmarks, so these are
15	not Administration targets but they're pass-through
16	money as you're indicating. So we won't have any
17	trouble spending it if we can administratively get
18	it out. I think that NEPA process we're working
19	through the Department of Commerce on getting those
20	NEPA issues resolved, and I think that we've
21	convinced their legal counsel to step back and to
22	take a more case-by-case look at these things,
23	whereas initially two years ago they just took a
24	broad-based view and said, Of course you have to do
25	NEPA for everything.
26	And I know general counsel is backing

1	down a little. I know general counsel and they've
2	backed off from that, so some of these things we
3	don't have to do NEPA anymore.
4	MR. O'SHEA: That's good news. Thanks.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you. Ralph.
6	MR. RAYBURN: In the process, the House
7	has the full House approved the appropriations on
8	their side and the Senate has just passed the full
9	committee; is that right?
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think the Senate
11	is the full Senate, too, is it not?
12	MR. RAYBURN: Has it gone through the
13	full Senate?
14	MS. KATSOUROS: No.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: No?
16	MS. KATSOUROS: Just the committee.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Just okay. Thank
18	you, Mary.
19	MR. RAYBURN: But the full House has
20	approved it; right?
21	MS. KATSOUROS: Right. And the Senate's
22	not expected to consider it until September. They -
23	- it was not able to get on the agenda before the
24	August recess. So they probably it will probably
25	be after the elections before we actually see it,
26	you know.

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So everybody is a
2	continuing resolution.
3	MS. KATSOUROS: Yeah.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Anything else on
5	this?
6	(Pause.)
7	Thanks a lot.
8	Chris Moore.
9	MR. MOORE: This is a this is another
10	heads up agenda item. I don't expect that this will
11	take longer than 15 minutes. I'm not a loud
12	speaker, so I'll do my best.
13	I'm a new Chief of a new division. I've
14	only worked for NOAA Fisheries Service for about
15	three months. Before I got there, we had the Office
16	of Constituent Services and we had the State and
17	Federal Fisheries Division. We combined those two
18	groups and we now have the Partnerships and
19	Communications Division. We're hoping that title
20	more accurately reflects the activities that are
21	associated with that particular division.
22	Prior to working with working for
23	NOAA Fisheries, I worked for the Mid-Atlantic
24	Council for over 17 years, most recently as their
25	Deputy Director. I was a Deputy Director for seven
26	years. So I've been involved in fisheries

1	management for about 20 years. Prior to that, I
2	worked for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
3	Commission.
4	I'm here today to discuss a new
5	initiative. It's a national outreach plan. It's
6	actually something that we've attempted as an agency
7	before. We're hoping this time to actually get a
8	plan through and done. It's an important
9	initiative. When I first started working for NOAA
10	Fisheries Service, I recognized that we didn't have
11	an outreach plan and, given our diverse activities
12	and the number of outreach initiatives and things
13	that we were doing, I thought it was appropriate to
14	have one.
15	If we could have the next slide, Rachel.
16	Basically, we're in the process now of developing
17	this particular plan. It's the objective is to
18	develop a plan that has the cooperation and support
19	of all of NOAA Fisheries Service leadership and
20	outreach representatives. We're hoping that this
21	particular outreach plan will guide and coordinate
22	the Agency's outreach initiatives and efforts.
23	Our vision of the document is the one
24	that's a strategic plan but not a large strategic
25	plan; in other words, we're looking at a document
26	that will probably be 15 to 20 pages in length.

1	It's going to be a living document, something that
2	we'll revisit each year with all of our outreach
3	representatives. And we're looking at it as a true
4	action plan; in other words, this particular
5	outreach plan will detail a number of activities or
6	action items that we hope to accomplish over any
7	given year.
8	We're expecting that as this document is
9	developed, it will also have associated budgets that
10	will be able to be attached to it or linked to it as
11	an appendix.
12	Looking at in terms of the document
13	structure and, again, this isn't something that's
14	complete yet so, again, this is a head's up agenda
15	item. This particular document is being drafted.
16	At this point in time, we have a steering committee
17	that's been appointed. The steering committee has
18	drafted a number of goals and objectives, these
19	over-arching goals and objectives, and we'll be
20	looking at those in a second.
21	We're looking at a document that's going
22	to have national goals and objectives that will
23	apply to all the regions and science centers. These
24	particular goals and objectives will be over-arching
25	and would accommodate the existing outreach plans
26	that currently exist within the Agency. We have a

1	number of outreach plans. Some of the regions have
2	outreach plans. There's also outreach plans for
3	some of the line offices. Perhaps you've seen the
4	outreach plan for protected resources. We also have
5	an outreach plan for habitat. And, again, there's
6	some in the regions.
7	We're looking at a document that will be
8	divided into individual chapters so that each one of
9	the regions and science centers could outline their
10	own strategies and action items that would address
11	these national goals and objectives. We're hoping
12	that the overall that the document would align
13	these individual outreach activities with these
14	national goals in an effort to increase the Agency's
15	coordination and provide a more unified approach to
16	outreach.
17	The completed plan we believe that a
18	plan would benefit the regions and the science
19	centers by providing additional services, increasing
20	efficiencies, allowing for the development of
21	national products. From a bureaucratic point of
22	view, it will allow us to track milestones and
23	performance measures and hopefully attract some
24	additional funding for research as well.
25	One of the things that we've talked
26	about I've had a number of conversations with

1	regional administrators and science directors and
2	they ask me what type of national products we might
3	be involved in in terms of coordination. One of
4	them is something that we've talked about or at
5	least the Agency has talked about for a number of
6	years, and that's a basic pamphlet that details what
7	NOAA Fisheries is all about. This is something that
8	we can accomplish through a coordinated effort
9	nationwide, something that all of the outreach
10	coordinators could help in the development of. It
11	could also accommodate the individual regions or
12	science centers by allowing for inserts that could
13	be drafted and then stuck into the pamphlet. So
14	this is something I think that would benefit all of
15	our regions and science centers as well as
16	headquarters in terms of an informational need.
17	If I could have the next slide. These -
18	- as I said, at this point in the process or this
19	point in the plan development, we have a steering
20	committee. The steering committee has drafted a
21	total of six or come up with a number of goals,
22	six goals, and a number of objectives to attain
23	those particular goals. I actually have a handout
24	that Rachel will give you in a minute that detail
25	these goals and objectives so that, you know you
26	have them in front of you

1	I'm hoping that when you get a chance to
2	look at them, you can give me some feedback in terms
3	of whether or not you think they're appropriate,
4	whether or not you think we need a national outreach
5	plan.
6	In terms of the goals, the individual
7	goals, the first one is to increase collaboration
8	and communication efforts by building and
9	maintaining effective partnerships. We think that's
10	an important goal.
11	We have seven objectives to achieve that
12	particular goal, including establishing procedures
13	and protocols, establishing two-way flows of
14	information, increasing partnering activities,
15	increasing collaboration to create synergy between
16	partners, using partnerships to further common
17	goals, communicate consistent messages, and so on.
18	Again, this is a list that will be provided to you
19	in a minute.
20	The second goal is to improve
21	stewardship of coastal and marine ecosystems through
22	a well-informed public. We have a number of
23	objectives to achieve that particular goal as well.
24	The objectives would be things like
25	increase the understanding of the role of science
26	and conservation of fisheries management, develop

1	materials with clear and consistent messages, and so
2	on.
3	Another goal that's been proposed by the
4	steering committee is to develop coordinated
5	campaigns within NOAA and with partners to improve
6	NOAA Fisheries Service image and increase national
7	recognition.
8	One of the objectives under that
9	particular goal is to produce outreach materials
10	that recognize this one NOAA concept that you may
11	have heard about.
12	The other one is to develop materials
13	that convey consistent messages that are continually
14	repeated and reinforced and so on.
15	Next slide, Rachel.
16	These are the three other goals. Goal
17	number four is to anticipate and respond proactively
18	to emerging issues and policies. This goal was an
19	important one to the regional administrators that
20	deal with a number of controversial issues in their
21	particular regions.
22	The objectives here would be to inform
23	constituents of emerging issues and policies prior
24	to implementation, to disseminate informational
25	materials regarding policies and programs, and so
26	on.

1	Another goal is to seek opportunities to
2	use technology to deliver information and messages.
3	Again, objectives under this particular goal would
4	be to promote and advertise current inventory of
5	technology-based resources, offer recommendations
6	for the use of new technology, and so on.
7	The final goal is to develop
8	methodologies to measure NOAA Fisheries' success in
9	conducting outreach. This was something that we
10	heard a number of times, especially from the science
11	directors, who are very performance-based. They
12	were very interested in identifying mechanisms that
13	can be used to measure the effects of outreach
14	activities. They wanted to establish a baseline so
15	that we could gauge the success of our future
16	outreach activities and they wanted to involve
17	partners in the collection of data to measure the
18	success of outreach activities.
19	So those are the those are the six
20	goals really quickly. Again, I'll provide a list to
21	you in a second.
22	Next slide, Rachel. So this is the
23	planning process. Again, we don't have a national
24	outreach plan yet. We hope to have one by the end
25	of the year. We formed the steering committee that
26	involved regional representations. I've had

1	informal meetings with the regional administrators
2	and the science directors regarding national
3	outreach plan and whether or not it's appropriate.
4	They've also had the chance to look at the goals and
5	objectives.
6	The current draft of the goals and
7	objectives that you'll see on the piece of paper
8	that Rachel's going to give you in a minute reflects
9	their comments and suggestions.
10	We thought it would be good to give you
11	a head's up just to sort of see what kind of
12	reaction we might get to a national outreach plan.
13	We think that MAFAC represents a good cross-section
14	of our constituents and partners, so we thought that
15	this was an appropriate meeting to, again, discuss
16	this.
17	We hope that the next time that MAFAC
18	meets, we'll have an actual plan for you to look at
19	and we'll have a more detailed presentation for you
20	to comment on.
21	We expect if things go well to have a
22	coordinators' meeting via telephone probably the
23	first or second week of August to discuss our
24	progress. In the middle of August I think
25	actually towards the end of August August 22nd
26	we have a NOAA Fisheries Leadership Council meeting.

1	That particular meeting, we're going to go forward
2	with a discussion of where we're at in terms of
3	goals, objectives in the draft document as well as
4	some of the strategies that the outreach
5	coordinators have identified to meet those
6	particular objectives.
7	If things go well in August, we're going
8	to have a facilitated outreach meeting probably the
9	end of September, beginning of October where all the
10	outreach representatives from the regions and
11	science centers will get together and identify
12	strategies to achieve the goals and objectives.
13	Finally, once the that meeting has
14	taken place and we have a chance to regroup and get
15	the document drafted, we'll make sure that we get it
16	out for public comment.
17	So, with that, I'd be glad to discuss
18	any aspect of my presentation. Again, Rachel, if
19	you could pass out those documents, that would be
20	great. That's it.
21	Thanks, Jim.
22	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Chris.
23	MR. ROBERTS: I have a question. Chris,
24	what interaction have you had with maybe something
25	like the Sea-Grant Communicators group national
26	group? They're constantly involved in these kind of

1	things, impacts, outcomes, outreach. Might be
2	fruitful are they on your steering committee? Is
3	anybody from that group
4	MR. MOORE: No. There's nobody from
5	Sea-Grants on the steering committee. The steering
6	committee is composed of all NOAA Fisheries
7	representation. There's a couple people from the
8	regions. There's a person from Headquarters
9	actually, there's two people from Headquarters on
10	the steering committee.
11	Steering committee was formed basically
12	to help detail a process and put together a draft so
13	that we can get it out and get comment on it. We
14	have talked about getting Sea-Grant involved as a
15	good group to look at these goals and objectives as
16	well as identify some of the action items that we
17	might want to undertake.
18	I think that there is a meeting
19	scheduled for September.
20	MR. RAYBURN: October.
21	MR. MOORE: October, yeah, and we're
22	thinking that that might be an appropriate time to
23	go forward with the draft and let them comment on
24	it.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Bill.
26	MR. DEWEY: Chris, has the steering

1	committee had any discussions about who the target
2	audiences are? I mean, obviously the NOAA
3	constituents, but I'm thinking about the House
4	markup and, you know, there's obviously some
5	outreach maybe needed on the House.
6	MR. MOORE: Yeah. Sure. Absolutely.
7	MR. DEWEY: I mean, is it general public
8	to educate them about who NOAA is or is it the
9	fisheries constituents or could you talk about that?
10	MR. MOORE: Actually, we're just getting
11	going on this. We've only started we started the
12	process in June. The steering committee again has
13	detailed the process. We're hoping when we get the
14	outreach coordinators together, that we'll get more
15	into the specifics. So at this point, we just have
16	objectives.
17	But, you know, it's a good point. I
18	think effective outreach is defined by three things.
19	You need to identify your target audience, you
20	identify the message clear message that you want
21	to get to them, and then you identify the
22	appropriate outreach tool. And, again, I hope that
23	as we go through this particular development and
24	this particular process, that MAFAC and other groups
25	like Sea-Grant will help us, you know, make sure
26	that we have the right target audience and we're

1	using the right outreach tools.
2	MR. DEWEY: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Over here.
4	MR. FORSTER: Just a follow-on to that
5	because I was going to ask about messages. I mean,
6	defining the target audience and then defining the
7	messages would seem to me to be critical.
8	MR. MOORE: Very critical.
9	MR. FORSTER: Because that's basically
10	getting back to policy. At some point, there will
11	be a summary list of messages which are the key
12	things that NOAA wants to promote?
13	MR. MOORE: Yeah. And I think the
14	messages will be I don't think, I know the
15	messages are going to be tied to the goals that are
16	adopted by the Agency as appropriate for this
17	outreach plan.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Billy.
19	MR. BILLY: Yes. I understand in
20	developing a national outreach plan, the need to
21	have generic goals and objectives that take into
22	account all the diverse interests and involvements
23	of NOAA Fisheries. But do you see eventually then
24	something along the lines of an annual plan where
25	you're specifically targeting communications in
26	certain selected areas that are relevant to key

1	initiatives or the key problem areas that are
2	currently being focused on or worked on by the
3	Agency?
4	MR. MOORE: Yes. Tom, that's a good
5	point. These if you look at when you get a
6	chance to review these in more detail when you
7	look at these goals and objectives, you'll notice
8	that they're pretty much over-arching goals and
9	objectives.
10	I had one regional administrator say
11	that it's pretty much motherhood and apple pie. And
12	they're over-arching for a reason; that is, to
13	accommodate all the other outreach, you know, plans
14	that are already out there.
15	And my vision of how this is going to
16	work is basically that every year we're going to
17	look at this particular plan. Again, I really want
18	it to be an action plan. So all the outreach
19	representatives from across the country will sit
20	down every year, look at the plan, detail the action
21	items that they want to accomplish over the next
22	year. So if there's a specific issue that's come up
23	or that they anticipate going to come up, that's
24	going to be the focus would be my guess.
25	MR. BILLY: Just to continue, another
26	good example is aquaculture where I think there's a

1	significant need to improve communication and
2	understanding of what it is and how it relates to
3	wild fisheries and how it relates to the health and
4	nutritional areas of citizens and so forth. So that
5	could be a theme then that could be focused on over
6	one or more years as NOAA Fisheries moves forward,
7	and there are many other examples in all the areas
8	that NOAA Fisheries is involved in.
9	MR. MOORE: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: We've got Heather
11	first.
12	MS. McCARTY: That's what I was going to
13	say.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. And then
15	Eric.
16	MR. SCHWAAB: Thanks, Jim. Just, Chris,
17	three quick points. One, I mean, I think you're on
18	the right track. I think this is really a valuable
19	exercise.
20	Secondly, I mean, to echo John's point,
21	I mean, I think your real challenge is going to be
22	identifying the key the priority messages that
23	you want to focus on, the substantive aspects of
24	this, and I think your challenge is going to be and
25	the place where you might get sidetracked is if you
26	try to be everything to all of those internal

1	internal drivers and you're going to have to really
2	force, you know, through some leaderships and focus
3	on priorities.
4	Thirdly, I think it's really in your
5	first goal, I think it's really important that you
6	acknowledge this isn't just a one-way communication.
7	It's a two-way or even multiple-way conversation
8	you're trying to support. And in that and to that
9	specifically, when you talk about using technology,
L O	I would suggest that that goal reflect also that
1	two-way element, not just be how do we use
L2	technology to deliver but how do we use technology
L3	to take in input as well. I mean, you know,
_4	everybody that's using Internet and technology is
15	using it in a way that's very interactive. We're
16	moving in that direction now and I think you should
17	think a little bit about that.
18	MR. MOORE: Thanks.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ralph?
20	MR. RAYBURN: Yes. I'd like to follow
21	up on what Ken Roberts said. There is a you've
22	probably met Terry Smith that Terry works in the
23	National Sea-Grant Office, but he's a NOAA Fisheries
24	employee. And I guess I think I understand a little
25	bit when you have these kinds of committees, you
26	need to limit it to the Government, stuff like that.

1	I think Terry would be a great conduit
2	for you between developing your plan a conduit
3	back to Sea-Grant because there are you know,
4	we've got 150 or I mean, 115, 120 fisheries
5	extension agents within Sea-Grant which, you know,
6	from the beginning have operated very closely with
7	NOAA Fisheries on fisheries issues throughout. So I
8	would certainly encourage you to use Terry as a
9	conduit to both Brian Lee and myself. Both of us
10	have theme teams that can really set a program for
11	Sea-Grant relative to fisheries in my case or
12	seafood in Brian's case. So I'd sure encourage you
13	to do that, Chris. We're very interested in what
14	you're doing, I mean, and appreciate you taking on
15	that effort. And that meeting in October, you know,
16	is the opportunity to address those fisheries
17	extinction folks who will be getting together for
18	the first time ever really does give you a fertile
19	field, I think, to pursue your objectives here, so
20	encourage that work.
21	MR. MOORE: Thanks. Thank you. Yeah.
22	I've known Terry for a long time. Yeah. When he
23	was at the science center.
24	MR. RAYBURN: Sure.
25	MR. MOORE: Yeah.
26	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah. Right, right,

1	right. MR. MOORE: So I
2	MR. RAYBURN: He had mentioned you
3	coming on and the relationship that you all have
4	had. So I think as a conduit and staying within,
5	not having to open it up too far, you know, to your
6	committee, but still have the conduit back to Sea-
7	Grant would be great.
8	MR. MOORE: Thanks. Thanks.
9	MS. McCARTY: Changed my mind. I am
10	going to say something. I agree with what Ralph
11	said. You should use what is already there, if you
12	can, in terms of the Sea-Grant resources.
13	Also, I was just thinking if you had any
14	opportunity on the steering committee to include
15	constituents, maybe not for a permanent committee
16	but maybe an ad hoc group that could sort of give
17	you some feedback sort of like this group does so
18	that you could get some idea of what people think
19	NOAA needs to do to improve their image.
20	We talk about it quite a bit in the
21	North Pacific, and everybody is surprised that NOAA
22	NMFS doesn't blow its own horn more loudly.
23	So this is going to be a really good change in that
24	regard.
25	But, you know, if you talk to the
26	constituents, they'll give you some good ideas about

Τ	the success stories that you could use and perhaps
2	even collaborate with you on commercial fisheries,
3	aquaculture, recreational, whatever. I think it
4	would be a good addition to the steering committee
5	process.
6	MR. MOORE: Thanks.
7	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Vince.
8	MR. O'SHEA: Thanks, Chris. I think
9	this is a good idea as well. I've taken what Bill
10	Dewey mentioned about the linkage to the Hill. I
11	really think that I mean, I'm almost ready to say
12	that ought to be a specific goal and but, maybe
13	more importantly, is organizationally I think it
14	would be helpful for you all to show that you're
15	linked to your Congressional affairs operation,
16	because it seems to me that this is aimed at sort of
17	the grassroots and you're counting on the
18	constituents then to tell their Congressional folks
19	the good things that NOAA's doing. And I think if
20	you were hooked up with Legislative Affairs group,
21	you know, and sewed it together, I think the
22	probability of making progress on that front would
23	be enhanced.
24	Otherwise, you're out here telling the
25	constituents what's going on and you've got
26	Legislative Affairs trying to spin the NOAA story up

1	on the Hill, and I think you two ought to be linked
2	together, quite frankly.
3	MR. MOORE: Good point. Thanks.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Anybody else? Mary
5	Hope.
6	MS. KATSOUROS: I would add one other
7	linkage the regional councils, because they're
8	part of that family, too, and if you all could tell
9	the same story, it would be good.
10	MR. MOORE: We haven't yeah, the
11	council's already identified in here as a partner.
12	MS. KATSOUROS: Okay.
13	MR. MOORE: Yeah.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Let's see.
15	We're slightly ahead of schedule. Mr. DiLernia, do
16	you want to try to jump to Sam's presentation ahead
17	of the break or
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah. Why don't we do
19	that. Sam, if you're ready.
20	MR. RAUCH: Sure.
21	MR. DiLERNIA: And then we'll take a
22	break right after Sam.
23	MR. RAUCH: So Bill already gave the
24	legislative update. But I'll give it again just in

We have a number of bills in the House

case you slept through it.

25

26

1	and the Senate that are going on. The most
2	important or the one that is going the farthest is
3	the Magnuson-Stevens Act. You are all aware that
4	last September, the Administration issued
5	released a bill is that going to work? the
6	Senate this past spring passed S-2012 patterned
7	after the Administration bill but containing some
8	different things. We talked at the January MAFAC
9	meeting about some of those differences.
10	The House has passed a bill out of
11	committee. We have been working with them on a
12	manager's amendment to prepare it to go to the
13	floor. And we had thought it might go to the floor
14	this week. Recently, that was taken off the table
15	because the deal that they had struck there's a
16	much more delicate balance in the House between the
17	environmental interests, the fishing interests, and
18	the fishing interests come down on different sides,
19	depending on the question.
20	And so there are some strong
21	personalities in the House and they are taking all
22	these seriously. And there was a deal that thought
23	that they could get the bill to the floor this week.
24	Late last week, that deal exploded temporarily. It
25	seems to be back on the table. But they have missed
26	their window to get it to the floor this week.

1	Whether or not it could still go to the
2	floor, I think the House is going to be here for a
3	couple days next week. It may still go to the floor
4	then. It may go to the floor in September. If it
5	doesn't go to the floor this week, it's going to be
6	hard to get to House passage in September and in a
7	conference report before the end of the year, which
8	is why Bill's pessimistic. It's not that he doesn't
9	think the House will pass the bill; it's just that
10	given an extra month, deals fall apart and they may
11	be running out of time to conference with the
12	Senate, which the two bills are significantly
13	different, that there will be some issues that they
14	have to address. And I know that the various
15	committees are talking about what the conference
16	would look like, but they don't have a bill in the
17	House yet.
18	The main issues that we think are still
19	outstanding on the House side, which seem to perhaps
20	be resolved, is concern over NEPA. The House has
21	always taken a much more hardline stance on NEPA
22	than the Senate did, and the Administration was
23	working with the House to try to have the NEPA
24	provisions look more like the Administration bill
25	and the Senate bill. Overfishing one of the
26	main Administration priorities is to have a time

2	the Senate bill, which we were disappointed about.
3	They went down the line of hard TACs instead. We
4	are hoping to get a time limit for ending
5	overfishing in the House bill. That's still up for
6	debate.
7	And rebuilding time periods. One of the
8	things the House did in their committee mark is put
9	flexible time periods to extend rebuilding. The
10	current Magnuson Act requires fish stocks to be
11	rebuilt in ten years except in certain circumstances
12	which can take longer, but they are statutorily-
13	defined circumstances. And that can create problems
14	for fisheries when you get towards the end of that
15	rebuilding time because you only have a few more
16	years left to get to a biomass target and it may
17	require very strict fishing regulations to get that
18	far. **SH , 1:44:07, 8/10/06** The House
19	bill had put in flexible extension provisions which
20	would allow the Secretary to extend those rebuilding
21	times under certain circumstances. Without a
22	defined end to overfishing, that gave us problems.
23	If there is a defined end to overfishing, rebuilding
24	can is less of a concern to us. It's still
25	somewhat of a concern. So that's that is one of
26	the issues that's out there.

limit for ending overfishing. There is not one in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

1	So those are the issues the three
2	main issues, I think, that are currently holding up
3	passage of the Magnuson bill in the House. And then
4	once they go to conference, it will be some sort of
5	compromise between the two.
6	The other bills that we have out there -
7	- the Administration has an aquaculture bill which
8	has I think not and Michael Rubino will talk more
9	about that it has not gotten a lot of traction in
10	the House or Senate in large part I think because
11	they're distracted by the Magnuson Act. Once the
12	Magnuson Act is done, I think they may turn their
13	attention to that. That probably I think there's
14	no way they're going to do that this legislative
15	session. We've been out there on the Hill working
16	with them so that next year, once they get through
17	with the Magnuson Act, they can turn their attention
18	to aquaculture and hopefully we can get that one
19	moving.
20	On the non-fisheries side but the
21	protected resources side, we've had a number of
22	developments, none I think which are leading
23	anywhere. One is the ESA reform bill that the House
24	passed in the matter of a week. It went from a
25	conference it went from the committee all the way
26	to the floor in the space of a week. And one of the

1	things that it did is it took NOAA completely out of
2	the ESA business and gave it all to Interior. It
3	did a number of other controversial things.
4	The Senate took up the was
5	considering a bill which would not have gone as far.
6	Around February or March, that effort seemed to die.
7	There seemed to be no interest in the Senate in
8	pursuing that and we haven't heard anything from the
9	Senate since then. So it's no ESA bill has
10	passed the Senate committee. I think it's safe to
11	say that the ESA is probably dead for this year.
12	Something could always happen, but I
13	think it's done with. That doesn't mean I mean,
14	ESA is always out there as a legislative issue.
15	Next year, things could change, but I think for this
16	year it's not going there.
17	The MMPA has seen some activity in the
18	House. We've had an Administration bill out there
19	for several years and the House recently passed an
20	amendment. The Senate's not done much with that. I
21	don't think anything significant is going to happen
22	on the ESA on the MMPA front, the Marine Mammal
23	Protection Act front this year. I think they're
24	out of time on that, although the fact that the
25	House did pass something I just don't think we're
26	going anywhere with that one. And that's it for the

1	legislative update.
2	Any questions?
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Bob was quickest.
4	MR. FLETCHER: Just curious. Because of
5	the concern about sea lion impacts on sturgeon, I
6	heard there was some pretty significant concerns
7	expressed by some of the Governors of the
8	Northwestern states. Is there any way that they can
9	be accommodated within the current language of the
10	MMPA? Or where is that whole issue going?
11	MR. RAUCH: Well, we have there are -
12	- we've always had sea lion and salmon interaction
13	problems. I mean, Ballard Locks is not very far
14	from here where, in the early '90s, we had sea lion
15	removal problems because they were sitting there
16	feasting on the salmon and we had the same problem
17	in Columbia and we had it elsewhere.
18	There are provisions in the Marine
19	Mammal Protection Act for non-lethal removal of the
20	sea lions, but we've found they come back. That's
21	not particularly effective although we tried to
22	do that. They also try to do things like squirting
23	(indiscernible *00:03:18) around them to get them to
24	go away, but they're bellying up to the buffet bar
25	for the salmon and it's very hard to get them to
26	stay away.

1	There are also provisions, much more
2	elaborate provisions, to allow a lethal take, which
3	can be quite controversial. So the MMPA currently
4	has those provisions in it that could allow non-
5	lethal and lethal takes if necessary, but we have
6	found that those become very difficult situations
7	between two defined resources, that sometimes you've
8	got endangered species but sometimes not and
9	sometimes it's just fishery resources and those are
10	less the endangered species are fairly easy to
11	deal with when you have a non-endangered predator
12	dealing with an endangered species, although it's
13	still difficult.
14	Legislatively, I don't think there's any
15	fix at the moment for any of that, not in our bill.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Bob, follow up?
17	MR. FLETCHER: I said sturgeon.
18	MR. RAUCH: Yeah. Well, there's
19	nothing we are not doing anything with sturgeon
20	as far as I know. But it's the same problem as
21	MR. FLETCHER: You might not be, but the
22	sea lions are.
23	MR. RAUCH: Well, what I'm suggesting is
24	that that's a at the moment, there are
25	administrative regulatory provisions in the current
26	statute to deal with those issues. I'm not familiar

1	with what's going on with the particulars in that,
2	but in terms of the legislative fixes, I don't think
3	there's anything in the legislation right now which
4	would deal with it.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Heather.
6	MS. McCARTY: Yeah. Sam, can you give
7	us a feel for what people are saying in the
8	aquaculture bill as you work that on the Hill? What
9	are their issues there?
10	MR. RAUCH: I think Michael can probably
11	do a better job of that in his presentation. We've
12	not been following that as closely because, at this
13	point, we've got our bill, we're doing a lot of
14	information, we're probably getting some feedback,
15	but I can't tell you what specific members are
16	saying. Maybe Michael can.
17	MS. McCARTY: You can wait.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: We can wait till
19	Mike's presentation if you want to.
20	Larry.
21	MR. SIMPSON: Sam, if you could or would
22	or want to, tell us a little bit about the Senate
23	version of, as you characterized it, recovery with
24	hard TACs?
25	MR. RAUCH: The Senate requires annual
26	or the main goal of the Senate is an annual hard

1	TAC. You have to put out every year, the fishery
2	management plan has to put out a TAC to manage to.
3	And if you don't meet that TAC, you have to pay it
4	back the next year. We worked in some flexibility
5	in the Senate language because sometimes it's
6	impossible we don't have the data to know that
7	you went over the first year. So we worked in a
8	little flexibility so you could pay it back within I
9	believe it was the next three years or the next time
10	you do the fishery management plan. But there is a
11	defined payback.
12	The House has required an annual TAC but
13	no payback provision. So it is a lot weaker and
14	they've gotten a lot of pushback that they're
15	weakening the Magnuson Act by not having anything in
16	there, you know, to prevent overfishing or to pay
17	back the hard TAC. But that was the main dispute
18	between the Administration and the Senate when we
19	thought there should be a defined end to overfishing
20	at the outset and the Senate wanted a hard TAC,
21	which actually we didn't disagree with it. We just
22	wanted more.
23	MR. SIMPSON: I don't know if I'd
24	characterize it as a hard TAC, at least the
25	conversations that I was privy to. There is a level
26	of allogation. There is an ARC

1	MR. RAUCH: Right.
2	MR. SIMPSON: And what they're doing is
3	trying to hold people accountable to that ABC. So
4	it wasn't establishing a hard TAC; it was
5	maintaining accountability for that allocation.
6	MR. RAUCH: Well, yes. I should say
7	it's a hard TAC because that's what the Senate staff
8	calls it.
9	MR. SIMPSON: Sure.
10	MR. RAUCH: And it's hard as opposed to
11	other things we establish management goals in
12	many fisheries and some of them require have
13	regulatory and I'm going to say penalties, but
14	they're not they're regulatory corrective
15	measures if you go over them. Others don't. Others
16	are, this is what we're going to try to manage to.
17	If we don't meet it, oh, well, and those are what we
18	call soft TAC. I know the environmental groups are
19	very much against those kinds of things.**7:56 JM**
20	And the Senate thought, There's no point
21	in setting that if you don't take corrective action.
22	So we had some concerns and we worked
23	with the Senate, but I think we're generally pleased
24	with the way the Senate came out, even though that
25	wasn't in that wasn't the TAC that we that
26	wasn't the approach we took in our bill. It's not

1	that we disagreed with the Senate; we were just
2	concerned about how that how that could be
3	implemented.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Pete.
5	MR. LEIPZIG: In the House bill, they
6	had flexibility in rebuilding for overfished species
7	and that was an issue you mentioned. Is the
8	Administration changing its position and desiring
9	some greater flexibility?
10	MR. RAUCH: The Administration position
11	is set. We are now sort of responding to what
12	because we did our bill. To officially change our
13	position, that requires a lot of work.
14	You know, the current Magnuson Act says
15	in ten years, unless you go over we had thought
16	that ten years is always an arbitrary number. I
17	know if you're familiar with Dr. Andy Rosenberg's
18	study, he hammers on this. We don't believe that
19	there actually is anything behind that to indicate
20	that the ten years is a biological number. Andy
21	will tell you most stocks could be rebuilt within
22	ten years. We don't think that's true. What we
23	what our approach was was the Magnuson Act can
24	control one thing the fishing effort. If we can
25	stop the fishing effort at overfishing, rebuilding
26	should be a biological basis and the fish can take

1	care of themselves. So we wanted a hard deadline,
2	cut that overfishing off early in the process, and
3	then not be overly concerned about the dates. So we
4	changed the rebuilding time frame to a biologically-
5	derived number, which was the same it is the time
6	you can achieve rebuilding without fishing plus one
7	new generation.
8	So the House had no overfishing deadline
9	and they had this variable rebuilding schedule. And
10	we expressed our concerns about that to them. I
11	think they are modifying that to both put in an
12	overfishing deadline and to put a cap on how the
13	the rebuilding schedules could be used.
14	And we I believe have sent them a
15	letter I think we sent them a letter saying we
16	appreciate those efforts. We think those efforts
17	are good development in the House bill because I
18	believe they have sent us something formally it's
19	not clear that it's gone going to pass but, if it
20	does pass, I think we're on record as supporting
21	efforts to stop rebuilding and to cap these flexible
22	
23	MR. LEIPZIG: Stop overfishing.
24	MR. RAUCH: stop overfishing stop
25	overfishing. I've got a cold, so stop
26	overfishing and to put a cap on these flexible

1	rebuilding time frames which are not as concerned
2	because our theory has always been that biology will
3	take care of itself once you stop overfishing. But
4	still they are they were somewhat of a concern to
5	us.
6	MR. FLETCHER: I guess I kind of take
7	exception to one of your comments, Sam.
8	MR. RAUCH: Right.
9	MR. FLETCHER: You said that a soft TAC
10	is where you manage to a number and, if you exceed,
11	you go, Oh, well. To the Pacific Council, that's
12	really not the case. While we manage to a number,
13	it's many times very much below the ABC. And if for
14	some reason there's a slight excess harvest over
15	this very conservative OY, the next year the council
16	is even more conservative in terms of how does it
17	approach regulations that reflect these harvests.
18	So I think it's not a precise science that we're
19	talking about.
20	MR. RAUCH: Right.
21	MR. FLETCHER: But I think you make
22	progress in the right direction in terms of
23	especially in terms of an overfished species, at
24	least on the Pacific Council, I I wasn't very
25	happy with how conservative the council was,
26	especially on the species that in the minds of some

1	scientists were about to be rebuilt. So it's not
2	quite, "Oh, well."
3	MR. RAUCH: Right. But I am merely
4	expressing to you what the Senate staff has told me
5	about how they characterize the two options.
6	You know, we approved all of these
7	measures and provisions and we think that for
8	certain fisheries, they make sense. So I'm not
9	I'm not gonna tell you that soft TACs or hard TACs
10	or any other kind of TACs are necessarily bad
11	because these are the fishing regimes we have. But
12	the Senate believed that this was their way to stop
13	the overfishing and to rebuild nationally these
14	stocks, and they were adamant about that. So we
15	were trying to work with them to make a workable
16	system. I still have some concerns about us being
17	able to implement it in a timely fashion, but I
18	think it is much more workable than the way it
19	started.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Is there a question
21	over here?
22	AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I have a question
23	about the energy bill that has been bouncing around
24	this year. I don't know where it is in the
25	legislative process. I know that we had an energy
26	bill last year, but I've heard that there's been

1	some level of legislative activity regarding
2	offshore drilling. And I don't know what else, and
3	so I'm wondering if you can give us an update on
4	that and also if there are concerns that NOAA does
5	have.
6	MR. RAUCH: Well, last year there was
7	as you said, there was just a very expansive energy
8	bill passed around August which did change our
9	habitat people because it required a much more
10	extensive procedure for dealing with private
11	hydroelectric facilities which deals with fish
12	passage for anadromous species. And so we were very
13	concerned about that.
14	This year, the only one that I've seen
15	that has any legs is, as you say, a provision to I
16	think open up the Gulf of Mexico to a lot of oil and
17	gas drilling. I cannot say whether that's really
18	going to go anywhere. We've had you know, we get
19	bills all the time that come in from Senators that
20	want or representatives that want to do
21	something, and most of those are going nowhere.
22	This one probably is going to get some
23	more traction, but I don't I don't know that I
24	I don't have a sense as to whether they really have
25	time to act on that. But it is to open up the Gulf
26	to more oil and gas exploration, which is somewhat

2	MR. LEIPZIG: Another question on the
3	House bill. Because rumors have circulated that the
4	version going to the floor may contain language that
5	isn't currently what was present when it came out in
6	the committee.
7	MR. RAUCH: Right. That's undoubtedly
8	true.
9	MR. LEIPZIG: Has the committee staff
10	shared any of that with you?
11	MR. RAUCH: I got this morning and I
12	have not read it a manager's amendment well,
13	let me back up. We have we have been working
14	with them on those three provisions that I talked
15	about.
16	MR. LEIPZIG: Right.
17	MR. RAUCH: And so we have seen language
18	with them on that. So, yes, we've seen that. We
19	had not until this morning seen a whole new bill.
20	And this morning I got and I'm not sure what
21	level of authority this thing that I got is
22	whether this is the bill that will go to the floor
23	or this is a draft of something they're thinking
24	about, I don't know, but it was the first time that
25	we've ever seen a comprehensive manager's amendment.
26	But there's almost always a manager's amendment

of a concern to us.

1	before you get to the floor. There was on the
2	Senate. So that's not unexpected. But we didn't
3	see anything until just this morning. We're
4	starting to look at that, but I haven't gone through
5	my e-mail to see
6	MR. LEIPZIG: Well, I was just curious.
7	If you haven't had the opportunity really to read
8	it, then
9	MR. RAUCH: No. I looked at the
10	headlines of what was in there.
11	MR. JONER: Sam, one of the places there
12	are big differences are in the approaches to
13	recreational data improvements. Do you all have an
14	opinion with respect to what was in the House bill
15	that passed committee versus what was in the Senate
16	bill?
17	MR. RAUCH: Well, I don't think we're
18	all that happy about either one. I mean, we want a
19	recreational registry because, without the registry,
20	the I mean, if you look at and one of the
21	things we'll talk about later today is the one of
22	the problems with our MRFSS surveys, defining the
23	universe of recreational fishing. And we wanted a
24	recreational registry of recreational fishermen to
25	do that and we still want that.
26	We didn't get that from either we

1	didn't get that in all the forms that we want from
2	either the Senate or the House. I mean, the House
3	is even less we got something from the Senate.
4	We wanted a little bit more, but we got something.
5	The House is even less supportive of the
6	recreational industry, so we're not all that happy
7	about that.
8	MR. SCHWAAB: Well, I think that just
9	from my observation, I mean, I think the first of
10	all, the recreational people and people around
11	this table have heard me say this before the
12	recreational registry is only one part of the
13	solution. And I think one of the things I like
14	about the Senate version is that it does contain
15	basically performance standards that relate more
16	specifically to improving the data with the
17	potential of recreational registry as a component of
18	that.
19	I wanted to but more specifically, as
20	a follow-up, does NOAA support the provision in the
21	Senate bill that would require the registration of
22	recreational anglers targeting anadromous species in
23	state waters?
24	MR. RAUCH: I think, yes, because the
25	anadromous species under the Magnuson Act right now,
26	I think goes in state waters as well.

1	MR. SCHWAAB: Yes.
2	MR. RAUCH: I believe so. We didn't
3	object to that. If it was in the Senate bill, I
4	you know, we supported that.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Shall we take a
6	break?
7	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah. We're way ahead of
8	schedule. I would say we'll take a 30-minute break.
9	
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Sure. Come back, as
11	it says, at 10:45 for aquaculture. We've got an
12	announcement apparently.
13	MR. BILLY: What are we supposed to do
14	about lunch?
15	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you hungry?
16	MR. BILLY: No, but I saw where we had
17	to put in applications.
18	MS. BRYANT: Right. For tomorrow,
19	number one, let me do say this. If you just arrived
20	here, please make certain that you sign in so that
21	we have public record of that. Also, for the folks
22	on the back wall, when you make some comments, more
23	than welcome to but, because we are on the public
24	record, we need you to come up, identify your name,
25	your affiliation, and if you could come up here so
26	that the mikes can pick you up better. Our

1	recorder's having a little problem.
2	With regard to lunch, we're talking
3	about lunch tomorrow. Because we are taking the
4	passenger bus that will be taking us down around
5	south again and over to the Manchester Lab, we're
6	going to be boarding at 12:15, hopefully taking off
7	by 12:30. What Rachel and I have worked out is
8	there is a place that will do boxed lunches. They
9	have a menu. Rachel and I need to get those orders
10	taken online and made this afternoon. So what she's
11	going to be doing is putting that menu over there by
12	the refreshment bar. If you can please take a look
13	at that menu, make your decision, and then write
14	down on a pad what you want and put your name next
15	to it. We need to get that faxed in and then they
16	will literally deliver that to us so that you can
17	have your lunch and refreshments on the bus
18	tomorrow.
19	MR. LEIPZIG: Do we need to square costs
20	with you?
21	MS. BRYANT: I'm going to be putting
22	this on my Visa and then, yes, you will be squaring
23	up with me. So
24	MS. O'MALLEY: So we will let you know
25	at the end each person how much you owe. Please try
26	to bring exact change if you can tomorrow.

1	MS. BRYANT: It will just be easier if I
2	put it on a Visa and get it done. But it was the
3	only way we could get you guys something easy and
4	you didn't have to worry about it and it looks like
5	a great place and we can do it online so it's real
6	simple.
7	MS. O'MALLEY: Also, this doesn't have
8	drinks at it, but there is a little store out front.
9	MS. BRYANT: Yeah, right, over here.
10	MS. MALLEY: Maybe if everyone can just
11	pick up their own drink, that would be helpful.
12	MR. SIMPSON: Are wives invited to this?
13	MS. BRYANT: Who?
14	MR. SIMPSON: Wives?
15	MS. BRYANT: Yes. Yes. Absolutely.
16	Today, people are on their own for lunch. This is
17	just only for tomorrow to make certain that we get
18	that planned appropriately. And that's it.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So we've got about
20	quarter after on that clock. So be back in half an
21	hour half an hour.
22	(Recess from 10:16 a.m., until 10:50 a.m.)
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks for coming
24	back. I think everyone was here exactly on time.
25	We just let people talk for a couple of minutes. So
26	are we ready for aquaculture? We have an

1	aquaculture subcommittee that's very interested in
2	this element that's one of the focus parts of this
3	meeting, so we'll give it the attention we need and,
4	unless the MAFAC aquaculture group wants to say
5	something, we'll start right off.
6	That's your person. Well, Steve?
7	MR. JONER: I was just going to
8	introduce Bob Iwamoto.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Oh, I was going to
10	do that, too, but please go ahead.
11	MR. JONER: Yeah. So sitting here is
12	Dr. Bob Iwamoto from the Northwest Science Center,
13	who's a key part of this, works with Mike and others
14	here. So
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you. I told
16	Bob that I was going to introduce him when we
17	started and, when I was speaking to him, it slipped
18	my mind. So thanks. Thanks for coming, Bob.
19	MR. IWAMOTO: Sure. Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: And
21	MR. BILLY: Thank you. The committee
22	members that were around a year will recall that
23	Bill Hogarth indicated to the committee that he was
24	interested in informing us about this new
25	legislation that was going to focus on the
26	appropriate management of aquaculture in the EEZ.

1	And at the meeting about a year ago, we had we
2	were briefed on the legislation and asked not only
3	to consider the draft bill at that time but to also
4	provide on a sustained basis the kind of interface
5	and support as appropriate for the work that was
6	going to be done by NOAA in the area of aquaculture
7	The discussion that ensued in the MAFAC
8	committee led to recommendations, among other
9	things, that NOAA develop a longer-term a ten-
10	year plan that laid out what goals NOAA foresaw in
11	terms of moving forward in the area of aquaculture
12	as well as more detailed information on the precise
13	role that NOAA would play in this regard.
14	We now have been provided for this
15	meeting a draft plan and are going to be looking at
16	or hearing from the NOAA people their thinking in
17	
	terms of how aquaculture can contribute to stock
18	terms of how aquaculture can contribute to stock enhancement as well as how it can contribute to
18 19	
	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to
19	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to economic development in increasing the supply of
19	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to economic development in increasing the supply of seafood more generally.
19 20 21	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to economic development in increasing the supply of seafood more generally. After the presentations today, tomorrow
19 20 21 22	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to economic development in increasing the supply of seafood more generally. After the presentations today, tomorrow morning we will have some time in the Commerce
19 20 21 22 23	enhancement as well as how it can contribute to economic development in increasing the supply of seafood more generally. After the presentations today, tomorrow morning we will have some time in the Commerce subcommittee, with participation by anyone else on

1	they stand at this point in time in the area of
2	aquaculture.
3	So I just wanted to set the stage for
4	this. This is, in part, in response to this
5	committee and we will then have opportunity to
6	provide further input before the end of this
7	meeting.
8	Thanks.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you, Tom.
10	Nothing else, Dr. Rust.
11	MR. RUST: Okay. Thank you. First, I'd
12	like to thank Steve for inviting me here and the
13	committee for listening to me. I'll try to take
14	about 15 minutes here and talk about marine stock
15	enhancement, focusing on non-salmonids or kind of
16	species which are still in the R&D stage that NOAA's
17	working on as well as people around the country.
18	The word aquaculture either elicits kind
19	of wonder in people's mind or raises the hackles on
20	the back of the neck. And part of the reason is
21	because is because we don't quite have the
22	history with aquaculture that we do with fisheries
23	or agriculture.
24	Also, because there's a great diversity
25	in aquaculture, yesterday you saw Taylor Shellfish.
26	You saw that industry. Tomorrow you go to

1	Manchester and you'll see we are a stone's throw
2	away from a salmon net pen framing company. You
3	will also see aquaculture being used to rescue genes
4	for endangered runs of salmonids. And you'll see
5	some of our work where we're looking at marine
6	fishing, just posing the question as to whether this
7	can be a tool for rebuilding depleted stocks.
8	Those of you within Alaska know also
9	that there's a large salmon ranching industry there
10	which produces fish for fishermen to catch. So
11	there's a tremendous variety of uses and types of
12	aquaculture spanning quite a broad continuum from
13	varied fisheries related even to the point of using
14	aquaculture just to test some hypotheses and using
15	cultured fish as ecosystem probes to see where they
16	go and what they do and who they interact with all
17	the way up to production for the market.
18	What I'm going to focus on now is really
19	kind of the research around stock enhancement, and
20	I've tried to balance some different inputs but
21	fairly diverse inputs. I know Steve really wants me
22	to focus locally and other people really want me to
23	focus on international, so I'm going to attempt to
24	do that all in 15 minutes.
25	Can we have the lights down? Okay. I'm
26	pointing with the right place. Okay. If I could

1	have okay, we're done. Okay. I said I wasn't
2	going to talk about salmon but we're going to start
3	with salmon just because it is the species group
4	that has been the greatest amount of work on and has
5	actually real enhancement programs going on. And
6	see what we can learn from it and what we should not
7	learn from it.
8	I'm going to talk a little bit about new
9	species and research programs in the U.S., trying to
10	highlight very briefly those that NOAA has supported
11	through various programs. I'm going to talk about
12	our work here. We're really at a lab scale research
13	looking at culture of marine fish at the Northwest
14	Fishery Science Center.
15	My background is as a physiologist. I
16	did my Master's looking at developmental biology of
17	striped bass at UC Davis, and then I came to the
18	University of Washington and studied fish nutrition.
19	So I kind of didn't know what I wanted to be when I
20	grew up, so I combined the aspects of larval fish
21	and nutrition.
22	So from an aquaculture perspective, that
23	means I really work on seeds and feed, both of which
24	can be applied for fish for a multiple of these
25	different reasons that I talked about.
26	We'll talk a little bit about our work.

1	Going to talk a little bit about some rockfish,
2	getting a little bit more local. This is a group of
3	species which has an enhancement track record in
4	Asia. Both Japan, Korea, and China are actively
5	working on or using our fish. And then where are we
6	going to go from here in this region?
7	Finally, I want to stop with an
8	advertisement for the Third International Symposium
9	on Stock Enhancement and Sea Ranching, which NOAA
10	and Seattle is hosting this September, so I wanted
11	to bring that up.
12	So if we start with salmon, and there's
13	a lot of words here, there's a huge salmon hatchery
14	industry in this part of the country, over a hundred
15	facilities around Washington State, hundred million
16	juvenile salmon, steelhead, just in this state
17	alone. And it provides a great deal of the harvest.
18	A lot of the salmon harvest were fish that came from
19	a hatchery. And this has been important for sports
20	fishing, it's been important for commercial fishing,
21	it's been important for tribal trust
22	responsibilities, and so on.
23	However, the other side is that some
24	hatchery practices, past practices, have been
25	implicated in wild salmon declines, as all of you
26	know so there's various sides of this equation

1	lots of controversy around it, lots of people
2	looking at different aspects.
3	And then on the other side of the
4	equation yet again, the ESA-listed stocks are
5	actually perhaps benefited through hatchery releases
6	in terms of recovery.
7	The source for this information is the
8	Hatchery Reform Group, which is operating out here
9	on this coast.
10	Okay. Now, if we start looking at other
11	species, salmon industry, the salmon hatcheries come
12	with a lot of baggage, and some of these things
13	many of these things we can apply directly and learn
14	from past mistakes and past successes, but other
15	things really require rethinking.
16	For example, there's very big
17	differences in life history before salmonids and
18	other species. Salmonids can be thought of as an
19	annual. Basically, they come back once; they die.
20	The hatchery technology has to supply the year class
21	year after year after year after year, and this has
22	been going on for a hundred years. So you've got
23	many, many generations of this interaction between
24	wild spawning fish and hatchery-spawning fish versus
25	something like let's say a rockfish that we're going
26	to kind of use as an example.

1	The enhancement may occur for less than
2	a generation. You're managing a population. It's
3	more like a perennial. You're trying to get it back
4	to an F level that somebody has decided is a rebuilt
5	level.
6	There's also great differences in terms
7	of number of offspring, the way mates are selected,
8	behavioral, and so on and so forth that really need
9	to be looked at again.
10	The genetic structure is different.
11	Salmon in many respects are very difficult as an
12	enhancement species because they form all these very
13	small distinct ESUs.
14	A lot of marine fish have a few ESUs but
15	are fairly homogeneous over larger chunks of space.
16	Goals are different, and we talked
17	about a little bit of that in my introduction.
18	The goals for salmon range from gene rescue all the
19	way up to commercial production.
20	It's a little bit different in terms of
21	what we're talking about with rockfish where we're
22	trying to rebuild populations to a certain level or
23	theorizing that we might be able to look at that.
24	Habitat quality is quite different.
25	There appears to be better habitat in the marine
26	environment when you compare that to what's going on

1	in the streams in urbanized areas, especially as
2	this.
3	A difference in management. Again,
4	population is managed versus escapement is managed
5	with salmonid.
6	And the other thing that's going on now
7	is kind of the beginning of looking at these other
8	issues are a responsible approach is kind of guiding
9	the thinking. And when I say a responsible
10	approach, I've provided a handout here that right
11	after my slides is a paper by Lee Blankenship and
12	Ken Leber in '95 called "The Responsible Approach to
13	Marine Stock Enhancement," and this paper in this
14	field really set the approach and the agenda
15	worldwide now for this whole field, and it's
16	interesting to see how different countries and
17	different locations have applied this approach to
18	marine stock enhancement.
19	If you don't read anything else on this
20	handout, I think that's probably the key one for
21	understanding stock enhancement research with non-
22	salmonids and where it's going.
23	My eyes are failing me. Okay. Around
24	the country, there are quite a number of
25	organizations which are looking at marine stock
26	enhancement. Some of these are relatively large

1	programs, like Texas Parks and Wildlife. Some
2	most of them, however, are strongly research-
3	oriented.
4	In the middle is Hubbs-Sea World. They
5	have kind of they're kind of operating at that
6	mid-level between research and actual production,
7	having put out about a million fish a million sea
8	bass over the last ten or so years.
9	Hawaii didn't make it on the map. They
10	have a lot of activity going on out there with
11	Oceanic Institute. So there's a number of partners
12	really looking at this issue around the country.
13	And it's with a number of species as
14	well, from crabs to flatfish to groundfish.
15	It also these species do represent an
16	economically important group in terms of the
17	recreational value primarily, but also commercial
18	value in a number of states. So it's not something
19	that is unique to this area. And it is a community
20	where we do interact with each other, we do exchange
21	information, and we try to learn from each other
22	'cause it's a relatively small community but a lot
23	of really good institutions involved.
24	Now, on this coast, these are the ones
25	that the Makah Tribe are primarily interested in
26	the canary rockfish is almost a twin in terms of

1	these pictures, but the yelloweye rockfish, and
2	these are species which they catch and by-catch in
3	some of their commercial fisheries. So I'm going to
4	talk a little bit about our work on these species.
5	They have a long rebuilding time. That
6	should say 2006, not 2007. But these are things
7	which are not going to come back at least any time
8	soon. Because of their life history, they had a
9	very old they have long generation times.
10	Yelloweye can live to be 120 years old or greater.
11	So they're kind of very slow growing the classic
12	species that are that make fisheries management
13	difficult.
14	And they're also in the overfished
15	category.
16	We're also working on Pacific cod, which
17	I'm not going to talk about today, which is locally
18	depleted here in Puget Sound and hasn't really
19	rebuilt at all and the our work on that is
20	looking at questions of whether the pod stock that
21	
	used to be in Puget Sound is locally adapted or
22	used to be in Puget Sound is locally adapted or whether it's an ebb and flow from the more northerly
22	
	whether it's an ebb and flow from the more northerly
23	whether it's an ebb and flow from the more northerly health population.

1	does elicit responses in the scientific community
2	one way or the other.
3	This is I just got this last week.
4	This is a reviewer who reviewed a proposal that I
5	had in to Washington Sea-Grant to look at whether
6	copepods can be junk food or health food for fish
7	larvae. So the whole project was really looking at
8	nutrition, larval fish nutrition. And one of the
9	rationales we used was the potential for using this
10	rockfish as enhancement or aquaculture species. And
11	we get a pretty glowing response here in the
12	beginning and then we get this little zinger here in
13	the middle where they say, "In contrast, the
14	rationale for developing aquaculture capabilities
15	for rockfish is weak. Stock enhancement is not a
16	viable or appropriate solution to the current
17	rockfish crisis and public funds should not be
18	diverted to this effort."
19	And this is in a scientific review. So
20	there is splits in the camp in terms of, you know,
21	whether people think that this is the direction to
22	go or not. And I would argue that you'll always see
23	this in areas which are limited in data that we have
24	available to us that need are crying for science
25	to answer some of these questions.
26	And you'll also see this when things are

1	new and where things are kind of on the bleeding
2	edge. So I don't take this as a bad things
3	necessarily, although we'll never get this grant now
4	I'm sure.
5	He did give he or she, whoever it
6	was did give us a "very good," but unless you get
7	all "excellents" these days, you don't get anywhere.
8	Larval, varied success. We've been a
9	group here since 1989. We started out looking at
10	lingcod, and what you see in this table are the
11	different species that we have raised from egg
12	through to a juvenile size. And that's the
13	bottleneck for a lot of these things. It's where we
14	started to look at developing technology.
15	The ones in the yellow are species that
16	had not ever been raised previously or done
17	previously in the United States. And you can see in
18	the parentheses the numbers. They're quite small.
19	We're really operating on a lab scale here.
20	But I would also argue that it's harder
21	to go from zero to one where is the yelloweye?
22	here than it is from one to a thousand or ten
23	thousand or a hundred thousand.
24	We've also done some releases here.
25	Pacific cod, these are very small and lingcod
26	very small releases, 20 or less fish. Highly

1	tagged, watched everywhere they went.
2	So let's look at some of the information
3	on whether this kind of approach may have some merit
4	and this is way back in '91, adapted from a paper by
5	Jeffrey Polovina, where he simulated 50 years of
6	catches using two different management strategies
7	for Pacific Ocean perch. The red line assumes no
8	hmm yeah, the red line is rebuilding assuming no
9	releases, just kind of current management at .06.
10	The yellow line assumes stocking a million juveniles
11	a year for the first 12 years only. And then some
12	of the other assumptions, he basically stole from
13	what was known about salmonid releases.
14	But in this case, it does cut rebuilding
15	time for this species from 60, 70, 80 years down to
16	20 years. So there is some idea that, you know,
17	putting more juveniles past the critical stage out
18	there actually may contribute to the fishery, which
19	is fairly common-sensical. So this is the good side
20	of the equation.
21	We're trying to update this a little bit
22	and get a little bit more sophisticated in the
23	modeling, but that work is still going on.
24	This would have been a shorter talk,
) E	
25	but also, I promised to talk a little bit about

1	a rockfish, same genera of the ones that we're
2	interested in here in Korea and Japan where they
3	have done releases for the last couple decades. And
4	there is quite a bit of information there on how
5	that's working and returns to the market.
6	This is just landings in Korea where
7	it's somewhat been stabilized whereas U.S. landings
8	are down. And then, at the same time, they've gone
9	and put more of these rockfish into net pens and
10	actually are producing twice as much through that
11	side than they are through releasing and wild
12	harvest. So it's a little more of the way these
13	things kind of interact and the lines of aquaculture
14	are blurred.
15	Returns to the fishery from some
16	releases around Myako, Japan, for example, have been
17	in the 30 and 40 percent range. So there is some
18	indication from sister species that this is
19	something which may have some merit to at least look
20	at.
21	Maybe I should do this at the beginning
22	of the slide. Okay. So what's next? For us,
23	paramount on this is to secure stable funding. We
24	are running now kind of on a shoestring. We need to
25	do more improved hatchery methods for the local
26	rockfish that we have, continue that work. And then

1	we need to scale up from a lab to a pilot scale, and
2	this is something that the Makah Tribe is interested
3	in in order to get numbers more like 10,000 to 20-
4	or 30,000 so that we can evaluate through some very
5	targeted releases the potential for rebuilding using
6	aquaculture.
7	Hand in hand with that goes development
8	of genetic and ecological risk protocols and
9	modeling around cumulative risk versus benefit
10	decision support models.
11	We are improving population dynamics.
12	There's a model which goes into that as well. And
13	then start conducting some of these experimental
14	releases that we can monitor.
15	So that's one more slide. Other way.
16	So that's the end of kind of the local.
17	I'll bring it back to international now.
18	Seattle was selected as the third as the site for
19	the Third International Symposium on Stock
20	Enhancement and Sea Ranching. You see how young the
21	science really is around this. We're only up to the
22	Third International Symposium. It's going to be
23	here in Seattle in September. I would encourage
24	people who are interested in this topic to attend or
25	come. If you can't come, you can send money. We
26	always are short on that. So that's pretty much my

1	talk.
2	And I'd be happy to take a few
3	questions.
4	MS. BRYANT: Mike, on that particular
5	thing, I actually have some handouts and I'll put
6	those out there.
7	MR. RUST: Okay.
8	MS. BRYANT: It's just a flyer that
9	gives you the dates and the location.
10	MR. RUST: That's it.
11	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: We've got some
12	questions. Tony.
13	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah. Mike, could you go
14	back to well, we can't go back to the slides
15	there. You had one of the a map of the U.S.
16	MR. RUST: Yes.
17	MR. DiLERNIA: And with species there.
18	Looked like you had a typog. You had a winter
19	flounder.
20	MR. RUST: Yep.
21	MR. DiLERNIA: Can you tell me more
22	about that, what you know about those.
23	MR. RUST: The winter flounder work is
24	more ongoing than the typog. The typog kind of is
25	at a hiatus. It was being done in our military

Connecticut lab. But the winter flounder is being

26

1	done at University of New Hampshire. Hunt Powell is
2	the PI there, and they've done a number of releases
3	around several of the estuaries there. It's all at
4	a scientific level now, small, you know, pods,
5	10,000 fish releases looking at how those fish react
6	in the estuaries primarily.
7	MR. DiLERNIA: So there have been
8	limited attempts, scientific attempts in the
9	Northeast for stock enhancement with those two
10	species?
11	MR. RUST: Well, yes. In the modern
12	era. I mean, of course we operated cod hatcheries
13	for a hundred years that released eggs and larvae
14	basically, until the '50s. But in the more recent
15	era, yeah, primarily in that area they've been
16	focused on flounder.
17	MR. DiLERNIA: Have we seen any has
18	there been any evidence of success?
19	MR. RUST: You can certainly find the
20	signature of the releases in the population, yeah.
21	I the exact numbers I don't have at hand, but,
22	yeah, there has been quite a bit of success on the
23	research side.
24	MR. DiLERNIA: Do you know how they're
25	being identified? Is it coded wire tags or
26	MR. RUST: Yeah, coded wire tags. And

1	that's the other thing that's happened in the last
2	ten years which has really allowed a lot of this
3	research to go forward is the tagging technology has
4	greatly advanced. I mean, we have like the pit tag
5	here on my keychain. We have coded wire tags. We
6	have genetic marking. We have alpha-numeric tags.
7	And now these new acoustic tags that are absolutely
8	fantastic for large fish. So that technology really
9	has allowed us to ask some of these questions about
10	what happens to these fish in the environment.
11	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Pete.
12	MR. LEIPZIG: Following up on the
13	tagging, if rockfish production were to go forward
14	on the Pacific Coast, are these fish going to be
15	tagged? Are you going to be able to differentiate
16	them from the wild stock?
17	MR. RUST: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. It
18	doesn't do us any good we don't get any
19	information back if we can't tell which are the wild
20	fish and which are the hatchery fish.
21	MR. LEIPZIG: Well, on the flip side,
22	the dive people can't tell they can't they can
23	no longer measure productivity if you're
24	supplementing the stock. We have wide variations in
25	
26	MR. RUST: Right.

1	MR. LEIPZIG: recruitment strengths
2	from year to year, and if you throw a bunch of fish
3	out there and you don't know if it's real from
4	well, we know it's real we don't know if it's
5	with natural production or if it was supplemental.
6	MR. RUST: Well, yeah. One thing
7	actually, you may even be able to get a better
8	handle because you can do different regions,
9	replicate local regions, some enhanced and some not
10	enhanced, and get enough replication to where you
11	could see the differences between those two.
12	MR. LEIPZIG: Do we have that response of
13	stock, that variability.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Heather.
15	MS. McCARTY: Thank you. You have a
16	crab on the map, too. Is that the blue crab in
17	Chesapeake Bay?
18	MR. RUST: Yes.
19	MS. McCARTY: We had a crab enhancement
20	workshop sponsored by Sea-Grant in March in Kodiak,
21	Alaska and we had folks from all over the world
22	really talking about crab enhancement and we're
23	starting a kind of a fledgling program in Alaska
24	with the help mostly of Brian Lee back here, and he
25	might want to talk about it later, but we had the
26	person from the Chesapeake Bay Lab is that what

1	it's called?
2	MR. RUST: It was probably University of
3	Maryland Marine Biotechnology Center. Yanni Zohar
4	is the head of that program.
5	MS. McCARTY: It was really fascinating.
6	MR. RUST: A lot of people are involved
7	with that.
8	MS. McCARTY: And they're also doing
9	lobster in Maine.
10	MR. RUST: That's yeah. I just heard
11	about that one. That's actually kind of a new
12	thing, I think. I hadn't known about that. There's
13	actually been lobster done in Norway quite
14	successfully for a number of years.
15	MS. McCARTY: We had those people at the
16	workshop in Norway talking about the lobster culture
17	there. It's pretty amazing.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: On that point, Mike,
19	or is it something different?
20	MR. RUBINO: It's on that point.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Please, go ahead.
22	MR. RUBINO: Just very briefly to follow
23	up. Just to give you an idea, at this stock
24	enhancement symposium, for one evening we're going
25	to bring together all of the U.S. researchers who
26	are either working with NOAA or involved with NOAA

26

1	in some way in terms of funding to talk about
2	strategy and sort of the future of stock enhancement
3	in the U.S.
4	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mike?
5	MR. RUST: Yes.
6	AUDIENCE MEMBER: You might mention to
7	Heather that Yanni is going to be speaking at this
8	symposium.
9	MR. RUST: Yeah. Yanni, the right.
10	The PI on that crab project is one of the keynote
11	speakers at the new symposium. And having looked at
12	the program, there's quite a number of crab and
13	MR. RUBINO: Shellfish.
14	MR. RUST: shellfish talks on that.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Larry was next.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Just had a FYI. I don't
17	know if you all are aware of it. There was a on
18	the slide, Mode Marine Lab was doing some work.
19	They had a fire and it destroyed I don't know
20	some 60,000 pounds of marketable stuff. I don't
21	remember what it was was it shrimp?
22	MR. RUBINO: Sturgeon.
23	MR. RUST: And Mote is probably the best
24	research laboratory in this field. Right now, their
25	scientist, Ken Leber, who runs that program, is
26	probably worldwide the leader in assessing marine

1	stock enhancement.
2	MR. DEWEY: I just wanted to point out -
3	- it wasn't a question for Mike but I guess just a
4	source of information that your focus was mostly
5	on finfish and certainly around the country there's
6	an awful lot done with mollusk and shellfish as well
7	and, you know, partnerships with the aquaculture
8	industry, we're using our technology to produce the
9	seed. Here in Washington State, we talked about
10	this a little bit on the tour yesterday, where we've
11	been working on a number of restoration projects
12	around the Puget Sound to help bring the native
13	Olympia oyster back using our hatchery and nurseries
14	to produce the seed for those projects and, you
15	know, just there's that opportunity to partner
16	with public/private partnerships to do that.
17	There's also a great example I've
18	shared it with Michael before that I'm familiar
19	with in New Zealand where there's a wild scallop
20	fishery in Tasman and Golden Bays that is enhanced
21	using aquaculture technology where the industry
22	works cooperatively, puts out spat collectors,
23	captures the scallop spat, nurses it in the
24	nurseries, and then releases it where it's then
25	commonly fished by people in that fishery. So it's
26	kind of a nice you know, good statistics there to

1	show the increases in catch since they've
2	implemented that program.
3	I think it's called the Challenger
4	Scallop Program or something.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Tom over here next.
6	MR. BILLY: Several other countries have
7	been mentioned from a science or research
8	perspective. Can you sort of give us a qualitative
9	sense of where the U.S. stands in relation to other
10	countries?
11	MR. RUST: Yeah, absolutely. We are
12	where the U.S. soccer team was when Diego Maradona
13	was kicked out of the World Cup in 1984 or whatever.
14	MR. LEIPZIG: Well, that helps.
15	MR. RUST: No, I'm sorry. We the
16	rest of the world is way ahead in this field. Most
17	of the success I've had in terms of varying those
18	species has been coming from has come from going
19	around the world and stealing other people's secrets
20	and bringing them back here.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Let's see. We've
22	got John Forster next.
23	MR. FORSTER: Mike, you commented a
24	little bit on some genetic modeling that's being
25	done. I'm wondering about economic modeling. And
26	it seems to me that the values that come out of this

1	program are multiple in terms of stock enhancement
2	or mitigation and so forth. Perhaps the lowest
3	value at the end of the day is just the fish as a
4	piece of meat.
5	And the costs that go into it are
6	obviously the hatchery component and then all the
7	mortality that you're going to see. In the case of
8	shellfish, for example, where it's more possible to
9	protect shellfish when you put them out, you get the
10	high survival so, therefore, it makes it more
11	feasible.
12	MR. RUST: Yes.
13	MR. FORSTER: Is anybody looking at
14	economic modeling in this whole thing?
15	MR. RUST: Yeah. Well, currently, the -
16	- this year, we've produced a thousand China
17	rockfish. Those rockfish cost me about \$850 apiece
18	because we got about \$85,000 to run the program. So
19	that's not going to work out.
20	MR. FORSTER: No.
21	MR. RUST: Years ago, during the Second
22	Symposium on Marine Stock Enhancement and Sea
23	Ranching was held in Kobe, Japan and Steve and I
24	actually had the opportunity to go to a Japanese
25	rockfish hatchery in Myako where they were releasing
26	rockfish and seeing the response. And they were

1	doing economic modeling and predicted at the time it
2	cost them about 40 cents apiece to produce a
3	juvenile. So they were doing a little better than
4	my \$850 for a juvenile.
5	But they didn't think it was going to be
6	economically viable until they got it down to about
7	30 cents.
8	Last November, at the UJNR, U.SJapan
9	Natural Resources meeting in San Diego, had the
10	opportunity to see the same researcher from Myako
11	back and they're now producing those rockfish for
12	nine cents apiece and it is excellent.
13	So the whole economic picture is a
14	moving target for us. I can tell you right now with
15	what we're doing, it ain't gonna pay. But the idea
16	is down the line, you know, with research, you bring
17	those costs down.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Mary Beth, I believe
19	you're next.
20	MS. TOOLEY: Yeah. It seems like
21	there's kind of a couple of focuses for stock
22	enhancement. One is as a tool for aquaculture and
23	the other is to bolster wild stocks. And where is
24	the focus? Is it, you know, 50/50 or I mean,
25	what direction do people seem to want to go?
26	MR. RUST: Well, I actually don't have

1	any money to do stock enhancement of rockilsh. The
2	work that I've done is coming for looking at
3	bioenergetic models of rockfish larvae which
4	requires us to produce a few individuals so that we
5	can put them in the lab and see, you know, how
6	they're burning metabolically.
7	So a lot of this certainly at my
8	stage, whether I raise that fish for going into a
9	metabolic chamber, whether I raise that fish for
10	release, or whether I raise that fish for somebody
11	to grow out later on, it's the same it's the same
12	question. At least 60 or 70 percent of the science
13	would be the same.
14	When we get to the point where we can
15	start making releases, then you need people focused
16	on the task at hand, but we're not quite there yet.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Steve was next.
18	MR. JONER: And I want to follow up on
19	what Mike said about going to Myako, Japan. You
20	know, I came back from that very inspired about the
21	opportunity for doing something about these depleted
22	rockfish.
23	And, unfortunately, we didn't get very
24	far because we started to deliver our message.
25	Shortly after that, Mike and I and a colleague from
26	Hubbs-Sea World did a presentation to Pacific

1	Council and some people purposely stayed away from
2	that just because they didn't want to acknowledge
3	that that could be done. And I just for the life of
4	me cannot figure out this mentality of you can't
5	you can't get there from here.
6	Now, I've heard people in the assessment
7	field here in Seattle say that, No, we've run the
8	numbers. You can't do it. Well, I think there are
9	people running the numbers and you can do it and
10	they are doing it in Japan and elsewhere and they're
11	doing it economically.
12	And you look at what they started with
13	in Japan. They were way worse than we are here.
14	And they had areas with no fishing and they have
15	rebuilt fishing. I guess because all the land was
16	taken up, all the available land for golf courses,
17	sportfishing became a recreational industry in
18	Japan. And, you know, that's something new, a
19	recent development.
20	And so they have developed recreational
21	fisheries in some of these coastal communities where
22	30 percent was it 30 or 70 percent of their catch
23	was from their released fish?
24	MR. RUST: I think it was like 40.
25	MR. JONER: Okay, 40. And, you know,
26	there it is pretty much a put-and-take fishery which

1	we're not promoting here. But the questions we get
2	or the opposition is, you know, What will this do to
3	the wild population? And I think it's already been
4	done to the wild population. And it's well
5	salmon hatcheries screw up the salmon and that's not
6	true. There are some very successful conservation
7	hatcheries the Makah Tribe is involved in one
8	where we rebuilt a near-extinct run of salmon using
9	the existing stock and we're doing that river by
10	river in some cases.
11	And so, you know, without going on and
12	on, the genetics are a question but there are people
13	that are looking at this University of Idaho, for
14	one all of these questions are being addressed
15	but still there's this reluctance. And when I bring
16	it up, usually the response is I'm just met with
17	silence. Nobody wants to even respond.
18	And so on the West Coast, we're looking
19	at 141 years to rebuild yelloweye rockfish at the
20	current rebuilding plan, which is you know, we're
21	being choked to where we can barely breathe on the
22	fisheries. If the plaintiffs that keep suing Frank
23	and others here, if they have their way, that time
24	will be shortened to 80 years or something like
25	that, a mere 80 years, but there will be no
26	fisheries left. I mean, it would cripple the

1	fisheries on the West Coast. So there is an
2	alternative.
3	And I think just looking at the example
4	of the stocks in Puget Sound where they were
5	overfished, they were depleted and they have not
6	come back on their own, something else has taken
7	their place and I think it's time to step in and try
8	to correct some of the problems it created.
9	And this is good stuff. So I just
10	you know, I had to get that out because, you know, I
11	think the committee has can have a role in
12	getting some of the Agency people in NMFS and in the
13	State of Washington, get them, you know, off the
14	dime and let's try some of this.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Steve. We
16	had Don over there in the corner was next, Don
17	McIsaac. You'll have to speak up because they're
18	trying to record it on the microphone.
19	MR. McISAAC: Okay. Well, first of all,
20	Jim, thanks for taking a question from the peanut
21	gallery. I hope the question will be helpful for
22	the committee.
23	Your graph on Pacific ocean perch, it
24	would be very impressive to be able to chop dozens
25	of years off of the rebuilding species like that if
26	at only five million juveniles released per year

1	for 12 years.
2	So two questions: Did that graph
3	pertain to the full range of Pacific ocean perch
4	from Mexico to Alaska, or was that just the West
5	Coast or was that just a subset of the West Coast?
6	And what survival did you assume on these juvenile
7	rockfish to the appropriate age of accountability?
8	MR. RUST: Yeah. All those are great
9	questions and I don't have great answers to them.
10	The paper was done in '91 and actually there were
11	several simulations run using various assumptions.
12	I just chose one to illustrate. I'd have to go back
13	in the paper, but I can get you that paper if you're
14	interested.
15	We're trying to develop a little bit
16	more sophisticated version of this because it's a
17	fairly simple analysis, but that's still ongoing and
18	back and forth. But I can certainly get you the
19	paper from '91.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Tom was next.
21	MR. BILLY: You mentioned in your
22	presentation the work on typog was on hiatus.
23	What's that code for? What does that mean?
24	MR. RUST: Unfunded.
25	MR. BILLY: Okay. How much funding is
26	there, a rough estimate, in NOAA Fisheries for this

1	type of work?
2	MR. RUST: In NOAA Fisheries?
3	MR. BILLY: Yes.
4	MR. RUST: For stock enhancement?
5	MR. BILLY: Yes.
6	MR. RUST: Including earmarks?
7	MR. BILLY: Whatever. I mean, just
8	roughly what are we is this
9	MR. RUST: Well, I think Mike can
10	address that better than I would. I just know what
11	comes into my lap, and I've got it right here.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Mike, are you going
13	to give that in your presentation or do you want to
14	is that something
15	MR. RUBINO: I could or I could just
16	answer it real briefly.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Go ahead.
18	MR. RUBINO: Between NOAA Fisheries and
19	OAR, which does a lot of the external grant
20	programs, it's about \$10 million. It's almost all
21	earmarks. So that's just a variety of labs around
22	the country. That does not include the salmon work.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: But that's not all
24	enhancement kind of stuff. There's a variety of
25	things that are covered with it.
26	MR. RUBINO: No. It's all stock

1	enhancement research.
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: It is.
3	MR. RUBINO: In addition to that, there
4	are other earmarks that are for commercial
5	aquaculture but, again, the line as Mike
6	explained, the line between commercial and
7	enhancement gets blurred because of all the hatchery
8	work which really goes both ways. So
9	MR. RUST: And probably three quarters
10	of that goes to like two or three labs; right?
11	MR. RUBINO: That's right. Gulf Coast
12	Research Lab, Oceanic Institute are the two big
13	ones.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: On this topic, Tom?
15	MR. RAFTICAN: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Go ahead.
17	MR. RAFTICAN: Approximately what's the
18	same enhancement dollars that go from the Department
19	of Agriculture into doing this terrestrial I
20	mean, you've got aquaculture here for \$10 million.
21	How much goes into research in the Department of
22	Agriculture?
23	MR. RUBINO: For aquaculture?
24	MR. RAFTICAN: No, no, no for
25	farming.
26	MR BILLY: It's in the billions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: That's a good point,
2	but maybe we'll
3	MR. RUBINO: I'll address some of that
4	scale issue in my talk, too.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I've got Larry
6	Simpson next.
7	MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8	Mike, you mentioned in your third slide, going back
9	to the economics, annual direct benefit to
10	Washington, one state, State of Washington, \$850
11	million from recreational fishing, eight states,
12	\$145 from commercial fishing, seven. Can you give
13	me the basis on how that was calculated, and really
14	my question is: Is the commercial figure industrial
15	value?
16	MR. RUST: Those figures came from the
17	Hatchery Science Review group. Those weren't my own
18	figures. And how where the numbers came from,
19	we'd have to look it up.
20	MR. SIMPSON: Eight hundred fifty of
21	value-added and
22	MR. RUST: Yeah. I'm sure that's the
23	value-added number because the salmon industry I
24	think X vessel is only around 20 million here. It's
25	about equal to the
26	MR. SIMPSON: It's the way most of them

1	report.
2	MR. RUST: farming industry in the
3	state. They're both around 20 million, I think,
4	wouldn't you say, John?
5	MR. FORSTER: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Pete.
7	MR. LEIPZIG: In a recent <u>International</u>
8	Aquaculture magazine, there was an article, very
9	brief article, on marine aquaculture and in it it
10	mentioned the Korean rockfish sea bass (?)
11	production. And it wasn't clear to me when I read
12	it whether they were spawning those fish or if it
13	was captured larva and growing them out.
14	MR. RUST: No. They're spawning them.
15	MR. LEIPZIG: And where they were
16	raising them. Is it in a pen culture, is it
17	spawning and releasing them and that was the
18	increase in production?
19	MR. RUST: Both. They have there's
20	probably, I would hazard a guess, 50 or 60 different
21	private rockfish hatcheries in Southern Korea, and
22	they grow them to support a net pen industry very
23	similar to our net pen industry.
24	But there's also some public maybe a
25	dozen or so public hatcheries which release rockfish
26	to support their fisheries.

1	MR. LEIPZIG: This article talked about
2	maybe I may have this number wrong but 30,000
3	metric tons of rockfish being produced.
4	MR. RUST: Yeah.
5	MR. LEIPZIG: Is that in the net pen
6	operation?
7	MR. RUST: Most of that would be the net
8	pens, yeah. In fact, that would all be net pens.
9	There's probably another 15 or 20 from the wild
10	capture. Net pens are the
11	MR. LEIPZIG: Those are big numbers.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: This interest is
13	good, but keep in mind that Dr. Rust will be along
14	at our tour tomorrow, so we can follow up some
15	questions. We have two more people on this list and
16	then we've fallen behind because it is our focus
17	point, but let's give Vince O'Shea
18	MR. O'SHEA: I'll pass, Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Vince will pass.
20	And then we had Randy Fisher.
21	MR. FISHER: I guess I was just curious
22	'cause I was with Usha (ph) and Mr. Long last week
23	and we were discussing this issue and they were all
24	saying how wonderful it is and those sorts of
25	things. So the question I have, I guess, is: How
26	do you decide what you're going to do? I mean, do

1	you get certain amount of money or how how
2	does this I mean, why did you pick lingcod?
3	MR. RUST: Me as a scientist?
4	MR. FISHER: Yeah.
5	MR. RUST: Lingcod was me as a
6	well, okay. My research group is funded 60 or so
7	percent by grant funding, so we are largely
8	influenced in what we do by what grants we get.
9	Lingcod per se was of interest to the
10	Squaxin Tribe down in South Puget Sound where
11	populations are were at the time below ten
12	percent of their unfished biomass probably, although
13	the stock enhancement wasn't really too good down
14	there.
15	It was also of interest at that time
16	with Washington State Department of Fish and
17	Wildlife. Pretty much nothing I pretty much do
18	nothing in my lab that doesn't have partnerships
19	with local and regional groups and address a problem
20	or an issue that they're having.
21	So we started with lingcod. Then when
22	populations were dow the populations have
23	actually come up certainly on the coast, so lingcod
24	is not really of interest for stock enhancement
25	anymore. There are some private individuals who
26	think it may be a commercial species, but it's not

Τ	really of interest other than maybe some small
2	regions like South Puget Sound where it does not
3	seem to have rebuilt.
4	It's also of interest in that the
5	release we did down there in the South Puget Sound
6	was 20 fish that were tagged incredibly with these
7	acoustic tags and it served as an opportunity to
8	have enough fish of a same cohort and the same
9	genetics to where you can run some experiments and
10	actually see where they go, who eats them, who they
11	eat, where they stay, and some of these things which
12	would be harder to do with wild fish.
13	So that's kind of the lingcod story.
14	It's now not one of our high
15	MR. FISHER: Could I add one follow-up
16	question then, sort of?
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: All right.
18	MR. FISHER: So you can theoretically do
19	stock enhancement, what you're doing here, without
20	the legislation that you think you need to have; is
21	that correct?
22	MR. RUST: That's a good point in that
23	the legislation merely addresses offshore.
24	MR. FISHER: Right.
25	MR. RUST: This is another part of the
26	NOAA portfolio, however. And I think that it's

1	important, as you saw, you know, the shellfish farms
2	and near shore, that's also part of the portfolio
3	that's not tied to the legislature.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Thank you
5	very much, Dr. Rust. That was very interesting.
6	Let's see. We've run over Michael, you were
7	scheduled for about an hour and a half, so why don't
8	you get started and we'll see how we feel in about
9	an hour, if we could finish up or we want to break
0	and come back and we'll
1	MR. RUBINO: Okay.
.2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: plan after we go
L3	through part of it.
_4	MR. RUBINO: While we're getting set up
.5	here, we this document that you have in your
L6	binders, it's a ten-year plan but it's really been
L7	ten years in the making. A series of national
_8	commissions, stakeholder meetings, different kinds
_9	of legislation, different kinds of research
20	initiatives. There are a number of people in this
21	room who were involved in this ten-year process.
22	Bruce Moorehead, who actually came back
23	and helped draft this with me and some others; Linda
24	Chavez, my predecessor; Dick Offiseer (ph); Bob
25	Iwamoto; Kerry Griffin Kerry's here as well
26	have all been involved in the thinking behind this

T	Irom NOAA's perspective.
2	My involvement started two years ago
3	actually at a MAFAC meeting in Juneau, Alaska before
4	I even came onboard, as they say at NOAA. I was
5	invited to come up to sort of see what this was all
6	about and what NOAA was all about.
7	Very early on, in October of 2004, I
8	we convened a group of experts and interested people
9	from around NOAA, all four agencies involved in
10	aquaculture, as well as some of the Sea-Grant
11	directors, to talk sort of take stock of the past
12	ten years and think about, okay, where do we go from
13	now?
14	And the cradle of this strategy really
15	came from that meeting. What we've done in the year
16	and a half since is to go around the country and to
17	ask leading questions and to listen coastal
18	communities, aquaculture entrepreneurs, fishery
19	management councils and commissions, environmental
20	groups, the feed industry, and others, to say to
21	ask them what kind of a program should NOAA have.
22	What are the key things driving your industry, your
23	business, your coastal communities and how can we
24	help?
25	So I think this plan reflects a little
26	bit of that thinking. It's great it's wonderful

1	that MAFAC wants to has asked for this. In some
2	ways, it's a good time to take stock, take a look at
3	sort of this first year and a half of a
4	reconstituted program and to get a reality check on
5	whether we're going in the right direction or how
6	this needs to be tweaked or changed and whether any
7	of this is realistic.
8	Okay. First slide. Because we're short
9	on time and because you know this very well, I'm
10	going to go through the first part of this
11	background about U.S. seafood supply and marine
12	aquaculture providing the context very quickly so
13	that I can get to some of the main points in this
14	ten-year plan.
15	We all know why we're here. Future of
16	seafood supply is largely in terms of increase
17	is largely aquaculture.
18	In the U.S., we consume about six
19	million tons, we import two thirds. Wild capture
20	provides about, oh, a little less than 20 percent.
21	Domestic aquaculture, maybe eight percent. If we
22	stay at the same level of one seafood meal a week
23	with modest increases in population, we're going to
24	need another two million tons of seafood in 20
25	years. If we eat more, the way all the
26	nutritionists say we should, you can do the math.

1	The real question is do we want to keep importing
2	this or do we want to grow more of it here?
3	Marine aquaculture is a very small part
4	of U.S. aquaculture. Most of it's still catfish and
5	trout. So marine aquaculture is about 20 percent by
6	value, 80 percent by weight.
7	It's oyster culture, mussel, scallop,
8	other kind of shellfish farming. There's a little
9	bit of salmon farming in the Puget Sound and in
10	Maine. We've got shrimp farming in Texas and in
11	Florida, algae culture and kelp culture in Maine and
12	in Hawaii, aquarium trade in Florida.
13	There are two sort of new frontiers in
14	marine aquaculture. One, a closed recirculating
15	system. A couple of weeks ago, I was down in
16	Louisiana and Mississippi and actually visited the
17	manufacturer of these D filters that Ron Long and
18	LSU helped to invent. They're selling like
19	hotcakes.
20	In Liberty, Mississippi, just across
21	Lake Pontchartrain, in converted garment factories,
22	those low-ceiling buildings that have been
23	mothballed down there for some time, U.S. and
24	Australian investors are converting them and putting
25	in these kind of large tanks, closed recirculating
26	systems, to grow barramundi, an Australian species,

1	redfish, they're looking at Cobia, and a variety of
2	both marine and freshwater species.
3	You've all heard about some of these
4	tilapia facilities going in around the country.
5	The other area is offshore, which we've
6	heard a lot about this past year. We've got crowded
7	coastlines, a lot of people, high land values, a lot
8	of coastal pollution that's pushing many parts of
9	the world further offshore. Technology's coming to
10	be able to do this. A lot of it's still in the
11	experimental phase, but more we're going to see
12	more and more of this and we're trying to figure out
13	what to do with it.
14	As we heard from Michael, a very large
15	part of existing our existing aquaculture
16	portfolio for NOAA is the marine stock enhancement
17	area.
18	So why now? Demand. If you go to
19	Mississippi or Louisiana, Texas, if you go to the
20	northeast of the U.S., coastal communities are
21	looking for more seafood product to put through and
22	to justify the continued existence of their
23	infrastructure boats, docks, cold storage,
24	processing, marketing, transport.
25	Aquaculture and fisheries are two ends
26	of the spectrum of producing seafood. And the

1	distinction is really getting blurred between the
2	two. And in many parts of the world, coastal
3	communities use a whole variety of technologies to
4	produce seafood. And so we're going to see more and
5	more of those examples where, in New England, you'll
6	see somebody catches quota one day, lobstering the
7	next day, which is arguably a form of aquaculture,
8	to working on offshore mussel line cultures based on
9	research from the University of New Hampshire. I
10	think we'll see similar kinds of things happening
11	very quickly in the Gulf.
12	Nutritionists, new technology. We heard
13	about need for restoration enhancement. You know,
14	from the Ocean Commission Report to Secretary
15	Gutierrez coming from the food industry to the
16	recent press conference when President Bush
17	announced the Northern Hawaiian Islands Sanctuary
18	he had a couple of lines in there "I guess I need
19	to go buy a beer for the guy who wrote those" has
20	generated a fair amount of attention for this
21	program.
22	Our colleague, Colin Nash, who some of
23	you know, a couple of years ago worked with some
24	people around the country, around the world to say,
25	Well, is this realistic? Can we really produce,
26	say, half of that two million metric ton increase

1	that we would need? And where would it come from?
2	It may be a little marine-centric - the
3	catfish people may quibble with it but he saw a
4	huge opportunity to increase in restoring shellfish
5	beds and expanding shellfish farming in the
6	country. *****
7	And he saw a lot of potential for marine
8	finfish. The market wants marine finfish. So where
9	are we going to put these things? How are we going
10	to do it?
11	We all know the challenges. Complicated
12	regulations or lack of regulations. We need the
13	political will to do this. At the end of the day,
14	if coastal communities don't want to do this and
15	it's not one size fits all. There are all different
16	kinds of aquaculture aquaculture is as diverse as
17	agriculture is, we're hearing but if we don't
18	have the political will to do it, it won't happen.
19	The public needs better information and,
20	as the nation's oceans science agency, NOAA has a
21	responsibility there.
22	Every agricultural I would say every
23	industry in this country that's successful has a
24	whole infrastructure of research and development,
25	extension agents in the aquaculture context, it
26	would be hatchery, disease, nutrition surrounding

1	that industry to support it.
2	That's an infrastructure we need to
3	build in this country for aquaculture.
4	What are we doing about it? NOAA's
5	Aquaculture Program has basically four parts to it -
6	- regulation, science, outreach, and international.
7	And as you'll see from the ten-year plan, really
8	sort of the objectives and the strategies that we've
9	thought about mirror these four activities.
10	The activities happen at four agencies
11	within NOAA. Most of the money is in NOAA Fisheries
12	and OAR, NOAA Fisheries being primarily regulatory
13	as well as having science centers, OAR having a
14	portfolio of competitive grants and earmarks.
15	National Ocean Service, though, could
16	play a very important role in the future because of
17	all of its capabilities. And the library it's
18	there currently now basically because of the
19	library, but all the GIS and satellite kind of
20	information is also going to be important as we do
21	mapping in the future.
22	Okay. The ten-year plan. Sometimes
23	it's kind of hard to figure out how to slice the pie
24	in terms of what's the goal, what's the strategy,
25	what's the results, what's an objective. Well,
26	we've made an attempt at it anyway.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Well, this is divided up into program
2	goals, specific goals for this program and the
3	strategies to implement those goals. We sort of
4	asked, In the best of all possible worlds, if we
5	could work together, where could we be in ten years?
6	I won't talk too much about the
7	challenges. I hope we can talk at the
8	subcommittee level, we'll talk about the challenges
9	a little bit. And my economist friends
10	said I really shouldn't have said benefits to talk
11	about results and impacts because one person's
12	benefit is another person's cost.
13	Let me go through four program goals
14	which mirror the four program activities. First one
15	is regulations. We're already working on this.
16	We're trying to improve we're trying to get
17	NOAA's act together in terms of how it reviews
18	aquaculture permits under existing laws and
19	regulations under Magnuson-Stevens, Endangered
20	Species, Marine Mammals, and so on. Our regional
21	offices, particularly through NOAA Fisheries, don't
22	have the tools, the expertise, the resources, the
23	backup when they get in-permit applications, whether
24	it be for shellfish or for cage culture, in state
25	waters to be able to make quick decisions. So if
26	we're going to be proactive, we need to provide them

1	with tools about water quality dispersion, about
2	genetics, about species, about new stock management,
3	about mapping and siting, about conflicting uses.
4	So working with the teams from around NOAA over the
5	next year or two, we're going to put together an
6	effective virtual guidebook for regional offices
7	which I think will help quite a bit.
8	Because we're a federal agency, we've
9	been asked to look at federal waters and that's
10	where this offshore legislation comes in. At the
11	moment, there is no clear way with permit
12	aquaculture in federal waters. If you go get your
13	Corps of Engineer permit per structure or EPA
14	permit, if you're big enough in terms of discharge,
15	but then you go to NOAA Fisheries for consultations
16	and they would say, Well, some lawyers define
17	aquaculture as fishing under Magnuson. Go to the
18	council system.
19	You can get an experimental fishing
20	permit to do a research experiment, renewable for up
21	to four years, but at the moment NOAA's not willing
22	to sign off on a commercial aquaculture permit in
23	federal waters. So we need to clarify that.
24	One way is legislation, but there is
25	Plan B and Plan C. Plan B would be actions by the
26	fishery management councils to manage species. Plan

1	C could be NOAA revises its definition of
2	aquaculture as fishing.
3	We need institutional standing to be
4	able to play the bureaucratic game within NOAA.
5	We need to enhance NOAA's science
6	capabilities. I'd like to talk to you about how
7	little money they have. In some ways, pardon the
8	pun take us back a step. NOAA has a very, very
9	rich tradition in aquaculture. Salmon farming,
10	shrimp farming, oyster techniques many of those
11	originated in NOAA labs. But in the '80s and '90s,
12	NOAA took on a whole variety of other
13	responsibilities and aquaculture kind of took a back
14	seat.
15	To be an effective regulator, though, to
16	be able to, you know, enable aquaculture to happen
17	as well as to safeguard environmental resources and
18	balance all these multiple uses, you've got to have
19	science capabilities. You can't just contract it
20	out. You've got to have it in-house to be able to
21	regulate it.
22	We're working with other federal
23	agencies on a product animal health plan nationally
24	and a national research plan, both of which should
25	be published in the next year or two. And as you
26	might imagine, we're working with because we're

1	so small and because we need to engage the rest of
2	NOAA, we're working with other programs within NOAA
3	on aquaculture initiatives sustainable fisheries,
4	habitat, protected resources, coastal zone
5	management, marine sanctuaries, coral reefs, the
6	satellite groups, and even beyond in terms of
7	Department of Commerce and NOAA, the Weather
8	Service, Economic Development Administration. It's
9	got to be part of all of NOAA working on these
10	things if it's going to work.
11	We have a research portfolio. How much
12	do we want to plan to pump in terms of research?
13	What's the role of public money in getting an
14	industry going and expanding an industry through
15	peer review grants, competitive grants, through
16	Congressional appropriations. Why it is that they
17	take some of these Congressional appropriations and
18	turn them into five regional aquaculture centers
19	around the country where a group of institutions
20	could sit every five years on a competitive basis,
21	be reviewed, and have five years' worth of money, \$5
22	million a year, to build sort of aquaculture centers
23	of excellence for commercial aquaculture and stock
24	enhancement research and the nexus is hatcheries.
25	Can we get the Economic Development
26	Administration and groups like that within Commerce?

1	Can we work with USDA's programs to provide loans,
2	soft money and investment money for aquaculture?
3	Can we do something like they do in the
4	Defense Department with DARPA or they do in Commerce
5	with the Advanced Technology Program, have sort of a
6	lighthouse-level large slug of money that goes into
7	aquaculture research and development.
8	Hundred million dollars. Lot of new
9	ideas we've talked about several times over the past
10	ten years. This is sort of the range of at the
11	moment, there's about one to \$4 million that goes
12	into the Competitive Grants Program for aquaculture.
13	There's another 15- to \$20 million in earmarks.
14	The USDA has 60- to \$80 million going
15	into aquaculture, again largely earmarks. I don't
16	know what Fish & Wildlife Service spends on its
17	stock enhancement programs. That compares to, you
18	know, almost a hundred million dollars in Norway,
19	which only has four million people, a couple hundred
20	million dollars in European Union that doesn't
21	include all the countries about \$80 million in
22	Canada, so that gives you a scale of where we are.
23	Now, if we could get to a \$50 million
24	program within NOAA, that would still only be two
25	and a half percent of NOAA's budget devoted to
26	ecosystem programs of one billion.

1	There's a lot of information and
2	misinformation about aquaculture. A lot of people
3	don't know about aquaculture. What is this? How
4	does it work? It's been around for a long, long
5	time in some parts of the country if you go to
6	coastal Louisiana in terms of oyster farming, or to
7	Chesapeake Bay but in other places, this is going
8	to be new. And if you're the new kid on the block,
9	people are suspicious of you. How do we work with
10	existing stakeholders through pilot projects and
11	demonstration projects?
12	The University of New Hampshire, from
13	day one when they did their offshore project, they
14	sat down with fishermen using led by the Sea-
15	Grant extension agents and said, How do you want
16	how can we work with you on this? So boat owners
17	and fishermen have been involved in technology,
18	design, servicing the research. They have been the
19	first adopters in terms of commercial success of
20	some of the research from the University of New
21	Hampshire project. Which is just one example of how
22	you go about this.
23	We gather a lot of information. So far,
24	we're not doing a good job of getting it out to the
25	public. You knew, we need better websites, we need
26	searchable websites. There's a lot of information

1	lying around the science centers. How do we get
2	that to the decision-makers and to the public?
3	We need to engage the media. I we've
4	done the offshore bill in some ways has allowed
5	us to have a national debate among some circles
6	about aquaculture. There have been over a hundred
7	newspaper articles. We've done half a dozen radio
8	talk shows, a couple of TV interviews. It's
9	generated some attention this past year.
10	Somehow or other, our back pocket we
11	have to work in this global world. Seventy percent
12	of our seafood is imported. U.S. consumers have
13	benefitted enormously from that. The U.S. industry
14	in some ways is very much involved in terms of
15	investment, technology, feed, equipment, services.
16	But what are we getting? What's the quality of that
17	food that's coming in?
18	How does this contribute to oceans
19	management around the world? Is it being grown
20	sustainably in other countries? Is it safe to eat?
21	all those kinds of questions. How can we work
22	as Mike gave you an example, he can go to Japan for
23	a week or two and learn things that will save him
24	five years in a lab. How can we work with
25	Norwegians, Canadians, French, Chileans, Mexicans,
26	and others who in some cases are way ahead of us

1	in some fields for exchange of information?
2	Okay. Now, there's sort of program
3	objectives and strategies. Where can we be in ten
4	years if we work together on this? It would be nice
5	to think that we had a permit system that worked,
6	where there was some certainty. And the biggest
7	thing industry is asking for is they don't mind
8	regulation; they want regulation it's some kind
9	of certainty of operation so they can know for ten
10	years, 20 years they can invest their money. And
11	this is everything from mom-and-pop operations to
12	large conglomerates.
13	So we've got to work that through and
14	it's got to be one, as I said, that enables
15	aquaculture to happen, safeguards environmental
16	resources, and balances multiple uses. And it ain't
17	easy to do this.
18	We'd like to see some of these regional
19	aquaculture missions. That's done on an ecosystem
20	management kind of basis. So these regional
21	aquaculture centers are integrated with the habitat,
22	effective resources, coral reef, and other programs
23	and with state and local partners.
24	In terms of new frontiers, I think it's
25	reasonable to think that in terms of offshore, we
26	could have maybe ten to 20 farms. If you look at

1	aquaculture in other parts of the world in terms of
2	how it's developed, typically it will develop quite
3	slowly over the first ten years. If it works and
4	you work out the bugs and you work out all the
5	stakeholder issues, then it can take off very
6	rapidly after that. So if we're to do closed
7	recirculating system aquaculture or offshore
8	aquaculture, I think over the next ten years we're
9	going to see a period of experimentation. Some
10	things will work, some won't. Figure it out
11	regionally. Those parts that do work are going to
12	take off very rapidly in the second 20 years.
13	Whether it's the stock enhancement or
14	commercial, we have a real dearth of hatchery
15	capability in the country. There's just not a lot
16	of hatcheries. There's not a lot of backup. If one
17	hatchery goes down, people can't get fingerlings or
18	they can't get spat. So, you know, the hurricane
19	wiped out a whole bunch of hatcheries in the Gulf,
20	for example. We need those hatcheries all talking
21	to each other so we don't have redundancy. It has
22	to be, to use the buzzword, public/private
23	partnerships in which some do commercial and some do
24	the R&D work.
25	You'll hear some you sit around and
26	go around the room and you try to figure out, okay.

1	could we work on ten species of marine fish? Do we
2	work on shellfish? Seaweeds and algaes are going to
3	be could be a big part of the future in terms of
4	nutrition, in terms of feeding fish, in terms of
5	getting productivity from the oceans.
6	What are the priorities for stock
7	enhancement species? Which ones of those species
8	should we go after the next time? Well, we
9	certainly could do this work over the next ten
10	years.
11	We can do a better job with outreach
12	education. We can be more fully engaged at the
13	international level.
14	The challenges. What stands in the way?
15	You heard about some of the challenges in the
16	beginning in terms of regulations and politics,
17	stakeholders, perceptions, lack of R&D money. It's
18	going to take a concerted effort by federal and
19	state governments. It's also going to take a
20	concerted effort by the private sector to invest,
21	but it's sort of a chicken and egg thing between the
22	two. The private sector is waiting for signals from
23	federal and state government in terms of regulation,
24	in terms of a supporting network. They have to be
25	willing to make that kind of investment. So how do
26	you get this going?

1	Internally, we have the classic
2	challenges of how do you get enough critical mass in
3	terms of an aquaculture team within NOAA, budget and
4	staffing to be able to do anything, to have sort of
5	a minimum level of resources to be able to effect
6	change and to work with partners.
7	We'll talk a little bit more about
8	legislation and regulatory mandates. As I said, we
9	spent a lot of the year talking to stakeholders.
10	We've received recent letters of support were sent
11	to the Senate Commerce Committee from National
12	Fisheries Institute, National Aquaculture
13	Association, Sliving (ph) Association, the
14	Veterinarians Association, leading research
15	institutes around the country and a whole variety of
16	aquaculture companies and entrepreneurs.
17	What's still missing are letters of
18	support from some environmental groups and from some
19	in the fishing community. But everyone needs to be
20	around this table together if we're going to move
21	forward with this.
22	One of the questions I get asked often
23	is, Okay, if we have a \$50 million aquaculture
24	program, what do we get? What does this buy us?
25	Secretary Gutierrez's office has been
26	calling me several times over the past two weeks

Τ	saying, can we get a million tons of production in
2	ten years, not 20 years? What would it take? Well,
3	China took our scallop technology. Look at China.
4	They're producing a million metric tons of scallops
5	in ten years.
6	Two little countries, Norway and Chile,
7	produce over a million metric tons of salmon. We've
8	got a whole variety of species available to us. You
9	know, this is possible. We've talked a bit about
10	some of the opportunities. Certainly some parts of
11	the country I'm going to be in Alabama and
12	Mississippi for a week in August talking to state
13	fisheries directors, to boat owners, to processing
14	facilities, to feed mills about, you know, off-
15	bottom oyster culture, about employing fishermen to
16	plant marsh grasses, about pilot projects for
17	offshore aquaculture. All these groups want to be
18	involved.
19	The sliving industry has really been at
20	the front of the food and nutrition aspects of
21	aquaculture. They've convened several brainstorming
22	sessions around the country to talk about what do
23	they call it? plant-based feeds for aquaculture.
24	We could have a similar group for algaes or for
25	other kinds of foodstuffs. As aquaculture grows,
26	we're going to need a diversity of supplies and it's

1	really a question of price. If you continue to fish
2	a hundred percent grain diet, it may not be the best
3	thing in terms of human nutrition, you may want
4	those oils that come from fish or from algaes, but
5	it's really just a question of price at this point.
6	Food supply and security. What happens
7	when Asia doesn't export all of its seafood to us
8	anymore and they consume it at home? How can we do
9	this in an ecosystem context? I think we can.
10	Another result I think will be expansion
11	of this research and development and expansion
12	network.
13	So over the next couple of days, I very
14	much look forward to listening and talking with all
15	of you about this and getting your ideas of whether
16	we're on the right track or not, what's missing.
17	Please don't be shy. Please be critical. Because
18	we need to sort through all of these things.
19	I just was going to conclude by just
20	giving you an update on the offshore legislation
21	since there were a couple of questions about that.
22	And as Michael said, offshore is and I think as
23	his presentation tried to show offshore is just
24	one small part of a broad-based program that we're
25	trying to develop but it's one that's gotten a lot
26	of attention recently because it's new.

1	The legislation's been introduced in the
2	Senate a year ago. The hurricanes have kind of
3	delayed everything for nine months or a year really
4	in terms of committee hearings' interest and
5	whatnot. So it was introduced in the Senate by
6	Senators Stevens and Inouye as a favor to the
7	Administration. Those two Senators and some others
8	also offered some amendments to the bill, the
9	primary one of which is a so-called up-down
10	amendment where I say the State of Alaska, if they
11	didn't want to have finfish aquaculture in state
12	waters in federal waters off of their state could
13	say, No, we don't want to be part of this program.
14	The Senate has held two hearings on it.
15	The other major issue that has come out, other than
16	the state coordination, is to work on the bill in
17	terms of the environmental standards of the bill.
18	The environmental requirements were kind of
19	sprinkled around the bill. They weren't well
20	understood by some stakeholders. So we've worked
21	with the Senate Commerce Committee on drafting
22	language that would clarify the environmental
23	section to the bill and I think we respond it
24	does respond and a version of that will be if
25	it's not already floating around, it will soon be
26	out which responds I think to most of the concerns.

1	So we've really done a lot of work on
2	the bill that should satisfy the state opt-out as
3	well as all the environmental areas. And I'd like
4	to think that we're at the point now where not only
5	the seafood and aquaculture communities but the rest
6	of the groups interested in aquaculture could
7	support this bill so that we can move ahead.
8	On the House side, there are a number of
9	representatives who are interested. It's been a
10	busy year. I think, as Bill said in his opening
11	remarks, I think the best we can hope for this year
12	would be for the Senate to mark up a bill, at least
13	to come up with its own version of the bill, to find
14	some House sponsors, and then to reintroduce the
15	bill in January, the next session.
16	But the hard work in some ways has been
17	done. We've worked at the staff level to work out
18	the bugs in the bill to the point where it could go
19	a lot quicker.
20	And let me stop there and answer
21	questions.
22	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Mike. That
23	was good. Incidentally, the testimony of Tim Keeney
24	and Dr. Hogarth at those two Senate hearings that
25	Mike mentioned is in your binders here. But are
26	there any questions for Mike?

1	MR. RAYBURN: So what's the process on
2	the environmental aspects of the legislation, the
3	process that of getting that out for public
4	review and see whether or not it has any merit? Is
5	that going to be done from the committee level?
6	MR. RUBINO: At this point, it's up to
7	Congress. The Administration's provided a
8	framework, a draft bill to Congress. Now it's
9	really up to Congress to do what they want to do
10	with it. So
11	MR. RAYBURN: But you said you've given
12	some language on the environmental
13	MR. RUBINO: Well, responding to the
14	committee requests, NOAA can now work with, as sort
15	of a technical expert, to provide information to
16	Congress. So we've done that. We've worked with
17	the Senate Commerce Committee with their
18	subcommittee on language that looks things that
19	were provided by the Ocean Conservancy, by the Task
20	Force on Marine Aquaculture, and some other
21	recommendations to make sure that there's a clear
22	section in the bill that says, you know, as you
23	develop the regulatory process and before you issue
24	a permit, thou shall consider the following things.
25	And it's the same list that you and I
26	would come up with. There's no mystery to any of

NEAL R. GROSS

2	MR. RAYBURN: And the senator from
3	California, is she comfortable with that or do you
4	know yet?
5	MR. RUBINO: Senator Boxer's staff has
6	been involved in the discussions.
7	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Bill.
8	MR. RUBINO: So it wouldn't be very much
9	different from the kinds of things that are in the
10	California bill, if that's what you're asking. In
11	the California bill, there's nothing new. It just
12	reflected what's already on the books in many states
13	around the country if you look at Maine, Washington,
14	Florida, Texas. They've had aquaculture regulations
15	in place for a long time. In terms of what we would
16	do with federal waters, you know, we really would
17	start with those state models as well as models from
18	Canada, Australia, Norway, and other places.
19	When you look at these, they all start
20	looking the same after a while. They really when
21	you and we learned a lot from salmon, from
22	shrimp, from catfish about what to do, what not to
23	do, best management practices. All of these various
24	environmental and stakeholder issues. I'd like to
25	think we can build on that knowledge, go through a -
26	- you know, if Congress passes the bill, we'll

the list.

1

1	provide a straw dog and then we'll go through a
2	stakeholder-intensive review process and a Federal
3	Register noted process that hopefully will only take
4	two years to actually come up with regulations that,
5	you know, states, fishery management councils, and
6	all the coastal communities can be proud of.
7	MR. DEWEY: A comment and a question for
8	Michael. From a comment standpoint, I just wanted
9	to say that one of the hats I wear is I'm on the
10	board of directors of the National Aquaculture
11	Association. Another hat I've been wearing for the
12	last year-plus is I've been on this little funded
13	Marine Aquaculture Task Force that Michael
14	referenced.
15	And in both cases, I just want to say I
16	appreciate Michael's efforts to do outreach with
17	those groups and supply information. It's been very
18	beneficial, I think a two-way exchange to hear what
19	our concerns are but also to understand where the
20	Administration's coming from.
21	Question for you, Michael, is on your
22	five regional aquaculture centers of excellence, I
23	just am curious to hear more of your thinking on
24	that and what you envision. I'm a little concerned
25	I don't want to see overlap with the USDA's
26	regional aquaculture centers and any kind of turf

1	issues evolving because of that. Were those the
2	USDA centers are really more administrative and
3	virtual centers than fund research through the
4	different universities in the five regions.
5	Are you envisioning something different
6	where you actually have facilities that are doing
7	NOAA is doing NOAA scientists are doing research
8	in these
9	MR. RUBINO: Well, a couple things. Let
10	me say that also over the past year and a half, we
11	have done quite a bit of work to foster a close
12	working relationship with USDA's Aquaculture Program
13	at the staff level. There's something called a
14	Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture which is the
15	federal coordinating committee on aquaculture and
16	working through that we're in close touch on things
17	like trying to put together a national research
18	plan, to dust off one that was drafted five years
19	ago. There's limited federal dollars going to
20	aquaculture. We need to be careful that we're not
21	tripping over each other, that we work in areas
22	where we have a competitive advantage and where
23	stakeholders would like us to work.
24	So anything that NOAA does going forward
25	would be closely coordinated with the USDA and
26	existing USDA activities.

1	This is an idea. What model it actually
2	comes out of, is this based around sort of
3	hatcheries, is it based around public/private
4	partnerships between some of these research
5	institutes that currently get earmarks, and some
6	NOAA labs and some industry associations? I think
7	this is something that has to be worked out.
8	But this idea of having to rely on year
9	to year money and playing the earmark game is not
10	necessarily the best one if we want if we have
11	these ambitious objectives. And if we could have
12	and this has been suggested by a number of these
13	institutions that have been the beneficiaries of
14	these earmarks that they would be happy to
15	participate in a system where every five years we've
16	got to pull together partners and compete with
17	against somebody else to get your selected money.
18	It would then have greater buy-in from local and
19	regional communities as well. But this is
20	something we have to work on.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Steve.
22	MR. JONER: I also have a comment and a
23	question. You mentioned University of New Hampshire
24	and their approach to this and Mikah McCarty and I
25	were there just a couple years ago and I was very
26	impressed with the way they are dealing with the

1	industry and I'm kind of rusty on their mission
2	statement for the state agency and the university,
3	but it was essentially to use aquaculture to
4	supplement the wild harvest in order to have
5	sustainable fishing economies and, you know, we saw
6	that opportunity starting back around '98 or so when
7	we started on this black cod sago fish aquaculture
8	with Mike. And the reaction by just the Makah
9	fishermen was some of the fishermen were absolutely
10	opposed to it because of what had happened with
11	Atlantic salmon and they said, We don't want to see
12	this happen. Stop what you're doing. There are
13	other fishermen who saw the future of it and when
14	Mike was running low on funds, one of the Makah
15	fishermen actually wrote a check for \$10,000 to help
16	support our ongoing research just out of his own
17	pocket because he wanted to see it go forward.
18	At about that same time, I guess it was
19	Penny Dalton was that her name?
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Could have been.
21	MR. JONER: she came out to
22	Manchester and we talked about it and her question
23	was, What about the industry? Do they support this?
24	And our answer was, Well, we would like the industry
25	to be the primary participants, the fishing
26	industry, but you need we need the outreach, we

1	need a demonstration project.
2	And every year when I walk into the
3	Halibut Commission meeting, I'm always jumped by two
4	or three fishermen who are afraid that I'm going to
5	destroy their fishery by this plot to take over the
6	worldwide production market of sago fish. I
7	wouldn't mind if I could, but I doubt I'll be able
8	to do that.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Two or three.
.0	MR. JONER: Well, I'd run and hide by
.1	then. So I get nervous when I see you 'cause I
_2	think all that gang is with you.
.3	(Laughter.)
.4	MR. JONER: So well, anyway, you
.5	know, to me it's a question of maintaining making
.6	it sustainable and, you know, fishermen are content
.7	to beat each other's brains out over fighting over a
.8	handful of fish, but you bring up some new idea like
L9	this and they don't want to deal with it.
20	So I look on there I don't know
21	maybe it's Kate Naughten's responsibility, but
22	somewhere there's a golden opportunity here on the
23	West Coast to jump in to a community you know,
24	somewhere where they have the infrastructure, the
25	boats, the people, there are a few processing plants
26	left, and use this as a way to supplement the wild

1	capturing.
2	And do you have do you have something
3	in mind for that? Is there a demonstration project
4	in mind or are you looking for one?
5	MR. RUBINO: I guess I would turn the
6	question around. Aquaculture's a technology. It
7	can be used for a variety of purposes. And you've
8	heard about many of those different purposes here
9	today. You know, how you go about it in your
10	community, in your state, in your region is really
11	up to you.
12	As a federal program, we have trust
13	responsibilities under federal laws, but we're also
14	a resource. So we're happy to work with you as a
15	resource to work in directions that you would like
16	to go in.
17	You know, in some parts of the country,
18	aquaculture's going to be used to complement
19	commercial fishing; in some places, it's just going
20	to go off on its own and be in its own world. But
21	the synergies between aquaculture and fishing are so
22	strong because of seafood and because of the
23	hatchery technologies that really it almost has to -
24	- but how this gets worked out is going to depend.
25	Each region's going to do it differently.
26	But I think your idea of starting with

1	prior demonstration projects is really a moder that
2	has been shown to work in a lot of places in the
3	country. You know, if you go to Florida where they
4	put down the same fishing, there are whole parts of
5	Florida that have converted to clam farming and
6	they're doing so well they don't want anybody to
7	know about it.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Frank oh, sorry.
9	Frank had a comment.
10	MR. LOCKHART: Just a follow-up of what
11	Steve said. When I was sitting at the table at the
12	April council meeting on climate, where we did shut
13	down a lot of the salmon fishing on the coast, the
14	number one comment that fishermen would come up to
15	me during the breaks and talk about was not salmon
16	fishing per se; it was about aquaculture. The nicer
17	ones would say, So is NOAA's goal just to kind of
18	put fishermen out of business and supplant it with
19	aquaculture? And the somewhat not so nice people
20	just concluded that that was, obviously, what was
21	going on, that and NMFS was had a goal to put all
22	commercial fishermen or at least salmon fishermen or
23	the West Coast out of business and supplant it with
24	aquaculture.
25	So I would say Kate Naughten has her
26	hands full on outreach on the West Coast, at least.

1	And the one thing that's not getting out
2	there is the enhancement part of it, but that's
3	how that plays a role. Everyone just assumes the
4	aquaculture bill is nothing but putting fishermen
5	out of business, so
6	MR. RUBINO: I would say that you, as a
7	deputy regional administrator, have your hands full
8	as well.
9	MR. LOCKHART: Yes. Oh, I agree, yeah.
10	And believe me, when they told me about this
11	MR. RUBINO: This is a NOAA-wide
12	initiative.
13	MR. LOCKHART: Yeah. Yeah.
14	MR. RUBINO: And one of our biggest
15	challenges is working with other parts of NOAA and
16	educating NOAA on the complexities of this issue and
17	the breadth of this issue, and aquaculture and the
18	kind of aquaculture program we'd like to have cuts
19	across all these various dimensions of aquaculture,
20	from using it as a technique to protect your
21	resources and species restoration to, you know, half
22	of Alaska's salmon fishery depends upon hatcheries.
23	You know, the oyster industry in the
24	East Coast and the West Coast and Louisiana depends
25	upon hatcheries.
26	Two newer forms of aquaculture that may

26

1	or may not fit with what's going on. In some cases,
2	yes, it's going to compete. In some cases, it can
3	complement. But the real competition is coming from
4	where?
5	MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Overseas.
6	MR. RUBINO: If you don't do
7	aquaculture, it's going to come from overseas, where
8	it's already coming from, and it's going to come
9	from other forms of protein. Look at center of the
10	plate beef, pork, chicken. So you know, so
11	the challenge for us is do we want to take advantage
12	of this technology or do we want to just keep
13	importing?
14	MR. LOCKHART: Yeah. I was just saying
15	that there is a strong impression out there
16	MR. RUBINO: Oh, and it's and it's
17	MR. LOCKHART: about that, and I just
18	wanted to correct one thing. I'm not the deputy.
19	I'm the Assistant Regional Administrator. That's a
20	big difference believe me.
21	MR. JONER: Well, Joe's leaving.
22	MR. LOCKHART: Yeah.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ken Roberts is next.
24	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25	Mike, I've just been informed you will be present
26	Wednesday morning when the Commerce Committee meets?

1	MR. RUBINO: Yes.
2	MR. ROBERTS: Okay. So I've got a list
3	of questions but I'm going to go to one now. Just
4	conceptually, rather than having an opt-out
5	provision, why not have an opt-in provision where
6	the "in" includes a number of benefits? You'll
7	receive support at the university for ten years to
8	build marine hatchery technology and juvenile
9	technology, etc.
10	And those are just a couple of things
11	I've been thinking about, but rather than opt out,
12	think about opting in and making it competitive to
13	get in because they're going to be assistance-type
14	things related to being in.
15	And particularly you know, I know we
16	all deal with the regional aquaculture centers, and
17	you're right; they do submit proposals the
18	universities in the regions submit proposals. But
19	offshore aquacultures are much bigger undertakings
20	for a university.
21	Like me, I've been working four years
22	now on getting something to capital outlay in the
23	state legislature to build something, and it's an
24	extremely enticing thing to have something
25	forthcoming if you were one of those that opted in
26	and competitively received monies to build

1	infrastructure 'cause the infrastructure's the
2	expensive thing and the time-consuming thing.
3	I just ask that. That's kind of a
4	contrarian viewpoint of opting out versus opting in,
5	but it seems to me opting in is a positive as
6	opposed to opting out being a negative.
7	MR. RUBINO: It's a good idea. I can
8	give you the name of the staff person that's in the
9	Commerce Committee who's working on this.
10	MR. ROBERTS: I'm sure they won't like
11	my comments, but
12	MR. RUBINO: No. I think
13	everything's still on the table at this point. You
14	know how Congress is. And, as I said, the
15	Administration's bill is just a starting point and
16	it's one that went through this interagency review
17	process and in some ways a lot of good ideas get
18	axed in that review process. So now's the time to
19	get those ideas back in again.
20	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think that's a
21	great idea. Not that you end up there, but to think
22	about that.
23	MS. BRYANT: And that's the value of
24	this committee, too, because you can get those
25	things in materials that can go outside the system.
26	MR. RUBINO: Correct. You guys can go

1	talk to your Congressmen and Senators.
2	MS. BRYANT: That's right.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: John Forster was
4	next.
5	MR. FORSTER: I'd like to comment a
6	little bit in terms of sort of the things the
7	words that were being used just now complement
8	commercial fishing, supplement commercial fishing
9	and how do you relate that to the one million or two
10	million ton deficit? It just seems to me that when
11	we look at our commercial fisheries and we look at
12	whatever it is, 50,000 tons of halibut, maybe 30,000
13	tons of black cod, the deficit for two million tons
14	is huge.
15	And if we really were going to do
16	anything about aquaculture, at least at that level,
17	then it is not going to be a complement or a
18	supplement to; it's going to be a whole new
19	activity. Good or bad.
20	But I think sometime we need to sort of
21	address the scale of what that number really means.
22	MR. RUBINO: Well, I think you're right
23	and I think the challenge is can we use the existing
24	seafood infrastructure
25	MR. FORSTER: Yeah.
26	MR. RUBINO: of commercial fishing of

1	boats, docks, processing, cold storage, marketing to
2	harvest seafood in a different way? That's right,
3	because there are not enough fish out there to
4	catch. We can do some work through enhancement to
5	supplement and we need to do a lot more work in
6	terms of the efficiency, the effectiveness. As Mike
7	said, there's been precious little done on that
8	field. That's a field that's ripe for a lot of
9	work. But we know we can grow fish and shellfish.
10	We can do it in coastal waters but, you know, I was
11	down in Tidewater, Virginia as I said, we spent a
12	lot of the year just going around just listening.
13	You can put a crab pod anywhere you want to in the
14	Chesapeake Bay pretty much a cage, a line, and a
15	buoy. If you want to restore oysters in the
16	Chesapeake Bay for all of the filter feeder reasons,
17	for commercial reasons, for aquaculture reasons, to
18	put that same cage in the bay with oysters in it
19	with a line and a buoy, you need all kinds of
20	permits. It can take you forever and you may not
21	get it. Do you know who the biggest opponents are,
22	I'm told?
23	MS. TOOLEY: Crab fishing.
24	MR. RUBINO: Hmm?
25	MS. TOOLEY: Crab fishing?
26	MR. RUBINO: Nope. Not fishermen. It's

2	second homes and vacation homes and retirement homes
3	are so high, they don't want to see more buoys.
4	They're afraid that their boats are going to scrape
5	on the bottom of these things.
6	So we you know, we're a very rich
7	country, we value our recreation and tourism. We've
8	got crowded coastlines. So, you know, do we go to
9	urban aquaculture with buoys and tanks? Which is
10	very expensive to do but someone's going to crack it
11	and figure out how to do it. Does Alaska want to
12	get into the game of coastal aquaculture more than
13	just shellfish and using hatcheries? Do we want to
14	go to offshore? Or do we somehow find stock
15	enhancement that works with certain species where
16	you could you know, a few weeks ago in the $\underline{\text{New}}$
17	York Times, there was an article Time magazine,
18	there was an article about cod, which you might want
19	to read. The guy didn't get everything right, but
20	it wasn't bad. You know, cod was this big romantic
21	thing of the North Atlantic, generations and
22	generations of fishermen. It's crashed. The
23	article was really about what are the management
24	options? A 20-year moratorium to rebuild stocks,
25	stock enhancement, aquaculture and nets, or some
26	combination of the three, and how do coastal

Coastal Real Estate Associations. Land values for

1

1	communities play into that?
2	That's just one example of many that
3	we're dealing with. So sorting this out is not
4	going to be easy. Anyway, I should stop talking and
5	take more questions.
6	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Mary Beth was next.
7	MS. TOOLEY: I think my question was
8	already covered.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Catherine.
10	MS. FOY: Well, this has been partially
11	covered. Catherine Foy, for the record.
12	John addressed the different views that
13	commercial fishermen have of aquaculture. But I
14	felt that he left out a point. Commercial fishermer
15	in Alaska, particularly, don't just view aquaculture
16	as a side industry. They view it as a direct
17	competitors to their wild stock. Even if it is not
18	same species, the pollock fishermen are becoming
19	increasingly concerned about tilapia farming. Yeah.
20	Because it's a whitefish.
21	How are you going to combat that ground
22	swell of very politically powerful
23	MR. RUBINO: Well, I think collectively
24	we have to answer that if we want to do finfish
25	aquaculture in this country. As you say, Alaska
26	uses aquaculture for shellfish, uses aquaculture for

1	hatcheries. Yes, Alaska fishermen have been hurt by
2	imports. Shrimp fishermen in the Gulf have been
3	hurt by imports. Big time.
4	But we are in a global marketplace and
5	that competition's not going to go away and, as John
6	Forster likes to point out, any new production is
7	competition. But that competition's going to come
8	from somewhere.
9	MS. FOY: True.
10	MR. RUBINO: So how do you deal with
11	that? How do you you know, how can we provide
12	economic opportunities for coastal communities? And
13	there are parts of the country maybe not Alaska -
14	- if you go to the Gulf or you go to New England,
15	they're looking for something to deal with their
16	resources. They need more seafood that comes from
17	those facilities.
18	So, as I said, it's not a one size fits
19	all.
20	MS. FOY: Right.
21	MR. RUBINO: And long term all the
22	market projections are we're going to need a lot.
23	Short term, there's always competition. So some of
24	it is a short term versus a long term thing.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Tom.
26	MR. BILLY: Your last comment was to the

1	point I was gonna raise. A couple of years ago,
2	when the advisory committee to the Departments of
3	Health and Human Services and Agriculture reviewed
4	the current nutrition policy of the country at that
5	time, the advisors came up with a recommendation
6	that there be an increase in per capita consumption
7	of seafood in the United States by a factor of two.
8	So your one or two million metric tons
9	isn't what they were thinking of. It's your six
10	million metric tons additional. Unfortunately, at
11	least from the perspective of human health, that
12	wasn't adopted by the policymakers that took that
13	advice in those two departments a year or so ago.
14	But I've been monitoring that and it's
15	pretty clear to me that not only is that
16	recommendation going to be repeated, but it's
17	probably going to be increased. That doubling per
18	capita consumption from a human health perspective
19	isn't enough. It needs to be greater than that.
20	So it would seem to me that we need to
21	be careful not setting our sights too low. And I'm
22	not arguing for all that needs to come from
23	aquaculture or anyplace else. I'm just saying
24	there's going to be a huge driving force to find the
25	source of that kind of supply. And if it happens in
26	the United States, it's also going to happen in

1	other at least developed countries around the world.
2	So I think it's in that context or in
3	that perspective that we need to think about this
4	whole area as well.
5	MR. RUBINO: Who's one of the largest
6	consumers of U.S. soybeans? Chinese aquaculture.
7	U.S. Soybean Industry Association is doing all kinds
8	of work in China. They'd love to sell more soybeans
9	here, but they're not waiting.
10	We consume huge amounts of sushi tuna
11	here. We've got sardine fishermen in California who
12	are catching sardines under our managed system,
13	freezing them in large vats and shipping them from
14	Australia into Mexico where they're dumped in the
15	tuna ranching operations. And they're saying, Why
16	can't we do that there?
17	So, I mean, the examples are you
18	know, there are many, many, many examples.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ralph.
20	MR. RAYBURN: I was curious. You know,
21	it seems like in the time frame that you're talking
22	about, and, you know, what the MAFAC is supposed to
23	be about, advising the Secretary and all of that,
24	you've got what? two years left in this
25	Administration. There will be a change. Is there
26	something that can be done beyond the ten-year, you

1	know, plan, or is that where we should be focused as
2	far as somewhat institutionalizing or building some
3	momentum for our offshore aquaculture, NOAA
4	Fisheries aquaculture, whatever, so there will be
5	some carryover, you know, to the next
6	Administration, the next Secretary realizing, you
7	know, the focus that they'll always have on trade
8	and deficits and all that kind of stuff? Is that the
9	focus issues they probably don't care about.
10	Deficits, they you know, it's always going to
11	ring true, I would suspect, to some Secretary of
12	Commerce.
13	In the process of developing a ten-year
14	plan, you know, have you thought about how you can
15	somewhat institutionalize that vision within
16	commerce if this is an area that really has
17	commercial application at the Secretarial level for
18	a reduction in the deficit, and is that integrated
19	into this ten-year plan as we see it now?
20	MR. RUBINO: Well, certainly I would
21	hope that this ten-year plan gets to the Secretary's
22	desk with some recommendations from MAFAC. I think
23	that would carry quite a bit of weight, given who's
24	sitting around this table.
25	It's a non-partisan issue. We're all
26	still going to be around, no matter who the next

Τ	Administration is or somebody eise will.
2	MR. RAYBURN: And you see that your
3	preparing in this ten-year plan is something that
4	will create that focused momentum or whatever that
5	will carry over?
6	MR. RUBINO: See, even if we wanted to
7	do this tomorrow, I think that we're talking about a
8	50-year time lapse, certainly a 20-year time lapse,
9	given the amount of time it takes to get these
10	things into place, just in terms of capital
11	construction, in terms of pilot projects, working
12	through the regional bugs that you've got to work
13	through.
14	But, you know, we've done it with other
15	parts of our agricultural industry. We've done it
16	with aquaculture products. Look at catfish. That
17	was a conscious decision by a group of states to go
18	from one form of agriculture to another.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: This has been a
20	really good discussion. Both presentations were
21	good and there were lots of questions. We have time
22	to continue this under the subcommittee structure
23	when they do that tomorrow morning or however that
24	works out.
25	So thanks to both the Michaels.
26	Appreciate what you've done here.

1	Let's see. We've got lunch was
2	originally scheduled for an hour and 15 minutes; is
3	that right?
4	MS. BRYANT: It's 12:30 now. Do you
5	want to come back at 1:00 I mean,
6	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: One? I don't think
7	so.
8	MS. BRYANT: I mean, not 1:00 I
9	didn't mean that I meant
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Can we do it in an
11	hour?
12	(Pause.)
13	(Lunch recess from 12:37 p.m., until 2:04
14	p.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	AFTERNOON SESSION
7	000
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks for coming
9	back. It took a little bit longer to get the meals
10	paid for than we anticipated, so we ran a little
11	bit over, but we'll go through this afternoon.
12	Our first agenda item is about the
13	"FishWatch" web page development. Rachel Butzler
14	is here to go through that.
15	Chris Moore it's sort of under his
16	division so, Chris, can you introduce this topic?
17	MR. MOORE: Actually, I talked to
18	Laurel. Laurel's going to do it.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: This Laurel?
20	MR. MOORE: Yeah, that Laurel.
21	MS. BRYANT: There's so many in the
22	room.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: We can't
24	communicate because we're too far apart.
25	Do you want to introduce this?
26	MS. BRYANT: Sure. I just want to say

1	that this is something that there's some history
2	with MAFAC on this. But we've got so many new
3	members I don't know, other than Randy and Larry
4	and perhaps Vince, would be familiar with that
5	history.
6	This has been a concept that we came up
7	with following certainly my experience in
8	Legislative Affairs. A lot of the issues that
9	we've kind of touched on, in and around, and NOAA's
10	inability to really synthesize very complex
11	information in a way that makes sense to your
12	average consumer, in a way that they can both care
13	about, in a way that they can understand integrated
14	to their daily lives, etc., and one of our favorite
15	documents is the status of stocks document. Those
16	of us with history like to call it SOS, as in
17	"help," or the "spank me" document because the way
18	it's always presented is information that's very
19	confusing, it becomes a hammer that you get beat
20	over the head with constantly, and we never
21	leverage from one year to the next any progress or
22	any change in environment.
23	That was the genesis of this idea, and
24	this is a Web-based consumer page to essentially be
25	able to begin to build on that kind of
26	understanding status of stocks, is it okay to

1	consume fish that you find available in your
2	grocery store, explain the management process, and
3	be able to grow it and develop it from that.
4	So it's been going a long time. MAFAC
5	wrote off on it originally in 2000, recommended it
6	go forward. That eventually ended up in the
7	National Academy of Public Administration report
8	and review. And so there's some history, and we
9	were really lucky to get Rachel Butzler this year
10	from Texas A&M to take it and she has taken this
11	and she has run with it. And so without further
12	ado, take it away.
13	MS. BUTZLER: Thank you. I think
14	Laurel almost said it all. Thank you for letting
15	me speak to you today. I'm doing a year-long
16	fellowship with what used to be the Office of
17	Constituent Services but now I'm under Chris Moore
18	and Partnerships and Communications.
19	And the main thing I've been working on
20	is this website called "FishWatch." I gave
21	everybody a handout and I apologize that the
22	writing is so small on the handout, but it's really
23	more for you to take notes next to specific slides
24	that you want to or questions or comments that you
25	might want to write down.
26	So the objectives of I'll probably

1	talk for about 15 minutes, so I want to present
2	FishWatch to you, get your initial feedback, and
3	then a strategy to move forward. I'm really hoping
4	to get more extensive feedback from MAFAC in the
5	future.
6	So our assignment NOAA Fisheries is
7	the nation's authority on domestic fishing and,
8	like Laurel said, we don't have a real concise way
9	to get this information out to the public. So our
10	assignment is to share this information. And, like
11	she said, other different organizations have
12	suggested some kind of method to get our
13	information out, like the public education page.
14	MAFAC itself requested a Web offering
15	on seafood choices in 2000. The National Fisheries
16	Institute has requested that NOAA provide science-
17	based information to prevent mis-information out
18	there from other organizations. And the U.S.
19	Commission on Ocean Policies has a call for ocean
20	literacy.
21	And then if you go online to Google and
22	request a quick Web search on "seafood choices" or
23	"fish guides," out of the first three pages,
24	nowhere at all does NOAA Fisheries come up. So I
25	think that's pretty important. We should be
26	providing this kind of information to the public.

1	50, Dasically, what we want Fishwatch
2	to do is to demonstrate how NOAA Fisheries is
3	actively managing our fisheries through science-
4	based management, but really what we want to stress
5	is that we manage our fisheries based on the
6	science and the data we collect. So our target
7	users are people who are concerned about
8	sustainability of the ocean.
9	Second, other target users may be your
10	conscientious consumer who's looking for concise
11	information about seafood. And basically people
12	just looking for the authority on seafood. There
13	are so many different organizations out there
14	saying, "Eat this. Don't eat this. Avoid this."
15	But we really need NOAA Fisheries needs to be
16	the authority on seafood.
17	So the themes behind this Web page are,
18	like I said, authoritative. That's kind of the big
19	thing behind this, is we want people to look to
20	NOAA for this information.
21	This website is going to support NOAA's
22	vision of an informed society and it's going to
23	show that we are actively managing our resources;
24	we're not just standing there and letting things
25	happen. We are making an effort to really manage
26	our oceans for sustainability.

1	The principles behind this site, we
2	cannot make recommendations but we can promote
3	informed decision-making, so we can give the
4	information to the public and then they can kind of
5	make their decisions from this information that we
6	give them. We want NMFS and NOAA to be a trusted
7	source of information. We cannot provide
8	decisions, so we should be a trusted source of
9	information.
10	This part is challenging, engaging,
11	easy-to-follow, and informative. With all this
12	technical information, it's been a big challenge to
13	try and figure out how to present this in an
14	engaging manner where people want to keep on
15	reading or finding out more information about
16	fisheries management.
17	This will this will pass approval by
18	the appropriate fisheries offices. We have all the
19	experts in fisheries, so we need to get their okay
20	on anything that we present. And any data that we
21	present, it will be presented transparently. So if
22	we want to talk about the swordfish stock
23	recovering, we want to have a chart that shows
24	biomass and we want to be able to say, Oh, look,
25	this biomass is recovering. So we want to show
26	people; we don't just want to say it's recovering.

1	We want to be able to show them the charts that
2	shows the biomass is recovering.
3	And the scope and strategy, this is
4	going to be kind of a supplemental or a visual
5	presentation of what NOAA does. We're not
6	proposing that we do any more research or anything.
7	All this research and data and reports are already
8	out there, but status of stocks is presented over
9	here, landing data landings data is over here,
10	research is done at the various centers across the
11	country. So this is kind of just to summarize it
12	all in one place so they will have a little chart
13	that says, This stock is not overfished and it has
14	recovered from this year, and then they can read a
15	little bit about the species itself, the light
16	history or different management practices that
17	helped this fish recover and that kind of thing.
18	So it's just presenting all in one place so people
19	can get a more complete picture of fisheries
20	management.
21	We want to start with the more common
22	grocery store species just 'cause this is what
23	people are pretty much interested in, but we will
24	expand as FishWatch matures and as more data
25	becomes available and we can present this data to
26	every single fishery that NOAA studies.

1	So this is kind of just a conceptual
2	model or a sample of kind of what we're thinking.
3	This would be the FishWatch main page and we can
4	have some text here that kind of just shows, you
5	know, what is FishWatch. Are you concerned about
6	the oceans? This is the kind of information that
7	we're presenting.
8	And then I'll have various links so
9	that the most important thing is that we'll have
10	our fisheries listed on this main page so if people
11	want to find out more information about swordfish,
12	they can just click on the swordfish link and then
13	that will show up.
14	We'll have lots of other information
15	that people can just click around to find out more
16	information on fisheries management. We'll have a
17	status of stocks link. We'll have a fisheries
18	management link that kind of explains what
19	fisheries management is. We'll have definitions,
20	related links.
21	And then on the bottom, we'll have
22	other links about history, landing data, biomass,
23	just how all this information fits together into
24	the big picture of fisheries management.
25	This is a sample of our fishery page,
26	so I just picked swordfish So we'd start you

1	know, we'd try to have pictures to make it more
2	engaging and just more interesting to look at than
3	just text. We can talk about the management. This
4	would be a brief summary of the management up here.
5	And then here's the stock status. That would come
6	directly from the status of stocks report. Here we
7	can present data like biomass landings and biomass
8	and, once again, this comes this is already
9	existing data, so it's just collecting all this
10	data and presenting it so they can look at the
11	species and understand the management of the
12	species.
13	This is just for has landing data
14	and then this is like history where they can learn
15	more about the fish itself and why is it
16	recovering, why isn't it recovering, just kind of
17	information about the fish.
18	And then there's plenty of room for
19	supplemental information. So if we present a chart
20	and our scientists decide that they need to explain
21	a whole lot more about that chart, there's so much
22	room for all this other information that we can put
23	in there.
24	And then kind of the architecture of
25	the website. Up in the far left, we just have the
26	home page. And then directly from that home page,

1	you can get your fisheries page. And that's the
2	important part of this is the fisheries page
3	itself.
4	Then we have all this supporting
5	information about life history, about biomass,
6	glossary, and any supplemental pages that we need
7	to have.
8	The timeline for this I'm only here
9	for a year, so I'm here to get it started, but
10	we're really trying to come up with a good strategy
11	or a good methodology so that this will continue
12	even after I leave.
13	We're working on the prototype right
14	now because this is just three species and, let's
15	see, our so we're working on the content and the
16	design and we're going to do an internal review in
17	NOAA and we're hoping to use MAFAC as an external
18	review just for these three species prototypes and
19	we're hoping to do this in about September or
20	October.
21	Once we incorporate our internal
22	comments and our external comments, we're hoping to
23	have a slightly larger version, a 15- to 20-species
24	by January 2007.
25	So, like I said, right now we're
26	working on the development of content. And one of

1	the the most important thing we're working on
2	right now is a good methodology because I think the
3	success of the site really depends on getting
4	people interested in this, figuring out how we get
5	the content approved, how to move forward once we
6	pick our species. So we're relying on the
7	expertise of our officers because we know
8	fisheries. You know, like I said, we're going to
9	use MAFAC we hope to use MAFAC as an external
10	review panel to get your feedback from it.
11	So, like I said, September or October
12	I'd like to contact you and we're going to have a
13	password-protected website and I will I'll give
14	you a form that has some more guided questions, but
15	we also want to get some kind of free-form feedback
16	and we'd like you to review both the content, the
17	language, the topics, is it helpful, do you think
18	people are interested in this, is it easy to
19	follow, and also just the layout I mean, just,
20	you know if you click here and you go here, does
21	that make sense. So those are kind of the things
22	that we're hoping to get feedback from you.
23	And so we're kind of working on a
24	like a this is the beginning of FishWatch. But
25	FishWatch really has potential to grow, so once we
26	get the methodology down, we could add ten to 20

1	fisheries a year. We'll be able to add additional
2	fisheries management, like aquaculture, habitat,
3	seafood and health. I know it's a really big
4	emerging issue, so we could just incorporate all
5	these issues of fisheries management that people
6	are interested in.
7	We'll right now, we're focusing on
8	domestic species, but we'll be able to we won't
9	be able to provide as much information as we do
10	about domestic species fisheries, but we can
11	provide information about imports and other non-
12	federally-managed species.
13	Recreational fisheries, too, we hope to
14	provide information about that.
15	And then, like I said before, we're
16	really focusing on getting an open line of
17	communication with our experts because, that way,
18	we can ensure that we're the most up-to-date
19	source. And once we establish that we're up to
20	date, we'll be even able to go further with things
21	like harmful algal blooms we mentioned some
22	other ones the other day things that
23	MS. BRYANT: El Nino, if you've got an
24	El Nino and it's impacting something all of a
25	sudden, it becomes in context but, right now, it's
26	separate information.

1	MS. BUTZLER: Right. So we can be the
2	most up-to-date source of information regarding
3	fisheries that there is.
4	So I will be contacting you but, if you
5	have any questions or ideas, I'd like to talk about
6	it now if we have time but also I've included my
7	contact information and my immediate supervisor's
8	contact information, too. So I look forward to any
9	comments or questions that anybody might have.
10	Yes?
11	MR. RAFTICAN: What's the address?
12	MS. BUTZLER: We don't have it yet, but
13	we're hoping it will be is it
14	FishWatch.NMFS.NOAA.gov?
15	MS. BRYANT: I think so. It will be a
16	beta site, so it's going to be a little bit
17	different, and the IT folks will get that provided.
18	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Pete.
19	MR. LEIPZIG: On your list of species,
20	I understand this is you're going to go through
21	a prototype of three species. But it struck me as
22	I was looking through it that it might be helpful
23	if you had it organized by area of the country.
24	There's so many common names. You may say rockfish
25	and I have one animal in mind and the East Coast
26	has striped bass, you know the list goes on.

1	It's just confusing. Snapper is another
2	MS. BUTZLER: I have a feeling that's
3	something that's going to come up in the review
4	panel, the best way to present it, but I'm hoping
5	that whatever way we present it on the main page,
6	we could also say by state or, you know, another
7	link view the species by what's recovered or
8	view the you know, view the species by all these
9	different ways. That's a good point.
10	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Another there's
11	been a variety of organizations that have had their
12	list of fish and they often urge people, Eat this
13	one or don't eat that one. And as I look at it,
14	it's sort of irritating on the don't eat ones where
15	they're managed and there's no reason that people
16	should avoid those. They should be eating them.
17	And sometimes they even have the wrong information.
18	I saw one recently where yellowtail rockfish, which
19	is a species on the West Coast that is in healthy
20	shape, was listed as one you should avoid. And
21	they just had it wrong.
22	And it would be nice if that could be
23	corrected here.
24	MS. BUTZLER: I think we actually had
25	this discussion the other day when I was speaking
26	to some people in Silver Spring, but where we have

1	the stock status, we want to have either a link or
2	a quick description that says, This is how we're
3	managing our fisheries. We have these ten
4	standards that we determine stock status of, and
5	they can kind of go to see that they're actively
6	being managed; granted, you know, it's not at a
7	hundred percent biomass but we are trying. And if
8	it's in the store, if it's federally managed, then
9	it's being managed. So we're we're going to try
10	and put that text in numerous places throughout so
11	that they know that domestic fisheries are managed
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: John.
13	MR. FORSTER: Yes. Really a follow-up
14	to what Peter just said. I'm conscious that not
15	everybody in the world thinks NOAA is the fount of
16	all wisdom on fisheries or even integrity, and
17	maybe that's sort of a back aquaculture and so,
18	I mean, how do you deal with that conflict, you
19	know? You want to sort of be the single source of
20	authority and communication.
21	And a suggestion. I mean, would there
22	be any way to make this interactive in some way or
23	at least to have a sort of continuing blog on the
24	side where people can actually lodge ideas and
25	comments?

MS. BUTZLER: We want to have a

26

1	"Frequently Asked Questions" page where they can
2	definitely submit that, but just to be able to
3	provide comments and questions, I'm sure we can set
4	up something that goes to the you know, a
5	generic e-mail that goes directly to whoever
6	happens to be the manager, so
7	MR. FORSTER: Thanks.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: To blog so other
9	people can see what somebody has said, there may be
10	technical problems
11	MR. FORSTER: Well, there are conflicts
12	of opinion out there on these things. There's no
13	such thing as authoritative subjects as far as I
14	can see.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Tom Billy was next.
16	MR. BILLY: The Food and Drug
17	Administration has something called the Fish List,
18	which represents what you can legally label a
19	species as. So whether you use it or not as your
20	source for your species, you ought to at least
21	reference it.
22	MS. BUTZLER: Right.
23	MR. DEWEY: Is there plans as it gets
24	developed and launched to do things like search
25	engine optimization and so on so that it does
26	become the hit. like if you Google "seafood." it

1	rises to the top of the list and
2	MS. BUTZLER: We would like to. I
3	don't know what the IT people think of that, but
4	it's definitely something that we're interested in.
5	MS. BRYANT: I know that we're trying
6	to actually that's something that has been
7	identified in fisheries and actually NOAA all
8	around. It's to try to improve that URL so that
9	there is a hit. And so that's something that
10	they're working on right now. I think we're
11	improved over what we used to be.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ken, did you have
13	your hand up? No.
14	MR. ROBERTS: Just a question that you
15	indicated you won't maybe be around. What
16	provisions have been made for placing the Webmaster
17	responsibilities within the NOAA office in
18	Washington? Who is actually going to maintain this
19	site, keep it upgraded? As you know, fisheries are
20	a very dynamic thing, all over the country,
21	different things happening. I mean, it's a big
22	challenge. And just assigning it to somebody who's
23	already fully employed might make it pretty weak
24	after a year or two, you know.
25	MS. BUTZLER: Right. We budget at
26	NOAA, we do five years in advance or, you know,

1	five-year increments, and we have we've been
2	working on getting it into the fiscal year budget
3	for the next four years but we're also working on
4	fiscal year '09 to '13. So we're definitely trying
5	to get it into the budget and we haven't identified
6	a specific person yet, but it's going to be we
7	need to figure out who's going to do it.
8	MR. ROBERTS: The only response that I
9	want to make is I have experience in administering
10	the communications unit that keeps our Content
11	Management System up, CMS system. The worst thing
12	that can happen to you is you put a lot of effort
13	into this thing to make a good presentation to the
14	public, because that's what your intention is, and
15	then have the thing melt away for lack of
16	attention.
17	Because it will convey to people just
18	the opposite of what you're intending to convey to
19	them as being an up-to-date, dynamic, conversive
20	organization. And if it's three months, five
21	months behind, people will quit using your site.
22	MS. BUTZLER: Yes.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Rachel will be
24	leaving but the responsibility will stay in Chris's
25	shop and so Chris is taking notes here, I'm sure.
26	MR. MOORE: Yes. I am.

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Let's see. I had
2	Ralph Rayburn.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah. I was not kind of
4	following this. And primarily what I'd like to try
5	to get the group to think about I weaseled my
6	way into that Wal-Mart meeting they had the end of
7	March where they brought all their major fisheries
8	suppliers together, and this was you know, this
9	was after they had announced a few months earlier
10	that the Wal-Mart in the next three to five years
11	were only going to buy fisheries products that are
12	certified sustainable, or something to that
13	either raw through MSC or aquaculture through the
14	aquaculture certification group.
15	And so what concerned me about that
16	meeting and it was just a day besides just being
17	there and seeing what they do, but I don't know
18	how to go about this, but it's like the
19	Government's authority over declaration that a
20	fishery is sustainable was being transferred to a
21	for-profit, non-profit, whatever group that
22	certifies other groups to come in and say whether
23	or not you should eat that fish or whether or not
24	you should buy that fish.
25	And so what this the Marine
26	Stewardship Council has done is got them a great

1	no offense, I mean, they've got the ball going, but
2	and you guys who are playing the world market
3	know better than I know they've got a good deal
4	going. And so if all of Wal-Mart's products have
5	to be certified through this group and then re-
6	certified and even now I've heard, you know,
7	just on side stuff, you know, the re-certification
8	process becomes even more onerous and it's like,
9	you know, they've got a captured situation here.
10	And so after that meeting and Rachel
11	was there and Michael Kelly was there and the fella
12	from the other NOAA person there was the guy that
13	does I guess the certification, the OC
14	certifications I can't remember his name but,
15	anyway and then, you know, all these others from
16	seafood suppliers and it and it somewhat
17	troubled me that there are fisheries in our
18	country, domestic wild fisheries, that will never
19	meet that certification process, I mean, because
20	just maybe because they're so loosely organized and
21	they're never going to pull it together to get
22	their act together to deal with an MSC type
23	certification.
24	So, you know, if you've got the major
25	retailer and everybody's going to try to outdo one
26	another I mean Whole Foods comes in and all the

Τ	other charms krogers and them would come in
2	and this is a requirement then, I mean, it's like
3	you can have all the management councils you want.
4	But if you know, if you're not going to be able
5	to sell the product, then, you know, what good is
6	it doing?
7	So maybe that's but so the point
8	I was trying to make when I was with I guess
9	Rachel and Michael and Rebecca Lent, I was thinking
10	how to get engaged in this Wal-Mart process. And
11	it just seemed to me like the Government would have
12	a role in this type of activity beyond just
13	consumer interest and, you know, broad-based
14	consumer education, but really as a means of
15	ensuring that our domestic fisheries remain viable
16	in a world market situation where that you have the
17	major retailers saying, I'll buy that product
18	because I know it's under management and it is
19	long-term sustainable.
20	I mean, I'm just a little bit more.
21	I'm trying to sort all this out, you know, from
22	really kind of a not necessarily day-to-day
23	operations of it but, you know, I went to that
24	meeting thinking, well, you know, Wal-Mart's trying
25	to, you know, bolster their image, you know, from -
26	- greening, to become more green.

1	And certainly their CEO has made those
2	comments, and Rachel can confirm. I mean, our
3	first video of the CEO after we did the Wal-Mart
4	cheer, which was really interesting, was our
5	first video was talking about how they were
6	reducing their packaging waste and how they were
7	trying to sell more fluorescent light bulbs because
8	of better energy conservation and how many, you
9	know, fewer coal-fired generating plants you would
10	need if everybody used a 40-watt fluorescent light
11	instead of the 60-watt incandescent.
12	Anyway, so that's a whole aspect of it.
13	So that's one aspect of it.
14	You know, I have the other aspect
15	that I gained from that meeting was Wal-Mart's got
16	a great deal, and I just use Wal-Mart I mean,
17	obviously they're doing some great stuff, but Wal-
18	Mart's got a great deal with seafood because
19	they're making a lot of money selling seafood and
20	they get this market built up and, in five or ten
21	years, they don't have the supply anymore, so the
22	cost of seafood to them goes up, the cost to their
23	consumers go up, and they've got to take it off
24	because it doesn't fit their so while it's good
25	on the front, you know, the greening-up aspect, to
26	me, the sense was they want to have a sustainable

1	fishery so they know they have something to sell
2	five to ten years out, you know.
3	So the first part of it, that's PR and
4	that's good and, you know, healthy. But the second
5	part seems to me like the sustainability
6	certification sustainability is something that the
7	whole management regime in the U.S. is about.
8	And so this kind of program, to the
9	extent that it could get validity throughout the
10	user base and credence throughout so that it could
11	stand as one identifier within the supply community
12	that the purchase of this fish is a sustainable
13	fish by, you know, rules and regulations of the
14	United States or something like that I think would
15	be a really makes this an important beyond just
16	consumer education aspect, if that makes any sense.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think that makes
18	a lot of sense. I have mixed feelings about this
19	for a couple of reasons. One is that I'm thinking
20	my best chances for personally for another job
21	when I get done with fisheries is a Wal-Mart
22	greeter so, on the one hand, I don't want to offend
23	them.
24	MR. LEIPZIG: We could have some
25	competitions.
26	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Early on in this,

1	certified species was pollock in Alaska in this
2	country and we I was the regional administrator
3	and we spent an enormous amount of our staff's time
4	working with them and then the document that came
5	out found pretty much all of us NMFS guys to be
6	reprehensible individuals and couldn't do enough to
7	say bad things about us.
8	So we're barely getting over that and I
9	think your comments about the law requires us to
10	manage sustainable fisheries anyway. So when we
11	participate in other events that allows them to set
12	our research and management agendas, it's a
13	question. It's a big topic area, so I appreciate
14	your comments.
15	Maybe somebody else has something to
16	say. Heather?
17	MS. McCARTY: Yeah. On that, I agree
18	with what Jim says, that it was a difficult job
19	when we certified the pollock fishery for the
20	National Marine Fisheries Service because,
21	basically, when these fisheries that are federally
22	managed are certified by MSC, what they're really
23	certifying is the management by the National Marine
24	Fisheries Service. When they certify state
25	fisheries, they're certifying the management by the
26	state whatever it is.

1	And I've been close to a couple of the
2	big ones, the first one which was the salmon in
3	Alaska and now the pollock in the North Bering Sea,
4	and it is actually a certification of the
5	management process.
6	So if that could be made clear, you
7	know, they're not mutually exclusive, in other
8	words. Even though they found NMFS to have a
9	number of shortcomings and recommended a bunch of
10	management changes, they did certify the fishery as
11	managed by the National Marine Fisheries Service.
12	The only problem is that this re-
13	certification process that you refer to is huge and
14	once you get certified, they give you all of these
15	things that you have to accomplish by the time this
16	re-certification comes around. If you don't, it's
17	really bad to be certified and then uncertified.
18	MR. BILLY: Oh, gosh, yes.
19	MS. McCARTY: And so they've really got
20	you over a barrel then.
21	MR. BILLY: That's so typical of any
22	I mean, I just think, from a professional
23	certification standpoint, too, you know, when you
24	go through that process, boy, then you're locked
25	in. You've got to pay your dues and you've got to
26	re-certify and I'm not saying good or bad I'm

1	just saying that and it's kind of from a MAFAC
2	perspective is this a role that NMFS should be
3	doing and, if so, is this a program and how can it
4	enhance to do that?
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Steve Joner had
6	some comments.
7	MR. JONER: Yeah. I just want to put
8	in a plug that Wal-Mart does sell Makah whiting
9	fillets, so look for them under the Ocean Gold
10	label. But we're not contributing to the
11	certification for whiting because we do catch
12	Canary there and, to me, so I'd rather not go down
13	that path because it's there's too much there
14	that
15	MS. BRYANT: It's expensive.
16	MR. JONER: Yeah.
17	I want to thank you for making
18	FishWatch two words, but I see it here and also you
19	have it one word. Whatever you call that, you
20	know, whatever the utilization of the English
21	language is where you compress and combine two
22	words into one, so my vote is for two words. But,
23	you know, one of the things I hear a lot is and,
24	of course, dealing with the rockfish on the West
25	Coast, our whole life seems to revolve around
26	rockfish, and the what is it? the urban

1	legend, I guess, is that the council's mismanaged
2	because the scientists were crying that we're
3	overfishing but the manager's said, Oh, no, no.
4	It's too hard for us to cut back. And that was not
5	at all the case. In fact, Rick Methot is here and
6	I often use the example, Rick's work on setting the
7	appropriate harvest level and, as more information
8	came available on the biology and the status of
9	these stocks, he would say, Whoops, we need to
10	reduce that and the council would immediately do it
11	and pretty soon we found ourselves in a tough spot.
12	It was never because of mismanagement.
13	Somehow, that needs to get on there because then
14	what people see is some acronym sues the Secretary
15	of Commerce over a council regulation and so you
16	need to also report on what happens to the
17	litigation and give the full picture.
18	MS. BRYANT: The litigation link.
19	MR. JONER: You need it because people
20	you know, the person on the street doesn't
21	understand all this.
22	MS. BRYANT: Well, on that note, if I
23	can just interrupt, it's funny because Catherine
24	and I were talking at lunch, the recent activity
25	that occurred was to our sea lions' research and we
26	are shut down And one of the things that we kind

1	of laughed about was wouldn't it be great to have
2	this up there and be able to literally put, you
3	know, temporarily suspended due to and be able to
4	put that information because the public doesn't
5	know. They have no idea that it's absolutely
6	stopped everything, it's pulled off resources.
7	It's going to have a domino effect. We're really
8	hoping and this is great information, but we're
9	really hoping this really becomes a platform to
10	provide very neutral not authoritative but at
11	least neutral where you don't just go to Monterey
12	Bay Aquarium and, you know, be be driven by
13	their standards and protocol, but that there is a
14	place to go where it's based on peer reviewed
15	science.
16	MR. JONER: Jim, there's two more
17	people from the neighborhood that just came in,
18	Rick and Mariam, if you want
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Introduce them,
20	please. Who are they?
21	MR. JONER: Mariam.
22	MS. McCALL: Hi. I'm Mariam McCall.
23	I'm with General Counsel's Office here.
24	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: And who is the
25	other one?
26	MR. JONER: Rick Methot.

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Rick Methot is
2	going to be on the agenda in a minute, so we'll
3	make sure he's introduced, but he's a scientist
4	attached to Headquarters now, but maintains his
5	residence here in Seattle.
6	So welcome.
7	MR. RAYBURN: It seems to me, though,
8	for this to be effective, it's got to be a point of
9	sale. You've got to have something at point of
10	sale, typically so how would you accomplish
11	that? Would you would you potentially have
12	kiosks in some places or have it seems to me
13	that you've got to you've got to have something
14	like that so when the consumer comes up, if they're
15	really interested I mean, go on a website before
16	they go buy fish, I wouldn't think so, but wouldn't
17	you think you'd need to have something at the point
18	of sale cards or kiosks or something?
19	MS. BRYANT: We've had some discussions
20	along marketing. We haven't gotten fully there, so
21	that's a good thing to hear.
22	MS. BUTZLER: Right. So, you know,
23	they have the wallet cards. Different
24	organizations have wallet cards that have that
25	so we
26	MR RAVBURN: Sure Vellow green and

1	red sturr.
2	MS. BUTZLER: can't provide these
3	recommendations, but we suggested providing these
4	wallet cards that have the link to say, you know,
5	For more information about sustainable fisheries,
6	go here. So they would have to do a little bit of
7	reading, but I guess if they were able to do some
8	reading, they could see domestic fisheries,
9	federally-managed fisheries, and, you know we
10	will have places on there that we, you know,
11	sources of ask your fish market, you know, Where
12	did this fish come from? If it was imported, you
13	know, what kind of regulations? If it came from
14	the United States, you know what the regulations
15	are.
16	So did that kind of answer your
17	question?
18	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah. And I'm sure the
19	informed consumer would but, you know, I mean, you
20	pick up a card and well, you know, if you're
21	going to buy a fish, you kind of need to be
22	interactive there, you know. And I don't know.
23	You just may think, you know, five, ten years out
24	as one of the incentives for engagement in this
25	program is the availability of some type of little
26	kiosk, you know, I mean, an inexpensive read-only

red stuff.

1	type display that could be there, somebody could
2	just punch just like you do when you go buy
3	spark plugs at the auto store, you know. You punch
4	in what kind of car you've got, the engine size,
5	and it tells you what spark plug, you know. You
6	could do the same kind of thing at the point of
7	sale, do the same thing. If you want to bake it,
8	this is the recommended something like that that
9	would help the consumer at the point of sale.
10	Otherwise,
11	MR. ROBERTS: Ralph, I hear what you're
12	saying but I guess my question is: Is the effort
13	by Monterey Bay Aquarium or other entities
14	effective?
15	MS. BRYANT: Yes.
16	MR. JONER: Yes.
17	MS. BRYANT: Very.
18	MR. ROBERTS: I mean, if I go buy fish,
19	I'm going to go buy fish because that's the fish I
20	want. And I don't know what other people do. Are
21	they swayed by that information?
22	MS. BRYANT: Oh, yes.
23	MR. ROBERTS: And there's evidence to
24	this effect?
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Professor.
26	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you. We often get

1	calls at the university for someone to go and speak
2	about seafood safety. I've been I've I met
3	Tom Billy almost 20 years ago on the issues of
4	seafood safety as I'm often invited to speak, and
5	invariably someone will come up with a palm card.
6	When you speak about seafood safety, someone comes
7	up with a palm card and says, Well and they're
8	looking at the species and explain this species to
9	me because it's red or, if it's a different color.
10	I probably do four or five stand-ups a
11	year on seafood safety trying to explain that
12	things are really better than the way they're
13	portrayed and invariably someone comes up with that
14	palm card.
15	MS. BRYANT: And they'll call me and
16	ask for more of them. They think National Marine
17	Fisheries Service produces them.
18	MR. LEIPZIG: I don't doubt that
19	there's a very active group of people. My question
20	is: Are they a minority that are vocal or is the
21	general public out there that buys the fish really
22	engaged in this debate?
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Just to be sure, I
24	think that Bill was next, to be followed down there
25	by Tom.
26	MR. DEWEY: Just on the I wanted to

1	bring this back to my question or my point earlier
2	about target audiences. And once you get this
3	FishWatch up and going, it would seem, from an
4	outreach standpoint, that you'd want to do
5	education and outreach to the chefs and the
6	restaurant associations and the retailers so that
7	while maybe their consumers aren't at a kiosk, that
8	may not be practical to do, although I like the
9	idea, you know. Certainly all those fish managers
10	and chefs have computers they're ordering from and
11	they can that's how they access the Monterey Bay
12	information to a large degree now.
13	But that should be a target audience
14	for you with this information.
15	MS. BUTZLER: Uh-huh. That's right.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Bill. And
17	then Tom was next.
18	MR. BILLY: There are one million
19	retail establishments. Your kiosks would be very
20	expensive. It would cost ten dollars each
21	that's \$10 million.
22	MR. RAYBURN: That's one major
23	contribution on your point, Tom.
24	MR. BILLY: Right.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Let's see. I've
26	got you on the list, Mary.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	MR. DEWEY: Hold on.
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: In a minute.
3	MR. DEWEY: So I think that that's
4	someone needs to investigate and look through the
5	past efforts of National Marine Fisheries Service
6	and others in this area. There's a whole multitude
7	of different ways to get this information into the
8	hands, and I think just a little work there would
9	identify the right path.
10	In part, in answer to your question, if
11	I remember correctly, the NOAA per capita
12	consumption figures showed that last year or the
13	last year the data was available was an all-time
14	record. So notwithstanding how many of these cards
15	are out there, people are eating more seafood.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Chris.
17	MR. DORSETT: Thanks. I had a question
18	about on your species list, you have shrimp.
19	And I'm sorry if I missed this, but it seems like
20	we're talking in terms of stock sustainability.
21	And with shrimp, you have a whole other set of
22	issues with habitat impact, bycatch, etc.
23	Is that kind of information going to be
24	listed on this site?
25	MS. BUTZLER: Yes. It will be. So in
26	the life history, we can have a description and, in

1	the management description, we could talk about,
2	you know a sentence about bycatch and what has
3	been done in the past, you know, ten, 15 years and
4	kind of where we see we're going. So we're not
5	gonna skirt the issue; it will be in there.
6	And then eventually we some of the
7	links, like the habitat links or we'd have a
8	bycatch link just generally, like on the main page,
9	so it's not fishery-specific, but we can go a lot
10	more in depth about the issues behind bycatch and
11	everything. So we will include it. We won't
12	MR. DORSETT: Will there be statistics
13	on bycatch and things like that? Or it will be
14	what we're doing about bycatch? Because those are
15	two different issues.
16	MS. BUTZLER: It should as long as
17	the information is available, it should be both.
18	So, like I said, we're not trying to do more
19	research. We're trying to summarize what's out
20	there. So as long as we can find it and the
21	shrimp experts, you know, when they're reviewing
22	the information, you know, if they say, This is
23	wrong. Take it out of there, we'll have to take it
24	out of there. But as long as it's there, we will
25	leave it up.
26	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Mary Hope.

1	MS. KATSOUROS: About, you know, doing
2	the campaign regarding a certain species, about
3	I think it was in 2002 there was a big campaign and
4	they got chefs involved and it was all over the $\underline{\text{New}}$
5	York Times, the Washington Post, you know, and
6	other, you know, metropolitan papers not to eat
7	swordfish. And, you know, I don't know how much
8	money was put into this campaign, but you would go
9	to restaurants and they would have this little
10	thing saying, Swordfish is not, you know there's
11	not enough of them. Do not eat it, etc., etc.
12	What happened was the swordfish was
13	already caught and available and then you had
14	seafood houses like Red Lobster, etc., you know,
15	buying up the swordfish that the other restaurants
16	weren't, and there was a larger demand for
17	swordfish than before the campaign started.
18	People were losing money so they I
19	actually taught a class and had them look at this
20	as a case study. So it had just the opposite
21	effect than was originally intended. So it was
22	unintended consequences which made swordfish, you
23	know, maybe good or bad, you know, more available
24	to the general public, something they knew about,
25	but the overall thing about not catching it or not
26	buying it didn't happen.

1	And so you have to worry about such
2	unintended consequences.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you. John
4	Forster
5	MR. FORSTER: Just to respond to
6	several of these comments and specifically to
7	Peter's point because we've seen it in the farmed
8	salmon industry. We've had BCB scare and the whole
9	wild thing and now everybody's eating as much
10	farmed salmon as they ever were than before.
11	So I think waging a public campaign is
12	actually a very difficult thing to do which is why
13	these people now are going off to the retail
14	chains. That's why I've seen Greenpeace go off to
15	the retail chains and why I've seen in regard to
16	Wal-Mart. And that's the danger, which is what
17	Ralph talked about. If you can shut a major
18	distributor down on these things, then you've got a
19	problem.
20	And so I just find myself wondering
21	maybe if there's some way NOAA can sort of if
22	there is a miscarriage of justice, in NOAA's
23	opinion, NOAA could fortify that, go in and say to
24	Wal-Mart, Look, no you're being misled here and
25	we'll stand behind you in this case if you feel
26	that you would like to continue to sell this

1	product and it's being wrongly presented.
2	But that's the danger. If they go off
3	to the distribution system, then you cut the supply
4	off to the public.
5	MR. JONER: That will ensure you an in
6	with Wal-Mart for your Peter job.
7	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Catherine.
8	MS. FOY: I'd like to point out that
9	you have some allies in this fight to get the word
10	out and those are the people that the producers,
11	the fishermen, the point of sale, the any value-
12	added products. You could get them to advertise
13	that they are managed by NOAA. Most of them cannot
14	afford a certification, but if they are managed,
15	then that gives them a respectability that they
16	need for the public.
17	So they would be probably more than
18	happy to put a "www.dot - Managed by NOAA. Checks
19	out," then that would get your word out very
20	quickly and still give you a point of sale access.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Good point. Ralph
22	had his hand up again.
23	MR. RAYBURN: The point I'm trying to
24	make is if I can just you know, we can have
25	domestic fisheries and other seafood supplies that
26	are impacted by external forces and these fisheries

1	are undergoing extensive management and
2	considerations in, you know, and the process is
3	ongoing and obviously not perfect but still it's
4	ongoing. And so, again, I go back to the idea of -
5	- and I think John expressed it well that you
6	you know, you're undermining what the Government's
7	doing in going in managing in a sustainable
8	fishery regime with a lot of external activities or
9	agendas and stuff like that.
10	And so the Government stepping in in
11	this way and finding some way to have an informed
12	consumer of seafood so they can accept that they're
13	going to buy this product because they appreciate
14	the fact it's being managed on a sustainable level,
15	or attempting to be sustainable, is important.
16	And it seems to me that should be a
17	role of NOAA Fisheries in this kind of regime, and
18	to validate that and to make it make it
19	substantial and robust enough so that you get by
20	and you're not just, you know, abdicating your
21	responsibility.
22	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Bill.
23	MR. DEWEY: I want to underscore what
24	John commented on with the sustainability
25	certification programs. I think that the survey
26	and the polling and statistics would support that,

1	by and large, the consumer back to Pete's
2	comment the consumer in the United States is not
3	that concerned about the sustainability. The
4	nutrition ranks very high in the polling,
5	nutritional value of seafood ranks high in the
6	polling but, in Europe, you'd get very different
7	results on that same question. But in the United
8	States, at least the polling that's been done
9	doesn't necessarily support that and the
10	environmental groups have realized that, the NGOs
11	have realized that and have also realized the way
12	to circumvent it, as John mentioned, is to go to
13	these retailers like Wal-Mart, which was that
14	was a major win for them. That got a lot of play
15	and a lot of other retailers are going to feel the
16	pressure now because of what Wal-Mart's done and
17	we're going to see a lot more certified MSC-
18	certified products as a result of that, which I
19	think is unfortunate. It's a disservice to NOAA.
20	It's a disservice to the industry. And in a lot of
21	cases, it's driven by green wash and what Wal-Mart
22	is trying to do there. But I guess it underscores
23	in my own mind there's an opportunity for NOAA,
24	whether it's through this website or through actual
25	outreach to these large retailers as well, to go in
26	and explain how well the fisheries are managed so

1	that they aren't feeling so much pressure to go
2	down the certification path.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you. Rachel,
4	that was great. Appreciate that. Generated a lot
5	of interest. I think this idea started with MAFAC
6	NOAA said six years ago, so it's nice to see it
7	come to a point where maybe it will be
8	MR. JONER: Jim, I just have a question
9	for Laurel. Will there be a chance to follow up on
10	this some more?
11	MS. BRYANT: Absolutely. Rachel will
12	be contacting you.
13	MR. JONER: I mean, in the
14	subcommittees? Is this not going on
15	MS. BRYANT: We absolutely can. There's
16	no reason not to. Vision team, I did want to say
17	we even have a breakout room, so we can do that.
18	I wanted to just put one last final
19	note on that. When Mary brought up the give
20	swordfish a break, it's this is the Rebecca Lent
21	hat. One of the things that just drives Rebecca
22	Lent crazy is to this day we run across people
23	still, Swordfish is overfished and don't eat it and
24	it's bad. And I say, No. International, we were
25	successful and we did it. We've never had a
26	platform to be able to demonstrate that really

1	active aggressive domestic management can have a
2	good influence.
3	The last thing I want to mention as far
4	as access and public awareness, one of the
5	opportunities that probably Jim and Sam will be
6	involved in having to carry forward when this gets
7	more mature, there's two major events in addition
8	to some of the seafood marketing and, you know,
9	everything from Boston Seafood to the seafood
10	promotion things that are going on that we would
11	feature this in, but there also is the pending
12	Ocean Hall that will be coming and opening in
13	September of 2008 that we're involved with.
14	And parallel to that project, and at
15	some point I will bring MAFAC a presentation on it
16	I'm the fisheries rep on that and they want
17	to have a web portal that will parallel everything
18	in that hall, in addition to having an Oceans in
19	the News kiosk right there at the Natural History
20	Museum that is to be maintained and updated.
21	One of the things that we've been
22	pushing very hard for is that included in that
23	architecture would be the FishWatch so that, as
24	things happen and as events occur so there are
25	some very long-term opportunities ahead and it
26	would be great to get your guidance.

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Laurel.
2	How's your cold, Sam?
3	MR. RAUCH: Well, I haven't taken the
4	medicine yet.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Can you
6	MR. RAUCH: It's going to knock me out
7	as soon as I take it.
8	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, Dr. Methot
9	was promised a three o'clock showtime. Would you
L O	mind switching or
1	MR. RAUCH: Sure. Go ahead.
L2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Do you want to do
L3	that, Rick?
14	MR. METHOT: Either way.
L5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. If it's okay
L 6	with you, Sam, let's do get to Rick Methot and
.7	this direct fish statistics and two little parts
L8	here. It's got my name by it on the agenda, but I
_9	don't know anything about it, so Rick Methot who,
20	as I mentioned, is one of the stock assessment
21	scientists from works for Headquarters now is
22	that enough introduction, Rick?
23	MR. METHOT: Close enough.
24	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay.
25	MR. METHOT: I'm going to be pinch-
26	hitting here today, so I'll do my best to answer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	any questions that come up, but we may have to get
2	back to you later on some issues.
3	First topic is bringing you up to speed
4	with where we're at with responding to the NRC
5	review of our recreational statistics programs.
6	You know, certainly these programs are, you know,
7	not only important both nationally and regionally;
8	they meet a number of needs that we have out there.
9	We need these to make reports on the catch and the
10	participation of our recreational fisheries, again
11	both regionally and nationally. We have a need for
12	that information.
13	Some of this information feeds, you
14	know, very directly into our stock assessment
15	programs to figure out what's going on with the
16	fishery impacts on these stocks and what is the
17	allowable catch level? And, finally, these
18	recreational statistics programs are becoming
19	increasingly important to the actual monitoring of
20	the performance of the fishery to feed back on the
21	regulatory programs making certain that things are
22	meeting the expectation that we have when fishery
23	management plans are developed.
24	So the these recreational
25	statistics, it's pretty widespread and it's
26	growing.

1	Our ability to, you know, carry out
2	these programs I mean, we asked for this NRC
3	review of the programs in order to get some
4	feedback on where we stand, you know, what's going
5	to be needed, and we got a pretty strong wake-up
6	call from them. You know, we know and our partners
7	in these programs know that there are shortcomings,
8	that we aren't able to do everything we want to do.
9	We got a pretty strong wake-up call from them that
10	we have a ways to go. There are technical issues
11	that need to be attended to in order to be certain
12	that the programs meet the needs and we need to be
13	more attentive to being certain that what we are
14	doing actually does meet the needs of the clients
15	that we have in the various councils and
16	commissions and our constituents around the
17	country. So there's a growing list of needs that
18	are out there.
19	If we're going to really meet these
20	needs, we're going to need to, you know, work with
21	you and a lot of our clients in order to get the
22	information. It's a two-way communication issue;
23	you know, what are our programs doing and what do
24	they need to do?
25	We've already taken steps to put in
26	place a steering committee. One of the first

1	things that the steering committee is doing is
2	organizing a workshop to pull together the
3	information from around the country. What's going
4	on immediately through this next month in
5	August, there will be workshops held on the Pacific
6	Coast, the Gulf, and Atlantic, the regional
7	workshops to bring together scientists, managers,
8	representatives from the recreational fishing
9	community to evaluate, you know, what are their
10	regional needs, what are the potential gaps that
11	are there in meeting those needs, and start pulling
12	this information together. We will come together.
13	The first week in September, there's a
14	meeting scheduled in Denver to have a joint
15	meeting, getting representatives from these
16	regional meetings together to talk about, again,
17	laying out reaffirming what it is that we're
18	looking to do with these recreational programs,
19	starting to identify, you know, what are the gaps
20	between what we can do today and what those needs
21	are, starting to identify what can we do with the
22	current resources that we have, where can we
23	reallocate what we're doing, re-emphasize the
24	efforts in order to start filling these gaps.
25	We'll also identify things that can only be
26	accomplished through an expanded program.

1	Now, again, the communication part of
2	this is critical that, you know obviously, the
3	credibility of our program has been questioned
4	through the results of this review. And we need to
5	reestablish that credibility. We can only do that
6	through good communication with all of our partners
7	on this and the whole community.
8	One of the things that we'd like to ask
9	immediately is that MAFAC work to establish a
10	subcommittee that would help us to accomplish this
11	kind of communication and feedback to improve our
12	program. We would ask that to have such a
13	subcommittee, that we, know, start very immediately
14	so that that representative could participate in
15	this September 6 to 8 workshop in Denver to start
16	laying the groundwork for what needs to happen from
17	there.
18	We think that for us to, you know, make
19	much further progress on responding to the review,
20	we have to take the results from that workshop and,
21	from there, what we will look to be accomplishing
22	is a fairly long-term plan to both do what we can
23	do technically both on the regional levels, working
24	with all the partners, as well as our core
25	statistics program in Silver Spring to look at what
26	could be accomplished today. But it's really the

1	long-term effort in order to meet the needs.
2	Jim, that's what we have current
3	status. The focus right now is on gearing up for
4	that workshop so we can get the feedback we need in
5	order to move on, and we very much want to work
6	with MAFAC to make that happen.
7	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So in order to get
8	ready for the workshop, I caught that you would
9	like to have MAFAC have a subcommittee so that such
10	representative could possibly be at the Denver
11	workshop. Is there any work before the MAFAC,
12	before the Denver workshop?
13	MR. METHOT: I don't think it's
14	absolutely necessary. I mean, obviously, you know,
15	there's a lot of expertise here and a lot of good
16	thinking on where we need to go with recreational
17	fisheries, but I don't think we absolutely need to
18	have anything from MAFAC before that time.
19	Again, we are holding or participating
20	in these regional workshops and that's going to be
21	our primary source of input for the September
22	meeting as well as, you know, the things we're
23	organizing ourselves in terms of potential areas of
24	responding to the NRC review.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Good. Thank you.
26	Go ahead

1	MR. DiLERNIA: Mr. Chairman, we have a
2	Chairman Fletcher is Chairman of the
3	Recreational Fisheries Subcommittee. And I would
4	think that it would go to his committee and, Mr.
5	Fletcher, I don't know if you could recommend
6	make recommendations maybe at the end of this
7	committee meeting at the end of our meeting in
8	the next couple of days as to how we should proceed
9	and how we should interact. But I would refer it
10	to your committee, sir.
11	MR. FLETCHER: Okay. Are you going to
12	be around, Rick?
13	MR. METHOT: I can be, but I have
14	another meeting tomorrow at Sand Point. So but
15	I certainly can call up you later.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: At least get
17	contact information back and forth so we can do the
18	best for you. Ken.
19	MR. ROBERTS: Is the NRC report public?
20	I mean, is it a link that we can go read it?
21	MR. METHOT: Yes. It is available at
22	this time.
23	MR. ROBERTS: And what's the link?
24	MR. METHOT: I don't have it
25	immediately available. We can get that information
26	to you.

1	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I thought it was
2	distributed to all the members.
3	MS. BRYANT: It is up on the Web, and I
4	think we sent this is the first time I've seen
5	it printed like that. We couldn't really get
6	copies before.
7	MR. ROBERTS: I'm wondering was there
8	any conclusion made as to what role the inability
9	to define the population that you're sampling
10	compared to other aspects of the problems?
11	MR. METHOT: It certainly is among the
12	technical issues. I mean, it's obviously a very
13	diverse population and with many aspects. And the
14	issues of identifying the populations being sampled
15	and being able to target the sampling to specific
16	aspects of the population are among the technical
17	areas that we need to shore up.
18	MR. ROBERTS: If you had the
19	registration done next year, how much more credible
20	would your estimates be, do you think?
21	MR. METHOT: Well, they certainly made
22	reference to having a registry as, you know, an
23	important thing to help have a more precise
24	sampling frame.
25	The scope of the registry, you know,
26	needs to be part of that. You know, there is a

1	registry for a component of the population means
2	that you still need to have another sampling
3	program for components that are excluded from that
4	registry. And so the issue of a two-framed
5	sampling comes up so that if you have a registry
6	that would allow you to be very efficient at
7	sampling one component, then you could focus some
8	other resources to try to cover things that are not
9	part of the registry. So there's various options
10	like that that can be considered once you have a
11	registry to cover at least the components.
12	But the more inclusive that registry
13	is, the more efficient that you can be in your
14	overall sampling.
15	MR. ROBERTS: That's one of the points
16	that I was getting to because we have a populous
17	state in Louisiana. If you're over 60 years old,
18	you don't need any kind of license other than a
19	five-dollar stamp saying you're over 60 years old
20	is what it amounts to, and so you're out of the
21	population survey.
22	And so at the start of any sort of
23	participation registration, it's very important if
24	it's costful really nothing particularly the
25	growing number of people that are in the retired
26	phase of their life because you're facing a growing

1	percentage of people who are participating who
2	aren't registered.
3	MR. METHOT: And it's possible to
4	consider issues of having registered participants
5	that are separate from who needs to pay to
6	participate, you know. The things can be separate
7	and but it's creativity along this line, so -
8	-
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: I think this item
10	was on the agenda mainly because we thought people
11	were familiar with the National Research Council's
12	report, which was not positive, so Rick was trying
13	to tell us how we intend to move forward on it
14	rather than answering questions about the
15	shortcomings not but if you want to go into
16	the technical problems, that's fine with me, but
17	that's it was more of a heads up and making sure
18	you had an ability to participate in the future.
19	But having said that, I've got a list
20	here with Vince being next.
21	MR. O'SHEA: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
22	First, a public announcement and that is when our
23	commission did a stock assessment, American
24	lobster, the most valuable species managed by our
25	commission, we put together a peer review team of
26	scientists from that weren't from the East Coast

1	and Dr. Methot was gracious enough to serve on
2	that, along with Terry Quinn, and we got a lot of
3	mileage out of that document they gave us, so thank
4	you very, very much for doing that.
5	The second part is sort of a truth in
6	advertising. Regarding the so-called East Coast
7	workshop prior to Denver, before the National
8	Academy of Science study was commissioned, the
9	Atlantic States Commission met with our member
10	states and we developed what we thought were the
11	needs from both the science perspective and the
12	managers' perspective for what we needed from a
13	recreational data collection system. What
14	we've committed to is and we presented that, by
15	the way, to Dr. Hogarth simultaneously with him
16	announcing that he was gonna do the National
17	Academy of Science thing that was going to take 18
18	months. So we've dusted off our white paper and
19	have circulated back to our state directors and at
20	our scheduled Commission meeting two weeks from now
21	in Crystal City, Virginia, we intend basically to
22	validate that white paper that was done two years
23	ago. Dr. Van Voorhees and maybe Dr. Ponwith intend
24	to be there. But I just want to make it clear for
25	the East Coast folks that figured on a workshop
26	with thousands of people and recreational, all

1	different sectors, that's not going to happen.
2	That's not what we committed to on this side.
3	But I think we're going to get, the
4	bottom line, the information you all need to feed
5	into the Denver meeting.
6	So thank you.
7	MR. METHOT: That's very good. Very
8	good. We certainly recognize that this is another
9	iteration in an ongoing process and that there's a
10	lot of good groundwork that's already accomplished,
11	so that would be excellent.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Eric.
13	MR. SCHWAAB: Yeah. Just just a
14	couple of process questions. Can you describe a
15	little bit the makeup of your steering committee?
16	MR. METHOT: Let's see. Do I have all
17	of our members here? It's a relatively small
18	group. Let's see. Who do we have on it? Randy,
19	Larry, yourself, and from Headquarters we have
20	Bonnie Ponwith and Nancy Thompson involved. And to
21	we've asked Kitty Simons from Pacific Region to
22	be involved as well in order to broaden the scope
23	of the fisheries that are covered, trying to keep
24	that part small and you know, we probably will
25	get involved in it a bit further as we approach
26	that workshop.

1	MR. SCHWAAB: And do you have and
2	these regional meetings, you have times and dates
3	for those or
4	MR. METHOT: Well, let's see. They're
5	all being managed regionally. We focused pretty
6	much on putting together the September workshop.
7	So the Pacific meeting is going to be the last week
8	of August, right, in Portland, and the Gulf and
9	Atlantic meetings are in a couple of weeks from
10	now, you'll have the Atlantic meeting.
11	MR. O'SHEA: I think it's Thursday, the
12	14th or 17th of August in Crystal City, during our
13	ASMFC meeting week.
14	MR. SCHWAAB: Is that advertised
15	somewhere on a general website somewhere?
16	MR. METHOT: Not that I know of. I
17	don't know we don't have it from ours, and
18	actually that's another I'm glad you brought
19	that up because we are working on putting together
20	an informational website and hopefully in a week or
21	so we'll have that fully operational so that we
22	will have a central point to get information on
23	this ongoing process.
24	But in terms of advertising, you know,
25	those regional meetings, I think I would just start
26	by going to the regional commissions to get

1	information on that.
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ralph.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah. I just had a
4	comment on it. I talked about having our
5	Recreational Subcommittee do this. I don't think
6	we have a Recreational Subcommittee, do we? I
7	mean, you've got
8	MR. FLETCHER: It's not formal. It was
9	kind of ad hoc.
10	MS. BRYANT: But Bob we kind of
11	talked about this subcommittee and rec. fish issues
12	come up. We've got Bob, who will be meeting with
13	all the recreational folks.
14	MR. RAYBURN: So there is an ad hoc?
15	Who's on it?
16	MR. FLETCHER: Well, Randy was on it.
17	MR. RAYBURN: I don't mean to make a
18	big deal out of it. I just
19	MS. BRYANT: And Tom.
20	MR. RAYBURN: kind of like
21	MR. FLETCHER: Vince was involved.
22	MR. RAYBURN: We've got the
23	subcommittee structure set up and
24	MS. BRYANT: The committee structure is
25	here, too. It doesn't mention recreational,
26	though. We just knew that that was going to be

1	MR. RAYBURN: That's not why I brought
2	that up. And all I was trying to do was just
3	formalize the process, that if we did have you
4	know, it looks to me like I think when we talked
5	about this, the Commerce Subcommittee was going to
6	cover recreational fisheries. You know, you have
7	Bob certainly on that, so I think you know, just
8	to formalize that, that you have that under the
9	Commerce Subcommittee would be a recreational
10	fisheries working group or whatever and then I
11	would further say that if somebody on that group
12	wanted to go could go to the Denver meeting,
13	that MAFAC should pay them to be the representative
14	at this Denver meeting. But I'd like to do it, you
15	know, within our formal structure and not
16	necessarily just creating another group out there.
17	But I'm just I'm sorry. I'm a little anal on
18	that stuff, I guess.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: To respond to what Ralph
20	is bringing up, the Recreational Subcommittee was
21	actually formed from the Commerce Subcommittee.
22	MR. RAYBURN: Okay.
23	MR. DiLERNIA: And the members that
24	were assigned to it or asked to do work at the last
25	committee meeting, last MAFAC committee meeting,
26	was Mr. Fletcher, Kramer, let's see Tom, right -

1	- Ralph, you were on there. Ken, I'm not sure if
2	you did any work on that. And I was on that.
3	So the recreational group at this point
4	would be basically the recreational representatives
5	to MAFAC, plus a couple of others Mr. Donofrio
6	has
7	MR. RAYBURN: He's on that as well,
8	though he's not listed here.
9	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah. He's been
10	assigned to it, although we haven't seen him.
11	MR. RAYBURN: And Bob is the chair of
12	that group.
13	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, he is.
14	MR. RAYBURN: I would think it
15	appropriate to support the comments here, that we
16	try to have a representative from MAFAC attend the
17	Denver meeting and that MAFAC, you know, support
18	that travel.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: I think that's what you
20	were asking for, weren't you?
21	MR. RAYBURN: That's what you're asking
22	for; right?
23	MR. METHOT: Absolutely. Absolutely.
24	MR. RAYBURN: And I was gonna suggest
25	that commissioners, too, but it sounds like the
26	commissions are already involved, so we'd get good

1	coverage if we had one of our, you know, principals
2	there. Does that work for you?
3	MR. METHOT: Very good.
4	MR. RAYBURN: And I can make that in a
5	motion or we can take it up at the end. I'll make
6	it in a motion, that we
7	MR. RAFTICAN: I'll second it.
8	MR. RAYBURN: that we direct or, you
9	know, have a chair of the Recreational or his
LO	representative attend the Denver meeting with
1	MAFAC's support for travel.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: We have a motion
L3	and a second. I guess is there any discussion? Is
4	there any
15	MR. RAYBURN: Laurel, is there any
16	MS. BRYANT: Well, that's fine. We had
17	it on the agenda for Thursday for all those things,
18	but that's fine. Let's
19	MR. RAYBURN: Oh, okay. No.
20	MS. BRYANT: do it no, I've got
21	it down.
22	MR. RAYBURN: And I didn't mean to jump
23	
24	MS. BRYANT: We'll I just need
25	MR. DiLERNIA: Could we table the
26	motion until Thursday?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	MR. RAYBURN: Fine. I have no problem
2	with that.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: Consent? The seconder
4	agrees?
5	MR. RAYBURN: As long as everybody
6	as long as we have a quorum left at the end of the
7	meeting on Thursday so we can take action. You
8	know, that's always a problem.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you,
10	Professor. I think that's the way to do it. We'll
1	bundle them together and, if it looks like we're
12	losing a quorum, we'll have an emergency meeting in
13	the lobby or something like that.
14	Okay. Thank you. Now, Rick, could you
L5	mention a little bit about the NOAA Ocean Research
16	Priorities Plan and whether there's opportunities
17	to review and input on that?
18	MR. METHOT: Yeah. Going even further
L9	afield to me talking about this, so please don't
20	ask any questions at all. But I did have a chance
21	to look a little bit about what's going on here,
22	and I think it is a good opportunity. The Joint
23	Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology is
24	putting together an effort to establish a
25	subcommittee that would be looking at putting
26	together a research plan and they've built this

1	upon a variety of efforts that have gone on through
2	the spring here.
3	There was a workshop, a public workshop
4	in April of this year, and that plus some other
5	public input has been used to put together what
6	they're calling an Ocean Research Priorities Plan
7	and Implementation Strategy. This is in draft form
8	now, but I expect that it's going to be released
9	fairly soon for review. It's going to be released
10	to the let's see a variety of groups,
11	including the National Academies of Ocean Studies
12	Board by the end of this month I believe is their
13	target for that review.
14	At that point, you know, the other
15	opportunities for public review. The scope of the
15 16	opportunities for public review. The scope of the report I think is very pertinent to the kind of
16	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of
16 17	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just
16 17 18	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being
16 17 18 19	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being ocean forecasts, ecosystem approaches to
16 17 18 19	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being ocean forecasts, ecosystem approaches to management, and ocean observation programs.
16 17 18 19 20 21	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being ocean forecasts, ecosystem approaches to management, and ocean observation programs. Some of their themes are stewardship of
16 17 18 19 20 21	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being ocean forecasts, ecosystem approaches to management, and ocean observation programs. Some of their themes are stewardship of natural resources, improving ecosystem health,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	report I think is very pertinent to the kind of issues that we have here today. I mean, just looking it, their over-arching priorities being ocean forecasts, ecosystem approaches to management, and ocean observation programs. Some of their themes are stewardship of natural resources, improving ecosystem health, increasing resilience of natural hazards, so a

1	recognizes that fisheries are part of the ecosystem
2	and it's something that it's a two-way
3	interaction, that the fisheries are affected by the
4	ecosystem as well as being one of the factors you
5	need to take into account.
6	So I expect that getting feedback from
7	MAFAC would be valuable and I think you'll find
8	that the report touches on themes that are very
9	important to you.
10	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: On a slightly
11	distracted one, Rick started speaking so you may
12	have said this but this comes out of the U.S.
13	Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Commission
14	which had all the recommendations following which
15	the Government with 19 agencies developed an Ocean
16	Action Plan. And so feeding the Ocean Action Plan
17	are a few things, one of which is a Subcommittee on
18	Management and Researched called SMAR, and the
19	other one is the Joint Subcommittee on Science and
20	Technology which is the research agenda that Rick
21	is talking about here, so it's making progress on
22	the Ocean Action Plan.
23	You may have said that, but I just
24	MR. METHOT: Part of it, but you
25	reinforced it well, and certainly good connections
26	with the efforts like the Ocean Observation System

1	is certainly part of it as well.
2	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Thanks. Any
3	questions on that? Vince?
4	MR. O'SHEA: This is back on the rec.
5	thing.
6	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Go ahead. I think
7	the other was informational and we'll watch for it,
8	but go ahead.
9	MR. O'SHEA: Just to make sure that I
10	understand on this recreational workshop and sort
11	of your overall strategy and I think there may
12	be some questions around the table about this and I
13	think it's important to get it clear before a work
14	group goes off and tries to do things. But my
15	understanding is you have the National Academy of
16	Science report, which has given a long laundry list
17	of things for the Agency to do to "fix MRFSS."
18	It's my understanding that within those
19	assignments, there is considerable the Agency
20	feels there's considerable discretion on how they
21	go about solving those particular problems and they
22	want to ensure that, at the end of the day, the
23	fixes that they build into MRFSS are responsive to
24	the needs of the councils, the state managers, as
25	well as the federal scientists and perhaps the
26	state scientists that are doing stock assessments.

1	And that's my understanding of what we're trying to
2	accomplish; that alignment is what we're trying to
3	accomplish in Denver.
4	And I suspect it's also going to be
5	hopefully a prioritized laundry list knowing that
6	we may not be able to do everything but at least we
7	ought to know what the present system is, know what
8	our needs are, do a gap analysis and see what we
9	can afford to pay.
10	Now, having you're nodding, Rick.
11	MR. METHOT: Yes.
12	MR. O'SHEA: So so far, so good. What
13	this doesn't say is what the Agency is doing to
14	reach out to the recreational community and engage
15	them in sort of the final or the sort of final
16	response to the National Academy of Science.
17	So while I think it's great that
18	somebody from MAFAC be present in Denver, I would
19	be it's not my understanding that that's how you
20	all are going to check the recreational box on this
21	MRFSS thing, that this is just a component of the
22	Agency's response to the National Academy of
23	Science.
24	MR. METHOT: Absolutely. We see that
25	involving MAFAC is very critical for us to be able
26	to fulfill that part of the requirement but that

1	won't be the only thing we're doing to reach out to
2	the constituent community. It's certainly the big
3	issue.
4	MR. O'SHEA: Because if I could,
5	because if we don't get the you know, quite
6	frankly, the recreational sector on board with this
7	response thing, we're going to be right back the
8	same to the square that started this whole
9	process two years ago.
LO	MR. METHOT: Right. Absolutely.
1	MR. O'SHEA: We will not have solved
12	anything.
13	MR. METHOT: Right.
4	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Good points. I
15	appreciate that. Larry.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Parallel event. We're
17	going to be involved in, and I hope you will, too,
18	council systems. We're going to involve the
19	charter boats. We're going to try to involve some
20	aspect of the private anglers. So it's going to be
21	MAFAC is just one of several inputs.
22	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Eric.
23	MR. SCHWAAB: Yeah. Just on this
24	back on this and we're trying to refrain from
25	getting into the details of what this looks like,
26	but Vince's comment about fixing MRFSS makes me

1	want to raise the question that I thought about
2	raising earlier but refrained, and that is are you
3	fixing MRFSS or is it among the possible outcomes
4	that you would replace MRFSS with something
5	entirely different that doesn't look at all like
6	MRFSS?
7	MR. METHOT: All options are to some
8	degree on the table, right. MRFSS is not I
9	mean, we also don't see this as just about MRFSS.
10	I mean, the report itself, you know, perhaps
11	focused on MRFSS in summary statements, but it was
12	pretty clear that on any program going out trying
13	to collect information on recreational fisheries to
14	some degree shared these faults. And we recognize
15	that, you know, MRFSS is trying to do something,
16	but we have other programs that we rely upon that
17	are not following exactly those protocols that are
18	part of the collection of efforts nationally that
19	are implemented regionally.
20	So we're all in this together is the
21	way we see it, and we need to have a joint
22	solution.
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, I think your
24	point's good. All options are on the table and you
25	will have an opportunity to influence it.
26	MR. SCHWAAB: That's the response I was

1	noping to hear because, frankly, you can do a lot
2	of things to fix MRFSS and you're still not gonna
3	get the kind of real-time data that you might need
4	out of this, and that's as far as I'll go into the
5	substance of this.
6	But I just wanted to also just echo
7	what Vince just said. There are two components to
8	this challenge that's before you. One is to fix
9	you know, to get more accurate and more timely
10	data. The other is to have the sectors like the
11	recreational sectors believe that you've done
12	that. And there are two entirely different sets of
13	challenges.
14	MR. METHOT: They're certainly
15	connected as well. And part of the workshop is to
16	identify just how far are we from, you know, the
17	need what you describe as real-time needs. We
18	aren't going to be able to provide real-time needs
19	today, so how big is that goal, how much can we
20	close it with current resources, and what would
21	take a big effort in order to close it to
22	everyone's satisfaction? I mean, we ought to be
23	realistic about laying out just what is this gap
24	and what it's going to take to close it.
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks, Rick.
26	Great. Let's see. Thanks, Rick. We appreciate

1	you coming over here.
2	We've got Bob?
3	MR. FLETCHER: Real quickly, Rick.
4	Would you clarify for me what these steering
5	committee meetings that Vince is involved in and
6	Randy is prior to this workshop?
7	MR. METHOT: Mostly about organizing
8	the workshop, just getting our scope
9	MR. FISHER: Mostly it's been about
10	Randy yelling on the phone about the fact he didn't
11	want to go to another meeting.
12	MR. METHOT: I was going to leave that
13	part out. But, really, it's right now focused on
14	getting us prepared for the scope of this workshop
15	right now.
16	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks.
17	MR. DiLERNIA: What do you need from
18	MAFAC or what can this committee do what can the
19	recreational sub working group do at this meeting
20	over the next day or two so that someone can come
21	from MAFAC prepared to participate in the September
22	meeting beginning of September in Denver?
23	MR. METHOT: I think the biggest thing
24	is to help us understand what it's going to take to
25	regain the trust of the recreational fishing
26	community about our statistics programs. I mean, I

1	think that's a big part of it. So it's going to be
2	trying to understand the scope of the communication
3	we need beyond just coming and talking with you.
4	You know, how much more do we need to do in order
5	to realistically reach out to the community?
6	MR. DiLERNIA: Fletch, you good with
7	that? Okay. Thank you.
8	MS. BRYANT: I think you said it at the
9	end. I talked with Bonnie on Thursday and we kind
10	of threw this together, it was really it was a
11	look at the MAFAC makeup and an interest in it.
12	There's such a broad representation and even a
13	broad representation within the recreational
14	community that it wasn't just getting input but
15	also guidance on how to strategize and actually
16	reach out and expand that knowledge and have it
17	come back in. So I think that will be a key
18	element.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thanks a lot.
20	Let's see. We have two agenda items left.
21	I'd propose that we do Sam's report on
22	Endangered Species Act and then take a five- or
23	eight-minute break while we set up the new
24	computers and then finish with Professor DiLernia's
25	"Vision" statement, if that works for everybody.
26	(Pause.)

1	MR. RAUCH: Okay. Bill thought it
2	would be a good idea to update this group on the
3	Endangered Species Act, mainly because of what I
4	said earlier today, that it looked like legislative
5	efforts, which had been ongoing for the last six,
6	ten years died an ugly death earlier this spring.
7	And the Endangered Species Act is
8	something that nobody really wants to touch because
9	everybody thinks it's broken but it's broken for
10	different reasons, diametrically-opposed reasons.
11	The environmental groups think it is not nearly
12	protective enough of the species, whereas property
13	groups think it is far too restrictive and so
14	everybody thinks change is needed but everybody is
15	scared of the change because they don't want to
16	lose what they're given.
17	But the legislation so the
18	Administration was I think quite publicly taking a
19	back seat to Congress and letting Congress work
20	through its process and that hasn't happened and
21	now we have a new Secretary of Interior, Senator
22	Henthorn, who introduced a new ESA bill when he was
23	in Commerce and now he's in charge of Interior and
24	both Commerce and Interior have to reassess now and
25	to figure out whether anything needs to be done to
26	the Endangered Species Act which affects it

1	affects what NMFS does dramatically, it affects
2	fisheries, it affects many things in this bill.
3	So let me see if I can lay out an
4	introduction to this issue. What we've had in the
5	ESA is the structure the system hasn't changed
6	for the last 20 years. The statute was
7	reauthorized more than 20 years ago, significantly
8	in '84. The regulations, the last significant
9	change to the regulations were in '86. That was
10	the structure and it really hasn't changed to any
11	major extent since then.
12	But what has changed, what has changed
13	is rather than going through regulations, we've had
14	a series of regulatory initiatives to try to
15	improve stakeholder participation in permitting,
16	safe harbors, candidate conservation agreements. I
17	don't propose to give you a lecture on what all
18	these things mean because it took me I've been
19	dealing with Endangered Species Act for a decade
20	and a half and I still don't know all the stuff
21	there is to know about it. And I've only got like
22	15 minutes, so I'm not going to
23	What else has changed is that we've got
24	court cases that have interpreted the static
25	regulatory regime from the Supreme Court there's
26	a number of Supreme Court decisions down to a

1	number of district court decisions, all of which
2	add layer and layer of judicially-imposed policies
3	on the Administration. And because everybody is
4	afraid to touch the Endangered Species Act, that's
5	what we have. So we have a lack of Government
6	leadership. The laws get created by judges
7	which is not necessarily a bad thing but, when that
8	happens, you get a lot of different and conflicting
9	directions. Depending on which judge you got and
10	how that case was resolved and what the law says,
11	you're going to get one court going one way and
12	another court going another way and that is not a
13	good way to run the Government.
14	But the most significant thing that has
15	happened, certainly from NMFS's perspective, is
16	that we have a massive increase in listings. We
17	didn't change the system, but we have changed what
18	goes into the system a hundred-fold from NMFS's
19	perspective.
20	Back in 1986, when there was the last
21	regulatory change, I think NMFS may have had three
22	species on the list. Now we've got the entire West
23	Coast is covered with salmon listings, we've got
24	listings out in the ocean, we've got critical
25	habitat being designated in the ocean, we've got
26	Atlantic salmon, we may have coral coming up very

1	soon. So NMFS's participation in this process is
2	increasing markedly and it is having the same kind
3	of effects certainly on the West Coast the Interior
4	is having and so we're running into the same kind
5	of claims from both the environmentalists and the
6	property owners about, you know, what's good and
7	bad about the Endangered Species Act.
8	So we're looking at what to do about
9	you know, it looks like legislative change, for
10	good or bad, is off the table. But what would we
11	do what can we do in the current system, what
12	things should we focus on is one of the things that
13	NMFS and Interior are beginning to look at using
14	the tools that we have.
15	I from NMFS's perspective, one of
16	the things that we want to focus on, and we've
17	heard this from a lot of people, is recovery. It's
18	easy to get on the Endangered Species Act. It's
19	very hard to get off. And it's easy to say we
20	should focus more on recovery. That's an easy
21	thing and everybody will agree with it. But what
22	do you do?
23	You've got, for instance, right whales,
24	300 Northern Atlantic right whales out there. It's
25	going to take 400 years, at minimum, if they
26	started breeding now and nobody ever kills another

1	one, for them to recover. Creating a recovery plan
2	that will assure you of getting there in 400 years,
3	that's tough. You know, these are endangered
4	species because there's not very many of them left.
5	That means they're not like some of these fish
6	stocks that can recover very quickly in ten years.
7	And so saying we want to focus on
8	recovery and actually doing it is very hard. And
9	it's very hard also because as pervasive as the
10	Federal Government is regulating, a lot of the
11	problems come from private landowners certainly for
12	salmon a lot of the actions needed to recover
13	I think we have a better opportunity in
14	the ocean, for ocean stocks, because the Federal
15	Government does have so much more control. But
16	that's why I'm saying we're at least looking at are
17	there ways you can improve recovery?
18	If you look at the bills, what was
19	going to get passed in Congress, everybody agreed
20	recovery was something we should focus on, so
21	Congress had some ideas about that.
22	The role of critical habitat. Critical
23	habitat is it looks like it's here to stay, at
24	least until Congress if Congress ever gets
25	around to it. But we've got some diametrically-
26	opposed pressures of critical habitat. On the one

1	hand, we've got pressures to designate more and
2	more lands as critical habitat. Then the question
3	is: What's their role?
4	And a lot of people say, well, the role
5	should be critical habitat has to have techniques
6	to recover. Okay. Well, since we don't know what
7	recovery is from these stocks, that creates a
8	difficult standard. It's a good ideal; it's hard
9	to put that in practice.
10	And, you know, what is critical
11	habitat is is it federal? What does it mean to
12	be in critical habitat? Because if it is a
13	wilderness area, if you designate critical habitat
14	and all of a sudden you can't do anything to it,
15	that becomes an enormous regulatory burden. If you
16	buy the idea that you can have some modifications
17	but have modifications that will ultimately benefit
18	endangered species, well, that creates a more
19	workable system but it also delays recovery by its
20	very nature.
21	So, you know, we are focused with those
22	contrasting mandates of critical habitat, between
23	having preserving doing everything possible
24	we can to get these off the list at the earliest
25	possible time and having a system that can work so
26	that you can have fishermen in critical habitat or

1	you can have development in critical habitat. And
2	if you can have those things, what level of those
3	things?
4	Private landowners and stakeholders.
5	These are two different groups but they're both
6	important. Landowners, as I said, for many of our
7	species that are not purely ocean species, you need
8	the private landowners in order to recover. If you
9	don't have them, you will never be able to recover.
10	So you need to figure out whether the ESA would be
11	top-heavy from the top down. You must do this in
12	the following line, or is it going to have
13	incentives. And most of the Congressional effort,
14	and I think most of the Administration's view of
15	this, is the ESA is top-heavy enough. We need to
16	work on the mechanics and create more incentives
17	and a lot of the policies I talked about and the
18	Congressional interest was attempts to get carrots
19	out there to get landowners into the program.
20	Stakeholders are different. The
21	stakeholders are the entire voting public. I mean,
22	I am not a landowner in California and yet it might
23	make me feel good to know that there that the
24	landowners in California are not eradicating the
25	last of some little species.
26	And this is the dynamic of the

1	Endangered Species Act. People in Oklanoma care
2	about turtles in the ocean, just because they do.
3	And, you know, these are the stakeholders that this
4	country is being part of. So paying attention to
5	those endangered species stakeholders is important
6	if any of these changes are going to work.
7	And it's also important even if
8	you're not a landowner but if you are a part of the
9	industry system, we've seen that where you can have
10	the industry involved in recovery, planning for
11	recovery. It has a lot greater chance of success
12	and it's going to have a lot better chance of
13	getting it right because you get funding and you
14	get all these other things. It's a collaborative
15	effort as opposed to a pure Government regulation.
16	But those are hard to do. Because if you have a
17	collaborative effort, that necessarily entails some
18	degree of compromise and nobody ever wants to
19	compromise in the Endangered Species Act.
20	Transparency of science and decisions.
21	This is a tough one. You know, I've litigated
22	Endangered Species Act cases since the early '90s.
23	And a lot of the decisions, not from NMFS let's
24	talk about these were law firms where you
25	couldn't follow from A to B. It was either it
26	was in jeopardy or it was listed because I know it

1	when I see it kind of science. And maybe you could
2	back it up, but sometimes you can't. And it goes
3	both ways. I mean, sometimes the sides were very
4	much in favor of the species. And so you would get
5	listings and decisions that were supportive of
6	species health and all that, but you couldn't
7	really justify it based on the science. And you
8	would get sued by them and you'd lose.
9	Or on the other side, you'd get
10	authorizations to allow some project or some
11	fishery
12	well, not fisheries, but some ten percent on
13	the (indiscernible) and, you know, the
14	(indiscernible) would say, Oh, this is going to be
15	fine. It's going to have no problem. And you
16	couldn't figure out how the (indiscernible) figured
17	that out, given the overall bad state of the fish.
18	And you'd lose.
19	There is a common theme in the ESAs.
20	If you couldn't explain your decisions, you'd lose.
21	The problem is that there's so few of them I
22	mean, it's a lot like the recreational fisheries in
23	terms of data quality. You don't really know and
24	you're dealing with uncertainties in this field.
25	So one of the challenges we have at
26	NMFS and at Fish & Wildlife Service is making our

1	decisions in general more transparent. There is an
2	overall I don't know whether anybody's talked to
3	this group about the Data Quality Act. It's a big
4	issue in this Administration to have more peer
5	review and better-explained science. And this is
6	on the Endangered Species Act and I think will
7	generate better transparency of science and
8	decisions. But that's one of our tasks is how to
9	do that.
10	And the last one is workable standards.
11	And the Endangered Species Act is tough because
12	there is never a compromise. I mean, if you're
13	wrong, it's not like you can pay it back next year
14	because there won't be any species left. So you
15	get a lot of very stringent standards and case law
16	and things like that, but the industry also needs
17	to work. There needs to be a way in which the
18	common person can come in and say, If I do this, I
19	either will get shut down or I won't. And right
20	now and I don't think it's just new. I think
21	this has been the case for a while you don't
22	really know what you're going to get when you come
23	to the Fish & Wildlife Service agencies or when you
24	get out of court. And so workable standards that
25	people can rely on is something that we're trying
26	to get.

1	And the current standards about what is
2	or is not prohibited under the Endangered Species
3	Act or how you get there are extremely confusing.
4	You need
5	All right. So the questions the
6	generic questions that we're going to be looking at
7	as an organization with Interior are should ESA
8	communications be improved? Could it be improved?
9	Should we actually given how controversial this
10	is, even to give this presentation, I'm nervous
11	because this is just a very difficult subject.
12	People get paranoid. I guess it's paranoid with
13	reason. They get paranoid to what the result will
14	be. Will we be giving up either the protections to
15	landowners or the species?
16	So should the communications be
17	improved? You know, are we comfortable living in a
18	system that everybody thinks is broken but nobody
19	wants to fix? And, if so, how should it be
20	improved? We have some choices, given that we're
21	not going to do legislation, I think, although, you
22	know, if we do legislation, we have to look at
23	that's a very long-term agenda and people have been
24	doing that for a long time.
25	We've done some administrative policies
26	to help improve the landowners and efficiencies and

1	we could do that we can do regulations. The
2	regulations haven't changed in a long time. Agency
3	emphasis, we can do that, too. You know, we can
4	say, Here is more emphasis on recovery. Well,
5	that's easy to say. We would agree. But that in
6	itself it doesn't get us very far.
7	So I know this is sort of a vague
8	presentation because, unless you're involved in the
9	nuts and bolts and details of the ESA, saying
10	anything more than the vague statements is very
11	hard.
12	MR. FLETCHER: But you're also an
13	attorney, so
14	MR. RAUCH: Yeah. Not anymore. I'm
15	retired.
16	MR. DiLERNIA: What do you mean not
17	anymore?
18	MR. RAUCH: Not anymore.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: You're not an attorney
20	anymore?
21	MR. RAUCH: No.
22	MR. DiLERNIA: Why not?
23	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Not a practicing
24	attorney.
25	MR. RAUCH: I'm not a practicing one.
26	I can't practice. I've been

1	AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's why I'm here.
2	I'm here to keep my eye on him.
3	MR. RAUCH: That's my presentation.
4	This is something that let me just finish. This
5	is something that NMFS is going to be doing. I'm
6	not sure what role MAFAC can play in that but, to
7	the extent that MAFAC wants to play in that, input
8	would be welcome because everybody else has given
9	us input and it would be better to have input from
10	the group that was designed to give us input.
11	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Thank you, Sam.
12	Larry, start out.
13	MR. SIMPSON: I have a general
14	question, Sam.
15	MR. RAUCH: Yes, sir.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Is the Fish & Wildlife
17	Service the lead agency of the Government for
18	Endangered Species Act and NOAA Fisheries
19	secondary, or are they co-equal?
20	MR. RAUCH: Well, on paper, they're co-
21	equal.
22	MR. SIMPSON: Okay.
23	MR. RAUCH: In reality, the Interior
24	has much greater political clout in terms of and
25	they're a broader program than we do.
26	MR. SIMPSON: Right. That's why I

1	asked it.
2	MR. RAUCH: And their Secretary knows a
3	whole lot more about it than our Secretary does.
4	Just the fact of the way it is.
5	MR. SIMPSON: Well, I could my
6	advice is a quarter will get you a cup of coffee.
7	MR. DiLERNIA: Speak up, Larry. I'm
8	sorry. I didn't hear a thing up here.
9	MR. RAUCH: You didn't it's nothing.
10	MR. DiLERNIA: Didn't miss anything?
11	Okay.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Anything
13	else? I guess we can discuss on Thursday whether
14	or not MAFAC wants to be involved in this.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, we have a
16	Protected Resources Subcommittee and Bob Fletcher
17	just got elected again because he's Chairman of
18	that also. Bob, the rest of us can go home. You
19	can take care of all of this work, can't you?
20	The recreational group is the working
21	group; it's ad hoc. But there is protected
22	resources that Fletcher just loves California sea
23	lions.
24	MR. RAUCH: And I think that's one of
25	the reasons that's one of the reasons Bill
26	thought we should come and make this presentation

а

1	because you already do have the standing Protected
2	Resources Subcommittee and this is one of the
3	things perhaps you might be interested in looking
4	at.
5	MR. DiLERNIA: And you need to know
6	from us those two questions, the answers to those
7	two questions.
8	MR. RAUCH: Well, to answer these
9	questions is not an easy thing. I don't propose to
10	think that you could answer these questions in two
11	days. But what I would like to know is do you want
12	to be involved in answering those questions and, if
13	so, how would you like to be involved in that?
14	And I think that's a legitimate
15	expectation that we can ask. But to answer those
16	questions, that's a long time and you don't want to
17	go into that based on my 15-minute presentation.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay.
19	MR. FISHER: Bill, are you going to do
20	something anyway or I mean, the election's two
21	years away. I mean, so
22	MR. RAUCH: Well, there's an election
23	in November.
24	MR. FISHER: Yeah. I mean, so
25	MR. RAUCH: No. We are looking at
26	that. I mean, we are looking at there's a lot

1	of things that we could theoretically do. We could
2	change the regulations. We could change we
3	could issue more policies. We could revise
4	policies. We could take away some of the work on
5	our policies. We could work on emphasis. We will
6	necessarily be implementing the Endangered Species
7	Act and one of the things we are one of the
8	things Senator Henthorn wants to do is to look at
9	can we use our tools other than legislation to
10	include in it? That's why I raise this now. It's
11	something Interior has taken the lead on. They
12	went out and talked to their stakeholders. We
13	thought we should go out and talk to ours. Whether
14	something happens in the next two years or not is a
15	question for (indiscernible) because, as I say,
16	anybody anytime you touch the Endangered Species
17	Act, it becomes a political issue just by the mere
18	fact that you're touching it.
19	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Sam, if guidelines
20	or regulations can be changed without the Act
21	changing, at some point Fish & Wildlife Service or
22	fisheries has proposals and there's a piece of
23	paper they could look at, it's obvious how MAFAC
24	could contribute. But do you think there's a role
25	prior to that time?
26	MR. RAUCH: Well, there should be. I

1	mean, that's you know, it depends on when and if
2	MAFAC wanted to take that up. I don't know you
3	know, at this point, the most significant change we
4	could make is a regulatory change, barring
5	legislation. How long it would take to actually
6	get to the point of issuing a proposed rule, I
7	don't know and it depends on that really depends
8	on powers that be over in D.C. well above me, the
9	timing of those kind of things.
10	But I think we think MAFAC can have a
11	role in it and it can be timely.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Heather.
13	MS. McCARTY: Thank you. Sam, are you
14	going to other stakeholder groups like the councils
15	and so on with these questions?
16	MR. RAUCH: We probably will go to the
17	council. I think the next council meeting is I
18	don't know when, but we will be trying to do that.
19	MS. McCARTY: Good.
20	MR. RAUCH: As I said, this is
21	something that Senator Henthorn Secretary
22	Henthorn now would like us to start looking at and
23	we're trying to do that, without putting something
24	on the table to start with because that's just bad.
25	MR. DiLERNIA: Sam, will you be here
26	Thursday?

1	MR. RAUCH: Yes, I will.
2	MR. DiLERNIA: Perhaps, Fletcher, your
3	group could meet with Sam on Thursday morning and
4	come back with some recommendations or comments or
5	
6	MS. BRYANT: On strategy.
7	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay.
8	MR. FLETCHER: It's going to be
9	interesting because that's three subcommittees that
10	I'm supposed to be at.
11	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah. I know. I know.
12	You'll have to be
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: You'll have to be
14	on your toes.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: Maybe when we adjourn
16	today, we'll try to figure out put our heads
17	together here.
18	MR. JONER: You're just going to have
19	to start early, Bob. Get here at 6:00 a.m.
20	MR. DiLERNIA: I mean, designate
21	what I would suggest that you designate a chairman
22	for some of your other groups and just take it that
23	way. That would be my suggestion.
24	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Mary Hope.
25	MS. KATSOUROS: How many species does
26	NMFS have listed as endangered?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	MR. RAUCH: I believe that NMFS has
2	about 30.
3	MS. KATSOUROS: And how many have been
4	de-listed in the last 20 years?
5	MR. RAUCH: From NMFS's perspective,
6	none. From
7	MS. BRYANT: Gray whale.
8	MR. FLETCHER: Gray whale.
9	MR. RAUCH: Gray whale, yeah. That was
10	I guess that was NMFS's, so, yeah, gray whales.
11	I believe Interior's got maybe three. Gray whale
12	is the only one I think was de-listed because it
13	recovered. I think the others were de-listed
14	because of data error. They found more of them
15	than they thought or they figured they weren't a
16	species.
17	I should say we actually did de-list
18	blue trout because we found it wasn't as later
19	in the process, we figured out it wasn't really a
20	subspecies and so we de-listed that.
21	MS. KATSOUROS: So one recovered. You
22	de-listed one because it was recovered.
23	MR. RAUCH: Yes.
24	MS. KATSOUROS: And then X because of
25	data errors.
26	MR. RAUCH: Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

1	MS. KATSOUROS: Of the 30.
2	MR. RAUCH: Yes. I mean, there's no
3	question that the Endangered Species Act at best is
4	putting more species into the protection and trying
5	to hold the line as opposed to getting them off the
6	list. Getting them off the list is tough.
7	And, you know, we we want to get
8	more off, but that's easier said than done.
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Pete.
10	MR. LEIPZIG: Of those 30 species, I'm
11	just curious, how many are salmonids?
12	MR. RAUCH: I think there's 26
13	salmonids.
14	MR. LEIPZIG: Okay.
15	MR. RAUCH: And we've got we've got
16	whales and turtles
17	MR. LEIPZIG: So there are 40.
18	MR. RAUCH: So maybe 40 then, maybe 40.
19	We've got 26 salmonids, we've got whales, we've got
20	turtles, we've got steller sea lions. We may have
21	coral.
22	MS. BRYANT: Yeah. We just added the
23	coral.
24	MR. RAUCH: Yeah. We've got Atlantic
25	salmon, which is not part of the 26. Some of them
26	are jointly managed with Interior. But it's I

1	mean, it's less than 50 I would think. Interior's
2	got maybe 700. They've got plants.
3	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Ken.
4	MR. ROBERTS: Just out of curiosity,
5	how much litigation does the General Counsel's
6	office get involved in on these species? Is it
7	burdensome, nonexistent?
8	MR. RAUCH: It's incredibly burdensome
9	Half of the litigation I mean, the General
10	Counsel's office litigates about a hundred cases a
11	year and half of those are endangered species
12	cases. The other half are fisheries cases.
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Okay. Thank you,
14	Sam. I think we've found some way we may make
15	progress through the committee process and so good
16	Let's see. If it's okay with everyone
17	Tony is going to lead the final session. How long
18	do you think it will take to go
19	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, how long do you
20	want to go? I think five, ten minutes.
21	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: If we come back at
22	4:00, we'll probably still be done by 5:00.
23	(Recess from 3:49 p.m., until 4:02 p.m.)
24	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: If we get started,
25	we'll still get a timely finish, I think. Just
26	before we get going, these microphones are very

1	sensitive. And so when the main conversation is
2	going on and people over here are having side
3	conversations about how stupid somebody else is,
4	that's on the tape. So you have to be careful with
5	what you're saying on this side.
6	MS. BRYANT: And just know that this is
7	going to some transcriber, who's not Mike, who
8	won't know anything and it will end up in the
9	transcript, so do be aware or we'll have a little
10	President Bush incident.
11	MR. SIMPSON: That's where you come in.
12	You've got to sanitize. My secretaries have to do
13	that a lot, a lot. Be surprised what they hear.
14	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Professor DiLernia
15	will lead us through
16	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you, Jim.
17	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: the "Vision"
18	document.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you. I spoke with
20	Dr. Hogarth this afternoon during lunchtime and he
21	reiterated something that he said this morning in
22	the conference call to us regarding the 2020
23	document. He said what he hopes that we eventually
24	produce is a document that say could be used by a
25	business group or a finance group if they said to
26	themselves, Okay, if we wanted to invest in

1	America's fisheries, where we see growth and where
2	we think we can make some money because that's
3	where we think the growth is going to be if
4	we're going to place money somewhere in an
5	investment, where should that money go?
6	Where would where do we see where
7	is the growth going to occur? Where is the
8	where will what sectors of the American fishing
9	industry want to go contraction? Which sectors of
10	the American fishing industry will go in expansion
11	and growth? And what are the factors that will
12	affect that that we can possibly invest in?
13	And so that's the I would say the
14	common theme or thread that we should keep in mind
15	as we look at this development of this 2020
16	document and where we're going to go with it.
17	This presentation is going to cover our
18	activities since the last MAFAC meeting, the
19	project itself, some of the issues to be discussed,
20	and how do we go forward.
21	In February, we all met in Fort
22	Lauderdale and the concept of MAFAC and the concept
23	of developing this 2020 document was approved by
24	the committee. Coincidental with my travel for the
25	Recreational Fishing Data meeting, I met with Dr.
26	Hogarth on March 28th and he reiterated what he

1	the message I just delivered to you regarding what
2	this document should eventually should produce or
3	what we should hopefully produce in the form of a
4	document.
5	And, to that end, on March 3rd (sic),
6	we met again in Silver Spring and Dr. Hogarth has
7	designated Mary Hope Katsouros as the staff to work
8	with MAFAC in producing this document. That was
9	done on March 30th.
10	During April, May, and June, there were
11	several discussions with members of the fishing
12	community regarding the MAFAC project. And on June
13	6th, again coincidental with travel for another
14	issue or another activity, there was a meeting in
15	Dr. Hogarth's office at his request and, in that
16	meeting, the participants Dr. Hogarth, Laurel,
17	Mary Hope, and myself to discuss our roles and
18	responsibilities associated with the project.
19	On June 15th, the National Fishermen
20	agreed to cover the project and its progress. And
21	we're going to see that part of this project really
22	is going to we have to do a significant amount
23	of outreach because the desire is to get input from
24	the American fishing industry regarding what they
25	see as where we are evolving and where we would be
26	15 years from now.

1	Originally, I had conceived or I
2	thought that the concept would simply come from the
3	members of MAFAC, but Dr. Hogarth was willing to
4	put some budget money towards this and he suggested
5	that we go beyond this meeting room and we contact
6	individuals in the industry in the country and ask
7	for their input and ask for their advice. And he's
8	been looking for outlets to contact the industry.
9	National Fisherman magazine has agreed
10	to be one of those outlets. And there have been
11	discussions with Sportfishing magazine to be an
12	outlet to the recreational community, and we have
13	an agreement in principle at this point between
14	Doug Owen, who's the editor of Sportfishing
15	magazine and the Agency regarding also helping us
16	promote this idea and providing an outlet for the
17	Agency to the recreational community, but that has
18	not been finalized yet, but we do have an
19	understanding and <u>Sportfishing</u> magazine has agreed
20	in concept to provide actually a column for Dr.
21	Hogarth similar to <u>Bill's Corner</u> that's a
22	national fishing magazine so that Bill can speak
23	directly to the recreational community.
24	On the 20th, there was a the minutes
25	of the June 6th meeting went to the participants.
26	On June 26th, the project description

1	was distributed. It was supposed to be distributed
2	to the working group, but I believe maybe all the
3	MAFAC members may have received it, a description
4	of the project itself.
5	Next slide, please. Next slide.
6	Develop a vision document which describes the
7	future of 2020 of the U.S. Marine Fisheries both
8	commercial and recreational sectors as well as the
9	availability of seafood for our nation's economy
10	and food security.
11	Next slide. Proposed duration and
12	methodology. It's conceived that it will take
13	it's going to be a two-phase project. One phase
14	will be in information-gathering and collecting of
15	data and information. And phase two, six months,
16	will consist of well, phase one is literature
17	review, data collection, special sessions. Dr.
18	Hogarth has suggested that we hold sessions in
19	conjunction with the regional fishery management
20	councils and also in conjunction with the three
21	state fisheries commissions to get information.
22	And phase two next slide six
23	months will be analyze and put together the data,
24	the information that we receive, and prepare drafts
25	for review and circulate the drafts amongst the
26	committee members and try to come up with a try

1	to develop a final report.
2	Next slide. Thorough report, future
3	marine fisheries. Present the committee's analysis
4	and deliberation over the last 12 months.
5	The report will contain, but not be
6	limited to, current trends. Again, this is
7	important. Current trends in both the recreational
8	sector, commercial sector, the consumer, and how
9	the present trends evolve over the next 15 years
10	and the impact of those trends on marine fisheries.
11	Probably that last sentence probably best describes
12	the project itself.
13	Next slide, please. Evolution of
14	management strategies and their impact on the
15	commercial and recreational fishing sector. I'm
16	sure we should look at where it's recommended
17	that we should look at that. I'm sure we'll hear
18	from the fishing community regarding that issue.
19	The role of aquaculture in enhancing
20	commercial and recreational fishing, meeting
21	seafood needs. I personally believe that
22	aquaculture will play a significant, significant
23	role in development of our fisheries over the next
24	15, 20 years, and I think it should have a
25	prominent place in this report.
26	A road map finally, Vision 2020, a

1	road map of the future of U.S. marine fisheries.
2	Next slide. The working group and
3	the reason we use the term "working group," it's
4	only because of all MAFAC members are expected
5	and hopefully will contribute and participate in
6	this project. But for organizational purposes, we
7	had to define a working group and so what we did
8	was what Dr. Hogarth suggested was that we take
9	the select a chairman from the various
10	subcommittees and, in addition to that, added a
11	couple of additional and also the executive
12	directors of the Commission and finally to that
13	group add a couple of additional members from the
14	committee.
15	So the working group consists of
16	myself, Mr. Billy, Mr. Dorsett, Mr. Fletcher, Mr.
17	Gilmore, Mr. Fisher, O'Shea, Mr. Simpson, Ms.
18	McCarty, and Mr. Rayburn.
19	But, again, that's a loose definition
20	of the working group. We hope everyone will
21	participate.
22	Next slide. Issues to be resolved.
23	Here are some of the questions that we need to get
24	some resolution, come to some conclusions on at the
25	end of this by the end of this meeting. Perhaps
26	not by the end of today but by the end of the MAFAC

1	meeting and there is going to be a working group
2	meeting tomorrow morning. I'll get to that in a
3	few minutes.
4	But time frame, number one, is 12
5	months sufficient?
6	Number two, in the questionnaire, what
7	should be included in our questionnaire? What type
8	of questions should we ask? How open-ended should
9	it be? An annotated bibliography, is it worth the
10	effort? Our staff would have to put together a
11	bibliography.
12	Are there any other suggestions from
13	the committee for publicizing the project?
14	And are Congressional briefings to
15	inform the members of Congress and staff
16	appropriate?
17	I'll look for answers or maybe some
18	discussion on this when I finish my report, and I'd
19	like to continue to answer these questions tomorrow
20	morning in the subcommittee meeting.
21	Next slide. Okay. Also, another
22	question is: Will additional sessions, aside from
23	the regional council meetings and the commission
24	meetings, be necessary? To that point, when I
25	mention regional council meetings and commission
26	meetings, which currently envision is that if we're

1	going to have a meeting at a regional fisheries
2	council meeting, we would hope the MAFAC member
3	that resides in that region or myself or both of
4	us, along with Ms. Katsouros, would run that
5	meeting, that informational-gathering meeting. I
6	don't want to use the term "hearing." I just I
7	mean, it's easy for me to use the term "hearing,"
8	but let me if I do use it, it's my mistake.
9	It's not a hearing. We are gathering information.
10	And so as we travel to the eight regions, we hope
11	that MAFAC members that reside in those regions
12	could possibly chair that information-gathering
13	meeting and also, as we go to the commission
14	meetings, we hope perhaps some of the committee
15	members who reside within the region that the
16	Commission encompasses could join us.
17	I mean, who better to know who to seek
18	advice from than those individuals who reside
19	within the region or the executive directors of the
20	three commissions who probably hear from their
21	fishermen on a regular basis and who could
22	recommend to us who are reliable sources of
23	information. And so we're going to rely on members
24	and the executive directors in giving us advice
25	regarding that where we should go for our
26	information-gathering.

1	Also, to that end, what other major
2	meetings should take place? Should there be any
3	additional major meetings take place and, if so,
4	who should attend?
5	Next slide. Moving forward, next
6	slide. Okay. The working group. There will be a
7	working group meeting tomorrow morning from 8:00
8	it's on your agenda from a subcommittee
9	working group anyone who wishes to attend from
10	MAFAC it will be from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon in
11	this room here. I'd like to have some discussion
12	now on some of the questions we've asked, but we do
13	have to adjourn by 5:00 at the latest today, and I
14	would like to develop a more defined strategy and
15	plan tomorrow morning in the working group with the
16	subcommittee here in this room.
17	The other subcommittee's going to meet
18	tomorrow morning. Is
19	MS. BRYANT: You've got the Tom
20	Billy.
21	MR. DiLERNIA: Tom Billy, the
22	aquaculture,
23	MS. BRYANT: Aquaculture.
24	MR. DiLERNIA: will be in the next
25	room also during the same time.
26	Now, the problem is if you want to

1	attend both, we're going to have to ask you to pop
2	back and forth unless there's I don't see any
3	other way at this point. And, again, you'll have
4	to just dance back and forth between the two.
5	It's unfortunate that we have the two
6	committees scheduled at the same time, particularly
7	because, again and I'll repeat I think
8	aquaculture will play such an important role in the
9	development of our fisheries over the next 15
10	years.
11	Laurel?
12	MS. BRYANT: I do want you to remember,
13	though, that the subcommittees it is
14	unfortunate. That's kind of the way it needed to
15	work out. But do remember that the purpose of the
16	subcommittees is to kind of do some heavy lifting,
17	some fleshing out, some detailing, and the hope and
18	the goal is to be able to do that in an efficient
19	manner so that the majority of Thursday can be for
20	that information and that fleshed-out detail to be
21	presented to the full Committee for truly in-depth
22	discussions and any decision-making. We were
23	really trying to maximize that full Committee time
24	to consider those issues.
25	And this agenda got a little loaded up
26	there at the end. We weren't expecting it. But I

1	think if we go with that approach and just know
2	this is a labor-saving device in order to deal with
3	multiple issues with few members, that maybe it
4	won't be so
5	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, Jim, I have a
6	suggestion, but
7	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, I don't have
8	a good suggestion, but we do have all day tomorrow,
9	if you consider the bus ride somehow and if you
10	consider I'm not sure what's planned at
11	Manchester, if there's any opportunity there. But
12	you also have Thursday morning.
13	MR. DiLERNIA: That was going to be my
14	suggestion.
15	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: So we may be able -
16	- if you had an agenda of the way you might step
17	through your meeting versus how Tom Billy steps
18	through aquaculture, it might allow the members to
19	
20	MR. DiLERNIA: Perhaps at the end of
21	by 12:00 noon tomorrow, Dr. Billy, you and I can
22	come together and try to plan some type of joint
23	meeting, whatever, for Thursday morning. So if we
24	could break up into two smaller groups to try to
25	get some work done tomorrow morning and then
26	Thursday morning bring maybe have the entire

1	Committee convene rather than have two
2	subcommittees and try to work on
3	MR. BILLY: When do we have to leave
4	tomorrow?
5	MS. BRYANT: We leave at the bus
6	comes at 12:15 and we'd like to be out of here by
7	12:30. We'll probably arrive at Manchester between
8	2:00 and 2:30. It always depends on traffic.
9	We'll have about two two hours and
10	15 minutes of a tour, see the research projects,
11	and then some relax time and salmon dinner will
12	commence at about 5:00 and we have some evening
13	entertainment that will probably commence at around
14	6:00 or 6:15.
15	So I don't know if there will be any
16	time over at Manchester, but on the bus there might
17	be.
18	MR. BILLY: Can we have like one of the
19	two groups start about 7:00 tomorrow morning?
20	MS. BRYANT: That room will be open and
21	so will this.
22	MR. BILLY: Seven to
23	MS. BRYANT: As early as you want.
24	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: 10:00 and then
25	10:00 to 12:00 and reverse it Thursday? It's three
26	hours and two hours.

1	MR. DiLERNIA: You mean, the entire
2	MAFAC group do aquaculture from 7:00 until 10:00
3	and then
4	MR. BILLY: Well, there's yeah.
5	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, I guess Mr.
6	Billy's aquaculture group could, for example, meet
7	from 7:00 to 10:00 and everyone that wanted to
8	attend that could, which wouldn't have to be the
9	whole MAFAC. And then if your group met from 10:00
10	till
11	MR. DiLERNIA: Twelve.
12	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: 12:00, then
13	whoever wanted to be in that, which might include
14	them all, but not necessarily. I'm not sure if
15	that's enough time.
16	MR. BILLY: Then we could play it by
17	ear for Thursday morning. See how far we get.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: I have no objection to
19	it if the other Committee members Committee
20	members, is that agreeable?
21	MS. McCARTY: That's a good idea.
22	MR. DiLERNIA: Very good. All right.
23	Let me just get it straight, Bill. You volunteered
24	to start the seven o'clock meeting?
25	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Well, let me
26	propose one other thing how about 7:00 till

1	9:00, 9:00 till 11:00, and you've got 11:00 to
2	12:00 to maybe finish up some aquaculture stuff
3	and, by that time, the members will know where to
4	go in case you don't get done in two hours.
5	MS. BRYANT: And you still have
6	Thursday that if you need to do more time on Vision
7	or whatever, there will be that.
8	MR. DiLERNIA: Do you want to do 7:00
9	or do you want me to do 7:00, Tom? It doesn't
10	matter.
11	MR. BILLY: I don't care.
12	MR. DiLERNIA: Let him do 7:00. You
13	just got 7:00. You got 7:00. We'll get 9:00.
14	MR. BILLY: That's fine 7:00.
15	MR. SIMPSON: Seven's Aquaculture; 9:00
16	is Vision?
17	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, sir.
18	MR. SIMPSON: Okay.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: Questions now on what
20	we've done so far? Heather?
21	MS. McCARTY: Are you anticipating that
22	this group will have a short discussion on what
23	you've presented now?
24	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.
25	MS. McCARTY: Okay. If so, I have

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

something that I want to say.

26

1	MR. DiLERNIA: Oh, okay. I just
2	MS. McCARTY: Whenever you're ready.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: And I'm ready.
4	MS. McCARTY: Okay.
5	MR. DiLERNIA: And I just want to,
6	again, point out that Mary Hope Katsouros, she's
7	our staff member on this and so she's going to be
8	taking notes on everything we say here, hopefully
9	putting it all together nice and neat for us. So,
10	Heather, please.
11	MS. McCARTY: I've been thinking about
12	this and one thing that struck me going through
13	this material, looking at the plan and so on, is
14	that in the process that we have laid out, we have
15	ample opportunity to hear from stakeholders in all
16	of these regions. And we have what we'll get
17	from that is everyone's idea of what they think is
18	going to happen in the future, which is, at best,
19	speculation, hope, and fear and so on.
20	And those are all really legitimate
21	because those drive those things drive a lot of
22	actions in policy. However, it strikes me that we
23	might also need consultation, advice, and so on
24	from expert individuals, particularly in the fields
25	of fishery science, climate change, market
26	analysis, and so on because we need to know what

1	the state of the resource might be and what we
2	should expect in those areas and in global markets
3	and so on.
4	And so it seems to me that we have sort
5	of two jobs. One is to get information from
6	stakeholders and the other is to get data and fact
7	or as close to it as you can from another whole
8	group of folks.
9	And I don't know how we can
10	legitimately talk about the future unless we look
11	at those things from both perspectives. I just
12	throw that out because I think we'll probably get
13	to that point, but I think we need to start
14	thinking about it now.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: To this point?
16	MR. LEIPZIG: Yeah.
17	MR. DiLERNIA: Pete.
18	MR. LEIPZIG: It just strikes me that
19	it's really the same thing. It's just who you're
20	asking.
21	MS. McCARTY: It's all speculation.
22	MR. LEIPZIG: They're different groups
23	of people.
24	MS. McCARTY: Right. But I'd rather
25	hear from a climate scientist about the future of
26	the temperature than I would from, you know,

1	MR. LEIPZIG: But he's still
2	speculating.
3	MS. McCARTY: Chris Oliver, you
4	know.
5	MR. LEIPZIG: But he's still
6	speculating. And the fishermen you talk to may not
7	talk about climate change. They're just focusing
8	your questions about speculating in the future to
9	different groups of people.
L O	MS. McCARTY: That's right. Anyway,
1	that's my statement.
12	MR. DiLERNIA: To this point, Mary
13	Hope?
4	MS. KATSOUROS: I think I'm not sure
15	but I think that there is a similar exercise
16	going on on the future of fisheries science.
17	MS. BRYANT: It's the I believe that
18	may be the data research priorities for the next
L9	ten years, which is kind of the document that Rick
20	mentioned that will be out for public comment in
21	about a month. And it's very good there's a
22	couple of documents that Rachel and I have been
23	looking at that we wanted to provide folks as kind
24	of an idea on how they approached it and what was
25	available.
26	MR. DiLERNIA: Heather.

1	MS. BRYANT: If that answers the
2	question.
3	MS. McCARTY: Just as a follow-up to
4	that, that's one of the things that started me
5	thinking about this, Mary Hope, was that this would
6	be a particularly good resource in that area, and
7	there's other resources that we could pull in in
8	the other areas, particularly in the area of
9	markets, but when when Captain Tony said, you
10	know, Bill Hogarth wants us to look at it from the
11	perspective of an investor, where are you going to
12	put your money if you were going to put your
13	money into fisheries, what would you look at?
14	You'd for sure want to look at the resource and
15	you'd for sure want to look at the management and
16	the market situation even though, as you point out,
17	Pete, it is speculative always. But you for sure
18	want to look at those things. You and you'd
19	also want to go around to the industry and say,
20	What do you think's going to happen? You'd want to
21	do all those things.
22	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.
23	MS. KATSOUROS: Is that the document
24	that Steve is doing with the science
25	MS. BRYANT: And it's still internal,
26	but I think they're anticipating going external and

1	we'll get copies to MAFAC and let everybody know
2	and I think that's late in August.
3	MS. KATSOUROS: Yes, 'cause Bill said
4	that that would help or, you know because that
5	they were doing that, that because I asked the
6	same question, Heather. How come, you know, if the
7	science is so important, you know, having
8	confidence in the science is as important.
9	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. I have John
10	Forster, Mr. O'Shea, and Eric. Mr. Forster.
11	MR. FORSTER: I was trying to think
12	through this a little bit from the business
13	perspective and sort of thinking what a business
14	would need and you, I think, Tony, had a slide of
15	current trends up there. And I think I would sort
16	of say, Well, what's the current status? I mean,
17	what do we actually know as of today how the
18	industry is structured financially? I've seen
19	these figures that Bill's talked about from time to
20	time, a \$53 billion industry we have here. Well,
21	how is that \$53 billion made up?
22	And what are the values that construct
23	it? Not only in terms of market, but what are the
24	costs that go into it?
25	And so you have this financial analysis
26	of the industry as it is today and therefore you

1	have a framework on which to understand what might
2	happen in the future.
3	Now, whether or not such analysis is
4	possible is a secondary question, but that is
5	definitely some information that I think a board of
6	directors would find very useful in looking at this
7	sort of thing.
8	MR. DiLERNIA: So you're suggesting an
9	analysis of the current composition of the fishing
10	industry in the U.S.?
11	MR. FORSTER: Yeah, even just how that
12	\$53.8 billion is made up, where does it come from
13	and then you could overlay that I would want to
14	see where are the costs that go into it? What
15	does it actually cost in terms of capital
16	resources, in terms of management resources? Just
17	what's the financial structure of the industry?
18	MR. DiLERNIA: That \$58 million (sic)
19	number that you brought up has been you were
20	quoting Dr. Hogarth.
21	MR. FORSTER: Am I not right? He talks
22	about this as a \$53 billion business; yes?
23	MR. DiLERNIA: Which means that that's
24	come from someplace within the Agency.
25	MR. FORSTER: And if you compute that
26	back to the pounds of fish that actually go into

1	the U.S. market everywhere, it works out
2	everything sells for about 13 bucks a pound because
3	I've done it. So clearly it's not sort of a landed
4	value. There's a whole other value in the industry
5	there which is part of the seafood business. And,
6	therefore, if you're trying to make a decision
7	about where you're going to go, I think you need to
8	know very clearly where you're at.
9	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. I don't in the
10	recreational industry, it's I mean, if I just do
11	a simple calculation, say, with my business with
12	fish, I'd calculate some of my fish that we
13	land, which would retail if we were to sell it,
14	it would retail for maybe \$12 or three-, \$400 each
15	because of the capturing and the recreational
16	activity was paid for for the fishing and all. So
17	that somehow must factor in.
18	But see, Mary Hope is writing.
19	Hopefully she's capturing what we're saying here.
20	To that point or 'cause I have I
21	have a list here. I have
22	MS. McCALL: I just have a question
23	'cause I used to be in Silver Spring, worked for
24	Headquarters.
25	MR. DiLERNIA: Oh, okay. Hold on.
26	Could you please state your name for the record.

1	MS. McCALL: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Mariam
2	McCall. I'm an attorney with NOAA and I'm just
3	wondering how are you going to 'cause I haven't
4	heard anyone say this rely on all the current
5	information that's out there in all the EISs that
6	the Council the Agency has put together, because
7	it would seem to me that a lot of what many of you
8	are saying is contained in the most recent
9	document; for instance, this is the DEIS on the
10	Pacific Coast groundfish fishery and it has all
11	that information about how the fishing industry for
12	the Pacific Coast groundfish fishery is set up. So
13	it would seem like a lot of that work has already
14	been done and it would be a matter of doing the
15	literature search for it and the pulling it out.
16	MR. DiLERNIA: Does anyone have like a
17	graduate student in economics that wants that's
18	I'm not joking. I just may go back to the
19	university and look for someone myself.
20	I understand you and thank you and
21	that's a good possible source of the information.
22	MS. McCALL: And if you want to read
23	this document, it's
24	MR. DiLERNIA: Back to the list. Mr.
25	O'Shea.
26	MR O'SHEA: Thanks Mr Chairman It

1	seems to me that this assignment or discussion
2	about going out and holding public hearings and
3	going to all the councils and all the commissions,
4	as I think about this, it really sort of puts MAFAC
5	in sort of a collection analysis mode, which is one
6	way to get at this problem but, in my mind, that's
7	a little bit different than having a group of
8	experts sitting in the room trying to envision what
9	the future is going to be using thanks for
10	bringing up available data and available
11	information and the state of the literature. I
12	hope I'm with friends here but, frankly, I'm quite
13	skeptical about what we're really going to get
14	what you're going to get by after an eight-hour
15	ASMFC Commission meeting having a seven o'clock
16	listening session. You and I both know who's going
17	to show up to that. You both we both know what
18	they're going to say and I suspect those folks are
19	around at the other council processes.
20	So I think just to call attention, it
21	seems to me it's a strategy shift here of the
22	decision to have MAFAC go out and start collecting
23	this stuff. And Heather I think, Heather,
24	you're absolutely that's why you and I I think
25	were exchanging glances back and forth earlier, is
26	we're going to have all kinds of stuff not

1	necessarily grounded in science, not necessarily
2	grounded in facts, and you're going to try to
3	project forward. And I've done these exercises for
4	other times and other places. And if it's a
5	venting thing to make people feel good, Roger, got
6	that. We can go do that. But if you want to try
7	to get something that's going to be unique and
8	different reflecting the unique characteristics of
9	this organization, we maybe ought to have a little
10	bit more discussion about where we're going to
11	spend our time.
12	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, thank you very
13	much, Vince. That's a good suggestion. You make
14	good points, and that's the purpose of this of
15	the presentation and of the meeting and the
16	discussion, as to how do we structure this work,
17	where do we go.
18	I can forecast who would show up to a
19	Mid-Atlantic Region meeting and what some of the
20	comments would be. Yes, I agree with you. At the
21	same time, how do we how does it become a
22	document that stakeholders somehow feel that
23	somehow that they were involved in developing or
24	had input into or participation in, that's where
25	Dr. Hogarth was coming from when he again, not
26	to speak for Bill, but I think that's where he was

1	coming from.
2	MR. O'SHEA: I guess my response, Bill,
3	my response would be and, again, this may be
4	heresy but it might not reflect what they say.
5	I think what it reflects is what MAFAC's opinion
6	is, and I don't think we ought to worry too much
7	about you know, and I'm not saying that the
8	public shouldn't be consulted but, by definition,
9	we're here all of us are here as a cross-section
10	of the public to provide expert advice to the
11	Secretary and the Assistant Administrator. So just
12	while public involvement is appropriate in a lot
13	of different cases, I think there's an ability of
14	this group to provide advice just on its own
15	standing and by doing its own sort of research,
16	quite frankly.
17	Thanks.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Thank you. Eric
19	Schwaab.
20	MR. SCHWAAB: Yeah. Well, just to
21	begin, I agree completely with what I think Vince
22	is saying. I don't think that we should exclude
23	interaction with our sort of traditional friends
24	and associates, but if we try to develop a document
25	that is somehow accepted by or reflects all of
26	that, then the document's going to be not worth

1	writing. I mean, we're going to be trying to
2	assert some real leadership here in thinking about
3	things in different ways.
4	And in that context, I think that the
5	information that we're going to get that's going to
6	be most meaningful is going to come from outside of
7	our traditional realm of contacts. So going out
8	and speaking to economists or, you know,
9	climatologists or whatever the case might be, is
10	going to be the place where we're going to get
11	information that is going to be brought into this
12	process in a way that's going to add some real
13	value to a very forward-looking project.
14	Now, just a word or two about that's
15	the substance a word or two about process. I
16	think that when we I think that we need to think
17	a lot about how we're going to have these
18	conversations, and public meetings or public
19	hearings in the traditional sense is I think not
20	going to give us the kind of input that we want.
21	And one of the things that we ought to be doing,
22	and maybe Mary Hope is going to do this I don't
23	know is designing the process for holding those
24	conversations and thinking very explicitly about
25	who we want to reach out to in that process so that
26	we gain not just buy-in, but the best information

1	possible that's relevant to the questions that we
2	are raising.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: Could you give me an
4	example, Eric? I'm trying to put into practical
5	application what you're saying because I in a
6	sense, I agree with you. I'm not sure
7	MR. SCHWAAB: Well, I think well, I
8	mean, the one you know, it's sort of somewhat
9	within our sort of traditional realm, but this
10	whole question of aquaculture. But the question of
11	aquaculture in the context of how global seafood
12	markets are going to be satisfied ten or 15 years
13	from now and how what we're doing today, both in
14	the amount and in the way that the supply is
15	comes forth, is either going to be is going to
16	fit into that future or not.
17	And if it doesn't, then what does that
18	future look like? I mean, we've got a guy like
19	Bill Dewey's who's right here and can tell us how
20	the current many of the current fisheries aren't
21	going to meet the markets of 15 or 20 years from
22	now and what those expectations are going to be and
23	just really be thinking about that a little bit.
24	I think that, you know, when we start
25	talking about recreational anglers or commercial
26	fishermen, I think we're leaving out whole big

1	sectors of stakeholders and user groups that are
2	going to be I think very dominant 15 or 20 years
3	from now. Local tourism officials or, you know,
4	the environmental community. Obviously, I assume
5	we'll be speaking at length with representatives of
6	the environmental community in this process but,
7	you know, what are coastal communities going to
8	look like 20 years from now and how are aquatic
9	resources going to be best utilized to meet the
10	economic, the social, the you know, the
11	environmental demands that are going to be out
12	there 15 or 20 years from now. I mean, those are
13	the kind of things that I think we need to
14	articulate the questions and then we need to figure
15	out how to get those questions answered, not just
16	say, Here's a bunch of people we want to talk to.
17	Now what do we want to ask them?
18	So process-wise, that's and then,
19	you know, the last thing I would say is that I
20	think that we ought to think about that in I
21	mean, we're talking about posting a questionnaire
22	to the website, but I would think that we'd want a
23	much more interactive website that's going to be a
24	centerpiece of this process as we go forward so
25	that it I mean, you know, we get into kind of,
26	you know, a sort of a blog-based approach where

1	there's, you know, a give and take about ideas,
2	there's exchange of information, there's a posting
3	of here's where we are now and we have
4	opportunities for back and forth on that again from
5	where we invite participation from people that
6	we traditionally don't hear from in ways that we
7	don't traditionally hear from.
8	But I think the design of that process
9	is going to take a lot of expertise, and I think,
10	frankly, we're going to have to spend some money to
11	make that happen in a way that it's going to
12	satisfy our ability to make the kinds of make
13	the kind of projections and recommendations that
14	Bill's looking for.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you very much.
16	Thank you. I'd like to stick to the list. I see
17	that Frank Lockhart.
18	MR. LOCKHART: Yeah.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: And just let's see
20	I have Pete and, Mary Beth, I have you. I have
21	right now, I have just to let you know, I have
22	Mr. Billy, Mary Beth, Larry Simpson, and Pete.
23	MR. LOCKHART: I had actually, it
24	was almost like we had planned it. My question is
25	a perfect segue from his, I think, and I actually
26	just have a question. Throughout the presentation

1	and some of the comments here, it's still a little
2	unclear to me whether Vision 2020 is, Okay, if
3	nothing changes, here's where we're going to be in
4	2020, or is it, Here's where we want to be in 2020?
5	They're completely different things.
6	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.
7	MR. LOCKHART: And I think there's a
8	completely different process of how you get there.
9	If you just want to say, Here's where things are
10	going and get comments, I think that's pretty easy.
11	You can get some experts and just do trends. But
12	if you want to have a vision of where you're going,
13	I think it requires a little bit more a lot more
14	work on your part and you still have to, I think,
15	lay the groundwork of, Here's where we are, here's
16	where the trends are putting us, and then you have
17	to ask really hard questions about that.
18	And
19	MR. DiLERNIA: Should I
20	MR. LOCKHART: Go ahead. And that's
21	basically what I was saying.
22	MR. DiLERNIA: Because what you're
23	saying is perhaps what some of us have seen as the
24	document being, Here's where we're going, here's
25	what's developing, here's what we see if left
26	alone, whatever. Here's where we're going to be.

1	MR. LOCKHART: Exactly. The default
2	position, yeah.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. What is naturally
4	occurring. How's the marketplace dictating what's
5	occurring? How is management how are we
6	developing? And then phase two is do we like that?
7	Do we like that? And that's another whole separate
8	issue to be discussed.
9	MR. LOCKHART: Yeah.
10	MR. DiLERNIA: Do we like that or do we
11	want to change that? Do we want to make
12	explanations? And if we don't like that, what do
13	we have to do to change it? That's step three.
14	MR. LOCKHART: Exactly. And I think
15	you guys, if that's what you want to do, you have
16	to start asking some tough questions, you know,
17	some basic trends. Fishing communities are
18	disappearing everywhere, except maybe Alaska. The
19	number of fishermen out there, if you judge it by
20	permits, is going way down, at least on the West
21	Coast.
22	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.
23	MR. LOCKHART: By orders of magnitude.
24	What does that mean? Because if it continues, I
25	mean, it's going to have some very serious
26	implications and I think you guys have an

T	opportunity to ask some really tough questions
2	because oftentimes these vision documents are so
3	milquetoast, I mean, that they don't really say
4	anything, you know. And you guys have an
5	opportunity to change that.
6	MR. DiLERNIA: At the risk of appearing
7	to be biased, which but in the development of
8	this document, I see that I believe that a
9	number of the individuals everyone sitting at
10	this table here is an expert in their field and we
11	know things. We know things intuitively. We see
12	how things are going. Sometimes by articulating
13	that as an individual, it's almost difficult, if
14	not impossible, based on the group that you're part
15	of or the group that you represent because
16	either the group that you represent or your party
17	doesn't agree with it or it's damaging to them or
18	whatever. But if those comments come out as part
19	of a report from the entire Committee, it lets us,
20	as I said, serve the group that we're representing
21	by putting the real truth out there, the real
22	facts, and insulating us a bit also. So I don't
23	know if that so I'm trying to, in a sense, give
24	the members an opportunity to really say what they
25	see and feel and, at the same time, give them some
26	cover, a political cover and insulate them a little

1	bit as to what the reality is of being up front
2	sometimes and saying what you think.
3	Mr. Billy.
4	MR. BILLY: This morning, when we
5	talked about aquaculture, we talked in terms of six
6	million metric tons and, allowing for modest
7	population increase, that increasing to seven
8	million metric tons. Then we talked further about
9	the possibility that for health and other reasons,
10	there might be a U.S. Government policy to
11	encourage doubling per capita consumption, which
12	would put it up in the range of 14 million metric
13	tons.
14	Those kinds of numbers, whatever the
15	right exact numbers are, sound like the kind of
16	at least part of the information that Bill's
17	thinking about in terms of investors looking at
18	U.S. fisheries. So at least in terms of the
19	seafood marketplace.
20	One thing that's not clear to me is
21	when we use the term "U.S. fisheries," what does
22	that include? Does that include all the importers
23	that import seafood that makes up 70 percent of
24	what's consumed in the U.S.? Is that part of U.S.
25	fisheries?

MR. DiLERNIA: You asked --

26

1	MR. BILLY: Anyone.
2	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, if I was to offer
3	you an answer
4	MR. BILLY: I don't know what we're
5	talking about from the writeup. What constitutes
6	"U.S. fisheries"? Is it all that goes into the
7	seafood supply?
8	MR. DiLERNIA: I would I would offer
9	
10	MR. BILLY: Where do you draw that
11	line?
12	MR. DiLERNIA: Yeah.
13	MR. BILLY: Is it just fishermen and
14	the processors that process domesticly-produced
15	fish and shellfish?
16	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, if we define it as
17	those who produce, both recreationally and
18	commercially,
19	MR. BILLY: Right.
20	MR. DiLERNIA: clearly we're going
21	to fall short of our goals, which means then that
22	we have to include aquaculture. And if aquaculture
23	is not projected to grow or if we don't see
24	aquaculture growing at the rate to satisfy the
25	demands that you've described, then we have to
26	expand it even further to include imports.

1	MR. BILLY: Well, yeah. To me, there's
2	a good likelihood that there's going to be
3	significant growth per capita consumption for a
4	variety of reasons. And that's going to come from
5	somewhere. It's either going to come from some
6	improvement in domestic production of fish from
7	wild stocks, from domestic aquaculture, from other
8	wild stocks around the world, to the extent that's
9	possible, and from aquaculture growth in other
10	parts of the world.
11	And so it is in that context then that
12	U.S. fisheries, as I think of it, which is domestic
13	fishing, fishermen, and processors and so forth,
14	it's in that environment that they will be
15	functioning in 2020. And so how they what they
16	have to do to be competitive is what they have to
17	do to to put them in the best position to make -
18	- be profitable and make a living and all of those
19	things will be in a context like that, a picture
20	that we will paint for the year 2020 and the demand
21	for seafood that exists at that time.
22	So I would agree with Heather's point
23	about we need to talk to some people that can help
24	us better pin down what that marketplace will
25	likely look at in 2020 and then work backwards from
26	that in terms of what that what opportunities

1	that represents for U.S. fisheries, as I define it.
2	MR. DiLERNIA: Mary Beth.
3	MS. TOOLEY: Originally I was going to
4	comment on something else and I will, but just to
5	follow up on what Tom had said, it seems like if we
6	develop a vision document, that we should kind of
7	focus and I don't disagree with what he said
8	but our document should focus on species and
9	fisheries that are under the jurisdictional of
10	National Marine Fisheries Service or NOAA. And
11	then I think you need to consider all of the things
12	that Tom just said, but in sort of a structural
13	sort of way of looking at it, the vision statement
14	should be about, you know, species and fisheries
15	that are managed by NOAA and items that Tom just
16	listed are going to impact all of them in a variety
17	of different ways.
18	But as far as reaching out to other
19	people, I mean, it did cross my mind that those
20	people who distribute that seafood, we don't often
21	see them at council meetings. There are separate
22	trade organizations in which they participate. But
23	many of them don't directly participate in the day-
24	to-day management. So if there was a way to reach
25	out to them, that could be quite helpful.
26	But my original thoughts were on you

1	know, including some social and community aspects
2	to the fisheries. We all do know where we are at
3	today. There are lots of concerns
4	MR. DiLERNIA: Someone's sitting on a
5	cell phone or something here. It's distracting. I
6	just want to say that because I didn't want to
7	take away from what you were saying, but I was
8	waiting for something to blow up.
9	MR. O'SHEA: It's not a cell phone.
10	(Asides.)
11	MR. DiLERNIA: I'm sorry.
12	MS. TOOLEY: But, you know, envisioning
13	where our communities are going is extremely
14	important. I mean, there was actually a vision
15	that was expressed earlier today about how
16	aquaculture could fit into that and how a fisherman
17	might choose to go groundfishing at a certain time
18	of year, lobstering in another, and maybe be
19	tending his aquaculture site at another. And we
20	don't have a regulatory structure that's working in
21	the direction that would allow a fisherman to do
22	that. If you're a lobsterer in the State of Maine,
23	you do not have a groundfish permit and it's
24	unlikely you're going to get one at any time in the
25	near future and vice versa.
26	So, I mean, those are things to

1	consider and, in New England, there's been a lot of
2	consideration of what do we want those communities
3	to look like in the future and there was a fleet
4	visioning project that was just completed not too
5	long ago that was reported out to the council at
6	its last meeting. And it is just groundfish that's
7	considered there because, obviously, groundfish is,
8	you know, an extreme case in New England and it
9	doesn't encompass the interactions of other
10	fisheries, but it could be helpful as a resource.
11	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Larry.
12	MR. SIMPSON: I'll try to be brief and
13	concise. I don't know what art is. I just know
14	what know if I like it. That's what we're
15	talking about here.
16	MR. DiLERNIA: Say again.
17	MR. SIMPSON: I said I don't know what
18	art is, but I know know what know good art
19	when I see it. That's what we're talking about
20	here.
21	I think the vision document purpose is
22	good. I think that someone else made a comment
23	that somebody else will control the content. MAFAC
24	will control the content. It's MAFAC's role to do
25	that. Mary Hope will do the staffing; she will
26	write it. And I think I have a little different

1	view about the input. I don't think throwing it
2	open at the end of the meeting is the way to do it.
3	If you come to the Gulf, I intend to put it on the
4	agenda as an agenda item. I would integrate it
5	rather than stand alone. I would also suggest that
6	you would do the same things with the council
7	put it in a committee and let them integrate it
8	rather than us stand alone.
9	There's no way to determine the final
10	structure at the beginning. Although that might be
11	comfortable, it's a dynamic process. And we will
12	mature during the process. You're going to get a
13	bunch of junk. Just the cost of doing business.
14	You're going to get a bunch of junk. You're going
15	to have some venting. You're going to get some
16	ideas.
17	MR. FLETCHER: From the usual suspects.
18	MR. SIMPSON: Well, yeah, and then I'll
19	speak to that. I think I'd written down councils,
20	commissions. Both I think are good. The jury's
21	out on Congress be staffers, but maybe, if it
22	jells, if it matures.
23	Then I had plus specific experts. I
24	think that's a good idea. I think maybe some
25	economists. I think maybe some trade associations
26	in our region Texas Shrimp Association, others,

1	Sea-Grant would be useful. I think maybe some
2	local people who could be put in contact with
3	legislators and everything just open, that
4	you're receiving input. That's the way I see it.
5	Why should we be doing this? Well, the
6	change from our beginning in '78 until now, I mean,
7	it first started off real slow. In the last five
8	years, it's just it's really, really sped up.
9	Changes like 50 percent reduction in number of
10	vessels fishing for shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico ir
11	the last three to five, six years. That's
12	significant. Bycatch interactions. Chris Dorsett
13	and others know these things as well as I do.
14	Environmental changes, you know. We went on a tour
15	at the Fort Lauderdale meeting where we toured the
16	little thing. There was one strip of a hundred
17	yards long of unbulkheaded habitat along that whole
18	ride and somebody owned that and gave it in
19	perpetuity to stay as a wilderness. That's got to
20	have an effect.
21	Okay. Societal shifts. We heard Bill
22	talk about some of his issues. We've got similar
23	issues in the Gulf with other fisheries, you know,
24	don't like this in their back yard, don't like to
25	smell this, don't like to deal with this. You've
26	got perception versus truth. We've got economics.

1	we've got recreational versus commercial. We've
2	got balance among all these things.
3	So I say it's a good work. I say let's
4	just get after it and see what comes out of it and
5	it will probably be dynamic and change during,
6	middle, and after the process.
7	That's it.
8	MR. DiLERNIA: Pete.
9	MR. LEIPZIG: Well, my comments were
10	probably more germane 20 minutes ago when I raised
11	my hand. At the time, I guess I was losing sight
12	of what we were trying to do. Opposing side of the
13	vision maybe.
14	You know, on one hand, I can see trying
15	to define, you know, where we think things are
16	going because we all have a sense of the direction
17	we're headed and I think we can probably identify,
18	as others have said, what we think probably needs
19	to occur to change that to where we'd like it to
20	go.
21	But some of the comments we're starting
22	to hear I mean, nothing wrong with interviewing
23	the experts. I mean, they can add to both of those
24	components, but things like climate scientists and
25	we're really getting out there. You know, we can
26	bring in all kinds of economics, you know, in terms

1	of profit and loss and we're writing a business
2	plan and I don't know that's really what Bill had
3	in mind.
4	This can really become a huge, huge
5	project if we aren't careful. And I don't know
6	that that's what he wanted. You know, he was
7	looking for something I think to get done in a
8	realistic time frame that, you know, that he might
9	still be here.
10	MR. DiLERNIA: I've got to tell you
11	he's the one who laid out going to the meetings and
12	going here and developing a questionnaire. I mean,
13	he kept talking and I kept saying, Uh-huh, uh-huh.
14	MR. LEIPZIG: You know, we could have a
15	series of meetings within a matter of months, you
16	know, given the schedules of Congress and state
17	commissions or whatever. You know, you can hold a
18	bunch of meetings real quickly. It's all of the
19	rest of the information. There's just an enormous
20	amount of data that exists. And what are you going
21	to use it for? Really what are you trying to
22	establish relative to what Bill wanted? And that's
23	my comment was I was losing track of where we're
24	supposed to be going. And I think that and I'm
25	not criticizing anybody's comments. Let's just
26	agree though on what it is rather than leave it

1	nebulous where we're going to keep going months and
2	months and we're still not clear what we're after,
3	why we're doing it, and we're holding meetings and
4	getting all kinds of input much of it may be
5	garbage; I suspect it will be and for what
6	purpose?
7	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, if I we only
8	have a few more minutes today, so I don't want to
9	come to any conclusions today, but I would like
10	this discussion to perhaps continue over on over
11	dinner this evening and perhaps tomorrow morning.
12	And by the time we leave here, I hope to have
13	definite conclusions and guidelines as to where we
14	go.
15	To that point, Heather, because I have
16	
17	MS. McCARTY: To that point.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, please.
19	MS. McCARTY: To that point. I agree
20	with you. I think there's a volume of stuff here
21	that we may or may not want to access. However, I
22	could ask one question and I'm going to ask it of
23	Dr. Balsiger. What do you think the pollack
24	fishery in the Bering Sea is going to look like in
25	five years, in ten years?
26	MR. SIMPSON: And I would ask a

1	different question. What would you like it for it
2	to look like?
3	MS. McCARTY: Well, I I know, but
4	MR. DiLERNIA: Well, can I interrupt
5	that before he answers? Is he allowed to answer
6	that question? In other words, in your position at
7	with your position there I mean, no. What do
8	you think it's going to look like?
9	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Four hundred and
10	fifty thousand tons in ten years instead of 1.4
11	million.
12	MS. McCARTY: There you go. And why?
13	CHAIRMAN BALSIGER: Because the water's
14	warming up.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: There you go.
16	MS. BRYANT: Absolutely.
17	MS. McCARTY: Thank you. That's why
18	I"m talking about climate.
19	MS. BRYANT: Absolutely.
20	MR. DiLERNIA: And that's I mean,
21	that's the kind of question answer I can give
22	for my fishery in Mid, and I think that's what you
23	can do, Pete, for the West Coast.
24	MR. LEIPZIG: And I wasn't picking
25	necessarily on climate.
26	MS. McCARTY: No, I know. I know you

1	weren't. I'm just using it as an example of what
2	we need to know in order to make educated
3	statements. That's all.
4	MR. LEIPZIG: But as we start
5	constructing this and it takes on the appearance of
6	a business plan, and we have to bring some people
7	in that are going to give us some advice on what's
8	going to happen with the Middle East so we can
9	project what the price of fuel is going to be to
LO	know whether people are going to be able to go
1	fishing, I think we're getting carried away.
12	MS. McCARTY: Yeah. Maybe we are.
13	MR. DiLERNIA: Dorothy, you're next.
4	You had your hand up.
15	MS. LOWMAN: Well, I think that I sort
16	of agree, you know, with the general gist of Vince
17	and tempered a little bit. You know, you can't do
18	everything. But I think we can sort of structure
L9	the thinking. What are some of the really global
20	things, and I think you have to consider a climate
21	change. There are factors that you can't we're
22	not going to change in you know, 2020, you know,
23	we all quit driving or whatever. And and now
24	what are these market you know, what are the
25	market demands or sort of the global opportunities
26	that are going to be there you know regardless of

2	them.
3	And then look at that and say, Okay,
4	you know, here is you have these and we have to
5	work within this sort of framework then in
6	envisioning our vision and those are sort of non-
7	negotiables. But then what are those things that,
8	you know that, again, then go through that
9	exercise. And then if we just continue on and it's
10	status quo and we kind of know what the projected
11	management ideas are out there but, you know but
12	so we don't change you know, say some things
13	we hope would happen fail or, you know and it's
14	just like the resistance, the kind of default kind
15	of you know, so it's a struggle with this hard-
16	to-make change and there's no money and, you know,
17	and you know, there's no money put into this and
18	so on and so forth, what would the future look
19	like? And then what do we want it to be?
20	And then really focus into what would
21	have to change, because I think that's going to be
22	a really important part of this, is if we want that
23	future, what has to where do you have to put
24	your resources and where do you have to put your
25	commitment and where do you have to put your
26	leadership and, you know and try to really

whether we access them or somebody else accesses

1

1	identify those.
2	To me, that would be a really useful
3	document. But, again, I think we're going to also
4	have to part of those resources is all these
5	people's time, the amount that can be budgeted for
6	this. I mean, I think Tony had an idea of seeing
7	if there's a graduate student out there that would
8	like to also be free help, you know, but that could
9	be you know, could be good to see what resources
10	we could put into it. But we ought to be realistic
11	about that, too.
12	MR. DiLERNIA: Ken.
13	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14	I'm going to offer a couple of answers to the four
15	questions you posed on your since you were nice
16	enough to prepare the questions, I'll propose some
17	answers for you.
18	First of all, I think 12 months is far
19	too short a time period, primarily because we have
20	a questionnaire involved. And I agree with Eric.
21	The minute you start trying to articulate your
22	questions, that will take months of exchange, and
23	that's when you really find out what it is you're
24	doing, when you sit down and try to articulate
25	those questions and all these people get their pet
26	questions or their pet interest incorporated into

1	those questions.
2	And from a questionnaire standpoint,
3	for a group that meets twice a year, 12 months is
4	just not a realistic time frame for us to get this
5	job done and I don't think we ought to go into it
6	constraining ourselves to 12 months and, to meet
7	that goal, may come out with something we're not
8	terribly pleased with. But I think the first step
9	is to articulate the questions and you'll see where
10	you really are.
1	You asked about an annotated
12	bibliography. Maybe because I come from academics,
13	annotated bibliographies are a thing of the past.
4	People do data searches. Click of a button, you
15	can get what you want. We can spend time doing it.
16	I don't think it's terribly useful unless you have
17	some particular phase of your work that you want to
18	emphasize in terms of developing an annotated
_9	bibliography to steer people towards certain sorts
20	of discovery and information. But an annotated
21	bibliography on everything that's going on in NOAA
22	Fisheries and all the subjects related thereto I
23	think would be not worthwhile because, like I say,
24	time has passed the annotated bibliography, passed
25	in my view. And the second thing is it's just too
26	comprehensive to do a good enough job, so I vote no

1	on spending time on an annotated bibliography.
2	Twelve months to me also is not enough
3	time. And I'd make one recommendation. The
4	working group if aquaculture is going to be a
5	big part of where the nation's going to be between
6	now and 2020, the working group does not have
7	somebody from aquaculture on it. I know we're all
8	going to have a chance to exchange, but the working
9	group's going to be the primary point of contact in
10	doing a lot of the busy work that the rest of us
11	MR. DiLERNIA: Tom Billy is.
12	MR. ROBERTS: Who's on it?
13	MR. DiLERNIA: Tom Billy.
14	MS. BRYANT: Tom Billy.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: Is his name missing from
16	the list there?
17	MR. ROBERTS: No. His name was there,
18	but I'm not sure, with all due respect, that I'd
19	classify Tom Billy as an aquaculture expert
20	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay.
21	MR. ROBERTS: when it comes to
22	businesses.
23	MR. BILLY: I am not an expert.
24	MR. ROBERTS: And I think I would think
25	Bill and I would think John if that's in fact
26	where we're going.

1	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay.
2	MR. ROBERTS: I mean, I see the seafood
3	technology and the process and the safety. But I
4	just don't see that for aquaculture. And it could
5	be a very big role for us to be playing here. So -
6	- just observations.
7	MR. DiLERNIA: I have to I'm sorry,
8	sir. I have three. You had said four. Someone
9	was speaking. I may have missed it. Twelve months
10	too short. You suggested a data search. You
11	suggested that
12	MR. ROBERTS: I didn't have an opinion
13	on your fourth question.
14	MR. DiLERNIA: No opinion on the
15	fourth. Thank you, sir. Perhaps that could be
16	those responses can become the beginning of the
17	meeting tomorrow discussing responses to those
18	questions and we have our first set of responses
19	already for nine o'clock tomorrow.
20	It's five o'clock. We're scheduled to
21	adjourn. Unless there's something that cannot wait
22	until tomorrow morning, I suggest that we adjourn
23	and tomorrow, Mr. Billy, your group will meet from
24	7:00 until 9:00 and then we'll meet at nine o'clock
25	here, the 2020 group.
26	Yes, sir.

1	MR. BILLY: Can I just see hands for
2	those that I can expect to show up at seven
3	o'clock?
4	MR. SCHWAAB: What was the question?
5	MR. BILLY: Who will be here at seven
6	o'clock for aquaculture?
7	MR. SCHWAAB: Will you wake me up, set
8	your alarm?
9	MR. BILLY: I will do that.
10	MR. DiLERNIA: All right. Before we
11	adjourn, Laurel has some housekeeping items.
12	MS. BRYANT: Heather has put Rachel
13	has put together a list on what everybody owes for
14	tomorrow's lunch. If you could bring exact change
15	it would be great. So we'll be able to pay them.
16	Also, if you've got valuables in this
17	room, it's okay we will make certain that it's
18	locked. Mike, I assume you're going to be tearing
19	down?
20	THE REPORTER: Tonight?
21	MS. BRYANT: Yeah.
22	THE REPORTER: I was not.
23	MS. BRYANT: You're not. You're going
24	to leave it up?
25	THE REPORTER: I'm going to leave
26	everything here for Thursday

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	MS. BRYANT: Okay, for Thursday.
2	Excellent. That's great. Okay. So we will be
3	locking this. So if you want to leave things here
4	or valuables, feel free to do so.
5	Thank you.
6	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Before we adjourn
7	the 2020 group, I'd like to thank Mary Hope for the
8	work that she's done so far and I'm sure we all
9	look forward to working with her in the future.
10	Thank you, Mary Hope.
11	(Meeting recessed at 5:07 p.m. on July 25,
12	2006, to reconvene on July 27, 2006.)
13	
14	
15	