## MARINE FISHERY ADVISORY COUNCIL

BARANOF HOTEL

JUNEAU, ALASKA

AUGUST 11, 2004

## PROCEEDINGS

(Juneau, Alaska - 08/11/2004)

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay, everybody. We're going to get started here because we've got lots to cover today. So Ralph is going to finish up his presentation that he had going yesterday.

MR. RAYBURN: I just wanted to carry on with a few of the conversations. I'm sorry Jim Murray is not here yet, but just to go back and reflect on yesterday afternoon where Jim gave a report on some of the responses that Sea Grant at least was initiating in reference to the motions and the activities of the MAFAC meeting back in last December and there were a few folks that still wanted to make comments and I think it -- as you recall, Jim Murray had mentioned may opportunity or possibility perhaps, if the group thought it appropriate, to have some subcommittee of MAFAC that may would be more in a continuous review type process of some of these bycatch measures and even some of the fisheries extension

| 1  | activities that Sea Grant were undergoing, possibly |
|----|---|
| 2  | in a review type subcommittee situation.            |
| 3  | So to get back to the discussion, if we             |
| 4  | could, Dick was next on the list and I don't know   |
| 5  | whether you remember what you were wanting to say   |
| 6  | on this issue and then I have Dick, Vince and Tony  |
| 7  | I'm not sure if you had something, okay and         |
| 8  | Rod had comments. So if you can remember your       |
| 9  | from the  |
| 10 | MR. GUTTING: Yes, I                                 |
| 11 | MR. RAYBURN:last 10 hours.                          |
| 12 | MR. GUTTING: Yeah, I do.                            |
| 13 | MR. RAYBURN: After all that excitement              |
| 14 | from last night                                     |
| 15 | MR. GUTTING: Yeah.                                  |
| 16 | MR. RAYBURN:and all the                             |
| 17 | MR. GUTTING: Still recovering. I just               |
| 18 | wanted to react to the suggest that perhaps MAFAC   |
| 19 | might have a role to play in some kind of review of |
| 20 | the Extension Program within Sea Grant, and I was   |
| 21 | left a little bit unclear as to exactly what kind   |
| 22 | of review that would be. But my only comment,       |
|    |   |

Ralph, is that if you are going to get involved in something like that, which would be very I think, quite intriguing for interesting and, MAFAC, there's real work to be done and I would suggest that you think through what kind of staff support you would need, what kind of perhaps even funding you would need in order to really do the kind of job that normally takes place when you do a review.

MAFAC is great at reviewing drafts and policies and having discussions, but actually getting involved in more of an operational type thing we're not really structured -- maybe we are now that we have an Executive Director. But, anyway, that was my comment -- that I thought from the presentation it needed to be focused a little bit more on the task that we were being asked to perform and then I think we would have to think through the implementation of it. There's a few people on the Committee like Bonnie, who will actually go out and do something and actually write and draft and do what I would call staff work, but

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 |   | that's  | an  | unusual | situation. | So | that's | my | only |
|---|---|---------|-----|---------|------------|----|--------|----|------|
| 2 | ; | suggest | ion | •       |            |    |        |    |      |

MR. RAYBURN: Okay. Thank you. Vince, did you want to comment?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. O'SHEA: You know, when I think of the Sea Grant Program over the years I associate them with catching fish and helping the industry improve its efficiency and I think with the focus on bycatch and the problems that we have with bycatch this is a terrific opportunity for Sea Grant to step up to the plate. I was disappointed with the New England Bycatch Workshop -- and Maggie alluded to it -that, you know, the attendance from the industry was really, I think, a disappointment. And I think that as you move that into Southeast and consider doing this, I think the Sea Grant could be a terrific resource to sort of facilitate the communication between the service and the industry and work at improving participation in those types of programs.

And then the second point I'd make is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Jim had made the comment it was very difficult to quantify what the Sea Grant Program or the Sea Grant agents are accomplishing, but I think that Washington, I presentation from think, demonstrated what the bottom line is and that's when we see the bycatch going like this and I think I would encourage the program to report in those types of terms because that's really what the end goal is, is to see the bycatch numbers go down, and it's really in the industry's interests to do that because that will ensure they stay in business and keep working. Those would be my two observations. Thank you.

MR. RAYBURN: Thank you, Vince. Rod.

MR. MOORE: Thanks, Ralph. My comments are sort of along the same lines as Dick's, and it's unfortunate that Jim isn't here. I think it is a good thing that MAFAC is being asked to do something that can help both NMFS and Sea Grant try to come up with a better program and make sure everybody is doing what they're supposed to be doing and all that sort of stuff, but it does

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

involve a lot of work. We've done similar or tried to do similar sorts of things in the past on MAFAC and, yeah, let's face it, everybody on MAFAC has got a day job. So it's kind of hard to spend some serious time doing the sort of review that needs to be done and, you know, it would also take time away from folks in NMFS and folks in Sea Grant to be able to provide you with the information that you need in order to properly conduct a review. So I guess my recommendation is to go ahead and do it but make sure that you've got the commitment from MAFAC members, from NMFS and from Sea Grant that people are actually going to do the job so it doesn't become a wasted effort.

We have tried in the past before a lot of you were here on MAFAC to do similar sorts of things, and they kind of fell apart because nobody had time to do them. You've got all of the ecosystem that Bonnie did is, you know, one of the rare instances where we actually came out, had separate meetings and that sort of stuff. We did something similar in bycatch several years ago,

2.

2.1

too, but it's been few and far between and it really does take a tremendous time and budget commitment and it's going to take a personnel commitment from both NMFS and Sea Grant. So you're going to have to get those commitments out there and locked in before you embark on this.

MR. RAYBURN: Uh-huh, okay. Any other comments on this subject, then? Yes, Scott.

MR. BURNS: Yeah, a quick one. I agree with Vince that this Chair. is an important area of focus for Sea Grant. And, on the one hand, sort of looking at the list of projects that were presented yesterday you see a real variety of initiatives and that's appropriate given the fact that the Sea Grant Program is often providing service to local fishing communities. the same time, I think it would be good to see a greater degree of synergy between the investments that were being made to the Sea Grant Program and the priorities of the Services's national bycatch plan and its spending priorities so that they could be a little bit more in sync and maybe accomplish

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| l more tog | ether |
|------------|-------|
|------------|-------|

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2 MR. RAYBURN: Thanks, Scott. Any other 3 -- Ken.

> Thanks, Mr. Chair. MR. ROBERTS: wrote some notes down yesterday at the conclusion, and I didn't get a chance to see Jim. I was going to ask the question whether he was proposing a review of Sea Grant Extension and National Marine Fisheries Service interactions; specifically, on his set-aside money -- the \$2 million that was a new enhancement effort. Was that what he was speaking about? Was he speaking an all encompassing study of everything that Sea Grant Extension does, from aquaculture to coastal zone interaction restoration techniques and in I needed it to be a little bit communities? sharper for me to make a decision as to whether or not things like Rod and them are speaking about -what kind of time commitment would it take to get it done, number 1?

wasn't sure and I wanted to ask him. One of his bullets was for Sea Grant Extension in each state to designate a bycatch contact. And after I got to thinking about that, I'm wondering what's stopping him from doing that now? iust couldn't I understand what the constraint was there, and I didn't see the reason for MAFAC to have to get involved in that, other than we didn't obviously have any objection it. Ι to But couldn't understand where he was constrained from doing that. So....

MR. RAYBURN: Thank you. Any other? You know, I'd like to just offer what I -- I mean, this has turned out to be a Sea Grant deal, and obviously I have some interest in that. But I really -- when we started the dialogue with Tony and I and Laurel about the bycatch issue, it was just that in the concept that Sea Grant was an element. And I really didn't set this up to impose Sea Grant into the MAFAC program, but it seemed like several things were coming together that would provide an opportunity for a relationship between

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MAFAC and Sea Grant.

| When Sea Grant received it's                        |
|---|
| reauthorization a couple of years ago it was fairly |
| unique that, in the language, fisheries extension   |
| enhancement was listed with a line item and ar      |
| authorization for appropriations. So I think, Ken,  |
| to your question with I understood that Murray      |
| was talking about it, and I'd certainly call or     |
| Laurel, too, because she's had some discussions     |
| with Jim, too, about what this vision and concept   |
| would be, but the focus that Jim was looking for    |
| was a high-level group such as MAFAC and MAFAC,     |
| I think, would be appropriate to validate the       |
| fisheries extension enhancement efforts that Sea    |
| Grant was undergoing and to ensure that the         |
| concerns that Vince raises and others about,        |
| you know, how Sea Grant can appropriately operate   |
| in this regime really supports the vision and the   |
| strategy that MAFAC is creating in the issue of     |
| bycatch. And maybe there are other fisheries        |
| issues out there where there would be a role, too,  |
| but it seems in bycatch.                            |

| So I think we're really looking or                  |
|---|
| my sense would be an element of MAFAC either at the |
| subcommittee or maybe an ad hoc working group that  |
| would be ready to validate what Sea Grant is        |
| attempting to do with fisheries extension           |
| enhancement and also hold Sea Grant's feet to the   |
| fire to come up with outputs and come up with more  |
| than just hiring people and putting them in the     |
| field but actually what are they accomplishing. I   |
| think that's what I heard, too, yesterday. It all   |
| looks good, but I think Liz asked the question so   |
| what does it mean? You know, what are the outputs?  |
| So, you know, it's not just a feel good thing. I    |
| believe it's really something to validate it you    |
| know, absent any relationship I have with Sea Grant |
| to ensure that what they're doing is synergistic    |
| to what NOAA Fisheries needs to have done, what     |
| they regions need to have done. If they're not      |
| you know, people on the dock responding not as      |
| agents for NOAA Fisheries, but certainly as a       |
| conduit for information to the fisheries community. |
| So that would be my two cents' worth, but I would   |

yield to Laurel, if I could, Mr. Chairman, because she has some vision and has talked to Jim and maybe a perception on this as well.

MS. BRYANT: I don't want to -- Ralph has pretty much said it all. I think -- and, Jack, you know, chime in anytime you want to -- this kind of initiated when that monies first came through. I know Jack and I have served on the first panel, and it was for fisheries outreach enhancement, and the initial discussions that I've been involved in with Hill staff early on it was really to get bodies on the docks.

I mean, we've got all the need in the world to educate fishermen, to reach out to the industry. Vince just said, gee, the turnout from the industry was disappointing. Well, you know, that's an old song we all hear, and this looked like an opportunity where you've got skill sets and bodies that Sea Grant has. We've got all the issues and all the need. But you can't just throw money at it because even though you get the proposals out there there's no follow through. You

2.

2.1

don't know, well, did it accomplish what it was supposed to? Are the proposals targeting the most need, and are they delivering it?

And to Rod's point, yes, it does take time and some commitment and it takes some staff, certainly on the part of Fisheries and Sea Grant. But I think without that kind of investment and finding some routine way -- which I think MAFAC can offer us, if there is a subcommittee, some routine way to revisit and review. You can start integrating a process that then becomes visible and then can actually gain some of that support. And for Fisheries to do it in a vacuum, you all are the national reps that are out there and know where some of the problem areas are and know where maybe there are opportunities on -- or letting those Sea Grant Extension offices know what some of the needs are and that there is this opportunity and help us craft stuff. So this was merely trying to take advantage and trying to put some kind of process in place to take advantage of some monies and, certainly, some Hill interest and,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | as we kind of coined it, getting bodies on the     |
|----|--|
| 2  | dock, and bycatch seemed to be a good beginning    |
| 3  | point for that. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.              |
| 4  | MR. RAYBURN: I'm sorry. The hat did                |
| 5  | it, Rod.   |
| 6  | MR. MOORE: Yeah, I figured if I                    |
| 7  | waved  |
| 8  | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I                               |
| 9  | MR. MOORE:if I wiggled my tail                     |
| 10 | at you, you might pay attention.                   |
| 11 | MR. RAYBURN:I'm lost in space.                     |
| 12 | Yeah, really. Rod, please. Thank you, Laurel.      |
| 13 | MR. MOORE: I just wanted to point out              |
| 14 | and, you know, sort of bolster some of what Laurel |
| 15 | said. Before your class got on MAFAC, we actually  |
| 16 | had a long discussion. It was in our, I think,     |
| 17 | 2000 New York meeting about ways to better improve |
| 18 | communication of not just new gear types and so    |
| 19 | forth but, you know, regulatory activities and all |
| 20 | of that sort of stuff with the fishing community.  |
| 21 | And one of the things that MAFAC came up with at   |

that time was that we ought to see if we can use

| 1  | Sea Grant to do this because Sea Grant does have    |
|----|---|
| 2  | the people down on the docks to do these sorts of   |
| 3  | things. So, you know, MAFAC does have a history of  |
| 4  | trying to get Sea Grant kind of pulled in and       |
| 5  | involved in this. You know, like I said, my         |
| 6  | comments were more to how MAFAC is going to do its  |
| 7  | work and how the structure is going to be and make  |
| 8  | sure you guys                                       |
| 9  | MS. BRYANT: Yeah.                                   |
| 10 | MR. MOORE:don't set yourselves                      |
| 11 | up for failure. You know, do something that's       |
| 12 | going to work.                                      |
| 13 | MR. RAYBURN: Maggie, was that                       |
| 14 | MS. BRYANT: And don't start throwing                |
| 15 | pens at people, Maggie.                             |
| 16 | MS. RAYMOND: Thank you, Ralph. I have               |
| 17 | a suggestion as I've been sitting here listening to |
| 18 | people, and if Sea Grant is going to continue and   |
| 19 | go forward with more of these workshops like they   |
| 20 | had in New England possibly you might check with    |
| 21 | who your MAFAC people are in whatever region that   |
| 22 | is. That certainly wasn't done in New England.      |

1 MR. RAYBURN: Okay. 2. MS. RAYMOND: And, you know, I think 3 the outreach in New England to the industry was not 4 good, and so you really need to improve that. 5 know, and I looked at the presentation and I thought that was a lot of money that was spent on 6 7 that workshop and I don't know what the outcomes of 8 it will be. But I think if they're going 9 continue with that then that needs a lot of 10 improvement. 11 MR. RAYBURN: Okay. Thank you. Ι 12 think that is the plan. At least the Southeast 13 Regional Administrator seems to be interested in 14 following suit, and I'll probably be in a role of 15 assisting in preparation for the workshop in the 16 So any comments you have on how to Southeast. 17 improve it certainly would be welcome. 18 And also, Maggie, MS. BRYANT: just 19 with outreach, because I know that they were trying 20 to do everything they could and do it on Webs and 2.1 all of that. So getting that back to the region

and Marla Trollan and everything, that would be

helpful as well, whatever your suggestions for improving it would be.

MR. RAYBURN: You know, I'd have one other comment. Not to dominate, but it seems to me in the role of MAFAC it's -- you know, as the advisor to the Secretary of Commerce on all living marine resources under his jurisdiction that this is -- we then create a point of focus where that there can be this consideration given for different elements of Commerce that are dealing in fisheries, whether it be just NOAA Fisheries or whether it be Sea Grant Extension. But I know just from my own experience and career and where I've been that there sometimes is a conflict where you have Sea Grant going one way and NOAA Fisheries or other groups going another way, and there's not a point of really bringing it together. And, I mean, as we've gone around and tried to establish the relationship of -- you know, certainly there's that baggage that's left over from previous times where that's happened, and so you don't necessarily want a system where you force everybody to march in the

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

same step. But, certainly, you don't want to have a situation where one unit of Commerce, even though it's relatively independent and university based and all that, it's still -- if it wasn't for the money coming through Commerce the program wouldn't exist. So, you know, you still have some -- you need some point of focus, I think, to ensure that what one group is doing is validated with the other group. And so MAFAC seems to me to be a reasonable point of focus, and I'd say that whether I was in Sea Grant or not. I mean, I'm really not trying to push this in that realm, but I think that would be an appropriate deal, too.

So maybe if I could suggest then perhaps we could look at possibly establishing a group. I would consider maybe a mixture or find out within Tony's Outreach Committee who in his group may be willing to be interested in committing to this, the people in Bycatch doing the same thing, and Laurel could look at what the staff time may be required to do this and how it may set up and give us in a proposal about how this may work.

2.

2.1

| 1  | Liz, you had talked to me a little bit I mean,      |
|----|---|
| 2  | does that kind of sense a little bit of what you    |
| 3  | were interested in doing, or does that hit the      |
| 4  | target at all?                                      |
| 5  | MS. SHEEHAN: I think that MAFAC car                 |
| 6  | help respond to the presentation to help focus and  |
| 7  | I think, as Vince suggested, figure out how does    |
| 8  | their work relate to the end goal so we can track   |
| 9  | that more closely. My only concern about taking on  |
| 10 | a bigger project is looking back at the minutes and |
| 11 | the sort of top 10 issues that we laid out in       |
| 12 | December in New York that we're supposed to be      |
| 13 | working on, and so how does that weigh against      |
| 14 | maybe those issues in terms of MAFAC time? So that  |
| 15 | would just be my but I would be happy to            |
| 16 | participate in sort of looking at how we measure    |
| 17 | the goals.  |
| 18 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What page is the              |
| 19 | top 10?   |
| 20 | MS. SHEEHAN: First of the minutes.                  |
| 21 | MR. RAYBURN: Any other comments, then?              |
| 22 | Yes, Rod.   |

| MR. MOORE: Ralph, again, if I can just              |
|---|
| offer an observation, what you might want to do is  |
| ask Laurel to work with Jim Murray and come back to |
| you guys at whatever your next meeting is with a    |
| suggested structure and budget and, you know, how   |
| this would be accomplished and so forth. And then   |
| when you appoint your working group you might want  |
| to consider, regardless of who is on which          |
| subcommittee, seeing if you can get an appropriate  |
| mix of the various regions of the NOAA regions      |
| of the U.S. so that you've got somebody from New    |
| England, somebody from Southeast, somebody from the |
| Gulf, somebody from the West Coast, somebody from   |
| Alaska and, that way, your plugged in to what's     |
| going on because Sea Grant does different things,   |
| as you know, Ralph, in different parts of the       |
| country. So rather than looking at who's sitting    |
| on what subcommittee in MAFAC form your working     |
| group based on where the expertise and local        |
| knowledge can come from so you can filter that in.  |
| But you might as I say, you may want to wait        |
| until your next meeting to do this so you can get   |

| 1  | things better fleshed out, get a better             |
|----|---|
| 2  | understanding of what the budget and time           |
| 3  | commitments would be both from NMFS and from Sea    |
| 4  | Grant.  |
| 5  | MR. RAYBURN: Okay. Is that a how                    |
| 6  | best to handle that is a motion or just a           |
| 7  | consensus? Would you want to have that as a         |
| 8  | motion, Rod, that we pass                           |
| 9  | MR. MOORE: I am reluctant to make                   |
| 10 | motions to commit MAFAC members to stuff where I'm  |
| 11 | not going to be around, but if you want me to I'd   |
| 12 | be more than happy to, Ralph.                       |
| 13 | MR. RAYBURN: You're still a member in               |
| 14 | good standing, as far as I know, even though you've |
| 15 | got the hat.  |
| 16 | MR. MOORE: Good sitting. I don't know               |
| 17 | about standing. Well, I will so move that MAFAC     |
| 18 | ask NMFS or the MAFAC designated Federal officer to |
| 19 | come back at whatever your next meeting is with a   |
| 20 | report on the staffing and time and fiscal          |
| 21 | commitments and a suggested plan of action from the |
| 22 | Federal side to allow MAFAC the opportunity to      |

| 1   | consider establishing a working group that would  |
|-----|---|
| 2   | serve as a continuing oversight of Sea Grant/NMFS |
| 3   | interactions. There, you got a motion. If anybody |
| 4   | wants to second it, that's fine.                  |
| 5   | MS. BRYANT: I'm so glad we got a                  |
| 6   | recorder.   |
| 7   | MR. RAYBURN: Seconds?                             |
| 8   | MR. BURNS: Second.                                |
| 9   | MR. RAYBURN: Thank you. Thanks,                   |
| LO  | Scott.  |
| L1  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Discussion on             |
| L2  | the motion. Does anybody remember exactly what he |
| L3  | said?   |
| L 4 | MR. MOORE: Yeah, I do, but I ain't                |
| L5  | going to be here. You can pay me to come to       |
| L6  | Hawaii, and I'll tell you.                        |
| L 7 | MS. BRYANT: It's being recorded.                  |
| L8  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Maggie.                   |
| L9  | MS. RAYMOND: I got as far as to                   |
| 20  | establish a working group to                      |
| 21  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: We got it on              |
| 22  | the recording.                                    |

| 1   | MS. RAYMOND: Oh.                                    |
|-----|---|
| 2   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: It's recorded.              |
| 3   | MS. RAYMOND: Yeah, but I want to know               |
| 4   | what it is before I vote on it.                     |
| 5   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Can you read                |
| 6   | it back? Can the recorder read it back?             |
| 7   | MS. RAYMOND: Can you repeat that part?              |
| 8   | MR. MOORE: I can start from the                     |
| 9   | beginning. I'm not sure I can start from the        |
| 10  | middle.   |
| 11  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Can you ask                 |
| 12  | the recorder to read it back?                       |
| 13  | MR. RAYBURN: Read what you have,                    |
| 14  | Maggie, and maybe then we can just                  |
| 15  | MS. RAYMOND: MAFAC asked NMFS' DFO to               |
| 16  | report on staffing, time, commitments and a plan of |
| 17  | action to allow MAFAC to establish a working group  |
| 18  | to  |
| 19  | MR. MOORE: To provide continuing                    |
| 20  | oversight of NMFS/Sea Grant interactions, I think   |
| 21  | is how I phrased it.                                |
| 2.2 | MC DAVMOND: Thank you                               |

| 1  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                       |
|----|---|
| 2  | Discussion.   |
| 3  | MR. MOORE: Short-term memory loss.                  |
| 4  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yes, sir.                   |
| 5  | MR. SIMPSON: I personally think this                |
| 6  | is an excellent idea.                               |
| 7  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Could you say               |
| 8  | that again?   |
| 9  | MR. SIMPSON: I say I personally think               |
| 10 | this is an excellent idea                           |
| 11 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Oh, okay.                   |
| 12 | MR. SIMPSON:and I think it has a                    |
| 13 | way of focusing and directing and initiating        |
| 14 | direction to Sea Grant. In many Sea Grant           |
| 15 | programs, it's been my experience that they are     |
| 16 | very focused; in others, they seem to be wandering  |
| 17 | a little aimlessly. And I think this kind of        |
| 18 | group, with the crosscutting knowledge and          |
| 19 | expertise that it has, has an excellent potential   |
| 20 | as well as, I think, probability of doing good work |
| 21 | here. You know, we're not talking about this group  |
| 22 | doing the generation and the staff work. Assuming   |

| 1  | you have some staff to help you do the things, the  |
|----|---|
| 2  | mind and the brainpower and experience is what this |
| 3  | group would offer this activity, and it's good to   |
| 4  | have a different group to look to.                  |
| 5  | We in the Gulf in our FIN Program                   |
| 6  | Fisheries Information Network have used outside     |
| 7  | people to tell us are we doing what we should be    |
| 8  | doing with data collection. It's a good thing. I    |
| 9  | support it. I think it's an excellent thing.        |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Any                   |
| 11 | other comments? Tony.                               |
| 12 | MR. DILERNIA: Question. As a member                 |
| 13 | of the freshman class, I'm still having a little    |
| 14 | bit of difficulty understanding the difference      |
| 15 | between committees and working groups. Just         |
| 16 | because the term working group was used in the      |
| 17 | motion, it's a good opportunity for me to ask for a |
| 18 | clarification maybe one more time.                  |
| 19 | MR. MOORE: No problem. May I respond,               |
| 20 | Mr. Chairman?                                       |
| 21 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Sure.                       |
| 22 | MS. BRYANT: Yes, you may.                           |

| 1  | MR. MOORE: When we reinvented MAFAC                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | back at the ptomaine palace meeting in Maryland in  |
| 3  | 1998 we set up a structure whereby there would be a |
| 4  | couple of standing committees that are formally     |
| 5  | designated with membership and so forth, and the    |
| 6  | chairs of those committees sort of served on the    |
| 7  | Steering Committee, along with the Chairman of      |
| 8  | MAFAC, to provide sort of executive direction for   |
| 9  | MAFAC in terms of budget and that sort of thing.    |
| 10 | When you guys came in I guess at the last meeting,  |
| 11 | or whenever it was it must have been at the last    |
| 12 | meeting   |
| 13 | MR. DILERNIA: This is our fourth.                   |
| 14 | MR. MOORE: Huh?                                     |
| 15 | MR. DILERNIA: This is our fourth.                   |
| 16 | MR. MOORE: This is your fourth?                     |
| 17 | MR. DILERNIA: This is the fourth                    |
| 18 | meeting for the                                     |
| 19 | MR. MOORE: God, time flies when you're              |
| 20 | having fun.   |
| 21 | MR. DILERNIA: Yeah, I know.                         |
| 22 | MR. MOORE: All right. It was the                    |

| 1  | first meeting in D.C                               |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. DILERNIA: Yes.                                 |
| 3  | MR. MOORE:that you guys were at.                   |
| 4  | That's   |
| 5  | MS. BRYANT: Right.                                 |
| 6  | MR. MOORE:what it was. You                         |
| 7  | decided to change that structure somewhat by       |
| 8  | getting rid of some of the standing committees and |
| 9  | establishing different ones. But, other than that, |
| 10 | what you said was that we would continue to have   |
| 11 | the standing committees and then, as necessary,    |
| 12 | appoint working groups for specific tasks, whether |
| 13 | they be short-term or long-term, but more goal     |
| 14 | directed tasks towards certain things. That's why, |
| 15 | for example, we have the National Standard One     |
| 16 | Guideline working group. It was a short-term       |
| 17 | duration directed to a specific issue. You know,   |
| 18 | there were three of us appointed to it, and so     |
| 19 | forth and so on.                                   |
| 20 | So for something like this, rather than            |
| 21 | having a standing committee which would seem to    |

indicate the now and forever kind of thing you may

| 1  | want to have a specific working group which gives   |
|----|---|
| 2  | you a little bit more flexibility for people to get |
| 3  | on and off and it also working groups, the way      |
| 4  | that MAFAC was structured, are exempt from the one  |
| 5  | person one committee rule and, you know, everybody  |
| 6  | lobbies to get on the Outreach Committee and        |
| 7  | everybody lobbies to get off the Bycatch Committee, |
| 8  | you know, that sort of thing. So a working group    |
| 9  | is a more flexible functioning subunit of MAFAC     |
| 10 | with a specific goal.                               |
| 11 | MR. DILERNIA: Thank you.                            |
| 12 | MR. MOORE: You're welcome.                          |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Any other                   |
| 14 | comments on the motion?                             |
| 15 | MR. MOORE: Do I get to be named MAFAC               |
| 16 | historian?  |
| 17 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: We'll put you               |
| 18 | in the museum.                                      |
| 19 | MR. MOORE: Can I take my hat?                       |
| 20 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay, take the              |
| 21 | hat. We have a motion on the table. So if there     |
| 22 | is no other comments on the motion, all those in    |

| 1  | favor signify by saying aye.           |
|----|--|
| 2  | IN UNISON: Aye.                        |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Those opposed, |
| 4  | same sign.                             |
| 5  | (No opposing responses)                |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hearing none,  |
| 7  | we have direction. Ralph.              |
| 8  | MS. BRYANT: I've been directed.        |
| 9  | MR. RAYBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: You have       |
| 11 | anything else?                         |
| 12 | MR. RAYBURN: That's all I have. Thank  |
| 13 | you.                                   |
| 14 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thank    |
| 15 | you. And Committee?                    |
| 16 | MR. ROBERTS: Are we jumping over       |
| 17 | Jack's?                                |
| 18 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Jack?          |
| 19 | MR. ROBERTS: Are we jumping over       |
| 20 | National Standard One Guidelines?      |
| 21 | MS. BRYANT: No. Jack's next.           |
| 22 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: No. He's up    |
|    |  |

next, and he's promised that he wasn't going to take too much time, but Maggie had something she wanted to.....

MS. RAYMOND: Thank you. I have a Yesterday, we received several process question. presentations from NMFS and at the end of the first one we agreed that the Outreach Committee would look at the Fish 101 document but we didn't make similar commitments on the other issues and I'm just wondering if we're going to be doing that at some point because there will be some conflicts. People will be on some working groups and some committees and we need to schedule this for those sessions for tomorrow morning and as you'll recall at our last meeting there was some controversy because some groups met and people didn't know where they were and they wanted to sit in on the discussion. So we have to make sure that before this day ends we have a schedule for tomorrow morning for the committees and the working groups that don't conflict and everybody knows where they're going to be meeting and so we -- you know,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | I just wanted to make sure we did that before this  |
|----|---|
| 2  | day ends.   |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                       |
| 4  | MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, could I also               |
| 5  | ask a process question?                             |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Sure.                       |
| 7  | MR. MOORE: And this is both to you and              |
| 8  | then to Tony and, Laurel, you in the absence of     |
| 9  | Bill, I guess.                                      |
| 10 | MS. BRYANT: Uh-huh.                                 |
| 11 | MR. MOORE: I was going through the                  |
| 12 | Fish 101 document yesterday and there's a whole     |
| 13 | bunch of comments that are fairly detailed that I   |
| 14 | would like to make and is the best way, Tony, to e- |
| 15 | mail them to you? I mean, I'm not going to have     |
| 16 | time to do it until after I leave here.             |
| 17 | MR. DILERNIA: I would think, from what              |
| 18 | I'm hearing from yourself and from other members, I |
| 19 | would suggest that probably the best way the        |
| 20 | working group or the committee                      |
| 21 | MR. MOORE: Uh-huh, yeah, you're a                   |
| 22 | committee.  |

| 1   | MR. DILERNIA:committee gives its                    |
|-----|---|
| 2   | report would be that we would take comments         |
| 3   | tomorrow and summarize those comments and leave     |
| 4   | ourselves open well I don't know if Laurel if       |
| 5   | I can do this, leave ourselves open for additional  |
| 6   | e-mail comments from other members, and I would     |
| 7   | compile all of that and photo the original          |
| 8   | comments plus the additional e-mail comments to     |
| 9   | Laurel within however many working days it takes to |
| LO  | give us a deadline five days, seven days.           |
| L1  | MR. MOORE: Give me till the end of the              |
| L2  | month. I'm not going to be around next week.        |
| L3  | MR. DILERNIA: That's fine by me so                  |
| L 4 | long as it's fine by staff.                         |
| L5  | MS. BRYANT: Oh, absolutely.                         |
| L6  | MR. DILERNIA: Okay.                                 |
| L7  | MS. BRYANT: And it's going to take                  |
| L8  | time, actually. I mean, the transcripts, it takes   |
| L9  | a number of weeks before those get in and once      |
| 20  | those come in it will be having to go over the      |
| 21  | transcript.   |
| 22  | MR. MOORE: I mean, I'm not a member of              |

| 1   | the Outreach Committee and, like I say, the         |
|-----|---|
| 2   | comments are extensive.                             |
| 3   | MR. DILERNIA: Any comments that I                   |
| 4   | receive I would forward to the full Committee under |
| 5   | the broadcast e-mail saying these are comments I    |
| 6   | received from, you know, Mr. Moore, and, you know,  |
| 7   | if you have any other and wish to add to it or      |
| 8   | whatever so everybody sees what's being said. I     |
| 9   | would you know, I think                             |
| LO  | MR. MOORE: Yeah. That's fine.                       |
| L1  | MR. DILERNIA:e-mail is a great                      |
| L2  | thing and for us to be able to communicate that     |
| L3  | way, just broadcast it.                             |
| L 4 | MR. MOORE: Yeah. I just, you                        |
| L5  | know  |
| L6  | MR. DILERNIA: That's how I would go.                |
| L7  | MR. MOORE:wanted to figure out a                    |
| L8  | way to get some comments to you guys. That's all.   |
| L9  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: In the past,                |
| 20  | some of the committees have worked by e-mail. So,   |
| 21  | okay?   |
| 22  | MR. MOORE: Thank you.                               |

| 1  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: So, yeah,                   |
|----|---|
| 2  | we'll just set up some time before we get done this |
| 3  | evening and figure out all the committees since     |
| 4  | we're going to start                                |
| 5  | MS. BRYANT: Who's going to be meeting               |
| 6  | and when.   |
| 7  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah. So,                   |
| 8  | Jack?   |
| 9  | MR. DUNNIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.              |
| 10 | I'm going to work really hard to get you back on    |
| 11 | schedule. Laurel very kindly provided a nice block  |
| 12 | of time to talk about the National Standard One     |
| 13 | Guideline this morning. Back when she was doing     |
| 14 | agenda planning, we weren't exactly sure where we   |
| 15 | were going to be. Given where we are, it wouldn't   |
| 16 | be useful for you to take that time today. So what  |
| 17 | I'm going to do is just to bring you up to speed    |
| 18 | with what's happened since the last time you met    |
| 19 | and where we see this going and what I would like   |
| 20 | to ask you for assistance for as we more forward in |
| 21 | the process.  |

When you met in December in New York,

Rick Methot, who is one of our senior scientists -he works at the national level, although his office is in Seattle -- made a presentation on a working group report that was developed internally and has been available on the Web for sometime. The working group worked under the leadership of Pamela Mace (ph) for about a year and a half, and it came up with a series of issues related to the quideline for National Standard One that the working group -and I was a member of it -- recommended to Bill and Rebecca that needed to be dealt with. We met as a Fisheries Leadership Council in August of last year and endorsed the recommendations of the working The working group then had to finish the paper, and it was rolled out in early December and presented to you at that meeting in New York City.

Since then, the task that we have been up to is to take the recommendations of the working group report and put them into regulatory language that we could actually incorporate into the CFR, and that was hard job. It was a small group. There were about four of us that worked on it, and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

what we found as we were going through -- you know, actually taking the text of the working group report and the text of the regulation we found two First of all, there were a lot of very problems. detailed issues where the working group report wasn't clear; and, you know, it looked good as we were sort of reviewing it. We thought we knew what it said, but when you actually have to write the language it doesn't always appear to be so. ended up having to qo through a number of clarifying exercises back with the working group.

Secondly, we ended up finding a lot of issues that we thought were obvious that ought to be picked up that had just sort of fallen through the cracks; and, in the end, we elected not to do that because we felt that our charge was to take the working group report and put it into regulatory language and not try to substitute our judgment for what we thought would be significant or not, or unclear or not or something like that. So we really did try to limit ourselves just at coming up with a document that would be the regulatory

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

language for the working group report. We also internally realized we would have to write a NEPA document to accompany this rather significant rule-making, and we undertook to -- we made the determination that, at least at this stage, it didn't appear that any IS would be necessary. So we've written a draft environmental assessment.

In terms of process, the idea that we had last December -- and I think we talked to you about this -- was one that we have ended that following through on and is not to qo immediately to a proposed rule, which is very formal and has a lot of procedural implications for what we can do and how we can deal with the public; but, rather, to put out our document for general public consumption early on and let people know that we would be glad to hear your suggestions -or their suggestions -- and try to incorporate those, then, into what will be a proposed rule and that's what we've done. That went out about six weeks ago. It's available on the Web, both the draft regulatory language and the environmental

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

assessment.

| We haven't gotten a lot of responses                |
|---|
| yet. We haven't set a deadline for coming back to   |
| us, but what we have let the public know is that    |
| our expectation is that we would like to begin the  |
| final preparation of our proposed rule on September |
| 1st. That doesn't mean we're going to stop          |
| comments because, I mean, we're not in a formal     |
| process. We have a lot of flexibility. If           |
| comments come in before the proposed rule goes out, |
| you know, we can and may try to respond to those as |
| best we can at the time. I know there are some      |
| regional Fishery Management Councils in particular  |
| who are not going to have an opportunity to meet    |
| until during that month of September, and they've   |
| indicated to us that they may want to consider that |
| and would we try to use their comments if we could, |
| and our response has been sure. So it's nice to do  |
| this in this way, in this sort of informal process. |
| I think it will help communications. So we are      |
| going to proceed and will probably around the early |
| couple of weeks of October have a proposed rule out |

in the Federal Register.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

The draft that is on the Web site shouldn't surprise anybody because it's supposed to be language to implement the stuff that was in the working group report that came out in December of '03. So if there's new stuff in there to you, maybe we messed up. So if you were to just focus on the ideas in the working group report you would be doing the right thing. It is still our hope that we can have a final rule in January -- as close to January 1st as possible. That's going to require us to move very quickly, and it will depend upon the nature and extent of comments that we receive once we get a proposed rule.

So I would like to have an opportunity to talk about the issue to talk -- and probably in an executive session -- to talk about the public comment that we got and what our response to it is and get your feedback and advice to us as to how we should be responding to this. There's going to be a timing question. You're not meeting in December this year. You're apparently going to meet in

January. So, you know, it's up to Bill and Rebecca to see, you know, how -- whether or not they're willing to be able to hold off. I know Bill is very anxious about moving this and, you know, depending on how the election comes out January could be a very important month for Bill Hogarth. So, you know, we're going to have to see how that works out. It may be that we'll talk to Laurel the possibility of some interim meeting. Maybe a virtual meeting of some sort that would give MAFAC members an opportunity to feed back to us your reactions to the public comment that we receive on the proposed rule. But that's the process that we're going through and sort of what our expectation is for a time frame for completing the project.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Rod.

MR. MOORE: Thanks, Al. A couple of things, Jack. First of all, on the process of trying to do an interim meeting and so forth there is a National Standard One Guideline Working Group that we have in MAFAC. One member is going to be

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

gone after the end of this month, but -- so I'm assuming that you want to reappoint to that seat, but the other two members are still around. So, you know, you may want to try to coordinate through that working group as well as involve all of MAFAC. Let me finish, Jack.

MR. DUNNIGAN: No, I....

MR. MOORE: Oh, okay. The second thing is looking at what MAFAC adopted at our December meeting on the National Standard One process there are two issues there but most of it, aside from complimenting the working group and the work that you quys have done, which I still think excellent -- you know, a lot of it has to do with stuff that should be done in the future in terms of involvement of councils and so forth, but there were two particular issues. One was looking at environmental influences on rebuilding, and the other was reconsidering the decision to reject an update on Restrepo's work. I'm assuming that both of those recommendations by MAFAC have gone by the boards, given the process that you're in?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | MR. DUNNIGAN: No. I think they've                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | been deferred.                                     |
| 3  | MR. MOORE: Okay.                                   |
| 4  | MR. DUNNIGAN: The recommendations                  |
| 5  | haven't gone by the boards, but at this stage of   |
| 6  | the exercise our job was not to respond to any new |
| 7  | information. We had a very thoughtful comment from |
| 8  | The Marine Fish Conservation Network. We also      |
| 9  | didn't respond to that in drafting this proposed   |
| 10 | rule. Our task was to take the working group       |
| 11 | report and make it into a proposed rule and not    |
| 12 | address the policy feedback that we were getting   |
| 13 | from whomever, and so those recommendations are    |
| 14 | deferred. And now that we're getting and asking    |
| 15 | for comment back                                   |
| 16 | MR. MOORE: Uh-huh.                                 |
| 17 | MR. DUNNIGAN:we will be                            |
| 18 | considering those in deciding where to go with the |
| 19 | proposed rule.                                     |
| 20 | MR. MOORE: Okay. So the MAFAC                      |
| 21 | comments then are still on record. Do they have to |
| 22 | be resubmitted to you guys                         |

| 1  | MR. DUNNIGAN: No.                                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | MS. BRYANT: I don't think so.                      |
| 3  | MR. MOORE:under the proposed                       |
| 4  | rule   |
| 5  | MR. DUNNIGAN: No, no.                              |
| 6  | MR. MOORE:or process or                            |
| 7  | MR. DUNNIGAN: No.                                  |
| 8  | MR. MOORE: Okay. So our comments are               |
| 9  | still formally on record                           |
| 10 | MR. DUNNIGAN: Right.                               |
| 11 | MR. MOORE:from MAFAC?                              |
| 12 | MS. BRYANT: Yes.                                   |
| 13 | MR. MOORE: Thanks. I'm done, Dick.                 |
| 14 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Dick.                      |
| 15 | MR. GUTTING: Jack, I just wanted to                |
| 16 | compliment you on the process and the              |
| 17 | presentations. I think what is striking to me just |
| 18 | from a historical standpoint is you were really    |
| 19 | engaging us in a dialogue and I think thank you    |
| 20 | for that. That's making the best use of this       |
| 21 | Committee. This is an incredibly complicated,      |
| 22 | dense issue. It's mind numbing in its complexity,  |

and so I appreciate how difficult it is to try to bring it forward.

My only suggestion is that we all have an opportunity to comment. Each of us as individual can certainly review this and give you our thoughts, but to make the most productive use of this Committee what would really be exciting would be if you or Bill were able to, after you've seen the comments from others -- you've got some core policy choices, and if you could bring back to the Committee kind of what's on your minds what's on Bill's mind. You know, what are the policy choices that you see as being the most significant ones, and basically giving MAFAC three to five of those questions like you did yesterday. Put them up on the board and then have the discussion.

The value of MAFAC, it seems to me, is in each one of the members hearing the others' comments and being able to react to it. But to be useful we have to be relevant, and we really need you to say, look, guys, you know, here's a choice

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1   | we've got to make. You know, we can go this way,    |
|-----|---|
| 2   | or we can go that way. What's your advice? If you   |
| 3   | could help frame that discussion in the fall or     |
| 4   | whenever is an appropriate time I think it would be |
| 5   | a very  |
| 6   | MR. DUNNIGAN: Okay.                                 |
| 7   | MR. GUTTING:exciting, productive                    |
| 8   | meeting, rather than trying to jump into this thing |
| 9   | and get buried instantly in the terminology and the |
| LO  | technical aspects of it.                            |
| L1  | MR. DUNNIGAN: Right. That's a good                  |
| L2  | suggestion.   |
| L3  | MR. GUTTING: That would be my                       |
| L 4 | suggestion.   |
| L5  | MR. DUNNIGAN: Good suggestion. Thank                |
| L6  | you.  |
| L7  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: No other                    |
| L8  | comments?   |
| L9  | MR. DUNNIGAN: That's all I have.                    |
| 20  | Thank you.  |
| 21  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thanks,               |
| 22  | Jack. Okay  |

| 1   | MS. BRYANT: I need to go find Bill.                |
|-----|--|
| 2   | Do you want to take a break?                       |
| 3   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: We've got                  |
| 4   | Governor Frank Murkowski coming at 9:30. So        |
| 5   | another five minutes. So                           |
| 6   | MS. BRYANT: You want to take a break               |
| 7   | while I go and find Bill and give him a phone call |
| 8   | and see if he's still on-line?                     |
| 9   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah.                      |
| LO  | MS. BRYANT: You want me to do that?                |
| L1  | Take a break so I can go.                          |
| L2  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. We'll                |
| L3  | take five. Everybody can get a cup of coffee       |
| L 4 | before the Governor gets here.                     |
| L5  | MR. KENT: If I could see the speakers              |
| L6  | for the next session out in the hall for just a    |
| L7  | minute I'd appreciate it. Thank you.               |
| L8  | (Off record)                                       |
| L9  | GOVERNOR MURKOWSKI: (Equipment                     |
| 20  | malfunction) adequate fishery that will provide a  |
| 21  | good living opportunity for many of our smaller    |
| 22  | communities in Wrangell. As you know, there's      |

quite a fishery out of there and a few other areas on the west coast of Prince of Wales and there's room for others and it's going to take good management and good science. The idea of moving in beyond that, of course, is something that I think we're faced with in the aquaculture area as to how far, if at all, we want to go and I'm mixing synonyms a little bit in a sense because Canada is moving into the black cod. They're moving into the shrimp. They're moving into halibut.

always maintained We have here in Alaska a concern about farm raised salmon, and I maintain that concern. My administration is not in a position at this time nor are we likely to be, in my opinion, to promote fish farming. We think that we are managing pretty well our anatomous fish to the point that we can do better with quality control, advertising wild Alaska salmon and better marketing efforts and concentrate on our wild species and let the Canadians and others that have already established a significant market for farm raised salmon continue, and we'll try and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

concentrate more on the quality issue and the benefits of wild Alaska salmon because clearly there have been concerns raised about farmed salmon and the environment that they are raised in and the consequences of disease associated with that and escape.

just wanted to kind of outline, you know, where we're coming from, I think, as far as cod, halibut and shrimp and other species that we are going to be faced with at some point in time if, indeed, it does develop into a significant farm commercial -- that we're going to have to evaluate that as we go along. But the point I want to make is a pretty simple one. We want to make our decisions on the basis of the best science as emotions and that's opposed to the what I'm committed to and that's why I think our Department of Fish and Game has done a pretty good job. mean, if you want to get a flavor for it, why just hang around the Kenai River and get the diversity of those from the commercial aspects and those from the sportfishing aspects, and neither side are very

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

happy. But they had a record run, which suggests that, you know, we must be somewhere in the middle, although people will argue either way. But, you know, the policies and guidelines that comes out of gatherings such as this are very important in the direction of managing this renewable resource, and that's why I wanted to come down and say hello and answer any question or, if I don't have the answers, give them to Allen and he's pretty good at it. And that's about all I have to say other than to thank you for being here and contributing your expertise and time.

One of the things I learned a long time ago in my 22 years in the Senate is we have a lot of hearings and the hearings bring in the witnesses and the witnesses are the best supposedly witnesses that, you know, we could reach out and get. But it's awfully hard to get them in a mode to give their opinion and kind of lay their reputation on the line with their opinion. There's a reluctance. Well, I can't quite say that because if I had a little more time or if I had another study or a

2.

| little more money I could probably give you a more  |
|---|
| definitive but, hell, who are you going to          |
| depend on if you can't depend on those people,      |
| because that's all there is. You can't depend on a  |
| bunch of Senators that know nothing about it and    |
| are going to vote yes or no. They're not going to   |
| vote maybe. So that's why, you know, your input is  |
| so important, and I think it works both ways. You   |
| have to kind of realize that you are important.     |
| Your, you know, field of study and expertise is all |
| we can look towards.                                |
| On the other hand you get into the                  |

On the other hand, you get into the shouting matches with those that are moved by the emotional argument, and oftentimes they carry the day. But that's just the harsh reality of my experience working out there. But you've got some people that clearly have been around for a while and know what they're doing. Gunnar and others certainly have a wide-ranging reputation. So I commend you. That's it. Anything else? Okay.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Thank you.

GOVERNOR MURKOWSKI: I can get out of

| 1  | town fast.  |
|----|---|
| 2  | (Applause)  |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Don, that was               |
| 4  | timed just right. Now the Aquaculture has got       |
| 5  | their marching orders.                              |
| 6  | MR. KENT: Thank you. I'd still like                 |
| 7  | five minutes, if we could. I haven't had a chance   |
| 8  | to actually meet with the speakers, and Linda needs |
| 9  | to set up her presentation. So if we could          |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Sure. We'll                 |
| 11 | drink coffee for that time.                         |
| 12 | MR. KENT: Thank you very much.                      |
| 13 | Appreciate it. Again, if I could have the speakers  |
| 14 | outside.  |
| 15 | (Off record)  |
| 16 | MR. KENT: Thank you, Alvin. As                      |
| 17 | Chairman of the Aquaculture Subcommittee, I've been |
| 18 | asked to introduce the speakers today on this       |
| 19 | subject, and I just want to give a little bit of    |
| 20 | historical background. Love the hat, Rod. Please,   |
| 21 | don't ever take it off.                             |
| 22 | First off, I'd like to thank Alvin for              |

arranging for the Governor's visit. That was wonderful and, as Alvin said, it kind of sets the context for what we need to deal with now. in D.C., last meeting Washington, Subcommittee reported back to the full Committee on recommendations within the made the Commission's report, and in our December meeting in New York we also reported back on the comments made on the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy report, the draft report. We decided to come spend some extra time at the next MAFAC meeting -- this one -- to go into a little more depth, have speakers come and present material and then have a more in-depth discussion.

During that time period since the New York meeting, NOAA has taken a look at its goal -- its published goal it's had for sometime of producing 2 million metric tons of additional seafood through aquaculture to meet the estimated increase in U.S. domestic demand and thereby offsetting a predicted additional contribution to the trade deficit of approximately \$5 billion.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Toward that end, one strategy for trying to realize that goal was for the Department to direct NMFS to develop a business case, that business case to investigate the potential for development of aquaculture in the EEZ as is being done offshore in many other countries around the world.

So that draft business case is going to be brought to you in its current form today by Linda Chaves. Dr. Hogarth has asked MAFAC to make comments on the case. We've taken Linda out of order here and moving her to the front so that we can set the context for the meeting with the business case. We have speakers here representing not only the economic aspects but the fishing industry, environmental community, Native peoples and scientific research.

I would ask that during the presentations what we do is we limit our questions to those of clarification holding, you know, second order philosophical discussions for the end of the speakers and then the major philosophical discussions towards the end after the final speaker

2.

2.1

is done and then Linda can come up and will set context overall for all the presentations, have the philosophical discussions in the full Committee, and then tomorrow morning the Aquaculture Subcommittee during the breakout session will meet and try to summarize all of these issues back and come back with a report from the Subcommittee. With that introduction aside, I'd like to ask Linda to go ahead and start.

CO-CHAIR DR. **HOGARTH:** Let me say something before Linda to sort of -- from a NOAA perspective and a NOAA Fisheries perspective. know, we've talked about aquaculture for many years We've done code of in the Federal government. We've done different things as far as conduct. aquaculture is concerned, but it never has, except for the Department of Agriculture, really had money and, you know, people putting any effort into it. Permitting is somewhat of a haphazard type thing. We give experimental permits to get something for OAR has some money that they work aquaculture. with different various groups. You know, we think

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

it's time that we have a really open dialogue on aquaculture. The seafood industry being in the condition it's in, we finally think that this is the opportunity not only for food production in several instances but it is also a very valuable tool for stock enhancement, and I think it's being used as stock enhancement a lot more than people realize. But they sort of separate out the stock enhancement and don't call it aquaculture, but it's really aquaculture.

On the West. Coast, we have approximately 11 hatcheries that we operate connection with the Endangered Species Act salmon on the West Coast, and there's some here in Alaska that operate for salmon. If you look at what's happened in some of the states that have had reduction in fisheries or taking people out of fisheries such as Florida -- Linda will talk about it -- but it went into net ban. Those fishermen were able to pick up and do aquaculture of clams. So, you know, it's been an avenue, I think, for the industry that if you can't, you know, make a good

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

living in fishing off wild stocks there are some opportunities, I think, in aquaculture that it could go to.

And I think we need to look at the big picture. We need to make sure -- there are several questions you'll see at the end of this, which I won't go into because Linda and the others will discuss it very thoroughly. But we're not trying to push anything down anybody's throat. We just think that it's time to have an open discussion. We know what other countries are doing. We know that, for example, Norway is putting in probably more money in aquaculture than we are spending in entire fishery budget. And we know what imports are doing in several instances to shrimp industry. They've gone up 30 percent. So we know that our industry is being impacted by imports and aquaculture products, but we still don't seem to have a policy or things in this country to go into aquaculture in a responsible way. That's what we're looking for. Should this country have aquaculture? Should it have stock

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

enhancement? What species would you utilize? How would you do it responsibly? Who would do the permits, and things like this?

you know, So, we want good This will be aired many times before, discussion. I think, something permanent goes on, but the opportunities for deepwater aquaculture is going to be -- there's a project in California, for example, that they will release one millionth white sea bass as stock enhancement soon. If you go to Hawaii, estimate -- a whole lot of species that have been taken through the -- you know, that have gone through aquaculture and are ready for commercial production. I think it would help the market. think it would help us maintain the market. example, in red snapper we have a market of about six months a year. Then imports or something else takes over or some other species takes over. you have to fight to get that market back.

So, you know, I know it's controversial and maybe it's not the right time to be talking about it, but I think it's the time -- I think time

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is sort of running out on us if we don't talk about it and don't do it responsibly and don't get everybody's input. It will be done openly. It will be done with a good thorough discussion from all those, pros and cons, and everyone. But, hopefully, at the end of this we could go in with an open mind and come out with some type of policy or direction that will make this -- it will aid our industry, aid our fishermen, create jobs and help the economy and help those people who are really being impacted. That's the goal. So I hope today -- I've looked forward to today because I think it will be a good open discussion. So that's my two cents' worth before we start.

Thanks, Bill. MS. CHAVES: First of defined all, aquaculture as bу the National Aquaculture Act -- and I thought this was important because I've heard a lot of different terms being used -- aquaculture, mariculture -- people talking about mariculture just being shellfish aquaculture -- but it is really the propagation of myriad aquatic organisms in a controlled selective

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

environment for any commercial, recreational or public purpose. So that includes enhancement. It includes endangered species recovery and a whole variety of other things.

Aquaculture, as far as we're concerned, can be used for is tool. Tt. commercial Those are moi in a cage off of Hawaii. production. Enhancement of wild fishery stocks. This is the first yellow-eye rockfish that we've been able to grow in our laboratories, looking at possibly using those to enhance those resources because they're depleted. And then, of course, recovering endangered species where we've done a lot of work on Redfish Lake sockeye.

What I'm going to talk about today is to provide a little bit of a context for aquaculture in the United States, briefly review the Ocean Commission recommendations, introduce the National Offshore Aquaculture Act around which there's been an awful lot of discussion and publicity and, also, introduce the business case which you were provided copies of, and I can't read

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

mine somehow. I need better glasses.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

Current situation. Wild capture fisheries are static, and they're unlikely to As much as we would like to have the expand. oceans produce a whole lot more fish, that's not seafood going to happen. Our demands are increasing just not in the United States, but globally, and in the United States we imported \$11 million worth of seafood last year to meet that domestic demand and our deficit just for seafood products -- not all fisheries products, which include industrial things, but just for seafood -was \$7.8 billion and those numbers are increasing on an annual basis.

There is some question about the safety of some of our imports, particularly in the world we live in today. I know I've seen photographs of shrimp coming in with nails stuck in them, which you couldn't see very easily. But if a consumer were to eat those, who knows what would happen? And there's also the issue of coastal communities being economically depressed, which will be touched

1 on.

2.

2.1

2.2

From a global perspective, world harvests have plateaued. There may be some increases, but not much. You can see -- and these numbers, I know, are very small, but starting in the 1950s you see increase. But then, early 90s, you really don't see a whole lot of increase and I think we're just seeing some ups and downs. So you can't expect much more seafood to be coming from wild harvests.

There has been some studies looking at protein consumption around the world and developing countries eat more seafood but you have to realize that their protein consumption is significantly lower than our protein consumption. But there is an estimation that total seafood consumption is going to increase by about four percent per year globally and that will end up resulting in about a 21 kilogram per capita consumption rate by the year 2030 and those are whole fish numbers, not processed product. We get into an issue sometimes when we're comparing per capita consumption numbers

that we gather in the United States where we talk about the finished product. So we're eating 15.6 pounds per capita, but all other countries convert it back to round weight. So you have to do some conversions when you're using comparisons.

Already today a third of all seafood is coming from aquaculture and the estimation is that by 2030 over 50 percent of all seafood consumed in the world is going to be coming from aquaculture and there has been an analysis saying that 54 million metric tons of seafood is going to have to come from aquaculture in that same time period. That's a lot of fish. As an example of what's this is happened and very particularly -interesting, I know, and poignant to people in Alaska, but your blue bars are all of your wild Pacific and Atlantic harvests, and your red ones are aquaculture product. So what you see here is that, by 2001, 55 percent of qlobal salmon production was from aquaculture. You can have all the discussion you want about prices being paid, but the bottom line is that that fish is being

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

consumed, and the markets have grown to meet that demand.

With regard to where the United States is on aquaculture production, I don't know if you can see the little red bar at the top of these tall blue bars, but that's what the United States produces -- that little tiny red cap at the very top of those bars -- very, very little, and most of that production is from catfish. While consumption in the states has hovered around 15 pounds per capita since the 1980s there have been some recent increases, but that's been primarily because of the availability of farm products, particularly shrimp, salmon and, to a lesser extent, tilapia most recently and, also, catfish -- both domestic production and imported product.

We get our fish from -- about a little over 4 million metric tons is harvested every year, but we don't eat all of that in the United States.

A lot of that is exported. Our production from aquaculture is right around 500,000 metric tons a year and those numbers are very, very difficult

2.

2.1

| 1  | because the states all gather the information and   |
|----|---|
| 2  | they don't gather it consistently and we're trying  |
| 3  | to do a better job of finding out exactly how much  |
| 4  | we produce in the country but it's not readily      |
| 5  | available.  |
| 6  | MR. KENT: And, again, that's not just               |
| 7  | marine species. That's all                          |
| 8  | MS. CHAVES: Yeah, that's                            |
| 9  | MR. KENT:aquaculture production.                    |
| 10 | MS. CHAVES: And that includes                       |
| 11 | MR. KENT: Primarily catfish.                        |
| 12 | MS. CHAVES: That yeah, right                        |
| 13 | yeah, two-thirds probably of aquaculture production |
| 14 | in this country is from catfish. Of the imports,    |
| 15 | the equivalent of over 5 million metric tons of     |
| 16 | round fish to meet domestic supply and it's         |
| 17 | estimated that probably about 40 percent of that is |
| 18 | cultured today and we expect those numbers to be    |
| 19 | increasing as well.                                 |
| 20 | And so we've done some work to take a               |
| 21 | look at what we expect demand to be in the future,  |
| 22 | and we expect that there will be a need for an      |

additional two million metric tons of seafood above and beyond what we consume in today's market. So what we've done here is your middle line, in the blue, these are our wild harvests for seafood. We've projected out to 2025 and we increased it to what our highest level of harvest has ever been. What's left of that supply as exports is this lower line, and I'd like to remind you that all these numbers have been converted back to round weight. Our statisticians went through and took a look at our exports and if it was a fillet that was being exported they used one conversion factor. If it was a headed and gutted fish, they used a different conversion factor.

When I saw these numbers, I was quite frankly amazed. I went back to them and they went back to the numbers and said, no, these numbers are accurate. But, now, it's more important from the demand side. This red line is what we've been consuming and it's pretty much a straight line and you see we've projected out to 2025, assuming that per capita consumption would remain the same,

2.

2.1

| Τ  | although I think a lot of people would like to see  |
|----|---|
| 2  | per capita consumption increase I know I            |
| 3  | personally would like to be able to eat more        |
| 4  | seafood and we're just basing this on a moderate    |
| 5  | projection of population growth. So your delta      |
| 6  | between the top of this red line and what we're     |
| 7  | eating today, down here the difference between      |
| 8  | what we had then and what we're eating today is two |
| 9  | million metric tons more seafood. So the question   |
| 10 | is, where is that going to come from?               |
| 11 | MR. BURNS: Linda, could I ask a quick               |
| 12 | question  |
| 13 | MS. CHAVES: Yeah.                                   |
| 14 | MR. BURNS:on the last slide? So                     |
| 15 | we're exporting 80 percent?                         |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: Yeah, we have calculated                |
| 17 | that over 75 percent of what we consume in this     |
| 18 | country comes from imports. Now, there is an issue  |
| 19 | because we do have seafood, particularly from       |
| 20 | Alaska, that's being exported to China, being       |
| 21 | processed in China. Some of it comes back to the    |
| 22 | United States. Some of it goes on to Europe, and    |

| 1  | it's very difficult from the statistics to          |
|----|---|
| 2  | determine exactly what those numbers are. But we    |
| 3  | export an enormous quantity of seafood, and largely |
| 4  | because it's product that, one, you can get a       |
| 5  | better price for it overseas; or, two, it's         |
| 6  | something that no one wants to eat here. I haven't  |
| 7  | seen pollock broil on many menus, you know, and a   |
| 8  | whole bunch of other things that you don't see on   |
| 9  | menus. We don't eat much mackerel in this country.  |
| 10 | You know, there are a whole batch of things, and    |
| 11 | the markets for pollock, herring all those types    |
| 12 | of things are much better in other countries.       |
| 13 | And some years ago we tried to change we tried      |
| 14 | to influence the American palate. We tried to get   |
| 15 | Americans to eat more of these underutilized        |
| 16 | species   |
| 17 | MR. BURNS: Yeah, I remember the                     |
| 18 | mackerel case and all that.                         |
| 19 | MS. CHAVES: There were some that it                 |
| 20 | worked for, but there were an awful lot that there  |
| 21 | really wasn't a whole lot of interest.              |
| 22 | Now, the Ocean Commission recognizes                |

this whole thing about aquaculture being a part of the future, and they dedicated an entire chapter to what should be done with aquaculture. They have four main recommendations. One of them was that NOAA should be named as the lead for marine aquaculture and that there would be a new office of aquaculture established either at the NOAA level or at the next level, but they weren't specific about that. We're fully supportive of being the lead agency for marine aquaculture.

They also identified the need for a regulatory framework. This is something that's been identified by a consumer group -- constituent groups all around the country that, you know, you there in the EEZ because can't out the get regulations just don't exist; or, you can do it, but it's very complicated and confusing and it's being addressed very differently in all of regions and there's no consistency. And so we feel that the National Offshore Aquaculture Act, which is in drafting process, would give us permitting and regulatory authority in the EEZ and it

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

directly responsive to the Ocean Commission recommendation.

And they also talk about the need for increased funding for research and development, training and extension of tech transfer. This is something the industry, of course, is very supportive of. We have all kinds of plans for doing more research than we're doing right now. They're all on the books and all you need is money but, you know, that's something we can't talk about.

And the other thing that the Commission report asked us to do was to work through FAO to get more countries to adhere to best management practices and the code of conduct for responsible aquaculture development, and this is something that we're already doing to a certain extent. Every time we meet with a foreign government and we have aquaculture on the agenda we talk about codes of conduct. We talk about best management practices. We also talk about antibiotic use, therapeutants, try to introduce technology which would reduce the

2.

2.1

need for doing some of those things. So we're already doing some of that already. Is there room for more? Absolutely. It's just a matter of time and resources.

So why should NOAA be involved? Well, strategic plan that we've got a identifies aquaculture as part of ecosystems. It can reduce pressure on wild stocks. You can use it rebuilding depleted stocks. We want to take a look how we could accelerate stock rebuilding, at particularly for some of your long-lived West Coast species, which could take between 50 and 100 years to recover. So there are a lot of things in that area.

also have а major stewardship We responsibility in the Department of Commerce. This is something that we have that the Department of Agriculture does not, and we also have recognized scientific leadership. We have a number of laboratories around the country where there are people doing work on aquaculture and they're doing very, very good job and many of them are

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

recognized as the world leaders in their field. I believe that you were all provided with a copy -- you all correct me, if I'm wrong -- with the aquaculture policy.

MS. BRYANT: I don't think so. I put in the book what you had given me.

MS. CHAVES: Okay. We can provide you with a copy of the aquaculture policy. It about a six, seven-page document. It was written in 1998. It basically says that we're going to go forward and do this, and I don't want to take up too much time. Going into the Department of Commerce. Why should Commerce be interested? are, because they have responsibility for fostering economic development, creating jobs, encouraging competitiveness, developing technological excellence and improving food security to a certain There are a number of agencies within the Department that already have been involved in aquaculture activities around the country. for example -- the National Institute for Science [sic] and Technology -- has an Advanced Technology

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| Program, and through that program they have funded |
|--|
| the development of a machine which will vaccinate  |
| fish and they're working on the salmonus (ph)      |
| first and they can now vaccinate salmonus (ph)     |
| at the rate of over 6,000 fish per hour. You never |
| have to handle the fish. You have 99 point         |
| something percent accuracy on where the injection  |
| goes in. You have virtually no mortalities. It's   |
| a really slick project. Unfortunately, that        |
| technology will probably be used in Chile and in   |
| Norway before it would be used in the United       |
| States. But they're also working on developing it  |
| for some other species, and I know that we'll be   |
| trying it out in one of our labs, I think, to      |
| inject to vaccinate cod or ling cod.               |

The OC organizations obviously have some interests in community development. EDA is involved in that as well. ITA has some trade issues; and, of course, NOAA.

In 1999, the department put together a policy with goals for aquaculture, being quite ambitious. Unfortunately, we haven't made a whole

lot of progress to those in the last five years; but, importantly, they talk about increasing the value of domestic production five-fold to five billion; increasing exports of goods and services to two and a half; increasing jobs from 200 to 600,000 people and, also, enhancing the depletable wild fish stocks. And so we're trying to work towards those, but we don't have all of the regulatory things in place, and all the research capabilities are not there yet.

Why now? There's no fair permitting process available for the EEZ, and we are seeing an increasing interest of people moving out into that region. We have people coming in saying I want a permit. I want to grow something. The fishery is managed under a national plan. How do I get around the fact that I'm only allowed to hold two fish and they each have to be 35" long? It doesn't make it really worthwhile for aquaculture. So they end up having to get exemptive fishing permits. But those only last for a year and I think they can be renewed for another year, at which point that's

2.

2.1

when they have to take it to the bank. So there is a need for regulatory framework.

Jobs and trade. We see our imports increasing, but that's not going to change. We see jobs being necessary in coastal communities where this would work very well. People are being responsive to the Ocean Commission report. One of the reasons also to go offshore is that there is increasing competition for the use of the coastal zone. You've got a lot more tourism and you've got a lot more recreational fishing, a lot more issues and, in fact, it really makes a lot more sense to be doing your farming operation in deeper, cleaner water away from a lot of other impacts.

And I think the last point there is a very important one, and that is that there's some question about what kinds of environmental standards and requirements exist right now for aquaculture. EPA has discharge permits, but no one has really -- or, then, in state waters, states different have types of requirements for environmental standards, but they don't exist for

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the EEZ. And, with legislation, the Secretary of Commerce would have the authority to establish requirements as needed, and I'll go into that a little bit more in just a moment.

Now, the National Offshore Aquaculture exist until it. is Act. doesn't submitted Congress. So this is hypothetical discussion about what could be in a National Offshore Aquacultural Act if one were to be submitted to Congress. we would expect it to give the Department of Commerce authority to issue permits, and we think that there would have to be site permits so you could locate it in a specific place. But then you would also have to get an operational permit, and the operational permit would be for any species you were going to grow. So if you want to grow salmon and you want to grow halibut you're going to have to have two different operational permits, which will be specific to the species and may have different requirements for tagging, for stocking -all kinds of different things, depending upon the species that you want to culture.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

from There would be an exemption Magnuson-Stevens, and this is primarily because Magnuson-Stevens, when written, did not contemplate aquaculture. Magnuson-Stevens was written manage wild stocks. It doesn't address the whole aquaculture issue, and so rather than having you try to contort yourself through that maze, it just makes a whole lot more sense to do something else. But then there would be consultation with the Council before permits would be issued.

The other thing that we were involved in in other areas is a streamlined permitting processes. For aquaculture, right now you have to have permits from a number of different Federal agencies and they go sequentially. Frequently, it can take an awful long time. The idea would be to try to streamline the process; hopefully, where you could submit one application and then it would be provided to the other Federal agencies all at the same time so that you can hopefully get something done in your lifetime and some people might not like that.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | MS. RAYMOND: Under the exemption from               |
|----|---|
| 2  | the Magnuson-Stevens Act, you said that they would  |
| 3  | still consult with the Council on potential impacts |
| 4  | to habitat fish habitat.                            |
| 5  | MS. CHAVES: That could be one of the                |
| 6  | things, yeah.                                       |
| 7  | MS. RAYMOND: I mean, what other things              |
| 8  | would they consult with the Council on and what,    |
| 9  | really, authority would the Council's comments sort |
| 10 | of have on the whole                                |
| 11 | MS. CHAVES: That's still being worked               |
| 12 | out. That's still being worked out. Right now,      |
| 13 | the hypothetical legislation is fairly general and  |
| 14 | broad. The regulations will be much more specific,  |
| 15 | idea being that as an industry develops you may     |
| 16 | want to make changes upwards or downwards, and it's |
| 17 | going to be a lot easier to change regulations than |
| 18 | it is legislation.                                  |
| 19 | MR. DILERNIA: I understand the need                 |
| 20 | for exemption from Magnuson-Stevens. I think it's   |
| 21 | a good idea. The only complication I envision       |
| 22 | there is when you use the aquaculture product to    |

enhance wild stocks. Things could get a little trickier there, but.....

MS. CHAVES: Well, and I think that yeah, and if you're talking enhancement I would imagine that -- you know, we're not there yet, but when you're talking about stock rebuilding plans you may want to incorporate an enhancement aspect to your stock rebuilding plan. And we haven't discussed this with Sustainable Fisheries, but is this something that could possibly happen. But we have a long ways to go before we get to that, but it is something that, you know, we recognize that there are complications. Providing environmental and other safequards. There are mentioned -- oh, I'm sorry, Rod.

MR. MOORE: I figure if I wave the hat around somebody will pay attention. Either for you or Al, there's going to be several comments and questions about all of this. Do you want to hold them till the end, or do you want to take them in -- what's your pleasure?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I think Don                |
|-----|--|
| 2   | when he started kind of wanted to hold questions.  |
| 3   | MR. KENT: Yeah, what I'd like is to                |
| 4   | hold the questions during the presentation to just |
| 5   | points of clarification                            |
| 6   | MR. MOORE: Okay. That's                            |
| 7   | MR. KENT:and then hold the                         |
| 8   | discussion points for later on.                    |
| 9   | MR. MOORE: Can we discuss immediately              |
| LO  | after Linda gets done                              |
| L1  | MR. KENT: Certainly.                               |
| L2  | MR. MOORE:before we go into                        |
| L3  | other things? Okay. Thank you.                     |
| L 4 | MS. CHAVES: Okay. Provide                          |
| L5  | environmental and other safeguards, environmental  |
| L6  | requirements. There will be more environmental     |
| L7  | requirements than exist out in the EEZ right now,  |
| L 8 | and some of those will be determined based upon    |
| L9  | monitoring that is done in the early stages. Also, |
| 20  | taking a look at the monitoring results that have  |
| 21  | become available from other research projects that |
| 22  | are ongoing. We'll be hearing about one research   |

project today for sure, but all of the research projects where we are actually funding we building in fairly heavy-duty monitoring requirements so that we can see what's happening to that environment so that we can help use those in defining what the requirements will be. And this is an area where we see change happening over the five to 10 years as an industry becomes developed and there may be, as I mentioned before, different monitoring requirements for different species under different conditions.

Verv strong requirement to do monitoring, to do evaluation, and our enforcement people will have the authority to enforce whatever the regulations happen to be. Their roles will be the authority to suspend, modify or revoke permits for cause or in case something new comes up and, you know, you decide it's not good to have this operation here. You might say, guys, you have to shut down completely, or you need to move another location. So just because you have a permit to stay someplace for a period of time

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

doesn't mean that you might not have to move at some point in time, depending upon what's going on in that area. There is a capability to request bonds or other financial guarantees so that you can't abandon your facility or, if there is damage done, that there is some way to remunerate or pay back for that.

The legislation would also support the development of offshore aquaculture and support research and development to induce public/private partnerships. We think that that's going to be particularly important, especially in the early days as we're learning more as the there would also be reason develops. And lot of biological, require an awful social, production and economic data collection. As I mentioned before, we have a very hard time knowing how much fish is being grown in the United States right now. This will hopefully get at it so that we can start to get a better database to work with.

With regard to funding, there is a fee section in there where the government could charge

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| fees for permits. You could charge for an           |
|---|
| application permit. You could charge for a site     |
| permit. You could charge for an operating permit.   |
| We don't suggest any specific amount of money,      |
| although in the business case we've come up with    |
| some monies figures based on what fees are charged  |
| by some other people, but that's something that     |
| will be determined in Congress. I mean, that's not  |
| something that, you know, we're going to decide.    |
| The legislation would authorize appropriations, but |
| there are no specific dollars attached to it. So    |
| Congress could decide to authorize however much     |
| money they felt would be needed to do whatever      |
| portions of this legislation.                       |
| MR. RAYBURN: Linda, are there royalty               |

MR. RAYBURN: Linda, are there royalty authorizations within the fee capital?

MS. CHAVES: The way the fee language is written, it could be a royalty, but we did not address royalties. And the reason that we haven't gone into the whole royalty discussion is that we would be setting a precedent for collecting royalties of a non-extractive industry when the

| 1  | commercial fishing industry does not pay royalties, |
|----|---|
| 2  | and I think that if you're going to start talking   |
| 3  | about royalties there needs to be a much larger     |
| 4  | debate because I know the aquaculture industry is   |
| 5  | going to say we've got to pay royalties on fish     |
| 6  | that we put in and then take out. We think that     |
| 7  | the commercial industry ought to pay royalties on   |
| 8  | fish they didn't put in but took out. So, you       |
| 9  | know, we didn't think that this was the place to    |
| 10 | raise that flag. And that argument will take        |
| 11 | place, I'm sure.                                    |
| 12 | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah.                                  |
| 13 | MS. CHAVES: But, hopefully, not                     |
| 14 | because we've raised it.                            |
| 15 | MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.                             |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: And some countries do, and              |
| 17 | some countries don't. We also recognize that there  |
| 18 | is a considerable list of challenges surrounding    |
| 19 | aquaculture development opposition by commercial    |
| 20 | fishermen, perception of high risk by the financial |
| 21 | community, questions about private use of the       |

You know, what happens -- you know,

commons.

should you be allowed to block off a small area of the ocean to do something? Someone came back to me and said, well, that's what fishermen do except that their small area that they block off is moving. You know, there's is a moving target. This is a sitting target.

Fish meal controversy about feeding fish to fish. You know, I can say that an awful lot of people are doing a lot of research on trying to reduce the amount of fish fraction in fish food, but that is still an issue. But what frequently doesn't come up in conversations, that fish meal is also being fed to chickens and pigs and some other animals, but nobody ever complains about that.

Organic waste deposits. Disease transmission. Human health risk is something that's come up a lot lately with all the articles about PCBs and methyl mercury and Omega-3 fatty acids, and we need to shed a little more light on that. Introduction of non-indigenous species. Impact of escaped fish. Geodomes, and trying to build cage systems that are going to survive an

2.

offshore environment, which is a lot higher energy environment. So these are all issues that need to be dealt with. There has been research done on many of these. A lot of it is not known, but this is something that we need to get this information out into the general public and to have more discussion about what is going on in these areas.

At the same time, there are economic Bill mentioned opportunities. that I probably mention a couple of examples. The Florida issue. There was a net ban in 1995, and you now have 400 fishermen who have 600 leases and are growing hard clams. They do about \$34 million a year in sales and \$9 million in labor income and \$12 million in value-added products, and people in that part of the world think that's been fairly successful. In Maine, different types of numbers, but 1,400 jobs have been created with about \$10 million a year in tax revenues, \$130 million total positive impact in 2002, and the productivity, apparently, is about double the productivity of all other averaging businesses, and they're going to

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

salmon, trout and shellfish.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

We've tried to come up with a number of how many jobs are created for every thousand metric tons of fish that is produced, and it ranges all over the place depending upon all kinds of things. So we've got a range of 20 to 60 jobs per thousand metric tons out to 100 for indirect jobs after that. Now, those are numbers that I'll freely admit are not perfect numbers, and we're going to be doing a whole lot more work to refine that information, but the range is all over the place because of the different types of operations. For instance, I think the 60 direct jobs was from a shore based aquaculture facility way up on the —but no idea about the economics of it.

And there is, of course, the opportunity to revitalize depressed communities. One of the things that we looked at is, you know, employment opportunities for communities where you've got displaced fishermen, and I know that the idea of having fishermen going into fish farming is difficult to swallow for some people. But, at the

same time, there are fishermen who have decided to do this and, hopefully, we can have more of that happening or at least have people be more open to it and to really take a look at it. One of the things that I've always thought up here in Alaska is that you've got a lot of processing plants that are only open for, I don't know, three, four, at the most maybe six months out of the year, and wouldn't it be nice if you could have fish being supplied to those plants 12 months out of the year, have communities be there all year long and develop more community, if you will, but that's a decision that has to be made here.

There's, you know, tax revenues, and one of the other -- a couple of other studies have shown that the employee income is double the average for other agricultural fishing and farming jobs -- when you take the aggregate of those -- and that's been shown in Canada and Washington State and, I think, in Maine.

MR. BURNS: Linda, do you have any projections or estimates of likely economic

2.

opportunities associated with offshore aquaculture?

I mean, these are all examples from inshore,
right?

Yeah. I haven't done that MS. CHAVES: yet, but that's something that we're going to be So as far as the legislation is concerned, it has gone to OMB. It has gone out to other agencies for comment. We are now looking at all the comments that have come in from all the other Federal agencies. I have to say that none of the comments are deal breakers, if you will. They're all things that we can deal with. I mean, we have lawyers from three different agencies arguing about the definition of the Exclusive Economic Zone. not going to get in the middle of that one. We're going to put the three lawyers in a room and say you guys work it out and, you know, we'll take whatever you decide. So there's some issues like that that have to be dealt with, but pretty much no And then it will real problems. be an administration decision about whether or not legislation gets forwarded to Congress -- probably

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

a political decision this year -- and we have no control over that. And then, if it goes to Congress, then there -- you know, Congress will have to act -- decide what to do and when to do it and, I would imagine, have guite a few hearings.

Now, you were provided the business case, which Bill said we would like some comments on. This document was not requested by NOAA to sort of explain why aquaculture was important, and it was intended to be an internal document. We were asked to identify some of the issues around aguaculture and to talk a little bit about the possible costs and revenues for implementation. The document is a number of things. There are also a number of things that it is not. It talks about why we should pursue legislation. It is a draft It is not final. It was document. intended primarily for internal use. It's only an overview, and it is part of the whole response that we're trying to do in response to the Ocean Commission. It is not a definitive work on the economics of aquaculture. It is not an identification of all of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the contentious issues nor a resolving of all of It is not a discussion of actual costs and those. benefits to the industry. It does not say if you want to get into salmon or if you want to get into black cod or if you want to get into cobia you're going to have to invest X number of dollars, and It is not an this is what you're going to make. outline for future development, and it's not a tool to promote aquaculture. It really was meant as an internal document for people at the NOAA level and DOC level who had never heard the t.he aquaculture before. But these are people that can make decisions about where we go.

So we have a piece of paper that we're going to be handing out to all of you, which has some questions on it, because what we really need is some takeaway stuff so that we can improve upon this. So what we would like to do is review and incorporate your comments into the short report. We would also like to know what additional topics you think ought to be included in the longer robust analysis that we're going to be doing. We will be

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| preparing a very detailed economic overview. I was  |
|---|
| supposed to have this first document just be 15     |
| pages long. I think that with the appendices and    |
| the citations it's 23 pages. This next one is not   |
| going to have a page limit on it, and we'll be      |
| working with people we are working with people      |
| around the country industry people, some            |
| economists, who have a lot of experiences in this   |
| arena and it will provide some of the answers to    |
| some of the more difficult questions we expect      |
| people to be asking. And I think that's it, and if  |
| we don't do aquaculture we'll all be eating peanut  |
| butter and jellyfish sandwiches.                    |
| MR. KENT: So, we can take a few                     |
| questions. Alvin, would you like to make your list  |
| and   |
| CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Sure. Go                    |
| ahead, Rob.   |
| MR. MOORE: A couple of things. One is               |
| a process issue. Back in 1999 I'm being MAFAC       |
| historian again MAFAC actually had the              |
| opportunity to review an administration aquaculture |

bill, which eventually never went anywhere, and I

-- you know, and it's now in some way sort of

morphed this National Offshore whatever the heck

we're calling it here.

MS. CHAVES: The NOAA displayer.

No comment. I think it's MR. MOORE: unfortunate that you guys have not provided MAFAC with a draft copy of the bill. You can do that in executive session. You can do that and asked that it not be carried out. We all have appropriate security clearances, blah, blah, blah. We've been through this before, and there's been a lot of talk on the street because of all the presentations that are being made and so forth about what's in the And, as you're careful to point out, it's bill. not a real bill until it gets up there but, you know, here's an opportunity to use your Advisory Committee and it's not being done and I just want to make that point for probably the last time before I get off this thing, and then you'll have to have somebody else make it.

Second thing, on your bill you talked

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | about in terms of Magnuson Act exemptions there     |
|----|---|
| 2  | would be consultation with the Council.             |
| 3  | MS. CHAVES: Uh-huh.                                 |
| 4  | MR. MOORE: On the West Coast, we have               |
| 5  | this wonderful history of consultation with the     |
| 6  | Councils in terms of the National Marine            |
| 7  | Sanctuaries. There's a requirement in the National  |
| 8  | Marine Sanctuary Act that the sanctuaries consult   |
| 9  | with the Councils in regard to fishing regulations. |
| 10 | You know what consultation with the Council means?  |
| 11 | You write the regulations the way we tell you, or   |
| 12 | we're going to ignore you. So I have real           |
| 13 | heartburn about generic language that we're going   |
| 14 | to consult with the Councils and we'll maybe cover  |
| 15 | it in the regulations later on.                     |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: I think well, could                     |
| 17 | I   |
| 18 | MR. MOORE: Can I give my third one,                 |
| 19 | and then you can                                    |
| 20 | MS. CHAVES: Okay.                                   |
| 21 | MR. MOORE:respond.                                  |
| 22 | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah.                                  |
|    |   |

| 1 | MS. CH | HAVES: Okay. |
|---|--------|--------------|
|---|--------|--------------|

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

MR. MOORE: The third thing, when you talked about the value of having year-round processing in Alaska, so forth and so on, you damn well better get some good economists to be looking at that. There is a reason that various processing plants are located where they are....

MS. CHAVES: Right.

MR. MOORE: ....that they operate where they are and that they operate in the way they do, and just because they are empty for certain parts of the year does not mean if you put a floating fish pond out in the middle of the Nushagak River that they're going to be able to operate the full time. So you better look at your economics on that.

And, finally, it's great that you're creating all these jobs and the catfish farms and so forth. But, you know, I want to point out -- do you know what catfish competes with in the marketplace? It's wild caught Dover sole, it's wild caught Rex sole, it's wild caught west coast

| 1  | rockfish. So for all of the great money that the   |
|----|--|
| 2  | catfish guys down in Larry's part of the world are |
| 3  | making there                                       |
| 4  | MR. SIMPSON: I never heard of them                 |
| 5  | fish.  |
| 6  | MR. MOORE:you know, there's                        |
| 7  | MR. SIMPSON: How can we compete with               |
| 8  | stuff I've never heard of?                         |
| 9  | MR. MOORE: You never heard of catfish?             |
| 10 | MR. SIMPSON: No. The stuff you said.               |
| 11 | MR. MOORE: Well, that's because you                |
| 12 | don't work in the you only go out to those Cajur   |
| 13 | restaurants, you know.                             |
| 14 | MR. SIMPSON: That's right.                         |
| 15 | MR. MOORE: You got to go out to a real             |
| 16 | restaurant.  |
| 17 | MS. CHAVES: There's no Dover sole down             |
| 18 | there.   |
| 19 | MR. MOORE: But there's you know,                   |
| 20 | all of that catfish is causing problems for        |
| 21 | fishermen and processors and distributors and so   |
| 22 | forth of other wild caught species. So, again, you |

| 1  | know, you need to be looking at the fact that the   |
|----|---|
| 2  | seafood industry is a worldwide industry and        |
| 3  | there's a lot of substitution that goes on out      |
| 4  | there and you push that balloon down there in       |
| 5  | Mississippi it's going to pop out in Oregon. So     |
| 6  | those are my comments.                              |
| 7  | MS. CHAVES: Okay. I'm just going to                 |
| 8  | go over the first one, which dealt with the         |
| 9  | consultative process                                |
| 10 | MR. MOORE: The process.                             |
| 11 | MS. CHAVES:with MAFAC. I've                         |
| 12 | basically been told I couldn't show the legislation |
| 13 | to anyone. I understand there's some other things   |
| 14 | going on on the policy. I was told I couldn't show  |
| 15 | it to anybody, and since these were pretty high up  |
| 16 | lawyers, I didn't                                   |
| 17 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It wasn't Bill                |
| 18 | Hogarth.  |
| 19 | MS. CHAVES: It wasn't Bill Hogarth.                 |
| 20 | MR. MOORE: No, I know.                              |
| 21 | MS. CHAVES: This was way above Bill                 |
| 22 | Hogarth.  |

| 1  | MR. MOORE: Well, that's okay. You                   |
|----|---|
| 2  | know, we're advisors to the Secretary. So I want    |
| 3  | the Secretary to hear our words.                    |
| 4  | MS. CHAVES: But the other thing                     |
| 5  | is  |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: He will.                      |
| 7  | MS. CHAVES:that as this has been                    |
| 8  | going through the interagency review process and as |
| 9  | it went into the review process within the National |
| 10 | Marine Fisheries Service and through all the        |
| 11 | different NOAA line offices it's changed. I mean,   |
| 12 | there have been changes all the way along, and      |
| 13 | there are changes being made even as we speak. I    |
| 14 | think that's really                                 |
| 15 | MR. MOORE: But that's why you have an               |
| 16 | Advisory Committee to give you some advice up       |
| 17 | front, early.                                       |
| 18 | MS. CHAVES: And I think that some of                |
| 19 | the things that you're suggesting may have been in  |
| 20 | there at some point in time and may have been taken |
| 21 | out by other people lawyers, whatever who are       |
| 22 | all looking at it with different filters. But       |

| 1  | l chere will be prenty of opportunity before public |
|----|---|
| 2  | comment and discourse, I would imagine              |
| 3  | MR. MOORE: Oh, I'm sure there will be.              |
| 4  | MS. CHAVES:on this. I expect                        |
| 5  | that there will be lots of hearings                 |
| 6  | MR. MOORE: Oh, I'm sure there will be.              |
| 7  | MS. CHAVES:around the country,                      |
| 8  | and that some of us are going to be much busier     |
| 9  | than we would like to be dealing with these issues. |
| 10 | Second question was on                              |
| 11 | MR. MOORE: Consultation with the                    |
| 12 | Councils on this.                                   |
| 13 | MS. CHAVES: Consultation with                       |
| 14 | Councils. That is language that is actually being   |
| 15 | looked at right now, and that's something where     |
| 16 | there are changes to be made and exactly what that  |
| 17 | means because there's also consultation with tribes |
| 18 | and consultation with all the other Federal         |
| 19 | agencies. We do not supersede other Federal we      |
| 20 | do not override EPA's discharge laws.               |
| 21 | MR. MOORE: All I'm saying is that the               |
| 22 | term consultation with the Councils                 |

3 have a good feeling on the West Coast.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Can I join into that, too, because I do think that's a critical issue in this because if a Fishery Management Council is responsible for managing, you know, the stocks it's quite there more than just consultation input, in my opinion, you know, because then it could again be bypassed, you know.

MR. MOORE: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: So I think that is a key term. It hasn't been resolved, but I think that is one of the things you have to flag. It is key, you know. She answered your third part. If you're looking at possible questions that is under this discussion one of them is wild versus aquaculture, how to identify species which appropriate and deal with market access and competition. You know, I think that is, again, an extremely important issue. Who determines that? Ts it the Fishery Management Council that's

| 1  | managing the stocks, or does somebody just want to |
|----|--|
| 2  | go out and say, well, I like summer flounder.      |
| 3  | Well, you know, summer flounder, now, the stock is |
| 4  | going to an all-time high. Do we need you know,    |
| 5  | are you just going to drive the prices down here   |
| 6  | by   |
| 7  | MR. MOORE: Bill, my point is that                  |
| 8  | there are because of the nature of seafood in      |
| 9  | the marketplace                                    |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah.                        |
| 11 | MR. MOORE:there are impacts that                   |
| 12 | you can't look at by narrowly focusing             |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Right.                       |
| 14 | MR. MOORE:and saying we created                    |
| 15 | so many jobs in Mississippi by growing catfish,    |
| 16 | because there's an adverse economic impact         |
| 17 | someplace else. And I'm not trying to judge one    |
| 18 | way or the other whether aquaculture should go     |
| 19 | forward, but in terms of what the public needs to  |
| 20 | understand and needs to know, now they have to     |
| 21 | think about, okay, I create these jobs in          |

Mississippi. What does it do for the fishermen and

| 1   | the processors in Oregon? And that's the sort of   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | thing that you have to be cognizant of             |
| 3   | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Well, I agree.               |
| 4   | MR. MOORE:when you're doing                        |
| 5   | this.  |
| 6   | MS. CHAVES: But at the same how do                 |
| 7   | you deal with what's happening with aquaculture    |
| 8   | development in other parts of the world where you  |
| 9   | have absolutely no control?                        |
| LO  | MR. MOORE: It's not a question of                  |
| L1  | control, Linda. It's a question of if you're going |
| L2  | to do an honest economic analysis and an honest    |
| L3  | impact analysis of what this legislation might do  |
| L 4 | and what aquaculture might do, you have to look at |
| L5  | it more broadly than what's been shown, and that's |
| L6  | all I'm saying.                                    |
| L7  | MS. CHAVES: I know, and that's and                 |
| L8  | there's a couple of people who are involved in     |
| L9  | that.  |
| 20  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Are you done?              |
| 21  | MR. MOORE: Yeah, I'm done.                         |
| 22  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Dick.                |

MR. GUTTING: Couple of quick comments. First, I think you do need to move this issue forward. I mean, the time is right. We are going to have this conversation in Congress next year, and I commend you for trying to pull together information, trying to get expertise, trying to get focus on some of the key issues so that the debate next year, which is going to take place, will be hopefully informed and enriched by your efforts. And that's not to say that you've got it down and you haven't said you've got it down but two

comments, Linda, that struck me.

In your presentation, you never once mentioned states, and I'm telling you that I think the relationship of your program to the states will be a topic. And if you haven't figured out what your answers are, I suggest to try to address it because it will be an issue. The states are going to want a role. You've seen that issue play out in offshore oil and gas. You see it play out in fisheries every day. Part of what your proposal has got to address is what is the relationship, if

2.1

| 1   | any, to the states, and I don't want to get into   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | the substance. I'm just saying you didn't say      |
| 3   | anything about it. You need to have                |
| 4   | MS. CHAVES: It's                                   |
| 5   | MR. GUTTING:or you're dead at                      |
| 6   | the front door.                                    |
| 7   | MS. CHAVES: Yeah. CZMA consistency is              |
| 8   | in the legislation and there is a whole section on |
| 9   | that and I that's not up there.                    |
| LO  | MR. GUTTING: My second                             |
| L1  | MS. CHAVES: Good point, though. Thank              |
| L2  | you.   |
| L3  | MR. GUTTING:sort of general                        |
| L 4 | comment is everybody has strong, passionate        |
| L5  | feelings about the Councils, whether they're good  |
| L6  | or bad. My own personal feeling is the Council     |
| L7  | process is fabulous. It's strong. It is            |
| L8  | transparent. Yes, it's slow. Yes, it's             |
| L9  | frustrating. But you bring the stakeholders        |
| 20  | together, and you do need the stakeholders in the  |
| 21  | room. It would be a bad mistake to exclude the     |

stakeholders from the discussion. So I personally

think that that kind of transparent collaborative, consultative type of a decision making process, a planning process, is strong.

When I visit aquaculture operations around the country, those that have embraced the local communities and brought in the stakeholders have succeeded. Those who have tried to hide and exclude have failed. What I didn't hear you talk about is the -- if you will, how are going to make these decisions? Is there going to be a community of stakeholders involved in this, and how are they going to be involved? And my plea to you is if you are planning to sit in Washington, D.C. and make all the decisions without some kind of a community stakeholder participation, I urge you to rethink I didn't hear -- I didn't hear anything in it. your presentation about stakeholder involvement, and I think that is critical.

MS. CHAVES: Yeah. In budget documents we've put together, there's a significant amount of money for stakeholder involvement throughout this developmental process and further on, and we're

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | talking about in coastal communities. And if the    |
|----|---|
| 2  | program gets off the ground, I would expect that we |
| 3  | would have people in regional offices who would be  |
| 4  | the regional state contact liaison so that          |
| 5  | there's somebody there working definitely with the  |
| 6  | constituents on a day-to-day basis. But, also,      |
| 7  | before anything really happens, there will be a lot |
| 8  | of work with constituents around the country, and   |
| 9  | some of the things that are in the legislation come |
| 10 | from constituent meetings.                          |
| 11 | MR. GUTTING: Just a comment. People                 |
| 12 | like to feel like it's something more than they     |
| 13 | just have to go to a meeting and talk. I mean       |
| 14 | so I'll just leave it at that.                      |
| 15 | MS. CHAVES: Got you. Thank you.                     |
| 16 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Peter.                |
| 17 | MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Hi, Linda. I have                |
| 18 | three questions, no comments. First, what I got     |
| 19 | out of your presentation is that currently we, in   |
| 20 | the larger sense, are importing a lot more seafood  |
| 21 | than we're producing; but, at the same time, a lot  |
| 22 | of what we do catch we're exporting. When you talk  |

about aquaculture, are you envisioning that we're going to produce products that we're currently importing, or are we going to be just doing just more of the same -- producing products that we export and continuing to import?

I would hope that we would MS. CHAVES: be producing products, some of which we import. don't -- and I could be wrong, but I don't expect that we'll ever have a shrimp farming industry in this country to supplant the shrimp imports. Ι mean, we're just way too far behind in that. Т just don't -- I could be wrong, but I don't see that happening. Whether or not we would be farming more salmon here to supplant what's being farmed in other countries -- a very political issue. I'm not sure that I would go there. But I know that there's a lot of interest in farming cod. Now, we export a lot of cod; but, at the same time, there's a lot of demand for cod. So if we were to farm cod and have fresh cod available that might be a very, very nice market, and you could sell fresh cod all year long. I think it's going to be very, very

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | mixed depending upon the part of country you're in  |
|----|---|
| 2  | and what the business numbers turn out to be. Some  |
| 3  | things may make sense, and some of them won't. I    |
| 4  | don't know the answer, and I think that those are   |
| 5  | going to be business decisions.                     |
| 6  | MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Second question,                 |
| 7  | then. I envision that potentially in the marine     |
| 8  | environment there could be a considerable amount of |
| 9  | space use conflict, and you talked about the        |
| 10 | permitting site permits and, you know, so that      |
| 11 | people could be established and have a guarantee to |
| 12 | operate in a certain area. And this may sound       |
| 13 | facetious, but within the agency has there ever     |
| 14 | been a discussion about issuing permits to          |
| 15 | harvesters of wild fish to have secure access to    |
| 16 | those same sorts of locations?                      |
| 17 | MS. CHAVES: Not that I'm aware of.                  |
| 18 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure.                         |
| 19 | MS. CHAVES: I could be wrong on that.               |
| 20 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oyster leases.                |
| 21 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Could I let                   |
| 22 | me explain I'm going to respond to one thing        |

| that you said earlier. For example, you said       |
|--|
| shrimp probably wouldn't be. There is a great      |
| potential, in my opinion, for shrimp. We are       |
| producing about all the shrimp that we can produce |
| in this country, and the demand is still climbing. |
| You go to Hawaii and drive the backroads of        |
| Hawaii, they're producing pond raised shrimp.      |
| They're selling them right there on the side with  |
| all sorts of ways. I do think there is potential   |
| for shrimp. I really do. I think that's it         |
| seems like that's the potential for you know,      |
| shrimp demand is growing greatly, and              |
| MS. CHAVES: And the other thing or                 |
| shrimp is that there is an interest on the part of |
| some of the shrimp industry on enhancing shrimp,   |
| and we've talked about releasing a lot of you      |
| know, it's basically like your salmon enhancement  |
| program. I don't know if that's going to work or   |
| not, but   |
| MR. LEIPZIG: Well, my question on that             |
| wasn't so much, you know, what is                  |
| MS. CHAVES: Yeah.                                  |

| 1   | MR. LEIPZIG:potential, but                          |
|-----|---|
| 2   | whether it was part of the plan to try to replace   |
| 3   | imports with this type of production as opposed to  |
| 4   | there is no plan, it's just that we want to produce |
| 5   | stuff.  |
| 6   | MS. CHAVES: I think the you know,                   |
| 7   | take  |
| 8   | MR. LEIPZIG: And my answer was we're                |
| 9   | going to produce stuff, and let things              |
| LO  | MS. CHAVES: We're going to pro                      |
| L1  | well, I think that the industry is going to be      |
| L2  | will be making decisions about what the market is   |
| L3  | for   |
| L 4 | MR. LEIPZIG: Whatever works.                        |
| L5  | MS. CHAVES:and I think that are                     |
| L6  | some people who are talking to large restaurant     |
| L7  | chains and saying what is the product that you want |
| L8  | for the future and what are you importing from      |
| L9  | abroad and what would you like us to grow to meet   |
| 20  | your requirements, be it flavor, texture, size,     |
| 21  | whatever? And it may replace imports, and it may    |
| 2.2 | not.  |

| 1  | MR. LEIPZIG: Okay. Last question,                   |
|----|---|
| 2  | then, and this may be the same area that Dick       |
| 3  | Gutting was starting to go down to. But,            |
| 4  | currently, states have passed legislation that      |
| 5  | would, say, ban the landing of fish caught with     |
| 6  | particular gear                                     |
| 7  | MS. CHAVES: Uh-huh.                                 |
| 8  | MR. LEIPZIG:okay, and apparently                    |
| 9  | that's legal and if you fish with that type gear    |
| 10 | you can't land that fish. If the states were to     |
| 11 | pass legislation that says products produced in the |
| 12 | EEZ in this manner cannot be brought into this      |
| 13 | state have there been discussions about whether     |
| 14 | that is something that is going to be a problem or  |
| 15 | whether that's legal?                               |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: It could be. It could be                |
| 17 | and that would be a way that a state might          |
| 18 | effectively stop aquaculture off their EEZ and      |
| 19 | whether or not that would stand up to a legal       |
| 20 | challenge, I don't know.                            |
| 21 | MR. LEIPZIG: I'm done.                              |
| 22 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Ralph, please.              |

| 1   | MR. RAYBURN: I had a couple of                     |
|-----|--|
| 2   | questions on the legislation or whatever. Is the   |
| 3   | exemption for the aquaculture under Magnuson       |
| 4   | does that supplant the ruling that I think Jay     |
| 5   | Johnson made that aquaculture was fishing under    |
| 6   | Magnuson or does it supplant that, meaning that it |
| 7   | reverses that decision?                            |
| 8   | MS. CHAVES: It's something that I                  |
| 9   | think that some of the attorneys are looking at    |
| LO  | right now.   |
| L1  | MR. RAYBURN: Okay.                                 |
| L2  | MS. CHAVES: But the reason for                     |
| L3  | exemption is primarily an issue because of size,   |
| L 4 | possession and                                     |
| L5  | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I understand. But               |
| L6  | if   |
| L7  | MS. CHAVES: But I understand what                  |
| L8  | you're saying.                                     |
| L9  | MR. RAYBURN:the ruling had not                     |
| 20  | been made that it was                              |
| 21  | MS. CHAVES: Right.                                 |
| 22  | MR. RAYBURN:fishing under                          |

| 1  | Magnuson, then there wouldn't be an Act             |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. CHAVES: Right.                                  |
| 3  | MR. RAYBURN:right? And then,                        |
| 4  | secondly, if NOAA is prepared to lease the water    |
| 5  | column I suspect, would be what the water           |
| 6  | column, the floor is consideration given to         |
| 7  | enforcing the lease, providing policing authority   |
| 8  | or providing the policing for that lease? Not       |
| 9  | against the aquaculturists for, you know, misuse of |
| 10 | the permit; but, rather, to protect them from       |
| 11 | MS. CHAVES: Yes.                                    |
| 12 | MR. RAYBURN:poaching and other                      |
| 13 | things?   |
| 14 | MS. CHAVES: Yes, yes.                               |
| 15 | MR. RAYBURN: Is that provision in the               |
| 16 | legislature as well?                                |
| 17 | MS. CHAVES: Yes.                                    |
| 18 | MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.                             |
| 19 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. John.                 |
| 20 | MR. FORSTER: There's a couple of                    |
| 21 | comments, if I may, or one question, at least.      |
| 22 | Explaining to Scott just now you asked about        |

economic opportunities offshore, and Linda is There's precious little serious offshore right. aquaculture going on on which to base judgment, but all the support activities onshore -- the hatcheries, the feed supply, the processing, the marketing and the distribution. if you look at existing aquaculture industries, there are models there from which one can draw some fairly good information to base projections on.

And a question for Linda -- and Ralph just mentioned it in the context of policing, slightly -- I had it in a different context. But how do you see the codes of conduct being used as a tool in part of the enforcement process in this? I mean, one has got monitoring. One has got some regulations. But codes of conduct I know NOAA has considered, and there are international codes of conduct for this industry too, now. How do you see that being part of this mix?

MS. CHAVES: Well, with regard to conduct I think that, you know, one, they're not -- they're not law. They're not soft law.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | MR. FORSTER: Right.                                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. CHAVES: But it provides sort of an              |
| 3  | impetus to establish best management practices and  |
| 4  | to try to require suggest adherence to those.       |
| 5  | One of the things that's been talked about is maybe |
| 6  | even establishing some kind of a HACCP system for   |
| 7  | aquaculture operations, which you have HACCP        |
| 8  | systems in a processing plants, but may you need to |
| 9  | have HACCP systems for an aquaculture operation     |
| 10 | where there's a lot of record keeping, and your     |
| 11 | best management practices would be incorporated     |
| 12 | into those. The answers aren't final on that.       |
| 13 | It's just something that's been thought about.      |
| 14 | We've had to do an awful lot to get to where we are |
| 15 | now. We don't have a staff of 10, 15 people to go   |
| 16 | after chase after all of the answers,               |
| 17 | unfortunately.                                      |
| 18 | MR. FORSTER: But the code of conduct                |
| 19 | can be used a tool                                  |
| 20 | MS. CHAVES: Code of conduct can be                  |
| 21 | used as a tool.                                     |
| 22 | MR. FORSTER:through a HACCP type                    |

| 1  | of process, it would seem to me.                    |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. CHAVES: Yeah, yeah.                             |
| 3  | MR. FORSTER: I mean, the HACCP                      |
| 4  | approach seems pretty sensible.                     |
| 5  | MS. CHAVES: Yeah, and that's something              |
| 6  | that we need to talk about with more of the         |
| 7  | industry, and some of the industry has actually     |
| 8  | even suggested as much as five, 10 years ago        |
| 9  | MR. FORSTER: Yeah.                                  |
| 10 | MS. CHAVES:saying why don't we                      |
| 11 | establish a HACCP program for an aquaculture        |
| 12 | facility so that you've got the record keeping.     |
| 13 | You know what's happening.                          |
| 14 | MR. FORSTER: Absolutely.                            |
| 15 | MS. CHAVES: It makes a lot of sense;                |
| 16 | and, in the long run, it will save you money.       |
| 17 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. I'm on                |
| 18 | the list this time.                                 |
| 19 | MS. CHAVES: Yes, Mr. Chairman.                      |
| 20 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: A year or so                |
| 21 | ago when we talked about this, one of the questions |
| 22 | I had at that time and I was hoping it would        |

| have been up there, but it's how are going to deal  |
|---|
| with the states? I know that it's been brought up   |
| here a couple of times here, but I think it's       |
| really important because you have the State of      |
| Alaska, which basically says no aquaculture. I      |
| mean, they've defined mariculture out of it, that   |
| type of stuff; but, to me, my question then and my  |
| question still is if this happens I mean, I         |
| don't think there's a lot of question about how you |
| would do it because they're doing it everywhere.    |
| So you would adopt some of those to get it up and   |
| running, but if you have states that decide they    |
| don't want to participate in this what's going to   |
| be the line on how you're going to deal with that   |
| state? I mean, have you guys looked at are you      |
| still going to say that, okay, these are Federal    |
| waters so we don't really care what you say, we're  |
| doing it anyway?                                    |

MS. CHAVES: No. I think what the legislation will say is it can be done in Federal waters. But as was just pointed out, that fish that is harvested out in the EEZ is going to have

| 1  | to come to shore, and a state may put in place a    |
|----|---|
| 2  | ban on the landing of a fish that was farmed.       |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Well, yeah,                 |
| 4  | but I that's okay. That's two wrongs to make        |
| 5  | a right, I guess, or something. But, I mean, what   |
| 6  | I'm saying is you should look at saying that, you   |
| 7  | know, you're going to have to have consultation     |
| 8  | with each state                                     |
| 9  | MS. CHAVES: Well, and                               |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK:like Rod                     |
| 11 | wants.  |
| 12 | MS. CHAVES:through CZMA                             |
| 13 | consistency there is a deliberative process, and    |
| 14 | that could be blocked. I mean, we're not going to   |
| 15 | force aquaculture to happen off the State of        |
| 16 | Alaska. We can't do that. That's not the intent.    |
| 17 | But there are other states that would like to have  |
| 18 | aquaculture. And so one state may not want to do    |
| 19 | it, that should not preclude aquaculture            |
| 20 | development to occur in Federal waters off of other |
| 21 | states. Now, if                                     |
| 22 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah, and I                 |

maybe we just look at it different. I look at it as like a major issue, and you look at it as like, well, we've already dealt with it.

MS. CHAVES: I'm not saying we've already dealt with it. That's probably an overstatement, but....

Well, if I could just -- a MR. KENT: point of clarification. There is provision within the Coastal Management Act that provides for state agencies to appeal to NOAA through NOS -- I forget, the Office of Coastal Resource Management under NOS -- to make comments on permits in Federal waters. So that's a requirement that's there. It's something that could be reinforced in legislation, I would think. I don't think anything I've ever heard suggests that this can be done independent of any state's input. Again, even in California it like a minor thing, but there is sounds aquaculture permit that has to be granted to land product onto the dock. It's the same permit that a catfish farmer or a trout farmer would have to have for being onshore. But if the state doesn't want

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

to grant that permit then you can build all you 1 2. want offshore. You just don't have anyplace to 3 land it. 4 CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. And the 5 only other comment I had was also that when this gets up and running -- and it's been brought up 6 7 here a couple of times already -- it's going to be 8 really important that the long-reaching impacts to 9 any individual state or its fishery really needs to 10 be looked at, you know, before you crank up one of these on a large scale or whatever, but that's all 11 12 T have. MS. CHAVES: Okay. Thank you. 13 14 CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: And Tony. 15 MS. RAYMOND: Tony's there, and..... 16 MR. DILERNIA: Pass. 17 CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. 18 Yeah, I just want to MR. FLETCHER: 19 respond to a comment that Rod said because it was a 20 rather inaccurate depiction of what I think goes 2.1 on; and, also, I had a couple of comments. First 2.2 of all, recreational fishermen in southern

California, who is huge supporters of marine aquaculture as the result of our experience with the white sea bass hatchery. You heard Bill say that we're releasing the one millionth fish. That is building a bigger pie for both commercial and recreational anglers, and it's done in a way that treats the impacts on the environment very carefully. It's a very comprehensive program.

MS. CHAVES: Uh-huh.

We've really felt good MR. FLETCHER: When Rod said that if you about that process. raise more catfish in Mississippi the balloon bulges out on negative impacts on Dover sole sales, reality that forgets all about the importing massive amounts of fish and they could just as well be the bulge that affects the Dover sole sales as well as a domestic production of fish in marine offshore aquaculture. So I just wanted to make that comment because I think we're facing a reality that is that the world supply of fish is flooding into the U.S. Whether you like it or not, in the commercial industry that's a reality, and if

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | we can do a comprehensive and careful evaluation    |
|----|---|
| 2  | and implement a program that provides the economic  |
| 3  | benefits as well as the environmental safeguards    |
| 4  | then I'm all for it. So I just felt like Rod left   |
| 5  | kind of an inaccurate perception.                   |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thank                 |
| 7  | you. Larry.   |
| 8  | MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, sir. A couple               |
| 9  | of comm   |
| 10 | MR. MOORE: Listen to what I say,                    |
| 11 | Fletcher, god damn it.                              |
| 12 | MR. SIMPSON: A couple of comments on                |
| 13 | others' comments, and then a comment or two and a   |
| 14 | question. Yeah, we do have Pete dedicated to        |
| 15 | commercial areas oyster leases, for example.        |
| 16 | Bill mentioned the net ban in Florida, which limits |
| 17 | gear to a certain type. Therefore, that allows      |
| 18 | other people to use different gear or prevents one  |
| 19 | user group. And the issue about the state's         |
| 20 | preventing importation of aquacultured product is   |
| 21 | kind of a two-tiered thing. If it's dead product    |

and it's caught legally and done somewhere else,

22

the Lacey Act will eventually prevail and they may bring -- they may put a law in, but it won't hold.

But if you're bringing in a live, non-indigenous species then the states may have a hold on that so some states prevent non-indigenous species coming in live to their states.

One comment on the shrimp. You said we in the Gulf -- well, the shrimp is Gulf, basically, but we in shrimp are way behind. It's not really we're way behind. It's just that our land costs, labor, climate and regulations are not going to allow us to compete like they do in China and Malaysia and other places.

Another comment is I think that we ought to partition in some fashion the analysis of domestic versus foreign aquaculture. In other words, we need to clearly explain to the people who are going to be making decisions that domestic aquaculture has these effects on domestic economies -- jobs, et cetera -- and then you need to do the same thing for domestic [sic] aquaculture. In other words, you need to partition those two

2.

effects out so that people can clearly see the difference in domestic aquaculture versus foreign aquaculture in the overall case study.

And, lastly, I have one question that I still can't understand, and there's got to be more to it. You said there's a fish meal issue, a problem of fish eating too much fish. There's got to be more to that issue than I'm able in my simple mind to understand. Is it, in fact, the predator/prey issue, or is it, in fact, fish eating too much fish because most of the fish that I'm aware of eat fish.

MR. KENT: First off, I'm always concerned when a gentleman like you drawls on about his simple mind. I always get to feeling a little fear, so just avoid that. Linda deferred to John to.....

MR. FORSTER: Well, I think the fish meal issue is an issue of the fish meal industry, which has been going on for many years and as a raw material it is used in animal feeds and as the aquaculture industry has developed it has used it

2.

2.1

| 1  | as a primary source of raw material. Now, I don't   |
|----|---|
| 2  | think that anyone can argue that the aquaculture    |
| 3  | industry has been responsible for the creation of   |
| 4  | the fish meal industry. I don't know how long       |
| 5  | menhaden has been being fished in the Gulf, but I   |
| 6  | don't think the aquaculture industry has been       |
| 7  | responsible for driving that. So the arguments      |
| 8  | made that aquaculture is somehow driving the        |
| 9  | development of the fish meal industry and in fact,  |
| 10 | by inference, taking valuable fish from the mouths  |
| 11 | of the poor and hungry, I think, is a misstatement. |
| 12 | I do think there's a huge issue about fish          |
| 13 | meal  |
| 14 | MR. SIMPSON: I agree. I agree. So                   |
| 15 | it's the political issue                            |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: Yeah.                                   |
| 17 | MR. FORSTER: Yes.                                   |
| 18 | MR. SIMPSON:not the biological                      |
| 19 | issue?  |
| 20 | MR. FORSTER: Yeah.                                  |
| 21 | MR. SIMPSON: Okay.                                  |
| 22 | MR. FORSTER: All right.                             |

MR. SIMPSON: I understand now. 1 2. MR. FORSTER: Okay. 3 MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 4 CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Scott. 5 Thanks, Chairman. I don't MR. BURNS: 6 disagree with the notion that this is a good time 7 to rethink current statutory authority and the 8 regulatory framework for offshore aquaculture. 9 think it's a good time to do it. But the reason 10 for my question earlier was it's my understanding 11 that at present and in all likelihood for the next 12 decade or so the vast majority of both economic 13 opportunities and potential problems associated 14 with aquaculture will take place in inshore waters. 15 That's where the aquaculture is right now. 16 quess my point is that, that being the case, the 17 focus of national policy with respect 18 aquaculture ought to focus on those waters rather 19 than on offshore waters where, at this point, 20 aquaculture is really a somewhat speculative 2.1 venture.

MR. KENT:

2.2

I don't think you can call

it speculative when there's that many open ocean programs going on around the world right now but, you're right, the industry is focused in the nearshore environment but there is infrastructure in place within state agencies to address that. I think you've got a good point, that we ought to be looking at aquaculture not as just development of offshore but development of the overall aquaculture industry, and so I think a synergy between USDA and Department of Commerce needs to be reinforced to ensure that, you know, an overall industry is increased in a responsible manner.

MS. CHAVES: And the research requirements don't really change a whole lot whether you're talking inside three miles, outside of 10 miles. You still have the same environmental issues or questions, that whole list of challenges, and, you know, I can go on for a few more pages of issues that have been raised and I think that we need to do more work to answer those questions and the answers will have application to both inshore and offshore. In some cases, issues may not be as

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

severe offshore simply because of the different conditions you're operating in and the fact that you don't have, say, as much agricultural runoff to deal with, which sort of confuses what's going on in the water.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Chris.

MR. DORSETT: Linda, I appreciate the presentation, and I especially appreciate the caveats laid out of what the document is not. I found that very helpful.....

MS. CHAVES: Okay.

MR. DORSETT: ....after reading it.

But I'm a little bit confused because this is supposed to be for an internal audience and it's supposed to lay out the rationale but I think some of the caveats you laid out are some key issues that decision makers should know about in whether or not to proceed. So I was wandering -- I think I noted that there are going to be some other documents produced, et cetera. I'm just trying to figure out how this process -- where it's going from here, and I'm sorry if I missed it somewhere

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 in there.

| MS. CHAVES: Well, what happens now, I              |
|--|
| mean the legislation assuming that legislation     |
| will be submitted the administration will decide   |
| to submit legislation it's going to go through     |
| all kinds of reviews. There will be plenty of      |
| opportunity for changes and modifications. I mean, |
| right now, the Department of Commerce has said,    |
| yeah, we think we need to go forward and a lot of  |
| those caveats, I think, and a lot of those other   |
| issues are going to be dealt with through the      |
| regulatory process. I mean, the whole idea of      |
| legislation is to provide an umbrella so that you  |
| can address very, very specific issues in          |
| regulations. I don't know if that answers your     |
| questions or not.                                  |

MR. DORSETT: It does, but I would feel a lot more comfortable about people making the decision whether or not to go ahead with legislation to have all of the information.

MS. CHAVES: Well, and, actually, in the presentations that we've made there's been a

lot more information. They weren't just given this document. It was a fairly thick briefing book. Assistant Secretary Tim Keeny and I and others have been before a whole raft of people and we walk in and, you know, there are 20 people in there. It's the murder board.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Just to add to that point, you know I think there's a great probability that if this administration even does decide, which the Secretary and the Department do support moving forward with this legislation, it could very easily get introduced next year but then be pulled into the Magnuson reauthorization. think there's a real strong possibility. I think we don't know what will happen to it, you know, really. I think that, that said, Magnuson, I think it's almost a hundred percent it will be relooked at next year for reauthorization. they pull into that -- these other bills programs, and this one -- I think this will be one of the earlier discussions. You know, they may decide to just defer this to the Commerce Committee

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1   | for Magnuson reauthorization. So there are many    |
|-----|--|
| 2   | possibilities of what will happen to it, I think,  |
| 3   | at that point.                                     |
| 4   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Ralph.               |
| 5   | MR. RAYBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.              |
| 6   | Does the proposed legislation deal with incentives |
| 7   | such as providing an obligation guarantee or       |
| 8   | capital construction type funds to the industry?   |
| 9   | MS. CHAVES: The loan program is                    |
| LO  | already applicable to aquaculture.                 |
| L1  | MR. RAYBURN: It is?                                |
| L2  | MS. CHAVES: It is.                                 |
| L3  | MR. RAYBURN: The obligation guarantee?             |
| L 4 | So the obligation guarantee                        |
| L5  | MS. CHAVES: Yeah. We actually it's                 |
| L6  | no longer an obligation guarantee program. It's a  |
| L7  | direct loan program.                               |
| L8  | MR. RAYBURN: Oh.                                   |
| L9  | MS. CHAVES: And, in fact, some                     |
| 20  | freshwater aquaculture operations have been funded |
| 21  | through it already. And as far as the capital      |
| 22  | construction fund is concerned, it currently does  |

| 1  | not allow for deposits to be spent on aquaculture,  |
|----|---|
| 2  | but it is a proposal because there are some fairly  |
| 3  | sizeable receipts and there's some people who want  |
| 4  | to be able to try and pull their money out and get  |
| 5  | penalized for the new aquaculture development. And  |
| 6  | whether or not it would be allowed to be used       |
| 7  | completely for aquaculture I think that there are   |
| 8  | other agencies in front of it that would probably   |
| 9  | like to shut the whole program down, and so I don't |
| 10 | think that's going to happen.                       |
| 11 | MR. RAYBURN: And the proposal is                    |
| 12 | within the legislation or just as                   |
| 13 | MS. CHAVES: Yeah.                                   |
| 14 | MR. RAYBURN: It is within the                       |
| 15 | legislation. Thank you.                             |
| 16 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Dick.                       |
| 17 | MS. CHAVES: But we don't know if it                 |
| 18 | will survive.                                       |
| 19 | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I understand.                    |
| 20 | MR. GUTTING: Linda, I guess what I'm                |
| 21 | my topic is really the dynamic nature of any        |
| 22 | kind of program that you put together. A number of  |

people have been skeptical about the economic viability of the offshore environment as a place where commercial scale operations might take place and we're really in a kind of a transitional, experimental pilot testing kind of a mode and my suggestion is that whatever governmental framework that you erect out there -- whatever decision making framework, analytical framework, data requirements and all the rest -- recognize that you have within the establishment of an industry a transitional period and then you have a mature period.

MS. CHAVES: Uh-huh.

MR. GUTTING: And the rules and the procedures and the requirements -- perhaps the relationship to government -- are different in each one of those periods, and I encourage you to think in terms of those two stages, if you will, within the development of regions or areas and species and not put a full program in place right at the beginning. And the reason for -- I mean, I can remember in Law of the Sea -- I've said this before

2.

2.1

-- you know, when we went off to negotiate Law of the Sea in the late 60s and early 70s everyone had these great economic projects about the huge wealth that would come from seabed mining, and we built such an elaborate bureaucratic structure we never got anything. So you need to have, I think, two kinds of systems.

MS. CHAVES: Well, and I think one of the things that we would like to be able to do is know, pilot projects, have, you some demonstration projects where you can really test a lot of things and see what the economics are, and there are three projects ongoing right now. in cobia, in the Caribbean -- Puerto Rico. can talk about his project. There's work going on with moi in Hawaii where we're looking at the economics. And, you know, there are a number of other projects that are in the drawing books right now to be able to do demos to try to get to some of those answers, some of those very, very critical economic answers. I also would have to say that technology is moving to the point where it will be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1          | a lot easier to work in that hostile environment    |
|------------|---|
| 2          | than it would have been, say, five, 10 years ago.   |
| 3          | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Don, I've got               |
| 4          | Bonnie, and then maybe you want to move on to the   |
| 5          | next speaker.                                       |
| 6          | MS. CHAVES: Yeah.                                   |
| 7          | MR. KENT: Yeah. If we keep it at this               |
| 8          | rate, it will be 7:00 o'clock before we're finished |
| 9          | this evening, so                                    |
| LO         | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah. Bonnie.               |
| L1         | MS. CHAVES: I've been up here too                   |
| L2         | long.   |
| L3         | DR. BROWN: And mine is really a                     |
| L <b>4</b> | question or comment I hope directly relating to     |
| L5         | this. You said something that kind of scared me.    |
| L6         | MS. CHAVES: Uh-oh.                                  |
| L7         | DR. BROWN: You said, hey, it's just me              |
| L8         | and another I forget how you said it; but, you      |
| L9         | know, that it was kind of hard to gather all this   |
| 20         | information and be putting together that document   |
| 21         | and the one that's going to come after this, and    |
| 22         | Bill and Linda it was like you've only got one      |

| 1   | person doing this, and I'm really about to freak   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | out.   |
| 3   | MS. CHAVES: No. We have                            |
| 4   | DR. BROWN: This is a 15-person job or              |
| 5   | something, you know.                               |
| 6   | MS. CHAVES: We have more people and we             |
| 7   | are using outside contractors to do some of the    |
| 8   | work as well and we are building a staff back up.  |
| 9   | DR. BROWN: Okay, because that's scary.             |
| LO  | If there really are just a couple, then it's going |
| L1  | to be a very inbred process and I think you        |
| L2  | need   |
| L3  | MS. CHAVES: No. We're pulling                      |
| L 4 | people   |
| L5  | DR. BROWN:the sociologists and                     |
| L6  | the economics                                      |
| L7  | MS. CHAVES: We're pulling people from              |
| L8  | different backgrounds.                             |
| L9  | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                   |
| 20  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: So if there's              |
| 21  | more questions, just write them down because she's |
| 22  | going to be back up at the end of this again.      |

1 MR. SIMPSON: How do we turn these in? 2. MS. CHAVES: Why don't you hang on to 3 those through the other presentations and then turn 4 them in, I think. 5 MR. KENT: Very good.

Alvin, may I say? MS. BRYANT: notice that there are some papers and pages in presentations that we've passed out. We've had another FedEx delivery. So, hopefully, everybody's presentation is here. So the folks that you'll be hearing from, that's kind of that stack of paper, and Judy has also been handing some additional things out. If we have extra copies -- I don't know how many we have -- I need to make certain that I have them for the record, but for members of the public you're welcome to also be able to get copies of that. And all of these materials, I don't have them here but eventually they will be put up on-line on the MAFAC page so that you'll be able to see that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: And I hope the gifts came for the performance last night, since he

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1   | said  |
|-----|---|
| 2   | MS. BRYANT: Yes, they did.                          |
| 3   | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH:he had                         |
| 4   | heard that before. Okay.                            |
| 5   | MS. BRYANT: Yes, it did.                            |
| 6   | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Okay. Thanks.                 |
| 7   | MR. KENT: Mr. Chairman, with your                   |
| 8   | permission what I'd suggest is that we go ahead and |
| 9   | have Gunnar Knapp do his presentation and then      |
| LO  | handle questions up to the lunch hour.              |
| L1  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                       |
| L2  | MR. KENT: That will give Gunnar 50                  |
| L3  | minutes, if   |
| L 4 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: And today we                |
| L5  | want to try and break right at noon, too.           |
| L6  | MR. KENT: All right, great. Next is                 |
| L7  | Gunnar Knapp, the Professor of Economics, Institute |
| L8  | of Social and Economic Research, University of      |
| L9  | Alaska Anchorage.                                   |
| 20  | DR. KNAPP: Let's see if I can get this              |
| 21  | magic technology working. Hi, everybody. My name    |
| 22  | is Gunnar Knapp. I am a Professor of Economics up   |

at the University of Alaska in Anchorage, and I'm going to be talking about some economic considerations in thinking about the United States' marine aquaculture. Let's see if this works. Okay.

So let me talk a little bit of what's my background for talking about aquaculture. Well, basically, I've spent many years studying markets fisheries, and it's impossible for wild understand seafood markets without understanding what's happening in aquaculture. So I devoted learn as much as Т could years to aquaculture, and I've visited aquaculture operations in a number of different countries.

Why am I here today? Basically, somebody called me up from MAFAC and said can you come talk. So I'm speaking for myself. I'm not representing anybody, and I'm not representing the State of Alaska and its position. I'm not speaking for the wild fisheries or wild fishermen in Alaska -- a totally impossible task for anybody -- and nor am I representing aquaculture proponents. Just

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

talking for myself.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

always like to Т start with mу Then you'll know exactly where I'm going; and, also, I can guit after three minutes. So let me tell you my conclusions. First of all, the global seafood industry is in a period of rapid and profound change, and the key causes of this change are both economic globalization and aquaculture. Aquaculture is growing rapidly around the world because it can meet market demands for a predictable consistent supply of high-quality seafood, and world aquaculture production will continue to expand whether or not the United States becomes a significant producer.

Now, marine aquaculture offers significant potential economic benefits for the nation and coastal regions, but it's quite clear that offshore marine aquaculture will not develop in the United States without an enabling regulatory framework. So we will simply -- we don't have offshore aquaculture and we won't have it unless some kind of framework gets passed of the, you

know, type that's been talked about or some variation. Marine aquaculture clearly has potential environmental impacts and so does all food production, including wild fisheries, and the basic issue in considering marine aquaculture is whether and how it can be developed with acceptable environmental impacts. Marine aquaculture clearly will have market impacts on wild fisheries regardless of the extent of U.S. production, and Alaskans understand totally how expanding world aquaculture supply of farmed salmon has drastically depressed prices for our wild salmon fisheries.

Now, there's a flipside to that, and prices for fishermen that is lower -- hard fishermen, Alaska hard fishing communities -- they also benefit consumers. the issue And so is and how we consider these effects encouraging or discouraging marine aquaculture.

And, finally, in my opinion the issue is not some simplistic choice, do we want wild fisheries or do we want aquaculture. I really think the issue is more kind of how can we

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

responsibly develop our wild fisheries to get the maximum benefit from them, and how can we responsibly develop aquaculture to get the maximum from it?

aquaculture Okay, is а now very emotional issue in Alaska, and a great many Alaskans strongly believe that the answer to any kind of aquaculture is just say no. I personally think that we need to learn more and think more in developing aquaculture policy for the United States I'm saying we need an informed and for Alaska. debate about this very complex topic. We should think carefully about the opportunities offered by aquaculture and whether there are ways to achieve them while protecting the environment and other economic activities, including wild fisheries. Okay. So I want to talk -- basically five topics: globalization revolution, the aquaculture revolution, why is the aquaculture revolution happening; aquaculture in the United States and considerations for an informed debate.

Now, far-reaching changes are occurring

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| in the world economy which are generally referred   |
|---|
| to as globalization. This globalization is a whole  |
| lot of stuff that's going on at once, and it's      |
| interrelated. It includes increasing reliance on    |
| markets, the reduction in trade barriers,           |
| technological revolutions in communications and     |
| transportation, world economic integration in       |
| markets for resources, goods, services, labor and   |
| capital, movement of production to the low-cost     |
| producers, consolidation and integration resulting  |
| in larger and more powerful firms operating in many |
| countries, growing consumer incomes in developing   |
| countries, and increasing consumer expectations for |
| quality, convenience, variety and lower prices.     |
| And these phenomena, which are worldwide in all     |
| industries, are transforming to seafood production, |
| processing, distribution and retailing. We're       |
| seeing it in many respects. We're seeing rapid      |
| expansion of seafood trade around the world. We're  |
| seeing shifts in labor intensive seafood processing |
| to countries with low labor costs. We're seeing     |
| increasing consolidation and market power in the    |

retail and food services industry. We're seeing restructuring of seafood distribution networks. We're seeing increasing pressure on seafood suppliers to lower costs, and we're seeing increased talk about international standards for food handling and safety.

And one of the things that we're specifically seeing is in the United States, Europe and Japan -- the major developed countries seafood markets -- large retail and food service buyers are dominating more and more of the seafood market -the Wal-Marts, the Safeways, those folks -- and what do they want? They want consistent reliable supply of large volumes. They want low, and competitive prices. stable They want consistent quality. They want traceability, and they want products which consumers are going to like because consumers are going to feel that they're safe, healthy, convenient and environmentally and socially responsible.

Now, all this globalization is creating significant market challenges for wild fisheries,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

and traditional wild fisheries would still face these significant challenges and changes even if there were no aquaculture. So what I'm trying to say is there's a lot of concern about all of the changes we're seeing and a tendency to say, well, that's caused by farmed salmon. That's caused by aquaculture. But it's caused by -- yes, it's partly the cause of aquaculture but it's caused by more than aquaculture and the challenge wild fisheries have to respond to and adapt to is not only sort of surviving in an aquaculture world but surviving in a world that's changing what it's looking for from food producers.

The aquaculture revolution. Now, an aquaculture revolution, as Linda has talked about, is happening in the world's seafood industry. Aquaculture accounts for a large and growing share of world seafood production, and I won't go into the details and data other than to say that when you see these sort of total world production data like the graph I just showed you use them with a bit of care. For one thing, any data out of China

2.

2.1

are considered highly suspect, and that's really relevant because if you look at the world aquaculture production data China says they're producing 37 million metric tons of aquaculture. So we might -- I tend to take those data out. Another thing is that the trends in aquaculture, where you see aquaculture, really varies depending upon the type of fish.

Now, the largest and fastest growing share of world aquaculture production is in what the FAO calls freshwater and diadromous fish of which salmon farming is a relatively small share. Aquaculture production of crustaceans -- mainly, shrimp -- is also growing rapidly, and aquaculture represented a large share of long has production of mollusks, mussels, oysters, scallops and clams. So my simple point is this aquaculture revolution is much, much more than farmed salmon. Farmed salmon is only one of many species for which aquaculture production has grown very rapidly. Curiously, the growth trend of Atlantic salmon -farmed Atlantic salmon -- catfish, sea bass and sea

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bream -- you all know what those are -- tilapia -farmed tilapia is one of the fastest growing U.S.
seafood imports, along with farmed salmon. And if
you look at the U.S. per capita fish consumption
data, what's going up? Farm species are going up.
Farmed shrimp and farmed salmon. That's what
Americans are eating more of.

Now, on a global scale, there is very significant potential for growth in aquaculture production. And why do I say that? Because the aquaculture industry has very significant resources to invest in research, production and marketing. And technological innovation is occurring rapidly, and for any particular species or type of farming once the technological hurdles are overcome, as we've seen, farming of new species can expand at a very rapid rate. Here's a controversial statement or, potentially, a controversial one -- but there's no obvious limits to growth in world aquaculture production.

You say, well, what about feed? Well, fish farmers can substitute vegetable based feeds

2.

2.1

for fish based feeds and this is already happening and many aquaculture species don't depend on fish based feeds. That's why the soybean growers of America are very excited about aquaculture. environmental effects, the terrible what about environmental effects of aquaculture? Well, those reduced through regulation and through can be changes in new techniques and locations. Well, Well, it's clear what about market acceptance? that consumers do and will eat farm products.

And as you think about the future world that we're going into in the seafood industry I suggest that the past is not necessarily a guide to the future. Just because we're not seeing farming of a particular species, just because it is only small at the moment, just because consumers aren't eating it at the moment, just because you've never heard of it at the moment doesn't mean that it may not become a major and significant species that is being produced and that you're competing with in the not too distant future, and the major farmed species of the future are not necessarily going to

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

be those of today. And, if you think about the past, it was not a guide to the future for farmed salmon, catfish or tilapia, if you looked at the world of 1980 or even more recently.

Now, why is this aquaculture revolution it's Well, happening happening? because aquaculture can meet market demands for predictable year-round and growing supply of high-quality It's what stores want to offer to seafood. consumers because it's what the consumers looking for and I sort of -- that came home to me when I was wandering around Bethel two years ago in April and I go into the grocery store and I see fresh farmed tilapia. I said this is something, you know, we need to be -- we need to understand that this is not some temporary wool pulled over people's eyes who are not in the know, like we Aquaculture is happening because it's Alaskans. producing fish people want to eat, and it meets the needs of this globalized distribution scheme.

And another thing that we need to understand is it's happening, in part, because it

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| has significant competitive advantages over wild    |
|---|
| fisheries. It's got some advantages to it over      |
| wild fisheries, especially in a globalized economy. |
| The production is predictable. The production is    |
| year-round. The production can increase, and the    |
| production there's more flexibility in where it     |
| can occur. The consistency and predictability of    |
| production makes it easier to meet buyers' needs    |
| and to plan for marketing. And just to think about  |
| our sockeye salmon harvest in Alaska one, they      |
| vary from year to year; and, secondly, the          |
| production in any given year is typically 20, 30    |
| percent different from what we've predicted it      |
| would be immediately before the season. Whereas,    |
| salmon farmers around the world know exactly how    |
| much fish they have and they can plan exactly what  |
| day they are going to bring it to processing plants |
| and what day they're going to deliver it and so on. |
| That's a huge advantage. I'm not saying this is     |
| anything anybody should like. I'm saying this is    |
| the reality of the world.                           |

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

Year-round production reduces

production costs of aquaculture relevant to seasonal wild fisheries. It makes it possible for aquaculture to meet buyers' needs year-round. we've got tremendous inefficiencies associated with some of our seasonal wild fisheries. And this is -- you know, back on this theme of predictability, an interesting thing in B.C. processing plant where they process farmed salmon they put the fish in boxes where the boxes are already presold. know who the customer is. You know, that's not something that you usually see in our wild fisheries, and that's an advantage. Another is the ability to control production fish size and other This allows aquaculture producers to attributes. meet buyers' needs and lowers costs.

So if you're going to think about the future of aquaculture, I think that a better model than looking at wild fisheries and wild fisheries consumption might be the poultry industry, which has seen phenomenal long-term growth in consumption, and the reason is that that is an industry that has gone through this -- you know,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they go through this cycle of demand driven growth
-- innovation, new products, increased production,
lower prices, more demands, marketing -- and this
is, I expect, where aquaculture is going to go.

Now, what about aquaculture in Okav. Now, the United States, as I the United States? think we all know, has played a relatively small role in this aquaculture revolution -- .9 percent of farmed salmon, 5 percent of freshwater finfish, that being catfish -- very small. And as was talked about earlier, most of our aquaculture industry is catfish, oysters and clams. We have very, very little marine aquaculture production, and the flipside is numerous other countries have far larger production that we have.

Now, what kind of industry could we have in a technical sense or in an economic sense?

I think it's a reasonable hypothesis -- the only way you can know for sure is if you try it, which is a little bit of a Catch-22 aspect of this very difficult policy issue, but it's a reasonable hypothesis that the United States could

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

significantly expand marine aquaculture, if that's what we wanted to do. Why is that a reasonable hypothesis? Because we've got a number competitive advantages. We've got diverse conditions, high levels favorable water of technology, well-developed infrastructures, skilled labor, and we're very competitive in the animal farming industries.

On the other hand, we've got certain competitive disadvantages -- high labor costs. less developed infrastructure in have а regions, such as Alaska. But obviously the main reason why aquaculture hasn't developed in the States is a very unfavorable regulatory United In Alaska, we've got the finfish structure. We have a lack of an farming ban. enabling regulatory structure for the EEZ for offshore marine aquaculture and an ambivalent to hostile regulatory structure for most other coastal marine activity. So, basically, we don't have aquaculture because we haven't wanted it. But this aquaculture revolution is going to continue regardless of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

whether we choose to participate, and I think that's a real basic reality factor for the United States and states like Alaska to think about as we debate this complex and emotional aquaculture issue. This is going to happen around the world regardless of whether we want to be part of it.

Now, I'd like to talk just a little bit in closing about what I would see as considerations if we're going to have an informed debate about U.S. marine aquaculture policy. know, a starting point would be just developing some clear definitions of what we're talking about; and, in fact, there are many different kinds of aquaculture -- many kinds of aquaculture that would fall under the very broad definition that Linda started off her talk with -- you know, a sort of legal definition -- and some people include stock enhancement and ranching as part of aquaculture. mean, I'm sure you're all aware that aquaculture is mentioned in Alaska's Constitution, and the word aquaculture is in there as a reason why you could limit entry of fisheries -- to promote aquaculture

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

development -- but that's referring to salmon ranching. And then we talk about mariculture, you know, here, and I think a lot of people in Alaska think mariculture means shellfish aquaculture but that's not necessarily what it means to other people. So one little aspect of this debate that will simplify it is if you can come up with some common terminology.

Now, I think that there are Okay. significant potential economic clearly some benefits for the United States and costal regions from marine aquaculture. These include income, jobs, reduction of the trade deficit, diversification, stability, certain potential synergies with fisheries and backward linkages into and equipment production -- forward research linkages into processing and so on. So there's potential benefits. And, you know, one measure is if you simply go and look at the value of the aquaculture production in places where they're into it in a big way. Those are big numbers. Big numbers of the value being generated. You know,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more than a billion dollars of salmon produced every year in Norway and Chile. So it's big, big numbers.

Another thing is that, you know, these are -- you can say, well, those are corporations and so on, but it's real jobs and year-round jobs and jobs in remote coastal areas. I was sort of impressed by visiting a very remote area of western Norway in January and just seeing, you know, a lot of people working in the farming operation and in the processing plant. You don't see a lot of that in Alaska. We should be in Hawaii in January. That's what my wife told me.

Now, part of informing this debate about this very complex policy issue is we need research to better understand, well, you know, what are these benefits and for too long, I think, nationally and locally, we've talked about them in this sort of pointless debate about somebody that says, oh, here's this list of all the good things and somebody else says here's this list of all the bad things. But we don't really sort of think

2.

through, well, really, how many jobs of what kind, located where are you talking about, you know? So we need to define that and think about it because why would we even do this? The only reason we're doing it is if we think there's some benefit to it. So we really don't think carefully about what are those benefits and so that we know, you know, how does that compare with costs.

Now, obviously a major part of this debate is the environmental impacts, and the only observation I would offer here is that all food production has environmental impacts, including agriculture and wild fisheries, and if we adopt a standard of zero environmental impact or zero risk, will be one, marine aquaculture impossible; second, we'll be imposing a higher standard than we do for other kinds of food production; and we'll be imposing a higher standard than we do for other uses of the marine environment -- wild fisheries, salmon ranching, oil shipping. So I think that for an informed debate we need to have a lot of talk and research about what are these potential impacts

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| and risks, what are ways they can be reduced, and   |
|---|
| how do they actually compare with the potential     |
| benefits? Finally, obviously marine                 |
| aquaculture has impacts on markets for wild         |
| fisheries and obviously it lowers prices for wild   |
| fisheries and you've seen this in salmon. We had    |
| the discussion you know, somebody says, hey, you    |
| produced all this catfish in one state and somebody |
| says, well, yeah, you wrecked the market for my     |
| species over on the West Coast. And so there's no   |
| question that aquaculture causes significant        |
| economic difficulties for fishermen in fishing      |
| communities; but, on the other hand, that benefits  |
| consumers. Lower prices benefit consumers. And      |
| another thing that adds to the complexity is that   |
| the market impacts are going to occur regardless of |
| the extent to which we get into aquaculture. And    |
| we banned salmon farming, in part, because we       |
| didn't like the potential economic impacts, but it  |
| hasn't prevented it on our State of Alaska. And,    |
| furthermore, because our fisheries are wild         |
| fisheries, many of them depend on export markets.   |

It's not like we can to the trade policy route and say, well, you know, we'll just solve it -- we'll ban imports of those farmed fish, and we'll ban all the production and then our wild fisheries will be home free -- because a lot of these impacts of aquaculture, which is being done globally, occur in our export markets, such as the farmed salmon that trashed our Japanese salmon market. So it is a very complicated issue of how we should consider the market effects, and I think, you know, the starting point is to think very carefully about each of these points I just suggested and their magnitude and how incorporate it. That is not an easy policy question to answer.

And, finally, I'll leave you with a suggestion -- that I really think this debate needs to be thought about in a more sophisticated way than in simply do we want wild fisheries or do we want aquaculture. Obviously, there are interrelations in many different areas, but I really think that we'll get farther along if we think of all kinds of fisheries production and

2.

seafood production as valuable to the country, important, and how can we do it? How can we best get the most possible benefit in a responsible way? Thanks.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Rod.

Gunnar, I just want to MOORE: thank you for making the point I was trying to make earlier, which is that we do need better research on understanding what the benefits are, who gets them, and that we're not -- aquaculture isn't going to go away. I think you made that point far more eloquently than I did, and there are going to be economic benefits. There are going to be economic We need to understand what those are and who gets them and, unfortunately, as we all know, all politics is local. So, you know, what may be great in one area is not necessarily great another, and that's going to obviously influence what people say. But I think you gave an excellent presentation, and I really appreciate your trying to run through the various trade-offs and balances that people have to make.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | DR. KNAPP: Well, I was just struck by              |
|----|--|
| 2  | listening to this morning's discussion about what  |
| 3  | an incredibly complex                              |
| 4  | MR. MOORE: It is.                                  |
| 5  | DR. KNAPP:policy issue this is                     |
| 6  | for the country and that                           |
| 7  | MR. MOORE: It's terribly it's very                 |
| 8  | complex.   |
| 9  | DR. KNAPP:it I think one                           |
| 10 | aspect of it is that the, you know, sort of        |
| 11 | regional potentials, regional different regions    |
| 12 | of the country have different issues               |
| 13 | MR. MOORE: Uh-huh.                                 |
| 14 | DR. KNAPP:and, you know, some                      |
| 15 | are adamantly against it, I'm told; in some areas, |
| 16 | there's strong support trying to incorporate all   |
| 17 | that. There's different anyway, I wish good        |
| 18 | luck to the people who get it solved.              |
| 19 | MR. MOORE: I mean, I guess if I'm the              |
| 20 | state of Oregon trying to decide on a, you know,   |
| 21 | CZMA consistency determination on an offshore      |
| 22 | aquaculture facility off of Coos Bay I've got to   |

look at it in terms of what are the potential economic benefits to Coos Bay, which is a fairly economically depressed port, versus the fact that there's 300 to 400 fishing jobs in harvesting and processing and ice machines and so forth and so on that could be affected, either positively or negatively, by having an offshore facility there. And it's the sort of thing where we need that sort of economic information to make an informed and reasonable choice, and it's going to be hard to get because it is -- the seafood market is a global market, and it's all interrelated and I think you laid that out very well and I just really appreciate it.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Scott.

MR. BURNS: I also want to thank you for an excellent presentation. I thought it was right on. The question I had has to do with the focus of our discussion today, which is on offshore aquaculture, and since we're reviewing a kind for first-cut business plan for U.S. involvement in the offshore aquaculture industry can you shed any

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

light on what currently global production is from offshore facilities, what you see the trends in the next decade or so being, kind of recognizing as you said before it's hard to project where we're going to be 10 or 20 years from now based on historical trends.

Well, I'm certainly no DR. KNAPP: expert on this. In fact, all I know came from attending a conference last year in October down in Seattle where a number of people came and talked about. sort οf what's happening in offshore aquaculture. And my general sense -- and I think some other people can sum this up -- is that in terms of, you know, the volume of fish being raised in offshore pens, there is some commercial -- there are some going commercial operations going on around the world. But it's the scale -- the total scale of that is quite small at the moment. On the other hand, the message Ι drew from those presentations and what I sort of get from, you know, reading the aquaculture journals that I subscribe to and so on is that the technology is

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

rapidly advancing in offshore cage technology and all kinds of other stuff and so we're sort of on the edge of a technological breakthrough in how you do that. And so it's -- I guess I tried to suggest that the past is not necessarily a guide to the future, and that's my instincts that in terms of what we'll see around the world in terms of offshore aquaculture that has the potential to really significantly grow, and I think some of the speakers who are actually people who know this and are actually doing it are going to be talking today. So I defer to them.

MR. BURNS: Great. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you. I also, Professor Knapp, would like to thank you for a very unbiased and informed presentation, a very balanced presentation of looking at the facts without any emotion. I agree with you that the market will drive the development of aquaculture programs. In your presentation, as you closed you discussed exploring how aquaculture would develop and, also,

2.

2.1

if wild fisheries would develop. Has there been any studies done regarding how wild fisheries might as aquaculture develops? fisheries recreational and opportunities recreational fisheries may increase as commercial pressure on species decreases so that opportunity to harvest wild fish would still be It would just be by perhaps a different sector of the fishing population.

DR. KNAPP: Well, first of all, I think that -- well, one, no, I've not seen any good studies of that that you're talking. Secondly, I think that one of the sort of simplistic, naive perspectives running around among, you know, some people in the general public is something like this. Oh, well, aquaculture will be great because it will save the wild fisheries because we won't have to harvest so many commercial fish and then, you know, the wild fish will be okay and, you know, there's more fish to go sportfishing for. And I think that there are -- one, as anybody who spends any time around fisheries knows that you just can't

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| generalize about fish. There's so many fisherie    |
|--|
| and so many different species, and the nature o    |
| how wild fishing and wild fisheries are affected b |
| aquaculture through market effects or through      |
| environmental effects varies for each fish. But    |
| in general, I see little reason to think that t    |
| sort of subscribe to that simplistic view I jus    |
| tried to characterize, and I think that you almos  |
| it would be foolish to make any generalization     |
| like that. I think that again, I go back to m      |
| final point. If there are wild fisheries wher      |
| we're catching too many fish for whatever reaso    |
| who ought to manage those fisheries the right way  |
| so we're you know, if there are wild fisherie      |
| where, for some reason, there ought to be mor      |
| available for sport? Well, that's a decision fo    |
| the wild fishery manager, and lord knows we figh   |
| it out every day in Alaska, that issue. And that'  |
| a decision that's basically independent fro        |
| aquaculture, for the most part.                    |

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Randy.

MR. FISHER: Thank you. Thanks,

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

Gunnar, it was nice to hear this talk again. was great in Seattle when we put on this other conference, but I had never thought about this until today, actually, and that is if you thought about the future do you suppose that we should be thinking about things similar to the way we look at whatever IFOs now or IPQs or thev are in determining this issue? Meaning, when you look at policy in the future should we be concerned about foreign ownership, for instance? Should we be concerned about -- if you look in the future, I can visualize Wal-Mart Superstores suddenly deciding to go into the aquaculture business and taking over a huge, you know, part of the market. So should we be concerned about the same issues as we are on some of the private firms', you know, harvests -certain fisheries now, I guess would be the..... It's clearly an integral DR. KNAPP:

DR. KNAPP: It's clearly an integral issue in any kind of aquaculture development, whether you're talking a little shellfish farm in Kachemak Bay or a U.S. offshore aquaculture, you know, sort of -- if you're going to say, okay, this

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is a place where you can have aquaculture, what kind of rules and restrictions are you going to place on who can own that and who can get into it? What size can they be? Do they have to be local? Do they have to be U.S. citizens? You know, all those issues I would expect would arise οf immediately, and I think as I watch the aquaculture debate that takes place in, say, B.C., you know one of the themes that arises there is people say, foreigners well, you know, it's that are controlling this, and then the usual Norwegians or Dutch or whatever or, you know, similarly about Chile....

MR. FISHER: Right.

DR. KNAPP: .....you know. And so I would anticipate that that kind of issue would arise in any kind of national debate about the EEZ -- what kind of restrictions do we want -- as well as well any local or state debate. And, you know, that will get into -- you know, raise whole other cans of worms about related policy in other industries and so on, just one more dimension of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

this. But I think that if you were looking for ways to mitigate concerns, be it on a local regulatory level or a U.S. regulatory level, if you were looking for ways to mitigate concerns of aquaculture opponents one of a great many concerns would be this, well, are we locals going to get a benefit issue. So one way you could do that is impose various restrictions and bells and whistles that are designed to make sure that the locals do benefit or run the show or whatever. But then that brings another set of issues -- you know, the corresponding set of issues on the other side.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Ken.

MR. ROBERTS: Gunnar, I appreciate you as one economist to another. Very entertaining. Very direct to the point. I've got a question on -- to mitigate the effects Rod and other people have been discussing about the global impact whether we develop here or elsewhere there might be impact pricewise, jobwise, and whatnot in the community because of the flood of imports, let's say. There have been efforts to mitigate that in

2.

2.1

the past, particularly right here in Alaska, with a lot of public money going into programs that differentiate the wild catch from imported products. I'm going to put you on the spot. Is there a payoff there? Can that work? Can that really mitigate?

Well, I mean, a silver DR. KNAPP: lining for wild fisheries in this very difficult market competition is that as seafood consumption expands and as there's more aquaculture product wild fisheries become something unique and, in effect, have the potential to become -- to sort of have higher value because they're different from ordinary stuff. Once the ordinary stuff becomes this cheap, chunky farmed -- bland farm stuff, well then we've got this special wild product, and it may have various kinds of cachets. It may have its taste. It may have its wildness. Ιt may have its -you know, the pristine environment that it comes from or the image of the fishermen or whatever and there's no question that in part of the salmon market -- what I would call

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the high-end part of the salmon market -- that is beginning to pay off and that niche in the market or segment of the market is growing, okay. And I think that the silver lining for wild fisheries, in general, is that wherever aquaculture goes to wild fisheries -- you know, one of their advantages is they're not going to -- they're not likely to grow and so they're going to become increasingly special.

So the challenge is how do you make good use of that? And it is not just simply saying, oh, now we're going to use some money and tell everybody to buy wild fish. With that goes a whole set of responsibilities to manage fisheries and the harvests and the processing and the marketing in a way that you are actually responding to this new market demand. You can't just say, oh, now, you know, just buy Alaska salmon. It's great. You make it great -- you make it more great, even more great -- and then that can grow. So, yeah, you can do -- the short answer is you can do mitigating things for wild fisheries

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

impacted by imports -- imports from aquaculture or foreign imports -- but they still have to hold their own in the marketplace. You can't do it for them. They have to -- I mean, the subsidies can help a little bit; but, in a sense, wild fisheries have to find their way in a changing marketplace to take advantage of the new opportunities amidst these huge challenges.

MR. ROBERTS: So repetitive use of public funds, you're saying, in a specific fishery if not a good investment?

DR. KNAPP: No. In my opinion, there isn't any right or wrong answer to that. I mean, I think that it's a valid -- I think it's a valid use of Federal government money to assist the Alaska wild salmon industry or other wild fisheries that have been dramatically impacted by imports in a short period of time and dramatically impacted by changes and my personal belief is that's in the national interest. My personal belief is that that is not a long-term strategy. You can't build an industry sort of permanently dependent on

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

subsidies. You know, a long-term strategy for the Alaska salmon industry is not the school lunch program for pink salmon, you know. I support that, but that doesn't get you out of your problem in the long run. But we're getting into the local....

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Ralph. Then Larry. Then we're going to break for lunch.

MR. RAYBURN: Just a quick -- I've always related -- I'm from Texas so I've dealt a lot with the shrimp and I always related the issues that the wild caught shrimp fisherman is having to what a salmon fisherman up here is having -- and, by the way, some of your work has been very helpful as we've watched how you've worked with the salmon fishery up here in dealing with the niche market development or specializing their wild product. But you said -- and I didn't realize this they're really -- it seems to me there is some difference in that, actually, the -- correct me if I'm wrong, but the salmon fishery up here was really directing their market into Japan. So the displacement was not at a domestic level like it

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | was with the shrimp industry but more with the      |
|----|---|
| 2  | export; is that correct?                            |
| 3  | DR. KNAPP: Well, it's there's                       |
| 4  | MR. RAYBURN: Plus, I guess the                      |
| 5  | economic impacts are                                |
| 6  | DR. KNAPP:there are elements of                     |
| 7  | correctness in it. Anytime you talk about Alaska    |
| 8  | salmon, you've got to realize we've got lots of     |
| 9  | different kinds of salmon and lots of different     |
| 10 | kinds of fisheries, and they're going to very       |
| 11 | different markets.                                  |
| 12 | MR. RAYBURN: Okay.                                  |
| 13 | DR. KNAPP: And so if you're talking,                |
| 14 | say, our sockeye salmon or our red salmon those     |
| 15 | markets are very dependent upon an export market in |
| 16 | Japan. If you look at our troll fisheries and, you  |
| 17 | know, our chinook salmon, coho salmon, the market   |
| 18 | is highly dependent on the U.S. market. And so I    |
| 19 | guess the general way to it is very interesting     |
| 20 | to compare the problems of the U.S. shrimp industry |
| 21 | and the U.S. salmon industry. There are many        |

analogies. But one difference is, as I understand

22

it, the U.S. shrimp industry is almost entirely supplying to the domestic market whereas the Alaska salmon industry is much more complicated and large parts of it go to domestic market but, actually, by my estimate, about 60 percent goes to other markets. And then there's the whole issue of a very -- canned salmon is its own unique product form.

MR. RAYBURN: Got you.

DR. KNAPP: So it's....

MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Larry.

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Something Randy said that really started me thinking about something, and I just -- it's not so much a -- it's more of a comment, just to put it out on the table, just something that I was thinking. You know, in physiology it's an all or none theory with muscles, you know. A muscle contracts or doesn't. The more muscles that contract the stronger the pickup. So are we really talking about all or none theory here about

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| allowing foreign imports, or is there a means and  |
|--|
| method of allowing partial use of imports? In this |
| country, in the Magnuson Act the purpose was       |
| basically or one of the major purposes of the      |
| Magnuson Act was to get rid of foreign fishing is  |
| U.S. waters. In this country, you cannot have a    |
| U.S. flagged vessel unless it's built in this      |
| country. Would it not possibly be a means to       |
| transition into what we realize from the excellent |
| presentation by Gunnar here about globalized       |
| markets in aquaculture by saying that for every    |
| incremental increase in U.S. production of         |
| aquaculture there would be a concomitant decrease  |
| in imports, and would that get us to some kind of  |
| parity? Would that get us to some kind of          |
| political safe ground? Would that get us to some   |
| kind of economic benefit? Or should we just do     |
| like muscles and be all or none theory?            |
| CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It's illegal.                |
| Point blank illegal.                               |
| CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yep.                       |
| MR. SIMPSON: Huh?                                  |

1 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It's point blank 2 illegal. 3 MR. GUTTING: Oh, no, it's -- wait, Can I answer that? 4 wait. 5 MR. SIMPSON: How can it be illegal? 6 MR. GUTTING: No, there is a way. 7 MR. SIMPSON: Sure there's a way. MR. GUTTING: Under international trade 8 9 law there's an escape clause for industries facing 10 a surge of imports. When you have a sudden influx of imports and a domestic industry is materially 11 injured and those facts are confirmed by the U.S. 12 13 International Trade Commission then the President, 14 his discretion, may put temporary interim 15 measures in place, including quotas on imports --16 or tariff quotas -- as well as a package of 17 benefits. But there's one condition, Larry, okay? 18 And that is the President needs to have submitted 19 to him a plan, a business plan, showing that this 20 interim period -- it can't be more than five years 2.1 -- will be well used and that the industry will

take advantage of that time to become competitive

| 1  | again.  |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. SIMPSON: All right. So the                      |
| 3  | concomitant decrease must gravitate or must         |
| 4  | contribute to the concomitant increase of the U.S.  |
| 5  | market or the U.S. infrastructure or the fishermen. |
| 6  | They've got to make strides. They've got to use     |
| 7  | what happens here in that five-year period.         |
| 8  | MR. GUTTING: There was a recent case                |
| 9  | involving brooms pretty stupid, but that's what     |
| 10 | it was and the industry came in with a great        |
| 11 | plan and then after a year and a half didn't do     |
| 12 | anything.   |
| 13 | MR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.                                |
| 14 | MR. GUTTING: The President pulled.                  |
| 15 | MR. SIMPSON: How do cars work? Aren't               |
| 16 | there quotas on cars?                               |
| 17 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: (Shakes head)                 |
| 18 | MR. SIMPSON: They're not?                           |
| 19 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: No.                           |
| 20 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Cars?                       |
| 21 | MR. MOORE: Only at your dealership.                 |
| 22 | MR. SIMPSON: I thought at one time in               |

this country there were allocation quotas on cars from Toyota and whatever.

MR. GUTTING: It might have been years ago. Not anymore.

MR. SIMPSON: It was just a thought. I'm dangerous.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Mr. Chairman.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I just want to say one thing. I want to thank Gus for coming down and, you know, this I think is the type of discussion that we have to have if we move forward in this aquaculture discussion and where the U.S. goes. I just want to say I did spend quite a bit of time with Wal-Mart and Sam's in the corporate office, and it is very interesting to listen to them about the seafood industry, particularly, but all the things that -- the profit margins of where they can get it the cheapest. They want to buy a certain amount of U.S.; but, you know, you talk about moving offshore or moving into importing. I think they've considered these things. You know, would we be better off just going to China and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| setting up aquaculture and importing our shrimp,    |
|---|
| for example? But they look at the price structure   |
| and they say they have tried to market U.S.         |
| products as U.S. products and they have a very      |
| difficult time due to consistency and size and      |
| things. So I think we have to do more with our own  |
| markets for that niche, but I think we can make it. |
| But it's interesting if you sit down and talk to    |
| supermarkets and big companies like Sam's and Wal-  |
| Mart is how they look at this industry and how      |
| it's competing. But, as they say, that every day    |
| there's probably 20 different foreign countries in  |
| there trying to sell seafood, but very seldom do    |
| they see a U.S. person sitting in their office      |
| waiting for a turn to come in a sell seafood. So    |
| it's interesting, but I think it's part of this     |
| long-term discussion. But that's where your big     |
| markets are. You go in and look at Wal-Marts and    |
| they've Wal-Mart is now coming out with a           |
| Louisiana pack of shrimp and a Florida pack of      |
| shrimp, but they have only committed to a certain   |
| amount because they said the price is still higher  |

| but they're going to market it. But look on the    |
|--|
| back of all of them. You'll see that they're most  |
| every one of them are imported. Plus, the laws     |
| we have in the U.S. right now, you can repackage   |
| most anything and you don't know where it comes    |
| from.  |
| DR. KNAPP: Uh-huh.                                 |
| CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: But thanks                   |
| again. I think it's a very good discussion.        |
| MR. KENT: I'm just saying Gunnar will              |
| available later on during general discussion after |
| the rest of the presentations.                     |
| CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thanks,              |
| Gunnar, for your presentation and your input, and  |
| we're going to take a break. So a quarter after I  |
| guess we can start again.                          |
| (Off record)                                       |
| CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay,                      |
| everyone. We need to get rolling again. Oh, the    |
| little alarm thing was my fault. I told somebody   |
| they could open the door not realizing that it was |
| hooked up. So don't beat upon anybody else but me  |
|  |

| 1  | for that.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. KENT: Alvin, what's our timing for              |
| 3  | this afternoon?                                     |
| 4  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: We need to be               |
| 5  | completed by 4:45 today.                            |
| 6  | MR. KENT: And how much discussion                   |
| 7  | would you like to have at the end before we         |
| 8  | dismiss, adjourn?                                   |
| 9  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Well, from                  |
| 10 | what happened so far this morning you're going to   |
| 11 | get lots of discussion left. But don't we have      |
| 12 | a   |
| 13 | MR. KENT: We have four more                         |
| 14 | presenters.   |
| 15 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                       |
| 16 | MR. KENT: And we're saying we have,                 |
| 17 | what, three and a half hours, three hours and 20    |
| 18 | minutes?  |
| 19 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Well, it would              |
| 20 | probably be better if everybody is going to be here |
| 21 | to run through the presentations and hold the       |
| 22 | questions.  |

| 1  | MR. KENT: And, like, hold all the                   |
|----|---|
| 2  | discussion to the end?                              |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Sure, because               |
| 4  | so much of it is so interrelated anyway that a lot  |
| 5  | of the questions might get answered along the way.  |
| 6  | Plus you want to make sure that you get all of      |
| 7  | your presentations done.                            |
| 8  | MR. KENT: That's fine. Matt, is that                |
| 9  | okay with you?                                      |
| 10 | MR. RAND: Yeah, that's fine.                        |
| 11 | MR. KENT: That's great.                             |
| 12 | MR. RAND: Okay. I will do my best to                |
| 13 | be as brief as I can and                            |
| 14 | MR. KENT: With that, if I can, I'd                  |
| 15 | like to introduce Matt Rand, who is Director of the |
| 16 | Marine Fish Campaign of the National Environmental  |
| 17 | Trust. Matt came out to visit with us all the way   |
| 18 | from Washington, D.C. Matt, go ahead.               |
| 19 | MR. RAND: Thanks for having me. I'm                 |
| 20 | glad that alarm stopped because I have a loud       |
| 21 | voice, but I'm not sure I could carry quite over    |
| 22 | that. So who am I? I am the Director of the         |

Marine Fish Campaign for the National Environmental Trust. Т run our Conserve Our Ocean Legacy campaign, which is focused at strengthening conservation provisions within the Magnuson-Stevens Act having a direct interest in aquaculture; in addition, uniting the sportfishermen. We'll be out chasing your wild salmon on Saturday via float plane, trying to catch as many as I can and perhaps end up doing so.

Just a couple of quick observations on kind of where we are in the discussion that we've had so far. I think the environmental community -- and let me raise this, I am speaking for the Marine Campaign for the National Environmental Trust. I think by and large the environmental community has similar observations in by and large degrees with most of what I have to say, but probably with you folks around the table they differ from one sector to the next at some level or degree. We definitely do see the potential of aquaculture as being an environmentally friendly way to harvest seafood. It may surprise you, but we actually do see it as a

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

potential. In fact, there are some out there right now that we're supportive of. The native mollusk in New England seems to be a pretty successful aquaculture that's taking place in a biologically environmentally friendly manner. That being said, we also have major concerns with some of the other current species of marine aquaculture that are taking place.

Therefore, to start with off with my conclusion, we would like to see those issues addressed with our current aquaculture system before we expand the industry at all, and I'll go through our concerns as quickly as I can. about 15 minutes to try to address them all, and I will do so. A quick observation here and kind of a case in point. In 2000, there were 100,000 fish -farm raised salmon that escaped in Maine waters. As you probably all know, we are doing aquaculture for farmed fish -- farmed salmon -- in Maine. also know Atlantic salmon are endangered species now, and their numbers are dwindling every year. So, 2000, 100,000 fish escaped from Maine, and this

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

is according to -- well, that was a documented. The next one is according to a NOAA study known in Fish and Wildlife. 2002, we had 22 wild Atlantic salmon in Maine waters return. We are that there is any Atlantic salmon concerned aquaculture taking place in Maine waters. definitely have the ability to impact that endangered wild species there. In addition, to take a step back even a little bit further, those Atlantic salmon at one point were considered to be an endless source. We did not think we would ever overfish those species and yet we are down to, 2002, 22 fish. So you can see why we concerned. So before we expand, we would like to see some of these things addressed.

I think overall the biggest one that we haven't had a satisfactory answer to yet is biological pollution, both introduced non-native species and native species -- different issues for all of them -- and diseases and parasites. As everyone all well knows, the actual animals themselves can be considered pollution --

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

biological pollution that we're talking about here today. Most major aquaculture in the United States is outside of its native range -- examples in the Pacific, white leg shrimp, the Japanese and eastern oysters being grown on the West Coast, and Atlantic salmon being grown on the West Coast, aside from Alaska. Any of these individual species have the potential for major biodiversity impacts. The and extinction of possible displacement wild species. Other incident on the West Coast, 600,000 Atlantic salmon escaped in U.S. waters from '87 to '97. Over a million have escaped from '88 to '96 in B.C. waters. On average, we've got 90,000 a year escaping from B.C. from 1990 to 2000.

At this point, it's fairly well documented that Atlantic salmon are reproducing in B.C. waters completely. One could look at this as an invasive species. And we, in Alaska, have caught 556 salmon to date, but do keep in mind that there is no farming of Atlantic salmon in Alaska and the closest one is a thousand kilometers to the south and one of those Atlantic salmon was actually

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

caught in the Bering sea. So potential biological effects of introduced or invasive species.

Direct competition for wild stocks for food, habitat, spawning grounds and transfer of diseases and parasites. On the big -- most people understand what's going on here. There have been some transfers of a disease that is actually a parasite that was not found in the wilds It's a small pathogen that Finland, G salaris. reproduces very quickly. It eats the mucous of the salmon, and it eventually kills the salmon. was a new disease actually transferred from trout farming to wild salmon stocks in Finland. It ended up actually causing extinction of this salmon in --I have to look at my statistic here -- I believe it's 82 rivers in Finland. Since then, they've tried to eradicate it. They have not been able to do so, and that parasite is still living in the waters.

This is just a quick -- I tried to pull together some of the recent numbers. I already went through Atlantic salmon, the West Coast, over

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| a million in B.C oh, I'm sorry, did I yeah,         |
|---|
| 600,000 in 2002 in Denmark escaped. Over one        |
| million Atlantic salmon escaped in Chile just last  |
| month. So many farm salmon have escaped in Chile    |
| that the fishermen are now urging the government to |
| open a wild fishery or open a fishery of Atlantic   |
| salmon as a non-native species. I think what I'm    |
| getting to here is escapes. We feel that we still   |
| have not addressed the problem of escapes,          |
| especially within fish that are still escaping a    |
| million salmon just recently and it's a serious     |
| problem that has major biological and pollution     |
| effects. Some salmon farms. This guy is he's        |
| actually not escaping, but cranes are one of the    |
| sources of escapes. As you probably all well know,  |
| the biggest source of escapes is storms harming the |
| net pens. Predation is another big problem.         |
| Props, and then just kind of human problems that    |
| are taking place that are escapes.                  |

Native species. I think this is actually where we have our biggest concerns. Farmed native species causing biological pollution

| and actually gene pollution in the wild fish.       |
|---|
| Again, I'll kind of get back to what's taking place |
| in Maine. The problem is we're reducing the         |
| fitness level of these farmed fish I'm sorry, of    |
| the wild fish. The farmed fish are escaping and     |
| reproducing with the wild fish, passing on some     |
| other traits and actually reducing the fitness      |
| level of the native fish. So 30 to 50 percent of    |
| the genetic makeup of the Atlantic salmon now of    |
| European descent, and that's directly from the farm |
| raised fish actually reproducing with the wild      |
| fish. I cannot pronounce this river here the        |
| Magaguadavic River in New Brunswick 82 percent      |
| of the smolt leaving in '98 were of farmed origin.  |
| So the concern here is that, especially as we move  |
| forward, that biological pollution from native      |
| stocks in native ranges I'm sorry, wild stocks      |
| in native ranges has the possibility of             |
| reproducing, transferring their genes with the      |
| native species and reducing the fitness level of    |
| those fish.   |

To get on to the transgenetic,

genetically engineered, genetically modified, whatever you want to call them fish, there have been over 35 species that have been engineered; and, actually, I think that number has gone up fairly significantly recently. They're engineering growth hormone -- human growth hormone --Atlantic salmon -- I'm sorry, or they've got an antifreeze gene that they're engineering Atlantic salmon, so that many different transgenes that they're modifying into the fish. The Aqua Bounty farms, as probably many of you well know, have applied for a permit to sell their genetically engineered Atlantic salmon. To date, I think that's held up, but they do have letters of intent to sell their product already. So they are just waiting for a permit, and they will go right ahead and start selling those immediately.

You'll hear a lot about the sterile females as being what they are going to do for the solution so that there's not gene transfer. That's well and good and actually probably, at least to these Atlantic salmon that Aqua Bounty is doing,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will help gene transfer, although the technique that they are using is not a hundred percent. So there will be some gene transfer. Some fish that contain those genes will not be sterile. In addition, the problem that we'll have here is that there will be sterile females that will go up into the rivers and try to mate with males that are not sterile and these population models have -- one computer model shows extinction of the population within just a few generations. So that could be the problem that we would have potentially there. In addition, if they're not sterile fish the concern is that they have the potential to transfer the actual transgene into the wild species.

So parasites and disease. I think this one most folks are aware of in this area. The sea lice that have been exacerbated due to salmon farms. They are parasites that attach to fish, these little guys right here. And it's not nearly as big of a problem with adult fish but when we start looking at the smolt you can see where the parasites have attached and the problem is when the

2.

2.1

smolt come out of the rivers and pass through areas where there has been epidemics marginally due to some of the farms the parasites attach to the fish and they're killing the smolt. Sea lice epidemics have occurred in every major salmon farming country. Another concern is infectious salmon anemia. It was first found in Maine in 2001. As I mentioned earlier, G salaris is another pathogen that there is concern about being introduced from farmed fish.

Another major issue, I think we've had some discussion today about fish as feed and the ability of continuing to use forage fish as feed for aquaculture. My opinion is I tend to differ that there is a market out there or there is a ability out there to continue to use forage fish as fish meal and food for aquaculture. mentioned already today that we're -- Linda was talking about the increase in the level of few aquaculture in the next decades. Unfortunately, we do not see a potential increase in forage fish. There is a hope that we would move

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to herbivore fish and, you know, correct problem -- use soybeans, as was mentioned. But as of right now, we don't see that as the major source of protein for these fish. It's still -- the major source is forage fish. So one-third of the global catch is turned into fish meal and, in '98, 40 percent of that was actually used for food for aquaculture -- just am not seeing an answer to feeding these fish that we're going to be growing here and the increase that has been well documented. We don't see a continuum of the forage fish, and I think that's going to be a big problem potentially move forward with this as we The possibility is there, but by and technology. large we're very concerned that we're going to further exacerbate the problem with the forage fish.

Quickly, eutrophication is a problem, mostly a localized problem. Obviously, if we're talking about open ocean aquaculture I do believe that this is one that we can potentially solve the problem with. Really, it is a localized problem

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| Τ  | that happens, especially in estuary areas          |
|----|--|
| 2  | Chesapeake Bay, the Gulf where we do have farms    |
| 3  | taking place. It does further exacerbate those     |
| 4  | problems. Just an interesting statistic here. Two  |
| 5  | hundred thousand fish is equivalent to untreated   |
| 6  | sewage from 20,000, 25,000 and 65,000 for nitrogen |
| 7  | phosphorous and fecal matter. I guess we have      |
| 8  | about 30,000 in Juneau. So if there's a fish farm  |
| 9  | of 200,000 fish out there, that's equivalent to    |
| 10 | just using untreated sewage going right into the   |
| 11 | ocean out there.                                   |
| 12 | MR. KENT: Matt, as a point of                      |
| 13 | clarifi  |
| 14 | MR. RAND: Yeah.                                    |
| 15 | MR. KENT: I've seen that a couple of               |
| 16 | different times before, and I'm just wondering how |
| 17 | that gets calculated.                              |
| 18 | MR. RAND: Good question. I'm going to              |
| 19 | have to get back to you on that. I don't know the  |
| 20 | answer to that.                                    |
| 21 | MR. KENT: Okay.                                    |
| 22 | MR. RAND: So I wanted to get to a                  |

couple of other things. I didn't know if I was going to have enough time. Antibiotic resistance is another concern that we've had. Some of the chemicals that are used, where pesticides are also concerns, but I do believe they can be addressed and would be addressed with open ocean aquaculture but I do want to raise them as concerns. It has been documented that -- let's see, where am I here -- that some of the -- well, where I'm going with this? But, anyhow, those three chemicals that we raise concerns with -- antibiotics. wanted to pesticides and herbicides for use in aquaculture are concerns that we would like to see addressed before we move further forward.

Let me get on to our recommendations.

Again, these are our recommendations. Not all of the environmental community supports them. If we are to move forward, we do want to see them addressed. So national standards for open ocean aquaculture must be mandatory, not self-regulated.

Voluntary codes of conduct are not acceptable.

There must be sufficient notice. A 60-day comment

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| period must be available. We would want to see a    |
|---|
| full environmental impact statement consistent with |
| the requirements of NEPA. No part of the water      |
| column do we want to see this privatized.           |
| Environment and I guess this is kind of the big     |
| one right here that kind of gets to where our       |
| concerns are. Environmental impacts from net pen    |
| culture must be strongly regulated, including       |
| adopting regulations and developing technologies    |
| that eliminate as fully possible fish escapes;      |
| disease transfer to wild fish; depletion of global  |
| fish stocks; farm raised fish feed; discharge of    |
| waste and harm to the marine mammals with           |
| antibiotic use; raising genetically engineered non- |
| native marine aquatic species is prohibited. So     |
| that's kind of the overview of the environmental    |
| concerns. I couldn't give them justice in the time  |
| that I had.   |

So I guess I will close with that.

MR. KENT: I open it for any questions of clarification, leaving discussion to after the other presenters.

| 1  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Dick.                       |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. GUTTING: You mentioned one                      |
| 3  | example, I think, of an ocean aquaculture operation |
| 4  | that you felt would be something we could look at   |
| 5  | as being done properly.                             |
| 6  | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| 7  | MR. GUTTING: I may have missed                      |
| 8  | something. Is there a finfish operation that        |
| 9  | you   |
| 10 | MR. RAND: Well, we                                  |
| 11 | MR. GUTTING:would put in that                       |
| 12 | category?   |
| 13 | MR. RAND: The problem with finfish                  |
| 14 | that we see is the escapes. There's stuff that is   |
| 15 | being done on land catfish, you know, rectifies     |
| 16 | that problem for the most part. The problem with    |
| 17 | the catfish is the food; but, catfish, you know,    |
| 18 | we're fairly supportive of, aside from the food     |
| 19 | problems, and there's several others as well.       |
| 20 | MR. KENT: There's several questions                 |
| 21 | now. John.  |
| 22 | MR. FORSTER: Yeah, a couple of points.              |

| 1  | One, I think you referred to the issue of           |
|----|---|
| 2  | gyrodactylus salaris in Scandinavia.                |
| 3  | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| 4  | MR. FORSTER: It would be nice to see                |
| 5  | the references to that because I believe that was a |
| 6  | case in Norway not in Finland and I believe,        |
| 7  | also, it was actually introduced from salmon smolts |
| 8  | for an enhancement stocking program, not actually   |
| 9  | anything to do with commercial aquaculture.         |
| 10 | MR. RAND: I have some data for you.                 |
| 11 | MR. FORSTER: So, okay, well, that                   |
| 12 | would be good. And a question about the situation   |
| 13 | in British Columbia. You referred to a lot of       |
| 14 | escapes, and you said, I think, that Atlantic       |
| 15 | salmon were breeding in British Columbia. Can you   |
| 16 | clarify if that's breeding in terms of supporting a |
| 17 | naturally self-sustaining population, or it's just  |
| 18 | maybe one or two instances of a couple of fish      |
| 19 | actually having managed to spawn?                   |
| 20 | MR. RAND: Well, no, they are actually               |
| 21 | actually the spawners is your question; but,        |
| 22 | yes, they have been documented to actually spawn    |

| 1   | and reproduce.                                      |
|-----|---|
| 2   | MR. FORSTER: That means the juveniles               |
| 3   | have gone to sea and                                |
| 4   | MR. RAND: And come back.                            |
| 5   | MR. FORSTER:come back?                              |
| 6   | MR. RAND: Yep.                                      |
| 7   | MR. FORSTER: Well, again, that would                |
| 8   | not be consistent with the information I have. I    |
| 9   | think there's a number of people who might disagree |
| 10  | with some of it.                                    |
| 11  | MR. KENT: Go ahead, Al, if you'd do                 |
| 12  | the calling.  |
| 13  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Vince.                |
| 14  | MR. O'SHEA: Thank you. Did you say                  |
| 15  | there were fish farms in the Chesapeake Bay?        |
| 16  | MR. RAND: Yeah. Not fish, but                       |
| 17  | oysters.  |
| 18  | MR. O'SHEA: Oh, I thought you said                  |
| 19  | fish farms.   |
| 20  | MR. RAND: Sorry. Oysters.                           |
| 21  | Aquaculture.  |
| 2.2 | MR. O'SHEA: Okav.                                   |

| 1   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Bonnie, and                 |
|-----|---|
| 2   | then Larry.   |
| 3   | DR. BROWN: Yeah, I was real interested              |
| 4   | because this is something I work with. On your      |
| 5   | native species slide, it said biological pollution  |
| 6   | this is stuff I like to teach about so you          |
| 7   | said that it could that escapees could reduce       |
| 8   | the fitness of native fish                          |
| 9   | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| LO  | DR. BROWN:and there are a couple                    |
| L1  | of Fish and Wildlife Service NOAA refs there. But,  |
| L2  | just as a point of clarification, fitness is an     |
| L3  | evolutionary concept that we can only measure       |
| L 4 | indirectly through monitoring changes in things     |
| L5  | like growth rate or the number of spines, you know, |
| L6  | on fin rays and things, and so it's a plastic       |
| L7  | character that responds to that fitness means your  |
| L8  | ability to leave grandchildren, okay?               |
| L9  | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| 20  | DR. BROWN: So are you saying then that              |
| 21  | you have found some evidence, because I need to     |
| 22  | know that   |

| 1   | MR. RAND: No.                                       |
|-----|---|
| 2   | DR. BROWN:that escaped fish have                    |
| 3   | somehow reduced the ability of native fish to leave |
| 4   | grandchildren, because that's the layperson's       |
| 5   | definition of fitness.                              |
| 6   | MR. RAND: I don't believe that is                   |
| 7   | documented  |
| 8   | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                    |
| 9   | MR. RAND:that it has reduced the                    |
| LO  | actual fitness. The concern is that it will reduce  |
| L1  | the fitness.  |
| L2  | DR. BROWN: Okay. So and then, at the                |
| L3  | bottom, you said it can or could reduce             |
| L 4 | fitness   |
| L5  | MR. RAND: That's correct.                           |
| L6  | DR. BROWN:if, indeed, they did                      |
| L7  | that. But it says reduces fitness level of native   |
| L8  | fish, and so I'm like, uh-oh, because I don't I     |
| L9  | haven't   |
| 20  | MR. RAND: It's not                                  |
| 21  | DR. BROWN:ever seen the evidence                    |
| 22  | yet.  |

| 1   | MR. RAND:documented that an                         |
|-----|---|
| 2   | escaped fish has transferred genes to a native      |
| 3   | species and then documented that it's reduced the   |
| 4   | fitness.  |
| 5   | DR. BROWN: Right. Okay. So I agree                  |
| 6   | that it could and that that's a concern we all need |
| 7   | to think about, but I wasn't aware of anybody that  |
| 8   | had done a study on fitness.                        |
| 9   | MR. RAND: You're correct.                           |
| LO  | DR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.                         |
| L1  | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| L2  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Larry.                      |
| L3  | MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.               |
| L 4 | I appreciate your presentation. I'm still back on   |
| L5  | the fish meal issue                                 |
| L6  | MR. RAND: Uh-huh.                                   |
| L 7 | MR. SIMPSON:and I'm wondering if                    |
| L 8 | you're concerned what geographic area are you       |
| L 9 | concerned with the forage fish? Is it Northeast?    |
| 20  | Is it Gulf?   |
| 21  | MR. RAND: It's globally is what we're               |
| 22  | concerned about. I don't see the production of      |

| 1   | forage fish for fish meal increasing as             |
|-----|---|
| 2   | significantly as it's suggested that aquaculture is |
| 3   | going to increase.                                  |
| 4   | MR. SIMPSON: Okay. So you're                        |
| 5   | concerned that feeding fish will become so          |
| 6   | important and so prolific that there will be a      |
| 7   | problem finding more of that                        |
| 8   | MR. RAND: Or we're going to further                 |
| 9   | exacerbate the problems already out there on forage |
| LO  | fish.   |
| L1  | MR. SIMPSON: I didn't know there was a              |
| L2  | problem.  |
| L3  | MR. RAND: Well, there's not at this                 |
| L 4 | point, but if we increase the amount of aquaculture |
| L5  | that we're continuing, as proposed, and has been    |
| L6  | going up in the recent years, the concern is that   |
| L 7 | we're going to continue to go to that food source.  |
| L8  | You know, if the technology comes up that we're     |
| L9  | going to be feeding them soybeans or whatever else  |
| 20  | it may be, that may be a solution. Be we don't see  |
| 21  | that as the option at this point.                   |
| 22  | MR. SIMPSON: Okay. I'll leave you                   |

| Τ  | with a couple or three points. SPR on Gulf         |
|----|--|
| 2  | menhaden is about 60 percent. The Councils would   |
| 3  | love to have that. The largest biomass in the Gulf |
| 4  | is not Gulf menhaden, but bay anchovy. And, third, |
| 5  | in the Gulf we're taking about 20 percent out of   |
| 6  | that 100 percent of the animals available each     |
| 7  | year. I don't see there's a problem.               |
| 8  | MR. RAND: I think that's a                         |
| 9  | localized  |
| 10 | MR. SIMPSON: That's why I asked you if             |
| 11 | you were concerned                                 |
| 12 | MR. RAND:look at the potential                     |
| 13 | forage fish. I'm not familiar with the actual      |
| 14 | statistics in the Gulf as far as forage fish go.   |
| 15 | MR. SIMPSON: Well, in the Gulf you                 |
| 16 | produce menhaden I don't know, something like 75   |
| 17 | percent of all the menhaden is produced in the     |
| 18 | Gulf, maybe more.                                  |
| 19 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                      |
| 20 | MR. KENT: All right. Thanks very                   |
| 21 | much, Matt.  |
| 22 | MR. RAND: Thanks.                                  |

| 1  | MR. KENT: Mark, do you have a you                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | can work from your notes, or                       |
| 3  | MR. VINSEL: Yeah, I'll work from my                |
| 4  | notes.   |
| 5  | MR. KENT: Okay.                                    |
| 6  | MR. VINSEL: I don't have a                         |
| 7  | presentation on the PowerPoint up here.            |
| 8  | MR. KENT: All right. If I could                    |
| 9  | introduce you, this is Mark Vinsel, who is the     |
| 10 | Executive Director of the United Fishermen of      |
| 11 | Alaska. Mark.                                      |
| 12 | MR. VINSEL: I'm going to sit down. I               |
| 13 | passed out my handout to all of you, and I'll be   |
| 14 | speaking from those. I can answer any questions    |
| 15 | afterwards. I somewhat apologize but not sincerely |
| 16 | because UFA President Bob Thorstenson is not       |
| 17 | available that was on the agenda to speak. He's    |
| 18 | fishing right now, as are just about all Alaska    |
| 19 | fishermen who have a market for their products.    |
| 20 | This is probably right about the peak week of most |
| 21 | of our seasons.                                    |
| 22 | MR. KENT: Mark, most people would                  |

agree that a bad day fishing is better than a good day at MAFAC. So everybody understands.

MR. VINSEL: That's right. They're not used to getting lightning, though. Okay. United Alaska, we're the Fishermen of largest trade representing organization Alaska's commercial fishing industry. We're an umbrella organization with 33 regional or gear specific groups, including six non-profit aquaculture associations. have approximately 500 independent fishermen, crew or business members that support us through those membership categories. I don't need to belabor the point of Alaska's top-notch reputation in fisheries management, both in the state and the North Pacific Council. You're all familiar with that, but I have included that paragraph for some of the laypeople who might read this.

As you probably know -- since Governor Murkowski mentioned it -- fish farms were banned in 1990, and Governor Murkowski has also called for a five-year moratorium on the EEZ fish farms in the coastal waters off Alaska while supporting research

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

into related socio-economic impacts to fisheries dependent communities. Those are from his comments on the U.S. Commission on Oceans Report. As I mentioned, all of the United Fishermen of Alaska Board virtually is fishing right now. If you were to -- we definitely invite you and encourage you to hold public meetings on the development of this legislation or this process, and you will receive plenty of fishermen's input if that's scheduled probably anytime between about the middle of October and May.

That said, the UFA has a couple of official policy statements. We oppose fish farms and have for as long as anybody that I know that's been involved with UFA can remember. Nobody I talked to could remember how far back that went, but I'm assuming it goes back at least to 1990 when the state banned fish farms. More recently, on the topic of EEZ fish farming, this spring our Board supported a legislative environmental impact statement on legislation regarding the open ocean fish farms. UFA opposes voluntary regulatory

2.

2.1

for the aquaculture industry, measures and UFA opposes exemptions from Magnuson-Stevens, Jones Act any other applicable laws governing transportation and fisheries for the aquaculture In addition to these official positions industry. that UFA has passed on to our delegation in Washington, by word of mouth we're familiar with a wide range of concerns from individual fishermen. Most of these have been covered in other people's presentations, but -- so I want belabor them too long, but I will briefly touch on them.

I think, first and foremost, is the market and prices. What we see happening and, in acknowledgement of what Gunnar Knapp globalization and fish farming -- the double whammy -- as well as impacts to the Japanese economy, which was a major market for our Bristol Bay fishery and some others, but what we see is the -you know, especially farm salmon production capacity exceeded the market capacity at such an extreme rate that it drove the prices down roughly in half here in the U.S. Now, that wasn't just the

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| price for the salmon we were catching. It was the   |
|---|
| price for the salmon they were making, and I'm not  |
| sure if that was their intention. I can't imagine   |
| a business plan where you would go out and decide   |
| you're going to try to lose money, because that's   |
| what I understand they're doing. They I'll stop     |
| there on that point. But if we're going to move     |
| forward with industrial scale aquaculture support   |
| by the U.S. we should do this at a pace that can    |
| develop the market at the same time so that         |
| existing price for existing producers and price for |
| the new product is at a marked, stable level that   |
| can foster product development and sort of meet the |
| market's needs instead of creating all this fish    |
| and then hoping people will buy them and then       |
| selling it to them whatever they're willing to pay. |
| I think a proper business plan, which I look        |
| forward to seeing, will address that.               |

Communities, infrastructure and transportation. As Governor Murkowski pointed out, this is really big to all of Alaska's fishermen, especially our coastal communities where there's

| virtually no other source of income. We see the     |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| potential of offshore aquaculture is to completely  |  |  |  |  |
| bypass Alaska's communities. Currently, there are   |  |  |  |  |
| large fisheries that deliver to Seattle, and I      |  |  |  |  |
| believe there's infrastructure in place for Alaska  |  |  |  |  |
| to garner some revenue from that. I'm not           |  |  |  |  |
| completely familiar with the workings of that, but  |  |  |  |  |
| some of the questions to Gunnar Knapp said that,    |  |  |  |  |
| you know, local communities would naturally benefit |  |  |  |  |
| because the fish would come through here. But you   |  |  |  |  |
| guys can't even get your FedEx packages here. We    |  |  |  |  |
| can't get our fish out. So these kind of            |  |  |  |  |
| developments of this kind of industry could be done |  |  |  |  |
| in such a way that it helps us with our             |  |  |  |  |
| transportation issues that are still the number 1   |  |  |  |  |
| obstacle for us getting, you know, a good price for |  |  |  |  |
| our fish. So if you're going to do it here in       |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska, bring it through our communities. Help      |  |  |  |  |
| support us.   |  |  |  |  |

Another thing that was mentioned by somebody was that there are no royalties on fish. Well, our fisheries pay a landing tax and half of

that goes to the local community and half goes to the state and that pays for fish and game management, but it's a profit to our state. bring them through Alaska, if you're going to do with transportation it. and help us our infrastructure and you will probably see some of the resistance fall by the wayside where we all feel comfortable that we'll still be around.

Environment. I don't have the facts and figures. I'm not a scientist. I can tell you that fishermen are very concerned of Frankenfish. I don't think the genetically modified fish, if they were cut loose in Alaska waters, would -- I can't imagine they would only want to spawn with genetically sterile -other or genetically modified sterile females. They're going to try to spawn with the wild fish that are in our streams. And, from the pictures I've seen, being twice the size of the males that we've got they would probably edge them out and then that female's eggs aren't going to be fertilized and, you know, the possible introduction of genetically modified fish

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

into Alaska's waters is a mind-boggling fear to Alaska's fishermen and anybody here.

Other contaminants. You know, concentration of toxins that we see that I believe are the reason why Chile's fish still have a level of toxins higher, generally, than Alaska's fish, and I could only assume it's because of the feed because I don't think they have a lot of industrial sites. that kind pollution at their But concentration of toxins anywhere near Alaska, whether it comes out in their feces and mixes and gets eaten by other things -- granted, I don't know the science, and I might be just speaking complete nonsense here, but there lot of are а other fishermen that would also have this fear. market niche depends on both the quality of our fish and the tests that show this -- but reputation of purity and quality in the fish from the pristine environment and it's no consolation that these contaminants would be more diluted in the ocean because any increase in those levels puts to risk our market niche that we are making

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

progress on. As Gunnar Knapp mentioned -- and I think Governor Murkowski mentioned -- we're starting to show results at our high-end fisheries. This year's prices have been the best in, I guess, at least four or five years for our troll fishery, if not longer. The prices have continued to hold through the season, more or less, and that is the biggest sign of encouragement that any of us could have but that's completely at the risk of any increase in toxins whatsoever.

Invasive species. I mentioned that a little bit. I can't imagine you're going to put forth policy that's going to risk healthy wild fish stocks with genetically modified fish anywhere near Invasive species. I haven't kept a count as it. well as Matt has on how many there are out there, but I know we catch them occasionally, and it puts a lot of fear in us. I guess that extends way beyond fishermen and beyond commercial way fishermen for markets. I know -- I guess, what, down around Washington, D.C. you get people catching some tooth or some.....

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

IN UNISON: Snakeheads.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

MR. VINSEL: Snakeheads, yeah. You know, we're kind of playing with fire here where we're mixing up introducing species from all over, and I think we should be concerned about that. The concept of net pens holding fish to me is a joke. They get out of the net pens by the millions; and, you know, I don't even know if you can hold these things in a tank -- or it didn't work for oil. So put these things on dry land and you would probably have perhaps no problem with them among the fishermen here, at least on that concern.

Another big concern I see and we hear from fishermen is, in general, the state of Alaska, United Fishermen of Alaska, most the of organizations support the Commission on Policy's recommendation for ecosystem management. Yet, you know, last night it may have seemed like a nice, cool rain to you all. an aberration in our weather pattern. We don't get lightning around here, except for this summer. That's the third major lightning storm we've had here in Juneau. We also had a week of temperatures where it reached above 85. That was unprecedented around here this week -- or that was in June. had record dry and warm May and June, I believe. But anyways, you all know. There's global climate change going on, or at least some places. You've got towns like Shishmaref that are starting to float away. They've got to move the town 40 or 50 -- or nine miles inland or something like that, get it away from the rising water. To implement ecosystem based management in a time where things are obviously changing and then to throw in a major variable with industrial sized aquaculture going on, I think it really puts the chance of success for that kind of management shift -- you know, puts it at risk.

I guess another big point -- and to some of the people I talk to, this is the biggest one. This is a fundamental change -- or, potentially, could be in, you know, the open ocean, access to all. And the concept of private property rights, which not seeing a real draft plan with,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

you know, public airing and all that stuff these kind of concerns -- all of these concerns rampant in the vacuum of information that we have on where this process is and what the regulation is, where the draft business plan is. So without that kind of concrete information on which to base our understanding and to inform fishermen, you've qot a real PR problem out there, and I do understand that the Subcommittee on Aquaculture recommended that NOAA bring out a plan back in I still haven't seen anything. December. I was happy to see that recommendation was there, and hopefully somebody is listening.

But, you know, fishermen, we say we're the last of the buffalo hunters and that kind of thing. You know, range wars have happened in our Plains states. They weren't states then, as far as most of the states I know, and there wasn't really much local say about what was going on when cattle drives barbwire put up and was were eliminated, but that's what some people see this So we're very concerned. I already sort of as.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

briefly touched on here that, you know, that you see the high level of fear and misunderstanding. You recognize that probably in this Committee throughout the whole process here. I don't understand why this isn't brought out into the open in developing policy.

could point to -as has been mentioned, we do have aquaculture that's working here in Alaska. Our enhancement hatcheries. got one here. I don't know if any of you were able to tour our DIPAC facility. It's paid for by T don't know if commercial fishermen. happens to be any sportfishermen out there because you're kind of catching us between our dog salmon and our pink salmon, but in another two weeks we'll have coho salmon and they're bright and silver and there will be а lot of local sportfishermen enjoying those fish. You should see it when the king salmon are in, in June. But those are successful.

We also have a shellfish mariculture program going on that Governor Murkowski mentioned.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

We've made regulatory and testing changes so that they could deliver live. We're getting about, I think, \$10 a pound instead of a dollar a pound and, as you can imagine, that's helping a community that basically lost a lot of its salmon jobs and virtually all of its timber jobs over the last 10 years. At the heart of those successes are local control, cooperation of the fishermen and communities.

I've got a little litany list here of could translated concerns that be into recommendations. I think that I've covered these points, and I don't want to really belabor my I realize there's even some redundance speech any. in them. I compiled this from lists from other -from input that I have received and discussions at UFA Board level. But I think that key, at the very bottom, provide a transparent public process to engage and involve the state, the communities, the tribes, the fishermen -- sport and commercial. People who are interested in this should have a visibility into what's going on. I think another

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

important point is to those who would say that this doesn't fit into the Magnuson-Stevens Act, well, the timing couldn't be better to, you know, consider this in the Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization. So I'll conclude with that.

MR. KENT: Thank you. Any specific questions for clarification? Alvin will be calling it.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Go ahead.

I thought you said MR. FORSTER: Okay. something quite interesting in the context of local infrastructure and the fact that if you could be some way that aquaculture wouldn't assured in local communities and t.he the local bypass infrastructure there might be more receptiveness to the benefits it would bring. And, first of all, I can see how one could, in fact, devise regulations and an industry so that one could assure you on that point, but perhaps more important in terms of the study that NOAA is contemplating now -- the economic study -- it should look at just that

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

question: How aquaculture can bring benefits in term of local infrastructure to communities? What sort of benefits it does bring, and how that could be regulated to make sure that it happens. I would have thought that's an addressable concern, and if that indeed does encourage more people to think more positively about the idea that would be something that would be worth doing.

MR. KENT: Technically, that's not a clarification.

MR. FORSTER: Sorry.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Bob.

MR. FLETCHER: Mark, you and the previous speaker both focused on salmonid concerns, which I think are real and I think are appropriate to bring up, but open ocean aquaculture could provide benefits to Alaska and other parts of the nation if they focused on species, say, that were native and just tried to enhance as well as provide more food in, say -- let's say ling cod. your concerns cover any kind of open ocean aquaculture, or you more focused on the salmonid

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

## issues?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

MR. VINSEL: Well, we're already actively engaged in sable fish farming, although we acknowledge we don't have a lot of say in what British Columbia does. But if it's not an Alaska species, we don't want it in Alaska be.....

MR. FLETCHER: Ling cod is a.....

MR. VINSEL: .....and then the flipside of that is none of our species are overfished, although I have a little bit of trouble -- I'm going to step aside here. I'm not speaking in this -- I'm going to follow up with a sentence here. I'm not going to be talking for United Fishermen of I'm talking to you individually as Alaska. person who works in a job related to commercial fishing, funded by commercial fishing. I'm also President of the local Rain Country Flyfishers And, not speaking for UFA, here group. southeast Alaska I don't see hardly any -- I don't see friction between resident sportfishermen and the commercial fishermen. For one, we sure do enjoy that they produce all those DIPAC fish for

us; but, number 2, there's enough fish to go around here in southeast Alaska.

Now, I know there are places in Alaska that's not quite the case. There's where population pressures around Anchorage and, there, there is conflict. But the existing hatchery system is beneficial. It's accepted, generally. I think the people who actually pay for it would probably like it if more of the recreational people paid for some of those fish, but then there are concerns. For instance, among Trout Unlimited they have concerns over the carrying capacity or the straining of those fish. Those hatcheries which are done locally have, you know, local support. But I don't really see where the equation benefits anybody here to just keep making more fish. We've got fish. We just need to sell them. We need to get them to market.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Bill.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I want to thank you for the presentation, and Matt's earlier. I didn't get the opportunity. I think your

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| recommendations are, you know, good                 |
|---|
| recommendations. I think most of them we have       |
| considered and, in fact, the Atlantic salmon right  |
| now on the East Coast we are requiring a hundred    |
| percent markup of those fish even though we don't   |
| have much left there, to be honest with you. I      |
| think that you know, looking at this, the one       |
| thing I wanted to comment to you about is I can     |
| assure you you will have lots of public input. I    |
| had hoped that we would have the draft legislation  |
| out by now. We're not allowed to disseminate that   |
| until OMB gets through looking at it and they've    |
| just given us back comments and we have to respond  |
| to those. But we will do nothing unless there is a  |
| series of meetings across the country as soon as we |
| get the legislation out. We don't know who is       |
| going to introduce it or if it will be introduced,  |
| but we think this is something in my opinion,       |
| it's the first sort of real open, good dialogue     |
| we've had on aquaculture here today at MAFAC, but   |
| it's something we need to carry across the country. |
| And it will be a while, I think, before you see     |

anything really major done in aquaculture. I think there will some experimentations, some experiment projects and things like that maybe to look at how this things works out. But this can only be successful as we get community build-in, in my opinion, and get the states' involvement. So I take to heart the comments about having the information get out, and it will get out. I can assure you of that.

You know, we have a code of conduct. We have sort of a business model, and then we have the legislation -- the three pieces of documents that we're working on. We've hired a aquaculture coordinator with a lot of good background to get involved in this and to review these things now before we move out further. We lost a person internally, and we went outside and went through an extensive interview process to get what we think is going to be an excellent person to work with it. But, from my perspective, I guess we have to talk about the Magnuson, too. I may be -- I think you have to have involvement in the Council process for

2.

2.1

the managed fisheries, and this is another impact to look at, so to speak, if it's in -- if it's enhancement or if it's food production or what. But I think that it does need to be a separate aquaculture type permit, if we permit it. So it's a little different than meeting different requirements, but I think it does need input.

So Ι think your comments are well taken, and your recommendations are right on the mark to the things we've talked about. So thanks. But. we know it's been very important aquaculture facilities and enhancement are very important in Alaska and I know your sensitivity because you do have a tremendous fishery. think that's one of my sensitivities is species and, you know, how this impacts the already good population we have. From an enhancement standpoint and others, I think it has a role. hope that we can get these things -- you know, get level heads together and we can sort of work through those as we go forward.

MR. VINSEL: Thank you, and thank you

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | all for coming to Alaska.                           |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. RAYMOND: Thanks for having us.                  |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Thank you.                  |
| 4  | MR. KENT: Thank you.                                |
| 5  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: You have one                |
| 6  | more, I think?                                      |
| 7  | MR. KENT: There's two more.                         |
| 8  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Two more? Gee               |
| 9  | whiz.   |
| 10 | MR. KENT: Yeah. Is that okay?                       |
| 11 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah. I'll                  |
| 12 | just tell you, you know, I remember the first time  |
| 13 | this subject was brought up at this table. I think  |
| 14 | I was swearing at certain MAFAC members when it     |
| 15 | first came out. So we've gone quite a ways.         |
| 16 | MR. KENT: The bruises are still there,              |
| 17 | Alvin. They're deep.                                |
| 18 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                       |
| 19 | MR. KENT: Anyway, next is Don Bremner.              |
| 20 | Don is currently the acting Executive Director of   |
| 21 | the Southeast Alaska Inter-tribal Fish and Wildlife |
| 22 | Commission here in Juneau. Don.                     |

MR. BREMNER: Thank you, and thank you for coming to Alaska. Before I begin, I want to just describe a little bit about what the Intertribal Commission is all about. We're a coalition of tribes in southeast Alaska, and our goal is to enhance the commercial fish and subsistence lives that we have in rural Alaska. That's basically what we do.

Before I begin, I wanted to tell you a couple of stories that might be applicable to our thinking and our mind-set here, you know, and we could talk about that later. The first story pertains to Yakutat, Alaska, which that's where I'm In 1984, the glacier was closing -- the Hubbard glacier was closing off and there was media -- tens and tens and tens of media from all around the world. They had TV, radio, everybody and anybody there taking pictures, interviewing people about the closure of the glacier. Behind the glacier is about 90 miles of fjord where there were There were sea otter. There was porpoise. seals. You name it. All those wild creatures were back

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

there, and the focus was how do we preserve, protect and get porpoises and sea otters and everything out from behind the glacier so they don't starve to death? And at one of our public meetings, one of my father's tribal members got up and said save the baby seals, save the baby whales. What about saving the baby people? And everybody kind of, wow, man, isn't that something? The whole attention was always focused on the resource and the creatures. It wasn't focused on the economy and the people of Yakutat, and it kind of people off dead center to start thinking about the people.

The second story pertains to tribal fisheries, which I'll talk about. About a month ago we met with the Pacific Northwest Inter-tribal Fish and Wildlife Commission folks. They were up here, and they were talking about their programs on the Columbia River and whatnot, and they come to one of these — they had one of these neat PowerPoints like this and they showed one of their — they talked about how the economy and the fish

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

prices were affecting them as well, and they come to one of the slides that showed one of their tribal members. He was dipnetting, and on the back of his shirt it said will fish for sex. know, you think what's the moral of that story? Well, the moral of that story -- how do we take the moral of that story and apply it to what we're talking about here -- to the tribe? The moral of that story is our tribal members that as excluded from fisheries they're going to get creative. They're going to get creative. And you'll see from my presentation that's what we're going to offer.

You have in front of you my printout, and the reason I don't have a PowerPoint is because our experience and our role is based on years of social, physical, legal experience, and it's not based on statistics. But we read on research, and we understand them as well. So we want to offer an opportunity for partnering with your local fish -- with NOAA. If you look at the document, the first thing I say is that we have to establish some kind

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of order of understanding. We need to understand your organization, and you need to take time to understand who we are. That's really important because you think it's common knowledge of who you are? It's not. You found that out in your meetings around the country. Until yesterday, I only knew two NOAA people -- James and Phil Smith. Other than that, you're the most NOAA people I've ever seen in my life. So we need to come to the table and understand one another.

But, from our mind-set, you need to understand -- and we'll beat this drum forever -that our people have made a living from this ocean from time immemorial. We're an ocean culture. Wе will always be an ocean culture. Not anything you say or do is going to change that. You'll see later on when I talk about that. So we know we have things in common with you because you manage fisheries. Your ultimate goal is to build sustainable fisheries in the ocean. That's our ultimate goal. That's our ultimate goal in life. But we have differences which, you know, page one

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and two we list our differences that we know, but one of the most important things you should understand about us is that we're different people. We're living in Western society in a lot of similar ways, but we are different people. Senator Elton will get up and say, yes, that's right. are different. We are a different people. We see ourselves as a different nation, but keep that in mind -- keep those words in mind -- because go down to the bottom of that page three and understand that the Tlingit and Haida Tsimshian people we're in a constant state of becoming. We're becoming our ancestors. We're becoming our grandchildren.

Try to imagine what that means to a philosophy of life, to a philosophy of what our children and grandchildren are going to be thinking about what they're doing 100 years from now. Try to imagine what that means. There's no separation of generations within our culture like Western society. We are constantly becoming our ancestors, and we're constantly becoming our grandchildren. We pass that mind-set on to our children in our

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

culture, and the reason I mention that is because we're always going to be here. We're stakeholders that's always going to be here.

If you go to page four and look at the top, we understand and acknowledge and recognize the social, political, and legal aspects of your problem. Early on, we heard mention of a number of lawsuits that the organization has pending. Wе sure understand those. We've been on both sides of the track there with those. So we understand them. If you look on page four and five, what I have listed there is what we see ourselves as working partners. Standards of belief. Working partners. If we're going to succeed, there are ingredients -- some of these ingredients of what I have listed here has to be part of our relationship. American government has a couple of hundred years relationship with us and practices of every kind that has failed. So we're trying to establish standards that we believe in that would work. We're at page five, that last sentence. After everything is said and done, we have a stake in one

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

another's successes.

2.

2.1

2.2

I've heard talk over two days about budgets. Wouldn't it be neat if we went to Congress together as tribes saying, hey, we're an ocean culture. We're supporting this organization for these programs and these funds. It's important because regardless of state lines and tribal lines and everything fish don't know that. They just swim around, you know. They don't have boundaries. So having said that, I heard the discussion of all of the previous speakers, but -- and I -- Gunnar out there with his presentations. They're so amazingly precise. They're wake-up calls.

But from our perspective, look at our rural villages. You have a couple of handouts that are supporting documents, along with my presentation from the Denali Commission, Distressed Communities. All our communities are living below poverty. The per capita of income is real low. Unemployment is real high. Every statistic that you can calculate you would think that -- okay, let's look at these statistics and see where they

are on the scheme of things with these charts. Well, we're not doing very well. I mention those because when we come to discussing aquaculture in the State of Alaska we have to start thinking about the money portion. And I know you folks know a lot more about that, but in our rural villages Alaska we're resource rich and cash poor. the bottom line there. We don't have sustainable So if you take all your thinking economies. outside the three-mile limit and try to match it up with some society and economic structure on the beach it's not going to match because the economics that's taking place on the beach inside t.he three-mile limit is certainly not matching this big picture outside. So we're resource rich and cash poor, and our villages don't have sustainable economies.

In regards to the ecological issues and environmental issues, there's a real disconnect between the state laws and Federal laws on regulation management and implementation. For example, one of the things we tried to do a couple

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of years ago with the National Science Academies was we tried to get them to add one little more step in their scientific experiments and everything they had going on in the international community to test some of this salmon that they caught out there for environmental pollution. Well, you know, it didn't happen. Now, we read in today's paper about that. I just said, yeah, well, we told you about that. You know, it makes me wonder. How many times do you have say something right before somebody listens, and who do you say it to? We don't know. So I'm saying it to you.

Part οf the ecological issues environmental concerns we have is who is the Great White Father out there that we need to talk to say monitoring who's the high seas for this environmental pollution? We need to talk to that That's what we need to know. quy. An inshore example of international companies that we try to prevent pollution from is the cruise ships. working with the National ETA Office to try to come up with standards that meet our community goals.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

You know, not so much as the State of Alaska but our community. These little villages.

Okay, you look at the part commercial fishing in Alaska, I see a lot of folks here are from the state and other Alaskans are here and we have a real internal difference about what's needed and what's going on and who should be doing So it's not a secret that some of the things that I have listed here are things that the state and maybe the Federal agencies and other people will say no way. You don't know what you're talking about. And I'll say, okay, fine, that's -you could say that. But in the meantime, look at what's happening here on Gunnar Knapp's discussion of world economics of aquaculture. We're fighting over crumbs in the state of Alaska compared to world economics. I mean, just the park fishery out there in the Bering Sea ought to tell us that. But we're still arguing over it, We're peanuts. and it's taking us down.

So I point that out because we don't know what factors you're going to use in

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

calculating should we move forward with the program or not move forward with the program. So it's (fire alarm) what factors are you going to be using (fire alarm). If you don't mind, I'll keep talking (fire alarm).

(Off record)

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

MR. BREMNER: If it was blamed somebody from Alaska, I could really understand, but it was one of the Committee members. Now, it's important to understand the internal infrastructure issues that we have up here. If we don't iron those out like Gunnar Knapp says, then it's not going to make a difference whether open ocean aquaculture comes to Alaska or where. We're going to go down together if we don't come to grips with And in regards to open ocean aquaculture, those. as other folks in Alaska have said there's no laws that apply farming up here that authorize this. the majority of the people, including the tribal alliance, they have always come out and opposed salmon farming, halibut farming and sable fish farming. But in regards to what you're talking about now I think you'll see at the end of my discussion -- well, we'll think differently about this.

But some of the problems we have with what you're putting forward now about open ocean aquaculture is the potential redesignation of uses and user groups, and there's a 100-mile limit there. What this will automatically do -- and we don't have the time to talk about it -- it's going to create a lot of internal conflicts and you saw, from the decline of the salmon industry and others I had, more competition that we haven't come to grips with yet.

second problem is The the cost of entering into this opportunity is going to higher than we can afford to pay. The state can't afford to help up build the infrastructure in our communities on wild salmon. Who's going to be on our side and stand by our side for this Look at the economics. opportunity? It's not there for us right now. It's going to be a case of what we believe we see happen all the time. The

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

rich getting richer, and the poor getting poorer.

If only the big rich companies -- god forbid Haliburton decides to take up fisheries, and we won't have a chance, you know? So that's how we see that right now.

And the issue of state based management control to open ocean aquaculture is a real issue that we need to talk about because I know a lot of tribes are going to come to you and say, hey, wait a minute. In this state and this state and this state and including the State of Alaska they have a poor track record of working with the tribes in the rural villages. So it's not working. They don't recognize our tribal sovereignty or the benefits that they could receive from our participation. So we have differences.

Finally, I was hoping some of my elders would show, but they didn't know what time I was going to be on. Our (Tlingit language) -- that's our food in Tlingit -- it's really important. Just quickly, one of my elders said at one of our meetings when they were talking about the word

2.

2.1

subsistence, he said subsistence. He said when I eat Western food I feel like they're starving me, but when I eat my Native food I am full and I am Well, there's generations of satisfied. relationship to the food, even with our elders. us, subsistence is a regulatory word which comes under ANILCA and ANCSA. You'll hear it from a lot of Native people across America -- especially in Alaska -- the food is our way of life, and you'll see on page eight the foods that are a part of our It's been that way for generations. life. And all these foods listed are exposed to the 200-mile limit at one stage of their lives. So we have a stake in what you're doing. We'll exercise our right to whatever it takes to preserve and protect that.

Finally, on page nine -- and I'm just about done, in spite of the alarms going off -- you know, I didn't realize that I would have that kind of effect with alarms going off, you know. The loss of these foods would be cultural genocide of our people. That's just these foods here. Try to

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

imagine that somebody in 2004 in America can say the loss of these foods would be cultural genocide of our people. It's amazing, but it's true. The foods that are listed, it's who we are. It's our existence, our way of life, and we're going to defend it.

like I said yesterday, if So our subsistence fish is at the top of the food chain in this ocean that swims around out there -- Senator Elton will verify that -- we'll defend that to no So that's who we are and what we do and how we think. But if you try to imagine, okay, what do you guys want or need or what can you do the first thing that I think should happen -- is because this is the most NOAA people I've ever seen in my life I'm wondering about establishing a tribal You know, a lot of you folks have heard liaison. of these tribal liaisons in America -- across America -- but the purpose of saying there should be something like that is because look at what's happening. This bill that you're proposing that's just about on the fast track -- and then it takes a

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

long time to gear up tribes to have some kind of input. We're going to announce today -- you'll see at the end of this that we're going to have to work with you and then we're going to have to work outside of you to try to jump ahead of where you're at.

We offer number 2 and 3, that you should look at your programs to see where tribes can plug in. We look at training Try to imagine that in 2004 the Native education. Americans have a lot of educated people. I know one tribal council that has every -- they have bachelor's and doctorates and masters. They're They're educated, you know. weird to work with. But we have people keep being educated now that can plug into your programs and your systems and become a part of you, stand by you on national issues. would be a front man of a lot of your discussion instead of a tail. And we have people more educated and wiser than I -- that's for sure -- but I am here to say we need these places to plug in with MOUs or MOAs, whatever working mechanism that

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you have.

| Finally, because of what you're doing              |
|--|
| here we are going to work outside of you with our  |
| legislators, the Secretary of Interior, the        |
| Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs on getting   |
| designation of ocean stewardship programs and      |
| tribal economic zones within the 200-mile EEZ. Try |
| to imagine what that's going to look like in six   |
| months when you go to Congress. We go to Congress. |
| You say this is the opportunity, and we say, no,   |
| this is the opportunity. Try to imagine what the   |
| ocean is going to be mapped out like. The ocean    |
| and its 200-mile limit EEZ is going to be mapped   |
| out like oil tracts tracts of oil for sale and     |
| lease. That's what we're talking about. So that's  |
| who we are. That's what we plan to do. We ask      |
| that you take our thoughts to decision making      |
| bodies and one way or another we're going to meet  |
| again, whether it's at one of your conferences or  |
| in D.C. We're going to try to talk to you before   |
| we go to court. It's costly for everybody. You     |
| don't have the money. We don't have the money, but |

| 1  | we're stakeholders and we want to be a part of the  |
|----|---|
| 2  | program. Thank you.                                 |
| 3  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Thank you,                  |
| 4  | Don. Does anyone have questions? Okay. Thank        |
| 5  | you.  |
| 6  | MR. KENT: Thank you very much. And,                 |
| 7  | again, our apologies for the Randy messing with     |
| 8  | the door again. Our final speaker for this session  |
| 9  | is Rich Langan as Director of the University of New |
| 10 | Hampshire Cooperative Institute for New England     |
| 11 | Mariculture and Fisheries. Rich.                    |
| 12 | DR. LANGAN: Thank you, Don. First of                |
| 13 | all, I'd like to thank this Committee for inviting  |
| 14 | me here. I've really enjoyed the meeting so far,    |
| 15 | and it also gave me the opportunity for my first    |
| 16 | visit to Alaska although, from what I hear it isn't |
| 17 | really Alaska. Is that right?                       |
| 18 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: You got to go               |
| 19 | that way farther.                                   |
| 20 | DR. LANGAN: Anybody mind if I oper                  |
| 21 | this door? While I'm getting this booted up it      |
| 22 | will take a second I'm from the Northeast, and      |

those of you in the room probably know that the fishery situation in the Northeast is drastically different than the fishery situation in Alaska. We are -- we have lost a number of fishing jobs. We have lost a number of processing jobs, and there's been a ripple effect throughout the economy and a tremendous change over the entire demographics of the Northeast. I feel like I should probably admit to some guilt in that because I was a commercial fisherman back in what we called the glory days in the early 80s, and there's several things that I took away from my fishing experience for that four-year period.

The first thing was I really, truly understood the meaning of hard work, and everything I've done since then has been pretty cushy compared to commercial fishing. The second thing I realized is that we were taking way too many fish and that there were going to be consequences for that. And, along those same lines, there was something I heard about -- and this was around 1984 -- called aquaculture, and I said I got to think about

2.

2.1

looking into that because farming fish, you know, I think there's going to be consequences of catching too many fish. So the last thing I took away from fishing was a Ph.D. degree, and what I mean by that was along with catching too many fish I also noticed that particularly in the Northern shrimp fishery we were taking so many little fish -- so many undersized fish -- that it was sometimes three or four times the catch of shrimp. So I did my Ph.D. dissertation on discards in the trawl So I earned a Ph.D. and I never -fisheries. without spending any time in the classroom. tell anybody that I didn't take any classes for my But, anyway, that's what I took away from fishing, and it's enough time for me to get this booted up. So I guess that worked.

(At ease)

DR. LANGAN: Okay. I'm here to tell you about a project that's been going on in the Northeast for the past several years. I am the Director of this program as well as a participant in this, but think of me as a representative of all

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| my colleagues at the University of New Hampshire,   |
|---|
| other research institutions that we're working with |
| in the Northeast, as well as our industrial         |
| partners. That project, the Open Ocean Aquaculture  |
| Project, is part of a larger institute, the         |
| University of New Hampshire Cooperative Institute   |
| for New England Mariculture and Fisheries, and I    |
| think this is a point of this slide is that we      |
| consider fisheries and mariculture all being part   |
| of seafood production. We don't differentiate       |
| between them. Funding for this program comes from   |
| NOAA through Congressional appropriation through    |
| the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. We  |
| do have additional grants some small business       |
| innovation research grants, some SK grants while    |
| that program was still around but the bulk of       |
| the funding comes through this Congressional        |
| appropriation. My point here is doing this kind of  |
| work offshore this experimental work is             |
| expensive and very difficult to do on small grants. |
| And as I'm given to sloganeering, this is what      |
|   |

Responsible Seafood Production.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

In this presentation, I'm going to give you an overview of the project, talk about some of our recent accomplishments -- and those are these engineering, finfish categories \_\_\_ culture, culture, economics shellfish and technology transfer in commercialization. Also, talk about environmental assessments associated with project and then a little bit about what we're looking at down the road.

Now, our vision for this program is that at some point in time there's going to be a viable industry and it's going to be compatible with other activities going on out there environmentally responsible. Our mission for our group is to provide the regional and national expertise in research, technology development and technology transfer, and the goal for the project is to demonstrate that this is all possible biologically, engineering wise, economically, and environmentally.

Our approach -- now, this is somewhat

in chronological order. Some of these activities actually took place at the same time. Select a suitable site. What I mean by suitable and representative site and when I say open ocean aquaculture what I'm really talking about is exposed conditions. I'm not talking about EEZ necessarily, but someplace that's exposed to all the weather.

We engaged regional and local stakeholders, and I'll include in that group, first off, the commercial fishing industry, recreational fishermen, non-governmental organizations -- any agencies that were not necessarily associated with giving us a permit like U.S. Fish and Wildlife. So we brought all these people together to talk about what we were planning to do. And then, of course, we had to obtain state and Federal permits. This could be a separate presentation all on its own.

We could call it Tales of Wails and Woe.

We developed partnership with industry.

When I say industry, I'm talking people who make cages, people who make mooring systems, people who

2.

make engineered marine related components and we went ahead with some design and testing of offshore systems, established an offshore platform where we could conduct research and -- as well as the shore side infrastructure we needed to support that.

Select appropriate native species of fish and shellfish. I'll emphasize native there. I'll also mention here that all of the fish that we're working with have wild brood stock as their parents. So we're working only with F1 fish at this point in time. For the fish we were working with, the hatchery technologies were not there. The nursery technologies were not there. So this is something we had to do. We're pretty much starting from scratch with some of the species.

Of course, anytime you do anything out in the ocean you're going to have to evaluate your environment impacts. Nobody is going to let any activity happen without some information about that. Once we've got all that down, we wanted to demonstrate that this was all possible.

Evaluate the production economics and

2.

2.1

transfer technology. In terms of the economics of this, we're partway through this part of the project. We understand the economics of some of the shellfish culture very well. We don't understand the economics of the finfish culture very well. I'll give you what I have when I get that far.

characteristics. Project It's an interdisciplinary project because it's a very complex project and requires skill sets that are beyond one group of people. So aside from the usual -- biologists and oceanographers -- a couple of the things that I wanted to point out are social scientists. We did a lot of attitude assessment among the commercial fishermen. How do you feel about this? If there was an industry, would you be interested in working in this industry? So we got a lot of information from a lot of different groups in terms of social science. I also don't want to ignore that mechanical trades and maritime skills were very important to this. So we utilized a lot of that skill and knowledge from the commercial

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

fishing community. It's a regional effort. It's not just the University of New Hampshire. All these institutions were involved and still are involved. Also, the industry partnerships were key. If we didn't partner with industry and get that knowledge and get that capability we wouldn't be where we are today.

Research grants are awarded competitively. Just to let you know how this is done, I write what's called an omnibus grant to Within that grant, it includes a number of NOAA. different projects. Those projects are selected through a competitive process. I write an RFP based on input that I get on what are the critical issues that need to be addressed over the next year or two-year period. We release that RFP. Anvone is eligible to apply for a grant for that. It goes through a completely independent peer process, and that's how the projects are selected.

And, also, we've been sharing information with other similar type projects, and when I say similar type projects there is an

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

offshore farm off the Island of Culebra in Puerto That's a combined effort of the University of Miami and the University of Puerto Rico and a private company called Snapper Farm. There's operation Hawaii called in Cates another International, and that came about through the efforts of the University of Hawaii and The Oceanic Institute. It's now а totally commercial operation, as well as there's a number of people in Europe thinking about this. Now, when someone asks the question what's the offshore production -- and I think the best answer came from Gunnar, is not much right now but it is really about to happen.

As far as where the project is Okay. located, this is a bathymetric map of the Gulf of Maine. Some things that some people miaht recognize, here's Cape Cod right here. Georgia's bank. That dot now is taking up the entire coast of New Hampshire, all 18 miles of it. I'll bring you in a little closer to the site. you can see, we are 10 kilometers from shore. I'll translate. I was -- slip between kilometers and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

miles. Okay, we're about six miles offshore if you go directly off the New Hampshire coast and by virtue of this pile of rocks right here called The Isles of Shoals it really puts us still in state waters because even though state waters are normally three miles this group of islands is shared by Maine and New Hampshire. So it pushes the state boundary out to six miles right at this location.

The water out here is two meters deep. The current velocities range between a little less than a knot to over two knots. So we get a lot of flow going through here, and this is the one that really makes this site representative of offshore sites. We've had significant wave heights greater than nine meters -- so 30-foot waves and storms. We actually measured a sustained 24-hour period where we had waves of 12 meters -- that's nearly 40 feet -- and I'm happy to say it didn't do anything to our installation out there. Everything was Not only does it get rough, but it gets fine. And this is sea water -- full-strength sea cold.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

water, freezing -- and you can see that anything we have at the surface is going freeze. That's one of our feed buoys. That's another one of our feed buoys. We have to go out there on a fairly regular basis when we have cold snaps and chop the ice off these buoys. So it's a very rigorous environment.

As our project manager -- our field manager -- says, if we can do this here it can be done anywhere.

So let's talk about engineering first. involved developing Our engineering approach mooring designs, automated feeders automated feeders, I'll tell you why that's so technology for important -and then If you've got a farm six miles operations. offshore, you can't be going out there all the time in a boat. So you've got to be able to operate at that shore from a nice, comfy office from your computer using technology. And then, to accomplish this, we employed computer programming, computer modeling, scale model testing and then field evaluation and verification.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

The cages that we're using at our site are really one of the only truly submersible cages available on the market. This is a called a Ocean Spar Seastation, and characteristic of it is it's a central spar that you can put air in. You could raise this to the surface. There's also air in this rim right here. Other characteristics of it are that it's got very taut netting on it so that it is quite a bit different than what are called gravity cages or surface cages.

Our initial cage installation. When we first started out, we were saying, okay, we're putting something out in the ocean, something no one has done up before. We want to make sure this is going to stay there. So we created this system of four anchors and a submerged grid. This grid sat about 60 feet below the surface and then the cage, of course, you see, has a very large footprint for just a very small cage, and this worked very well. But we said, all right, farm of the future is not going to be able to take up that kind of footprint. So we said we need to come up

2.1

with another design. Stealing a bit from what they normally do in the salmon industry now where they have cages attached to each other -- sometimes 12 cages -- we took -- oh, let me go back -- we took that idea and created a four-cage grid that you see right here. This is still 60 feet below the surface. The tops of these cages in their submerged position are 30 feet below the surface. This is actually a bathymetric map using multibeam sonar and 3-D visualization of the site.

Our engineering tools include finite element model, and this is a model that was created by some of the engineers at the University of New Hampshire. You can see here what we're doing is -- let me go back, and see if I can get that to load again -- there it is. You can see that what we're doing is we're modeling the motion and the stresses on the cages in a seven-meter sea -- so in about a 25-foot wave. From that model, we're able to know what the stress points are. We also have the facilities at the university for a tow tank. Here we are towing this, so we understand the stresses

2.

2.1

of current flow. And, in that same tank, we can creates waves then so that we can test these scale models under different wave conditions. Once we understand these types of stresses, then we can -- when we put the system out in the environment, we can attach some equipment to it and understand what these forces are.

This is a very difficult picture to see but this is one of the junction points of the mooring system and these are load cells and these load cells actually have a small computer on them.

So they actually can store on this little computer the forces on the cages. We can match that up with the environmental conditions.

I mentioned feeding being a big issue. When you have a farm offshore in the winter in New England there might be times when for a week you can't get out there to feed your fish. You're not doing to have healthy fish if you can't feed them. So we realized that feeding fish automatically was a very important thing. Well, someone who knows the salmon industry says big deal, you know.

2.

2.1

They're feeding fish all the time in the salmon industry with automated feeders. Well, they're not pumping fish to submerged cages. They're using air to blow feed into a pen. So this is a totally different technology that was needed.

This is a schematic of our original design. This is a quarter-ton design. It's a very small feed buoy. I won't go through all diagrammatic description of this, but the top part of it holds the feed. The lower part is filled with computers and controllers and this is what it looks like when it's on-site. This is powered by sun and wind, and this becomes a slurry of feed and water down through the submerged cage. this was no easy trick because the cage sits down here and it doesn't go up and down in the tide. But we have about a three-meter tide, and then we've got to deal with wave heights. So this thing sitting at the surface has got to move up and down. So this took quite a bit of engineering work up front, as well as some testing to figure out how we moor these things.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Once again, we put it through scale model testing and then once we were satisfied that we could moor this thing out here we said, okay, let's move up to the next prototype, which is a one-ton feeder, and that one is powered by diesel power because we just couldn't generate enough energy from wind and sun to feed with that. We also said, okay, we've got this thing out here and how are we going to fill it up? So we built this feed blower, and we have a cyclonic decelerator right here that gets rid of the fines and dust so that we can go out and fill this feeder by pumping feed from the boat.

Similarly, we subjected this to the finite element modeling and this is once again a 70-year sea and you can see that we're not really that happy with this design, the way that flops around like that. So we're thinking that next round is going to be a slightly different shape and more in configuration for the theaters. We also get reports every hour back from the feeders. The feeders are also our brains. That's where the

2.1

computer is. And, interestingly enough, if you look right -- you're not going to be able to see any of this, but this gives us GPS information. We want to just make sure it's there. So that helps quite a bit, but it reports on the load cell tensions in different parts of the mooring. So we can get that kind of communication from this buoy just sitting at a desk at the university.

The next design is coming out -- I think this was one of the designs, but I think we're looking more at this type of pillbox shape for our next design for our next feeder. We've got to maintain and improve some of the things that -always tinker with things that you've you know, We want to make improvements to the created. remote operation system and, in particular, it's video feedback that we're having a problem with because we don't have enough bandwidth. This diagram right here is the diagram for a 20-ton feed buoy that could feed multiple cases. It will have four silos and feed all four cages. We're working on that right now with a company called Ocean Spar

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Technologies, and this is on an SBIR grant that we're doing this with.

In terms of finfish culture, I'll just go through the species. We started out doing summer flounder in 1999 and 2000. The only reason we did that is because that's the only marine finfish that was available. We had a hatchery that was doing land based culture. They did have some fish available for us, and we said, well, can we bring them from 500 grams to a kilogram in a season? Well, summer flounder, they like warm water. Once it gets to a certain temperature, they just don't feed. So this really did not work out as well as we had hoped.

We did acquire some halibut from a Canadian company in 2001, and we grew them out and finally harvested that cage this past year. We put some haddock in the cage in 2002, and we'll be taking them out this fall. We tried a very small group of Atlantic cod in 2001, and the growth rates that we saw and the survival looked very promising. So we kept trying and then, finally, in 2003, the

2.

2.1

industry partner that we worked with -- Great Bay

Aquaculture -- was successful in producing very

large numbers. So that was stocked last year.

Right now, we've got an experiment going on at the request of a person who somehow purchased land that had a hatchery on it and still had some steelhead trout to try to understand if steelhead trout could live in a submerged cage. other words, the common wisdom is that steelhead trout, Atlantic salmon, need to come to the surface, gulp air, and go back down. Well, we're doing an experiment now to see if they actually have to do that. We'll have a nursery cage that's split in half with a net that prevents the fish from getting to the surface. And, also, this year we were approached by the tuna seining industry about penning bluefin tuna. The United States is one of the few countries that does not pen bluefin tuna and hold them for market, and the tuna seining industry came to us and talked about it. wasn't enough time this year, but we're still in discussions with them of whether we can do that

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

next year.

2.

2.1

2.2

This is just -- I'll run you through some pictures of the fish. That was summer the flounder. This is the Atlantic halibut. We got them at 30 grams. We grew them in tanks to 100 grams, and then we harvested this past June at about 4 kilograms. Haddock we stocked at 70 grams. Right now, they're at about a kilogram. This is a disappointment for us. We found that they went to early maturation, so that we have to be looking at what can we do to prevent these fish from going prematurely to spawning conditions.

We stocked our largest number of fish last fall, 35,000 cod. This is a picture of them being pumped from their nursery pen into a well boat. They were then delivered out to the offshore cage where they've been since then, and they're about 250 grams right now -- or in April. We haven't done a measurement recently because the fish are very fragile and we you don't want to kill too many. So we're waiting till the temperature came up and we knew they were feeding regularly.

| Now, the Norwegians and the Scots and a             |
|---|
| couple of others the Icelanders are growing         |
| cod, and they know they can produce cod and grow it |
| to full size. But they will all admit, as well as   |
| we admit, we don't know the first thing about       |
| farming cod. We don't know about their behavior.    |
| We don't know if we're feeding the right amount.    |
| We don't know if we feed them the right time of     |
| day, the right number of times per day. So we       |
| said, well, how are we going to figure this out?    |
| And we said, okay, how about some telemetry. So in  |
| this picture we're seeing the insertion of some     |
| acoustic tags, and these are transmitters sonic     |
| transmitters into fish. You take the fish, put      |
| these in, suture them up. We have to make sure      |
| they recover, as you see in the little video right  |
| there, and then track them while we put them out in |
| the cage. This is a diagram showing the location    |
| of the hydrophones. In other words, these are the   |
| receivers when we put these sonically tagged fish   |
| out there, and this is the cod track.               |

So this is what the cod is doing. You

| can see that it's swimming. It almost seems         |
|---|
| random. But when we don't see all the fish we       |
| don't know is he doing that because he's bumping    |
| into somebody or is there some other reason why     |
| this fish is moving like that? So we can see the    |
| track of that fish, and we do this over, right now, |
| over two 48-hour periods or 96 hours before         |
| we have to go out and download the information and  |
| so on. This only tells us the tagged fish, and we   |
| can only tag a few fish. So we're combining this    |
| with video, and this video and what I want you      |
| to look at is look up here. This is where feed is   |
| being dropped. You can see a cloud that's coming    |
| down here, and you can see the random motion of the |
| fish. You see that cloud getting bigger, and what   |
| we're doing is we're pulsing feed down and I think  |
| if you look closely you'll see a few pellets        |
| dropping down. You can see the big pile of feed,    |
| and look at those fish. They know it's there.       |
| So this tells us a number of things.                |
| Number 1, the fish can sense when the feed is       |
| coming, and they know where to go for it. Number    |

2, is that they're all going into this big ball -this big cloud -- and how do we know if that's the
right way to deliver the feed to the fish? Should
we be distributing it throughout? Because this
might be the biggest, strongest fish that are
getting up there. So, you know, there's a lot we
need to -- this is generating more questions than
answers right now. But these are the kind of
tools, I think, that are going to help us really
understand how to farm these species. Once they
stop eating, they just go back random again.

Okay, the only fish t.hat. we've harvested, you know, all the way through from the cycle is halibut and I have some more detailed information that I didn't really want to put in the slide but come and talk to me afterwards and I'll let you know how we came up with this. So we're assuming four cages, 20,000 halibut per We're stocking two cages in year one, two cages in year two. Harvest size is three kilograms. calculated the annual operating costs of about half a million dollars, and this includes everything --

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

boats, feed, everything. Annual capital costs, we amortized them, and I've got all the different capital equipment. I've established the number of years we're amortizing that over. And so the total annual cost is three-quarters of a million dollars, annual production and the total is 120,000 kilograms. So we know that our production costs per kilogram is somewhere around \$6.50 per That's what we know so far in terms of kilogram. can you make money on this. There's a lot more we need to do.

Okay, one thing that makes our project different than the other offshore projects going on is that we're including bivalve culture. the fish cage design once again. He's submerged longlines for shellfish culture. Fish plus bivalves equals integrated aquaculture. people call it polyculture. Now, what is it about polyculture? There were some concerns about Now, we're in the Gulf of Maine, which nitrogen. is a very rich system. There's a lot of nitrogen naturally in the Gulf of Maine. That's why the

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| fishery has been so productive. But if you are in   |
|---|
| an area that is nitrogen sensitive some             |
| oligotrophic waters in the tropics, let's say. All  |
| right. We look at the fish cage. We're adding       |
| feed to the fish cage. There's a certain amount of  |
| uneaten food that goes through in a range that I    |
| take it from the literature is three to 10 percent  |
| and then, of course, fish feces. So 25 10 to 25     |
| percent of that total, depending on whose paper you |
| believe that is, that nitrogen comes off in         |
| feces. There's a great deal of the nitrogen that    |
| comes off in terms of metabolism from the gills so  |
| and H-4 ammonium comes off of the fish's gills,     |
| and that goes into the water column in the form of  |
| ammonium. And then, everything that drops to the    |
| bottom you get decompensation and remineralization. |
| That also adds to the dissolved nitrogen in the     |
| water column, which can lead to increased primary   |
| production. So if you're in an area where           |
| eutrophication is a concern, you have increased     |
| primary production, you add bivalves and you        |
| harvest those and you're removing a certain amount  |

of the nitrogen from that.

2.

2.1

2.2

Now, we cultured two species -- we had thought of three -- of shellfish. One was the giant sea scallop. The other one was blue mussel. The third species we thought about was the Belon oyster, which we gave up on because it was not a native species. But why culture mussels? Now, unlike salmon, where you can argue about flavor or taste, fat content, meat content, texture, there's no debate whether rope cultured mussels are better that wild caught mussels. You can see that this is an equal number of mussels. This is the meat from those mussels. That's what you get out of wild mussels.

Mussel culture isn't anything new. It's been done for a very long time. Spain has got an enormous industry that's been going on for a long time. Closest to us in the northeast where there's a large industry is in Prince Edward Island. These are surface referenced longlines, and all these buoys are additional longlines where they're growing shellfish. You couldn't do this in

You know, it wouldn't even take a the ocean. storm. It would take a normal day, and all that gear would be everywhere. So we said but, you know, maybe there's something to this. Can we take this system and submerge it, which is what we did. Here's the surface of the water. Here's where the head line or backbone of the system is. And the geometry of this system -- I hope you can see this, if it's a little faint -- geometry is maintained and the tension in the system is by buoyancy in these corner floats right here, and the dead weight of these anchors, and these are just simple granite The important part here is this geometry -- that this is 45 degrees -- and we did this and we said we don't know if this is going to work and, lo' and behold, it did work. Could be beginner's luck. I don't know.

The system is very simple. Concrete blocks, Polysteel rope. These things you can get in the United States. This is where I'm going to stop because anything else for mussel culture you can't buy in the U.S. You're buying it out of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Canada. You're buying it out of New Zealand.

You're buying it somewhere, but not the United

States. To me, it's a problem, but it's also an

opportunity.

The other thing that we wanted to do is we wanted to make this an opportunity for the local commercial fishermen. So we said, all right, our tending boat has got to be a typical fishing boat. This is a 40-foot boat, very typical of what for gill netting, lobstering people use and dragging in the inshore reef in New England. We added three pieces of equipment. This right here, this is called an aft idler star wheel; this piece, which is a forward hydraulically driven star wheel; and this right here is simply an overhead boom. There was a winch on this boat and we just fair led the wire from that winch to this overhead boom. we had tremendous lifting capacity that went over There's a close-up of this the side of the boat. forward hydraulic star wheel. I wish I could say you could buy this. We actually built this. of the guys that works for me, his father owns a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

machine shop and he actually machined this piece of equipment.

So, mussel culture, it starts with seed collection. We collect wild seed, and some times of the year the dominant phytoplankton organ -- or the zooplankton organism is mussel larvae. They're available all the year, but when you collect the issue is where you put your collecting ropes, when you put them in and that determines what kind of density you get and what kind of fallowing you get and you can see that densities ranged from 3,500 to 25,000 seed per meter.

Nursery culture. This is the simplest part. We just leave the seed on the seed lines and wait until they grow up to about an inch in size. That takes about four to six months. And for grow out we tried several different methods. it was all suspension from a submerged longline, but we used some of the more traditional methods that they use in the surface longline systems and we finally settled on this on the bottom. It was this really -- the New Zealand method for producing mussels,

2.

2.1

| which has a rope core that has a mussel seed that  |
|--|
| is wrapped on by a cotton sleeve or held on by a   |
| cotton sleeve. And in terms of seed                |
| collection, it's very difficult to see but every   |
| one of these bumps on here is a mussel seed. We've |
| collect mussel seed in inshore rafts. This is      |
| sitting under the dock at our Coast Guard station. |
| That's what seed line looks like after about four  |
| to six months. These are all one-inch seed. We've  |
| also collected seed at the offshore site. This is  |
| a seed collection from ropes that were put in the  |
| water in June. This is a picture that was taken in |
| October. These are ready to take off and sock out  |
| onto the system. We also found through trying      |
| collections all year round that we could collect   |
| seed in the fall as well. This is in February. We  |
| call that a snowfall here, but this is a fall      |
| deployment of collector lines, and in February we  |
| had seed that we could and that spring sock. So    |
| now we've got two cohorts that we can put out in   |
| the same year                                      |

The first thing you do when you get

| run it through a declumping and grading machine so |
|--|
| that we can separate the sizes out, and then we do |
| what's called sleeving or socking. Now, this is a  |
| machine that is a New Zealand idea a Canadian      |
| copy of a New Zealand idea, which we then tore     |
| apart and adapted. And the principle behind this   |
| is you have a hopper where you put the seed in.    |
| It's a hydraulically driven conveyer belt that     |
| moves that mussel seed into a chamber that which   |
| is right here. Then you insert a rope into that    |
| chamber, and that rope goes through this tube that |
| is covered and it's covered with the this cotton   |
| material. The rope comes out the other end is      |
| you have the rope, the mussel seed surrounding it, |
| and then the cotton material and you can see we're |
| just about ready to tie this off. Here's one tied  |
| off tie this off to the backbone of our head       |
| line.  |
| Voy gon goo it is not receive hand work            |

that seed to the inch size is you strip it off. We

You can see it's not very hard work, based on what this guy is doing. Doing this, it allows us to put out a continuous section of rope.

| So, in other words, we could rope and as long as    |
|---|
| we have a coil of rope that's 200 meters you can    |
| put that out on a longline in continuous loops. So  |
| it's very fast and very efficient to put out. This  |
| is a picture of the boat, and it's always difficult |
| to get this kind of picture. I always wanted        |
| another boat to be out there with us. But, anyway,  |
| this is the forward hydraulically driven star       |
| wheel. There's the aft wheel. This is the socking   |
| machine right here. There's the hopper behind it,   |
| and here are the ropes the grow out ropes that      |
| we just tied onto the line. That cotton is          |
| biodegradable. You can see in this picture it's     |
| already starting to break up. This is about two     |
| weeks after we put it out that that cotton is       |
| disintegrating. And here it is after it's fully     |
| disintegrated. So all you're left with is mussels   |
| holding to this growing rope. This is what it       |
| looks like under water.                             |

MR. KENT: Rich, you said two weeks?

DR. LANGAN: Yeah.

DR. BROWN: They were this big.

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

| 1   | DR. LANGAN: No. Two weeks for the                   |
|-----|---|
| 2   | cotton to dissolve.                                 |
| 3   | MR. KENT: Okay.                                     |
| 4   | DR. LANGAN: This is what the mussels                |
| 5   | look like.  |
| 6   | DR. BROWN: They got pretty damn big in              |
| 7   | two weeks.  |
| 8   | DR. LANGAN: Did you want to stop me?                |
| 9   | DR. BROWN: Yeah, I want to stop you.                |
| LO  | MR. O'SHEA: Yeah, but that wasn't                   |
| L1  | you're saying that the cotton disintegrated in two  |
| L2  | weeks and then it's like six weeks later you took a |
| L3  | picture of those?                                   |
| L 4 | DR. LANGAN: Yeah.                                   |
| L5  | MR. KENT: Okay.                                     |
| L6  | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                    |
| L7  | DR. LANGAN: Okay. In terms of growth,               |
| L8  | in this graph this is months plus deployment. This  |
| L9  | is the number of months that after the whole        |
| 20  | nursery culture period of four to six months that   |
| 21  | they've been out and grow out in the open oceans,   |
| 22  | and here's the shell height that they went out. So  |

20 millimeters is a little less than an inch; 25 is about an inch. So this is the range. This is eight sea cohorts. We actually have another sea cohort that I haven't added the data to this graph. But if you look at what the minimum market size for harvesting these mussels is, it's right about there. It's right about 55 millimeters. So you can see down here that it's about 8 months. So we're getting a crop ready for harvest in about 12 or 14 months, which is better than most of the other aguaculture industries in New England.

We also developed some harvesting machinery for this. Oops, I went forward. I can't Let's see. get that to play. There we go. simply, just some fabricated aluminum with an old pot hauler that we got off one of our lobstering friends and because you have that continuous line of rope you don't even have to stop. As long as you can keep up with the containers underneath of collecting the mussels. They're coming right off. We get almost no breakage using this method as This is what they look like when they come

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

off the line. They look pretty clean, but they still have to go through a washing and dehiscing period. You've got to take those threads off.

We've been packaging these mussels in 10-pound bags, marketing them to local restaurants, to local retail distributors, and you can see the label right there. It was the original label that we used. We actually created a name for these. were getting a wholesale of \$1.25 a pound, which beats the wholesale price for other competitive products by about \$.40 a pound. This is what they look like when they're cooked. Our meat yields are the lowest just post spawning, 40 percent, all the way up to about almost 60 percent. And when Mike called me and said, yeah, the meat yield was 60 percent this time I said, no, you've got to do that again and they did it again and I made them do it a third time until they finally came back and said, yeah, you know, three times this. So that's a remarkable meat yield.

This is the trade name that we've created for these. I think everybody got a copy of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the label that we've created, and this is our blurb. My attempt at Madison Avenue of creating the location identification and the identity of the product, and we have trademarked this. And so when I talk about the next thing that I'm going to talk about we're hoping that any growers that are growing get involved in this trademark, which will give them a license for completely for free as long as they agree to certain quality control BMPs and codes of practice.

from Besides marketing in the restaurants, some οf you may recognize gentleman. We fed them to people at different events. We also brought them down to the NOAA fish Here it was -- now, picture fry this past year. the NOAA fish fry. It's June. It's Washington, It's 90-something degrees. It's about 200 percent humidity, and then turn on about fryolaters and burners and imagine how hot that is. Now, here we were cooking halibut and mussels and, in addition to serving them in our booth, there was another group from the Estuarine Research Reserves

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

that was making a paella. They called me up and 1 So I 2. said can we get some mussels for our paella? 3 brought them about 30 pounds of mussels and, there 4 they are, adding the mussels to the paella. 5 gentleman right here is This from Stratford University's Culinary Institute and he's 6 7 Spanish and he's been a chef for 18 years -- 16 8 years in Spain and two years in the United States. 9 He came over to me after he was cooking these 10 things and he said these are the best mussels I've 11 And, you know, coming from anybody ever eaten. 12 that's a compliment. But someone who has been a chef for 18 years, particularly in Spain, where 13 14 they do know something about mussels, I thought 15 that was testimony for the quality of the product. 16 So let's look at the economics of this. I don't know if I'm taking too much time. 17 18 MR. KENT: Go ahead. 19 DR. LANGAN: I started thinking about, 20 well, you know, what's a reasonable amount to 2.1 produce for our region and to have something that you have product for 12 months out of the year. 2.2 So

| I looked at a 120-longline farm I'm not going to    |
|---|
| go through all these individual assumptions here,   |
| but I annualized the cost of running this farm at   |
| almost \$400,000. Our annual production is about    |
| 6,000 kilograms per line. So I was looking at       |
| about a million and half pounds of production per   |
| year from this area. Annual production costs that   |
| I calculated were about \$.24 per pound. So you     |
| produce the raw muscle that's stripped off the      |
| line, not dehisced and cleaned, for about \$.24. So |
| the gross proceeds with about a 10 percent loss is  |
| \$712,000, looking like an annual profit with that  |
| same 10 percent product loss at \$320,000.          |
| MR. O'SHEA: Is there labor in there?                |
| DR. LANGAN: Excuse me?                              |
| MR. O'SHEA: Labor?                                  |
| DR. LANGAN: Yes. Labor is in there.                 |
| Once we had this information, we were confident in  |
| our production capabilities. We were confident in   |
| the quality of the product. We thought the          |

economics looked good. So we took the show on the

road. And this gentleman right here is Roland

| 1  | Barnaby. He's the Sea Grant Extension agent at the |
|----|--|
| 2  | University of New Hampshire. He was our liaison    |
| 3  | with the fishing community. This is a group of     |
| 4  | fishermen at one of the meetings. This gentleman   |
| 5  | right here is from Great Eastern Mussel Farms, one |
| 6  | of the larger distributors of mussels in New       |
| 7  | England, talking to them about marketing. We had a |
| 8  | series of meetings towards the                     |
| 9  | MR. O'SHEA: Excuse me. Could you back              |
| 10 | that up? Is that Bob Jones in the back row from    |
| 11 | Florida big guy, grey hair, green shirt?           |
| 12 | DR. LANGAN: Right here?                            |
| 13 | MR. O'SHEA: No, come back.                         |
| 14 | MS. BRYANT: Come forward. In the                   |
| 15 | green shirt, way in the back?                      |
| 16 | MR. O'SHEA: Next to the t-shirt.                   |
| 17 | DR. LANGAN: Oh, no. That's Bruce                   |
| 18 | Smith.   |
| 19 | MR. O'SHEA: Okay.                                  |
| 20 | DR. LANGAN: He's actually a Fish and               |
| 21 | Game marine biologist.                             |
| 22 | MR. O'SHEA: I swear it looked like                 |

Jones.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

DR. LANGAN: In addition to having the meetings with demonstrations and talking to people we actually invited them to come out and engage in operations with us -- so some hands-on type of The results of this has been that information. there are two commercial farm sites that have been Applications were submitted recently approved. about nine months ago. We just got the approvals. They are located in this location right here. It's a small start. These are only five longlines apiece but, you know, these guys just want to get their feet wet and I'm hoping that this eventually grows into something larger.

I also did the economics of looking at just operating a five-longline farm. The numbers are not quite as good because you don't have the economy of scale. You're still profitable. costs right here, and I included are your processing, packaging and shipping in one of the Total costs of about \$50,000. It looks costs. like the profit for a five-longline farm for an individual operator could be about \$25,000. That is not bad considering he's only working 26 days a year on that farm. So he could expand. At least he's getting some supplemental income beyond the 42 days that he's allowed to fish.

Okay. In terms of environmental automated have assessments, we some instrumentation. This instrumentation buoy that you see here is just loaded with instruments that looking at dissolved oxygen, temperature, are humidity, fluorescence, turbidity. This is where our wave sensor is, too. So it also gives us the environmental conditions, and we have two ADCP current meters on there so we know the current flow in three dimensions at the site.

We're also looking at the benthic infauna with box cores, doing it to family level to see if there's any changes in the benthic community, and we also do epifauna using this camera system right here. This is an example of some of the output from that camera system. You can see a crab right here, some anemones and so on.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

We see a lot of tubes -- you know, holes for large worms and so on.

So we're looking at changes. Wе conduct resampling and analysis. core The indicators that we're using for sediment, it's change in sediment organic content, changes in the benthic community -- both the infauna and epifauna -- through the still and video, and then water quality, looking at oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorous, chlorophyll and total suspended solids. And since 1998 -- when we started our baseline studies -through 2004, we've seen no measurable changes. Admittedly, this is a small operation. If you expand it out, it's very difficult to speculate on We have done some modeling, but we have this. billions of gallons of water moving through that site in fairly deep water. So we're really distributing anything that's coming out of that system.

In terms of what we're doing next, engineering. The 20-ton feeder I had already mentioned. Improve the real time video

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

transmission. We're also working on new cage and mooring designs, trying to get a cage that's less expensive and larger volume because we think the economics are going to demand that. In terms of finfish, we're going to continue the work to understand cod physiology and behavior; also, looking at different juvenile production strategies and nursery strategies. We're also going to be looking at some live marketing of three-quarter kilogram cod.

Aquaculture, who Great Bay is the hatchery we work with, they were down at the Boston Seafood Show and they brought a tank down and they had some of their small cod swimming around in the They had three Korean buyers walk by and say tank. I'll take 10,000 a week. Well, we're going to hold them to that. So we're working out some methods because cod just can't be raised to the surface from a submerged cage. They have very sensitive swim bladders. So we're working on some techniques to be able to raise live fish and sell them to this market. Also, additional species, I

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

mentioned the experiment with steelhead and, also, blue fin tuna pending. For shellfish, we're looking to expand the commercialization efforts. Developing local processing capacity is something very important to us. We're looking at doing that at sea on one of the fishermen's boats.

Product branding and marketing. This is, you know, something that I have some idea on. I have enough knowledge of this that I'm dangerous. So we've got to bring somebody in with some knowledge about this, and continue with technology We have a lot of interest from the State transfer. of Maine, from Massachusetts and Rhode Island in doing something very similar. So I hope I didn't take up too much of your time. I thank you. Ιf you need more information in addition to materials that were passed out this is our Web site (ooa.unh.edu), and I'd be happy to take questions.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I think what we're going to do is we'll take a 10-minute break, and then come back and do questions so everybody

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | can get up for a minute.                            |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. KENT: Okay. And, if the speakers                |
| 3  | are willing, it would be nice if we would form like |
| 4  | a little panel to take questions up in the front.   |
| 5  | So if the speakers wouldn't mind being in display   |
| 6  | yet one more time, I'd appreciate it.               |
| 7  | (Off record)  |
| 8  | MS. RAYMOND:so you're in my                         |
| 9  | hands.  |
| 10 | MR. MOORE: Move we adjourn, Madame                  |
| 11 | Chairman.   |
| 12 | MS. RAYMOND: It's been pointed out to               |
| 13 | me that someone who was at least partially          |
| 14 | responsible for some of our entertainment last      |
| 15 | night is here.                                      |
| 16 | MS. BRYANT: Ray Wilson.                             |
| 17 | MS. RAYMOND: Ray Wilson.                            |
| 18 | (Applause)  |
| 19 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. This we're                       |
| 20 | going to do some questions and answers. You folks   |
| 21 | don't look real comfortable up there. I actually    |
| 22 | want if I could start, but I wanted to ask Rich     |

| 1  | a question. Is he                                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | DR. LANGAN: I'm still here.                        |
| 3  | MS. RAYMOND: Rich, I wanted to know                |
| 4  | first of all, thank you. That was a great          |
| 5  | presentation. You had everybody really mesmerized  |
| 6  | with that. My question, though, was how did you    |
| 7  | site those finfish cages without some kind of      |
| 8  | consultation with the New England Council relative |
| 9  | to potential habitat impact?                       |
| 10 | DR. LANGAN: Well, we invited the                   |
| 11 | Council when I described the process that we used. |
| 12 | Before we submitted any permit applications, the   |
| 13 | Council was one of those groups that we invited to |
| 14 | the so Paul wasn't necessarily the guy the came    |
| 15 | up. Pat  |
| 16 | MS. RAYMOND: Fiorelli.                             |
| 17 | DR. LANGAN: Yeah. Pat Fiorelli was                 |
| 18 | the one that showed up. She showed up a couple of  |
| 19 | times. She said the Council doesn't have any       |
| 20 | concerns about this. So                            |
| 21 | DR. BROWN: Interesting.                            |
| 22 | DR. LANGAN:I just took her at                      |

| 1  | her word.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. RAYMOND: I don't think that was                 |
| 3  | her decision to make, but okay.                     |
| 4  | DR. LANGAN: Oops. Sorry. Sorry.                     |
| 5  | MS. RAYMOND: Well, that was sort of                 |
| 6  | the the reason why I pointed that out was           |
| 7  | because I you know, when Linda was talking          |
| 8  | earlier about the legislation and, you know, trying |
| 9  | to exempt from the Magnuson-Stevens process. I'm    |
| 10 | not personally sure that that's a great idea,       |
| 11 | because I think that the Council has a role. If     |
| 12 | anybody else had done that if the Army Corps of     |
| 13 | Engineers had decided they wanted to do what you    |
| 14 | did they would have of had to gone to the Council,  |
| 15 | and Council would comment. Not that it would have   |
| 16 | changed anything, I don't think, but so, you        |
| 17 | know  |
| 18 | DR. LANGAN: Maggie, do you think that               |
| 19 | the fact that it was in state waters made any       |
| 20 | difference to                                       |
| 21 | MS. RAYMOND: It shouldn't.                          |
| 22 | DR. LANGAN: It shouldn't, okay.                     |

| 1  | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. So we're going to                |
|----|---|
| 2  | have questions for anybody on the panel, and Don.   |
| 3  | MR. KENT: Rich, I was curious about                 |
| 4  | your slide when you talked about when you           |
| 5  | introduced the concept of polyculture and suggested |
| 6  | that metabolic wastes or waste materials from the   |
| 7  | fish process could recycle into the nitrogen cycle, |
| 8  | create localized phytoplankton development which    |
| 9  | then could be utilized by a shellfish culture; and, |
| 10 | yet, you didn't have any measurable metabolites     |
| 11 | there. And, also, with a one-knot current, is the   |
| 12 | generation time of algae sufficient to really       |
| 13 | suggest that you could                              |
| 14 | DR. LANGAN: Well                                    |
| 15 | MR. KENT:localize that                              |
| 16 | phenomenon?   |
| 17 | DR. LANGAN:I don't think you                        |
| 18 | could. I mean, I true polyculture, when you're      |
| 19 | actually using that molecule, is really a closed    |
| 20 | system type thing. I look at it more on a mass      |
| 21 | balance type thing. We're adding this much          |
| 22 | nitrogen, this is what we're extracting, and I      |

actually do have a paper where I calculate it based on certain size fish farm at a certain feeding rate, the amount of bivalve harvest that you need You know, to balance that. as I said, in a location like the Gulf of Maine I don't think that that's something you need to worry about because it's already an extremely rich nitrogen situation. But if you're in a sensitive area, like some of the tropical waters, you may need to think about something like this. If you're closer to the surface, of course you're much better off going with some kind of a algalculture because that goes directly into the growth of the algae, and there's some significant opportunities for producing things like Porphya or Nori that could be an extremely valuable crop and take up that nitrogen coming from the waste and feed.

MR. KENT: Well, just back to the point then of actually the concern that some people have voiced about eutrophication and issues like that at the site. Was there anything in your studies that suggested that would be an issue in that

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

environment -- where you're in over a hundred feet of water and you've got a one to two-knot current? DR. LANGAN: No. Nothing that would indicate that. can't even Wе measure the difference in ammonium inside the cage where the fish are -- and it's generally three hours after the fish feed that they really excrete a lot of ammonia from the gills -- can't even measure the difference from upstream in the cage to the outside rims.

MR. KENT: Okay.

MS. RAYMOND: Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Now, I listened to the point that you brought up, Maggie, regarding the siting of the work. I know in New York waters we still have a significant number of sites that have been designated fish trap areas that were fixed structures. Up until about the mid 70s, there were fixed structures along the beach that consisted of poles, leaders -- net leaders -- fish pens immediately adjacent to many of the inlets. And while those commercial fishing operations are no

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | longer in existence those sites are still           |
|----|---|
| 2  | designated as fish pen sites and fish traps, and I  |
| 3  | can't help but wonder if those same sites couldn't  |
| 4  | be used to site aquaculture projects.               |
| 5  | MS. RAYMOND: Dick.                                  |
| 6  | MR. GUTTING: Two questions. Thank you               |
| 7  | all. I mean, those presentations were fantastic     |
| 8  | and I've attended a lot of conferences and I've     |
| 9  | never seen the array. It's just awesome. I'm so     |
| 10 | glad I'm here and so glad I had a chance to hear    |
| 11 | you all. My questions, though, will go to Rich      |
| 12 | just two. First, it looks like you've been at it    |
| 13 | for about five years and you've been looking at     |
| 14 | both the finfish and the molluscan shellfish. Just  |
| 15 | for the activities that you've been discussing, how |
| 16 | much total private and public investment is         |
| 17 | represented in that last five years?                |
| 18 | DR. LANGAN: Some of it is in-kind from              |
| 19 | the industry side. So it's a little difficult to    |
| 20 | estimate, but I'll say about \$11 million.          |
| 21 | MR. GUTTING: \$11 million. And my                   |
| 22 | second question sort of has two parts. What kind    |

of a governance structure is there for making the decisions about what you're going to do next, what species you're going to put in the water, what technologies you're going to use, what kind of environmental parameters you're going to be In other words, how in this project or sampling? series of projects are decisions getting made and, particular, to what extent do you stakeholders or outside people involved? Is this like a scientific model, or are you bringing in other people into your decision making process? Can you just describe that? And related to that is does this project of yours have an end? In other words, are you headed somewhere and then it's going to stop, or is this in your mind something that will just keep going and going and going?

DR. LANGAN: You're talking to someone involved in research whose livelihood depends on it. So it's never going to end. Actually, we have a set -- you know, I gave our mission goals but we have a set of specific objectives in each of the categories and out of, let's say, 20 objectives I

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think we've probably met 15 of those. So some of it -- well, I'll take the mussel culture component. us being engaged in we're So, right now, we're going to be experimenting. engaged in technology transfer, commercialization, and as soon as we can find someone who wants to work with the fishermen and fishing cooperatives -or whether they want to do it themselves -- on the whole marketing and management of production, we're So we're not mussel culture anymore. done. In fact, our two longline farms we signed that over to -- we can transfer that to another operator and they can add to it and make a big farm out of it.

Well, on the finfish side of things we'd like to be able to look at phased in commercialization. Think of it as -- I don't know, are you familiar with the Natural Energy Research Lab on the big island? What they do is they have a permanent site where they have water coming in and discharge permits and all the electricity that you need. You go in there and you pay a very low rent and it's for start-ups and it's mostly biotech and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| aquaculture start-ups. So you go in there and       |
|---|
| you've got all the facilities. You don't have to    |
| go through the 100,000 or \$200,000 it costs you to |
| get a permit to do this type of thing and you work  |
| on your idea, whether its producing sea horses or,  |
| you know, some pharmaceutical. And then once you    |
| demonstrated a proof of concept, then you can move  |
| into another module where it costs you a little     |
| more, and you're a commercial operation. Now, I'm   |
| looking at our site similar to that same model,     |
| where we have a very skilled staff right now        |
| operations staff. These guys know how to run a      |
| farm. And you've got people, even if they're in     |
| the aquaculture industry or if they're in the       |
| fishing industry and they've never been involved in |
| finfish farming before they've got a crew that can  |
| help them. So if they want to come out and say      |
| we'd like to rent this space for a dollar, put this |
| cage in, and get these fish and put it in there,    |
| they've got people that can train them and help     |
| them and we've got the infrastructure out there.    |
| We could feed the fish. We've got the               |

infrastructure onshore for moving feed and that sort of thing. So I'm looking at us as an incubator for business with phased commercialization where people come in and they say this looks like it could work, I'm going to get a farm site out there. So that's where I see it, but I still see it very long-term.

MR. KENT: Maggie.....

MR. GUTTING: Okay. And the governance? I mean, are you the evil genius that makes all the decisions? How do you figure on the.....

DR. LANGAN: No, no. I don't -- we would be in big trouble if I made the decisions. There is a group of us -- what we call our Executive Committee. It's a representative from all the different components of the project, and we're the ones that -- and that means so the environmental component, engineering, finfish, shellfish component, operations component, outreach component. They're out there supposedly talking to their constituents and their constituents might be

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the group of commercial fishermen who want to start mussel farming or they might be this industry group who wants to work with us to develop this new feed buoy. So that's where the ideas come in. But the ideas for what we do next is coming from a much larger global perspective -- where offshore aquaculture is going.

attend a lot of conferences in There's one coming up called foreign countries. Farming the Deep Blue in Ireland, and this is an interesting one because it's a different format. It's not just a bunch of talking heads, and they've invited us to qo over there and give I believe, Linda, you're going to presentations. be talking over there. John is going to be over there. So, you know, this is a global thing that's happening, and Gunnar was absolutely right when he said it was this close to really happening on a large scale commercially. So we get a lot of input from our local and regional user groups; but, also, by looking around at what's going on around the globe.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 MS. RAYMOND: Bonnie.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

DR. BROWN: Does Don want to, like, direct or guide.... MR. KENT: Go ahead. Go ahead, Bonnie.

DR. BROWN: Okay. So my question is to anybody that's owning, operating or any commercial or recreational fishers, all right? It's fairly well-known that anytime you deploy a structure in open water that fish tend to congregate there. As far as I know, it's not been decided whether those are fish that came from somewhere else or whether you've increased the carrying capacity of that open water area so that more fish can reside there. So my question for both sides of this is are ya'll aware of any interactions or effects — anything that's been detected — outside but in the vicinity of the cages that has to do with the aggregation of fish, the conflict of fishing and growing on that?

DR. LANGAN: You want me to take that one? I don't want to do all the talking up here, but yes, yes and yes. All three sites that I'm aware of -- Cates, the snapper farm site off the

| Τ  | Island of Culebra and our site are fish           |
|----|---|
| 2  | attractive devices. And the way it works at our   |
| 3  | site the one I'm more familiar with is we get     |
| 4  | small pollock that like to hide around the cage.  |
| 5  | You know, they like you know fish. They don't     |
| 6  | want to be out in the open. And what that does is |
| 7  | then attracts these lunker striped bass in        |
| 8  | season, of course from May through October. So    |
| 9  | that's really the kind of aggregation that we see |
| 10 | around our cage.                                  |
| 11 | I know the snapper farm gets a lot of             |
| 12 | juvenile fish around their cage. But the other    |
| 13 | thing that's really interesting about the snapper |
| 14 | farm, they get all these larval lobsters spiny    |
| 15 | lobsters settling in the cage and growing out to  |
| 16 | full size in the cage, eating the things that are |
| 17 | growing on the cage.                              |
| 18 | DR. BROWN: So can I throw my line and             |
| 19 | catch them, or am I excluded from that region?    |
| 20 | DR. LANGAN: Well, they're inside the              |
| 21 | cage.   |
| 22 | DR. BROWN: Well, no, but I mean                   |

| 1  | outside. The stripers.                              |
|----|---|
| 2  | DR. LANGAN: Oh, the stripers?                       |
| 3  | DR. BROWN: Yeah.                                    |
| 4  | DR. LANGAN: Oh, absolutely.                         |
| 5  | DR. BROWN: So I could come harvest                  |
| 6  | those stripers, and you guys wouldn't care?         |
| 7  | DR. LANGAN: No, of course not.                      |
| 8  | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                    |
| 9  | MS. BRYANT: Bonnie will be up there.                |
| 10 | DR. LANGAN: And Cates gets a lot of                 |
| 11 | fish of all kinds around its cages.                 |
| 12 | MS. RAYMOND: And, Mark, any others, in              |
| 13 | particular?   |
| 14 | MR. VINSEL: Well, I would just like to              |
| 15 | point out if you're fishing near that cage and it's |
| 16 | the net pens I'm familiar with I hope you don't     |
| 17 | hook the net.                                       |
| 18 | DR. BROWN: I know.                                  |
| 19 | DR. LANGAN: No, you don't want to do                |
| 20 | that  |
| 21 | DR. BROWN: Yeah.                                    |
| 22 | DR. LANGAN:because you'll lose                      |

| 1  | your lure.  |
|----|---|
| 2  | DR. BROWN: Right.                                   |
| 3  | MR. VINSEL: Or, with some of the                    |
| 4  | tackle we use you'll put a hole in the net.         |
| 5  | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                    |
| 6  | MR. VINSEL: That doesn't matter.                    |
| 7  | DR. LANGAN: It's real tight.                        |
| 8  | MR. O'SHEA: Well, if you're fishing                 |
| 9  | for stripers that's a fully recovered species, by   |
| 10 | the way   |
| 11 | DR. BROWN: That's right.                            |
| 12 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Ken. Ken, did you                |
| 13 | have a question?                                    |
| 14 | MR. ROBERTS: Oh, me?                                |
| 15 | MS. RAYMOND: Yeah.                                  |
| 16 | MR. ROBERTS: Yeah, okay. Thank you.                 |
| 17 | The question of transgenics of GMO fish. I don't    |
| 18 | know who I'm directing this at, but I guess I'll    |
| 19 | pick on you, Linda, since you have knowledge of the |
| 20 | draft plan which Dr. Hogarth said I know legal      |
| 21 | counsel said you shouldn't put out yet for the      |
| 22 | general public. But the question I've got is, in    |

| 1  | agriculture, I know where to go when I have a      |
|----|--|
| 2  | transgenic animal or a plant to get permission. I  |
| 3  | go to APAS. And if I want to sell it, I'll go to   |
| 4  | FDA and they're already confronting that obviously |
| 5  | in some sense. But in terms of actually what       |
| 6  | does the draft bill say now about how an applicant |
| 7  | with a trangenic                                   |
| 8  | MS. CHAVES: The                                    |
| 9  | MR. ROBERTS: Who is going to sign off              |
| 10 | on that? I know APAS in agriculture. But the       |
| 11 | question is, is a structure set up in NOAA yet to  |
| 12 | handle exactly how they're going to                |
| 13 | MS. CHAVES: The legislation                        |
| 14 | MR. ROBERTS:approve or                             |
| 15 | disapprove a transgenic?                           |
| 16 | MS. CHAVES: The legislation does not               |
| 17 | address it, but regulations would.                 |
| 18 | MR. ROBERTS: Regulations would.                    |
| 19 | MS. CHAVES: That would be in the                   |
| 20 | regulations.                                       |
| 21 | MR. GUTTING: It also has to be                     |
| 22 | approved by the Food and Drug Administration.      |

| 1  | MR. ROBERTS: Well, yeah, to sell it,               |
|----|--|
| 2  | correct.   |
| 3  | MS. CHAVES: But whether or not they                |
| 4  | can be used will be addressed in the regulations.  |
| 5  | The legislation is going to be silent on that, so  |
| 6  | far.   |
| 7  | MR. ROBERTS: Is that good?                         |
| 8  | MS. CHAVES: One may want to change                 |
| 9  | one's policy on that on a case by case basis at    |
| 10 | some point in time.                                |
| 11 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Just to that                 |
| 12 | point, Ken, I think certain things we're concerned |
| 13 | about if you get it in legislation it takes        |
| 14 | forever to you know, even longer than              |
| 15 | regulations. So I think the legislation sort of    |
| 16 | but also allows other things to be done by         |
| 17 | regulations so that, you know, you could do more,  |
| 18 | if you need to, case by base. If you put           |
| 19 | everything in legislation, it becomes a very       |
| 20 | difficult and so you walk that line between        |
| 21 | MR. ROBERTS: I have an appreciation                |
| 22 | for that. What I'm trying to tip everybody off     |

| 1  | to   |
|----|--|
| 2  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah, yeah.                  |
| 3  | MR. ROBERTS:is that trangenics                     |
| 4  | GMO on fish seem to be so dearly held to people    |
| 5  | that they may want it in legislation. At some      |
| 6  | time   |
| 7  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Right.                       |
| 8  | MR. ROBERTS:you may have to                        |
| 9  | confront that                                      |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Right.                       |
| 11 | MR. ROBERTS:is my point.                           |
| 12 | MS. CHAVES: At some point in time, it              |
| 13 | may come up it may come up in the process before   |
| 14 | anything is actually passed.                       |
| 15 | MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.                                 |
| 16 | MR. RAND: I'd just like to comment on              |
| 17 | that, too. Actually, before working on fish I      |
| 18 | worked on our GMO campaign for agriculture at one  |
| 19 | agency and EPA also has authority over crops and   |
| 20 | pesticides, and I think you are onto something.    |
| 21 | You have three different agencies. There's already |
|    |  |

been a huge push back by the consumers.

22

The

| 1  | technology to some level has already stalled       |
|----|--|
| 2  | because of environmental concerns, one, and a      |
| 3  | number of other concerns health concerns and,      |
| 4  | you know, the fact that we've got three different  |
| 5  | agencies governing the technologies there's been a |
| 6  | problem there, also.                               |
| 7  | MS. RAYMOND: Larry.                                |
| 8  | MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. One comment,               |
| 9  | and then a question of Matt. You can't bring non-  |
| 10 | indigenous species into Louisiana. If you wanted   |
| 11 | to raise vanami in a pond, you couldn't do that.   |
| 12 | The state prevents that in the State of Louisiana. |
| 13 | Question of Matt. If native species are used or    |
| 14 | unadulterated fish are used does that change your  |
| 15 | position or your group's position                  |
| 16 | MR. RAND: Well, there isn't                        |
| 17 | MR. SIMPSON: That's Mark. Excuse me,               |
| 18 | I'm sorry, Matt. Mark.                             |
| 19 | MR. RAND: Oh.                                      |
| 20 | MR. SIMPSON: Mark, would that change               |
| 21 | your position if only native species or            |
| 22 | unadulterated species were used?                   |

MR. VINSEL: That's something that I would have to wait and see addressed and discussed by the UFA Board.

MR. SIMPSON: I was just curious. Don, what about you? Matt, what about you? Would that change your ideas or not?

Oh, okay. Again, our MR. BREMNER: position is based on economics with the wild fisheries. And, again, if you look at my comments regarding the state on the lack of infrastructure support and -- only example that I could give that will probably stick in your mind was in -- I think it was in 1992 when the Army went into Mogadishu --I think that's how you pronounce it -- and they were going in there to alleviate the starvation and all the problems that was going on there. They did that very quickly with the resources and everything that they had on hand. But they found out real shortly that a long-term solution to correcting these problems that they were having in Somalia just wasn't there. The reason that it wasn't there was because the infrastructure in the people's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | villages was destroyd. There was no civilized      |
|----|--|
| 2  | economic system in place. So that's what is        |
| 3  | happening in Alaska. The economic system that      |
| 4  | should be in place the infrastructure that         |
| 5  | should be in place to support this wild commercial |
| 6  | fish economy that we're trying to make a living    |
| 7  | from is not there. So we don't see that we should  |
| 8  | move into an aquaculture if we still haven't come  |
| 9  | together as a state on fixing this wild resource   |
| 10 | problem.   |
| 11 | MR. SIMPSON: What about you, Matt?                 |
| 12 | MR. RAND: I think it's a step in the               |
| 13 | right direction what they're doing, F-1 generation |
| 14 | of native species. You know, there are still other |
| 15 | concerns that we would have                        |
| 16 | MR. SIMPSON: Sure.                                 |
| 17 | MR. RAND:the ones that I've                        |
| 18 | mentioned. But I think that is a step in the right |
| 19 | direction.   |
| 20 | DR. LANGAN: I just want to qualify                 |
| 21 | that. We're working with F-1s now, but that would  |
| 22 | not be the long-range plan. There would definitely |
|    |  |

be selective brood stock programs, and I don't want to give anybody the impression that we're going to depend on wild brook stock. I mean, there's no farming that goes on without selective breeding. It doesn't make sense.

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

MS. RAYMOND: Okay, Don.

Thank you. Relative to the MR. KENT: question of GMOs and selective breeding, I'm always a little vaque whether a selective breeding process represents GMO or not and -- or if that's -- you're talking about an animal that's transgenic opposed to being modified. But in some of the discussions, it's things -- you know, the ready belief that escapement of is GMOs would detrimental to the fitness of the wild population and, back to Bonnie's comment earlier, if fitness is a real succinct evolutionary term that there to be some differentiation there between popular belief and what a rigorous evaluation of relative fitness or impact of the wild population would be.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | And then, for just full discussion to               |
|----|---|
| 2  | the whole Committee, I am kind of curious as to     |
| 3  | what folks on the committee would think Council     |
| 4  | representation could do to move things forward and  |
| 5  | represent regional concerns. Is that a mechanism    |
| 6  | that NOAA could use to help it develop policies for |
| 7  | the offshore in different regions? And I'd just     |
| 8  | throw that open to anybody on the Committee.        |
| 9  | DR. BROWN: No takers.                               |
| 10 | MS. RAYMOND: Anybody want to respond                |
| 11 | to that?  |
| 12 | MR. SIMPSON: I can tell you what in                 |
| 13 | the Gulf they've done.                              |
| 14 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Pete.                            |
| 15 | MR. LEIPZIG: Well, I think the Council              |
| 16 | would have a role in this whole arena in terms of   |
| 17 | the space use issues. They've got constituents      |
| 18 | that are out there and utilizing certain areas. So  |
| 19 | if new permits for particular sites are going to be |
| 20 | issued it's going to begin to impact other people   |
| 21 | in the use that they have been accustomed to using  |

that same area for. So I think the Council gets

22

| involved there. If there is going to be programs    |
|---|
| that are going to be trying to supplement native    |
| stocks I think the Council has a role there just    |
| from its Scientific Committees of what the impacts  |
| would be in terms of estimating the productivity of |
| existing stocks when you are augmenting them with   |
| juveniles that may not be fully accounted for in    |
| the same manner that scientists are normally        |
| accounting for the productivity of the native       |
| stocks. So I think that there's a number of issues  |
| where the Councils have a legitimate role in terms  |
| of just fisheries management of what is going on    |
| now and what the scientific bodies are doing.       |

MR. KENT: Well, as our Committee meets tomorrow morning to summarize the comments and come back to the full Committee I just want to make sure that we include in then there, then, the idea that, you know, what would the role of the Councils be and how would that get delineated in legislation.

MR. LEIPZIG: Yeah, and to some degree it's hard to anticipate what the Councils' reaction is going to be not knowing what the specifics of a

б

| particular program are and, you know, that I think  |
|---|
| that you need to lay those things on the table      |
| before the Council so that they can have the        |
| opportunity.  |
| MR. KENT: Uh-huh.                                   |
| MR. LEIPZIG: I mean, I can speculate;               |
| but, you know, I'm certainly speculation is not     |
| going to cover everything.                          |
| MR. KENT: I'm not suggesting it has to              |
| be done high priority. I'm just saying that I       |
| think that people alluded earlier that you wouldn't |
| want to dismiss any involvement of the Council, and |
| I just think that it's important for us to bring    |
| that back as a recommendation.                      |
| MR. RAND: Just to answer your question              |
| of transgenics, first it's a new gene introduced    |
| into a species that can't happen through a natural  |
| occurrence through breeding. So, for instance, a    |
| human growth hormone into a fish.                   |
| MR. KENT: Okay.                                     |
| MR. RAND: You're not going to get that              |
| gene. Secondly, I think you're concern you          |
|   |

right question about raised the concern  $\circ f$ transgenics, mating and changing the fitness level with a native species. So a transgenic Atlantic salmon with a wild salmon probably, actually, less of a chance for mating to occur in the first place, at least for the proposed Aqua Bounty salmon. the concern here is that the potential from the transgene actually could be introduced into the wild population. We really don't know, you know, what the possibility is of that. In agriculture, the transgene from Вt corn bacillus thuringiensis corn -- actually has been introduced into wild corn -- or not wild corn, but the domestic corn and actually into the area of origin So that's the concerns, that in Mexico. transgene may actually pass over into the population.

MR. KENT: Yeah, and there's significant interest on the part of wildlife geneticists relative to enhancement programs where largemouth bass from Florida are brought up to Illinois and, hey, it's a faster growing bass.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1          | It's sticking in there. And it's only recently      |
|------------|---|
| 2          | that they have done fairly rigorous fitness studies |
| 3          | where they actually grow the crossed animals in     |
| 4          | those locations and find that they're actually      |
| 5          | ruining the stock. Mother Nature has already        |
| 6          | selected  |
| 7          | MR. RAND: Right.                                    |
| 8          | MR. KENT:the best largemouth                        |
| 9          | bass for Illinois.                                  |
| LO         | MR. RAND: Right.                                    |
| L1         | MR. KENT: So these aren't invalid                   |
| L2         | concerns. It's just you know, there's a lot of      |
| L3         | semantics that get thrown around, and I just think  |
| L <b>4</b> | we need to be clear on it.                          |
| L5         | MR. BREMNER: I want to throw something              |
| L6         | out there. I guess it's just food for thought.      |
| L 7        | But, again, I think a lot of what you're talking    |
| L8         | about and transgenics and all of that of whole      |
| L9         | field and it's really interesting and amazing and   |
| 20         | it's just amazing. But if you look at our own       |
| 21         | human history of selective breeding and, you know   |

-- and looking for that superhuman and test tube

22

| Τ  | bables and we could do all of that for<br>         |
|----|--|
| 2  | ourselves, as humans, but now it's come to a food  |
| 3  | source or a species and it becomes way too         |
| 4  | scientific and complicated when and I guess what   |
| 5  | I'm talking about is morals, the moral approach to |
| 6  | the discussion of that is probably more important  |
| 7  | than the thing itself because we do one thing to   |
| 8  | ourselves, as humans, and then we come over here   |
| 9  | and it's a little bit different. So I think, you   |
| 10 | know, education is so important about this.        |
| 11 | What   |
| 12 | MR. KENT: Uh-huh.                                  |
| 13 | MR. BREMNER:is the truth? What                     |
| 14 | is real?   |
| 15 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. I'm going to                    |
| 16 | just for a second, I'm going to see if there's     |
| 17 | anybody in the audience who has any questions, and |
| 18 | then I'll go back to the people that I have on the |
| 19 | list.  |
| 20 | MR. RAYBURN: There's one over here,                |
| 21 | Maggie.  |
| 22 | MS. RAYMOND: Yes.                                  |

MR. TKACZ: Yeah. Bob Tkacz, from the Alaska Fisherman's Journal. I would be interested in knowing from Rich what your history is with vessel interactions with your nets and other gear out in the water there.

Well, actually, we have a DR. LANGAN: history, and it's with tugs and barges. don't know if you've seen barges under tow, but there's a safety cable that goes to the barge and then there's a safety cable that loops down and they caught our additional feed buoy one time and luckily we had GPS so we could find it. only reason we knew is we went back and checked logs at the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard keeps track of who goes in and out of the harbor. But, you know, it's marked on the chart. It's lit with perimeter buoys. The guy was taking a shortcut and, you know, he ran into our feed buoy with his cable. So that's our history.

In terms of interactions with fishing vessels, no, because, you know, the site is where it is because we sat down with the fisherman and we

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| said, okay, we've got this big square. Where in     |
|---|
| this big square do we put the small square? And     |
| they said, right here, and then another guys says,  |
| no, over there and then finally after, you know, we |
| shuffled it a bit we landed where everybody could   |
| agree that now, okay, you guys, we'll let you in    |
| there. So they all know it's there. In fact, they   |
| tell us when they see, you know, tugs coming        |
| through and say, hey, this guy almost ran over your |
| stuff. He took he made a quick turn. Well, one      |
| guy didn't make the quick turn, and he caught our   |
| feed buoy.  |
| MR. TKACZ: How about sport vessels                  |

MR. TKACZ: How about sport vessels coming in to take advantage of your attractive nature?

DR. LANGAN: Sports vessels come in there, and people fish. Lobstermen fish. They love to fish right along the mussel lines and, you know, they -- because we set our mussel lines in the same pattern that the lobster guys do because, you know, just want to make sure that we don't put this way and then they all want to set this way.

So we set in, you know, parallel to the way they set and they set right alongside us and sometimes they claim well, we do really well under the mussel lines. And I said if that means I'm having dropoff then I've got a problem, but I don't.

MR. TKACZ: Thank you.

MR. KENT: Maggie.

MS. RAYMOND: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had a question about the cost of the technology. It's obviously very, very technically sophisticated material, and I wonder in the whole process of ideating about culturing these species if anybody has done any cost comparison about going the opposite way. In other words, instead of trying to take structures out to the ocean where the animals are, would it be not easier to maybe bring the animals of enclosed structure onshore? some sort There's got to be some kind of cost balancing just wondered if there, and Ι you've investigated that or if you know if there's been any investigation of that sort of thing?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

DR. LANGAN: There's a lot of analysis of land based culture, and there's some pretty sophisticated recirculating technologies, and there is some successful industries producing fish on In fact, most of the cultured halibut that land. are available today are produced on land. Tilapia. Anywhere that you're at, you know, the tropics, that's all being done in recirculating systems. The one disadvantage to recirculating systems is disease issues, and water quality issues are just so critical that you could very easily lose an entire crop. Before I turn it over to Linda, I just wanted to mention one thing that Randy Case, who has a way with words -- he says that farming fish onshore is like growing corn on a barge out in the ocean. So....

MS. CHAVES: I was just going to mention that I know that Mote Marine Lab is doing some working on the economics of raising sturgeon, for instance, in buildings inside -- and I think some other species that way -- and there is some people growing shrimp in the middle of the desert

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

and apparently being successful. So there are some possibilities, but I think it's going to have to be a business decision.

MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Larry, you had a -- I had you on the list. I thought you were going to respond to Don's question about what the Councils can do. You had your hand -- was that....

MR. SIMPSON: That's covered enough.

MS. RAYMOND: Okay. All right. Ralph.

MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I wanted to respond to Don and then maybe it was what Larry was saying, too. You know, if I heard your question right, Don, about what role the Council should have in this offshore aquaculture, I mean it seems to me that that's one of the major questions that even NOAA has to respond to as they go forward in this process. Are they going to manage the aquaculture operation offshore as a private activity, or are they going to try to keep it within a public activity? And, you know, down in our way the Councils respond to Corps of Engineers permits and,

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

you know, we have, obviously, offshore oil and gas operations down there. When they put those facilities down, they're removing another user group from that area and I guess they can even impose -- can't they, Larry -- a security zone around those rigs, you know. So.....

MR. SIMPSON: They do in New Orleans.

MR. RAYBURN: .....you are taking that on, and the Council has the opportunity -- as the industry does, or anyone else -- to respond to that. And it seems to me that if in the process of NOAA trying to take over this -- or, you know, positioning itself within the government to take it on, which seems me to be legitimate, but they're going to have to really consider are they going to manage it like an oil and gas operation relative to it's a private investment? You know, those fish that go in the water are private property. They're not public property anymore. So what role the Council has in that seems to me to be only a matter of within the enforcement context that as the fish transported into shore thev are somehow are

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| 1  | notified. There's a notification process so that    |
|----|---|
| 2  | transport can be in no way confused with a harvest  |
| 3  | from the EEZ. And so and, you know, we that         |
| 4  | would but, beyond that, you know I mean,            |
| 5  | besides the environmental ramifications that the    |
| 6  | Council would respond to any type of Corps permit   |
| 7  | or other permit, I don't see that they would have a |
| 8  | role.   |
| 9  | MR. KENT: Well, I think if one of the               |
| 10 | things that people were looking at was for areas of |
| 11 | opportunity to be identified and the Councils have  |
| 12 | responsibility for a central fish habitat that      |
| 13 | crossover right there would imply that the Council  |
| 14 | should have some role in helping to identify areas  |
| 15 | that were suitable for leasing.                     |
| 16 | MR. RAYBURN: Exactly. But that's a                  |
| 17 | current authority that they have. It's not an       |
| 18 | additional it's not anything additional that        |
| 19 | they would get in this offshore aquaculture. It     |
|    |   |

MS. RAYMOND: Bonnie.

permit, I would think.

would just be in the normal process of review of a

20

| DR. BROWN: Yeah. Okay. So kind of                   |
|---|
| away from that, Linda said a couple of times that's |
| a decision to be made on economics, and so I think  |
| my question is to Gunnar and Don and maybe Mark,    |
| maybe. And I know there are little tidbits about    |
| this that have already been put out, but is there   |
| what are your observations, good or bad, on how     |
| open ocean aquaculture could repair depressed local |
| economies? And, for example, are there any          |
| specific aspects you mentioned shipping. You        |
| know, yeah, sure, produce it and help us get it out |
| of here. So what are some of the things that we     |
| should look at more in-depth in doing an economic   |
| analysis because this is the document they have     |
| to prepare next that are specific and, you know,    |
| let's take Alaska as an example. If it's really     |
| economics that's driving a lot of this, what are    |
| those things that could possibly be fixed by this   |
| or could possibly be made worse by this?            |
| DR. KNAPP: Well, let me start with the              |
| made worse  |

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

DR. BROWN: Yeah.

DR. KNAPP: ....because I think a lot 1 2 of people are happy to help, you know, sort of add 3 to that list. 4 DR. BROWN: Yeah, okay. 5 And so one concern, other DR. KNAPP: is the whole sort of 6 than -- you know, one 7 environmental impacts from it and another is things 8 like -- you know, from the perspective of the barge 9 owner, jeez, we always used to take that shortcut 10 and now we got to, you know, drive out of the way 11 of all your cages and there's more and more of them all the time and so on. 12 13 DR. BROWN: Uh-huh. 14 And another is the market DR. KNAPP: 15 impacts of all this fish, and then another may be 16 sort of the reputation of, well, we used to think 17 of this as a pristine place where, you know, 18 independent fishermen harvested from pristine seas 19 and, now, it's just a big, stinky fish farm all 20 along that coast, you know. So all those things

and probably others could be added to a list of

ways that these are adverse economic impacts.

2.1

| But, in terms of positive impacts, when             |
|---|
| these things create you know, there's work.         |
| There's onshore work in supporting you know,        |
| just to support these operations and, you know, I   |
| don't know how many people you have in your lab     |
| there running the thing onshore and driving out the |
| boat once a week and then, also, the more technical |
| people that are designing the things and siting     |
| them and then all the marketing and processing and  |
| so on. It's an economic activity and almost all of  |
| it will happen on the shore. And so that's an       |
| opportunity that, one, people can get involved in.  |
| They can settle in the community. It's a year-      |
| round thing. There's work going on continuously.    |
| It can pay taxes you know, local I mean,            |
| there's some interesting issues there, but          |
| certainly the onshore facilities do pay taxes. And  |
| then so, one, it's just a new activity. Well,       |
| then are there potential synergies with existing    |
| activities? Well, there may be, you know, existing  |
| fish processors who say, sure, I'd like to do the   |
| processing of this fish or marketing organizations  |

| or this is an activity for a guy who runs a fishing |
|---|
| boat to hire himself out sort of doing tendering    |
| services or boat hauling stuff, you know. So you    |
| can think of all these things. And then there's     |
| sort of you know, hatchery operations can come      |
| out of this. So it's all pretty speculative         |
| because we don't have a lot of offshore aquaculture |
| to observe. I mean, if we want to know, say, the    |
| way salmon farming is currently practiced what      |
| that does in the way of economic impacts we can     |
| go look at a bunch of salmon farming operations and |
| make some judgments about how many people and what  |
| skills and  |
| DR. BROWN: Okay. I guess I'm thinking               |
| if we pretended that it's something like Rich's     |
| finfish operation how then do we go straight to the |
| economics of it and the culture of it               |
| DR. KNAPP: Well, I mean, I tell you                 |
| one thing you could do                              |
| DR. BROWN:and what's wrong with                     |
| it or what's right with it?                         |
| DP KNADD: One thing you gould do is                 |

-- we sort of -- I think somewhere somebody mentioned it, this thing doesn't sort of spring full bloom from nothing to this fully.....

DR. BROWN: Uh-huh.

DR. KNAPP: .....fully -- a thing that you set loose with 10,000 operations.

DR. BROWN: Right.

DR. KNAPP: Rather, you start with pilot projects, you know, like this one -- and you learn from it. You see what they do; and, you it seemed to -- and you do that in industry, any kind of new venture, and it certainly seemed to me to make sense from just all kinds of practical viewpoints. You don't initially start with granting random permits for all this. You grant a few permits under highly restrictive conditions and it's a -- it can go to a research thing or its a pilot test thing and you sort of see and you say, gee, is this -- and that begins to show you whether there's really anything in it or whether it's an economic loser, you know, and so So, I mean, it seemed to me that is a -- this on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

| s along<br>n on a |
|-------------------|
| n on a            |
|                   |
|                   |
|                   |
| sign on           |
| rn from           |
|                   |
| lot of            |
| o you             |
| o start           |
| ions of           |
| art out           |
| during            |
| nering a          |
|                   |
| to give           |
|                   |
|                   |
| ve from           |
| at have           |
| ands of           |
|                   |

| years. Our ancestors have been thousands of years.  |
|---|
| They're not going to move. They're not going to     |
| go away, and they have this mind-set of their       |
| existence. So we see what's happening out there,    |
| and it's going to take time to reflect on what's    |
| happening and assess what's happening now, what     |
| should be happening and how could we influence      |
| what's happening. I mean, we're going to approach   |
| it logically and not just socially, culturally,     |
| economically you know, legally. The communities     |
| in Alaska is going to have to take that time to     |
| reflect on this whole opportunity because change in |
| our small communities just doesn't happen. A lot    |
| of the communities here in Alaska don't even have   |
| Internet access. If they do, it's so slow it's      |
| like molasses. You wouldn't believe it. It's        |
| amazing. So change is going to it's going to be     |
| a lot of hard work to even change their mind-set to |
| even sit in a room with you to talk about it. It's  |
| going to take leadership of everybody in this room, |
| including the State of Alaska to have common        |
| values. We do not have common values. That's the    |

bottom line. Nobody has taken enough time to understand us, and this government is working really hard just to assimilate us and we're saying, wait a minute. We're Tlingits. We're always going to be Tlingits. Go away. So nobody has taken that time to understand our values. So it takes that, you know. Like I mentioned, becoming part of your education programs you have to change our minds and our intelligence of.....

DR. BROWN: Well I just have to say we have Mattaponi and a bunch of other Native American tribes in Virginia, and what I found interesting was that for generations -- if not more than hundreds of years is right -- they always, as they caught the shad, American shad, they had these rudimentary spawning operations where they would combine the eggs and the sperm and then they would hold them in these little tanks and ponds that they had made and release them to give back to the environment what they had taken. And, here we are, we've got this big shad restoration program, and it's something the Native Americans were doing long

2.

before there were white people there. And so I found it -- I don't know, it's just so different when I listen to you because yours didn't seem to include that and I thought, well, that's cool. just always assumed every Nat -- and it's problem, not yours -- I just assumed that all the different Native tribes had that kind of mind-set. And so now I'm hearing even more mind-sets, and you're right, you know, they have different....

Well, let me finish. MR. BREMNER: We all need to focus on the future. I mean, we have to balance today with the future, and we're working to do that. I mean, we're working to do that. we don't agree on that, then you're always going to have people focusing over here and groups focusing over there. And then, we all learn by doing. we're not given the opportunity to do, how could we That's the bottom line. We're not invited to be? We're not invited to do, so how could the table. It's impossible. But we'll run you off. we be? And, finally, if you think about the -- when you

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

hear Native Americans talk, we're talking about growing people for crying out loud and the focus of a lot of these government programs are growing fish and oysters and clams and whatever and our focus is growing people. So, you know, to come along to that side -- kind of thinking, you know I think we'll meet somewhere in the middle.

MS. RAYMOND: John.

MR. FORSTER: Thank you. I was going to ask Matt if he would maybe respond maybe to Gunnar's point that he made earlier about that nearly all forms of food production have environmental impact to a greater or lesser extent; and, yet, you presented a series of concerns which concluded really in the statement that until those concerns are addressed you call for a moratorium on any development of this industry. Well, I guess the key word there is addressed. And at what level do they have to be addressed? At what level of satisfaction or perfection does that occur, in your mind? At what level of tolerance do you have for imperfection, bearing in mind that all forms of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

|    | 100d production in race, most of our numan          |
|----|---|
| 2  | activities do have an impact?                       |
| 3  | MR. RAND: Yeah, I agree, they do have               |
| 4  | an impact. It's a tough one for me to answer,       |
| 5  | John, because I may be much more easygoing with it  |
| 6  | than some other organizations or other individuals. |
| 7  | There are concerns that we would like to see met.   |
| 8  | I can't give you a quantifiable number that says    |
| 9  | we need two percent escapes or we need five percent |
| 10 | escapes or we need, you know, 50 percent of the     |
| 11 | finfish using be herbivores. You know, where        |
| 12 | the environmental community will come down on an    |
| 13 | issue like that is kind of tough to say. We have    |
| 14 | the concerns. We don't feel that they're being met  |
| 15 | as well as we'd like to see them being met at this  |
| 16 | point. So that's where we are. I can't give you a   |
| 17 | quantifiable number.                                |
| 18 | MR. FORSTER: Do you think that it's                 |
| 19 | possible to get to a quantifiable number            |
| 20 | through   |
| 21 | MR. RAND: Yes, I do. I do think it's                |
| 22 | possible. And, you know, as has been suggested      |
|    |   |

it's moving forward. You know, the environmental community will come in. The technology will most like move forward. The policy is moving forward. We are, you know, part of this is the process in trying to get as -- environmentally responsible measures involved in the process as it goes. know, we'll do our best to hold up the process if we don't feel that the issues are being met -- you know, it's kind the way the environmental community goes, with land based agriculture as well. New technology. It's kind of the way the, I quess, new technology needed and the cultural side come together. So I can't give you a quantifiable number; but, yes, I do think it's possible. Ι think it's going to move forward regardless.

MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Al had wanted me to wrap this up at 4:15, and I still have six or eight people on the list. Is there anybody who just really, really needs to ask questions, because I think what we could do -- these folks are still going to be around, I assume, for the rest of the meeting. We've got some business to move on with.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If we have time at the end, you might be able to ask some questions then. Bill wanted to say something, and then we're going to move on to the next item of business.

MR. KENT: If I could just say on behalf of the Subcommittee on Aquaculture I really appreciate all of you taking the time away from your personal lives to travel all the way here. I know it wasn't quite the trip for some of you that it was for others but very much appreciated and I keep getting patted on the back by members of MAFAC for pulling it together and, really, Laurel pulled it all together and all credit to her. So just thank all of you for your participation.

(Applause)

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Before you leave, I just want to, you know, thank each of you. I've been listening very quietly to the discussion because I think it's good to have the open dialogue and I -- you know, there are a lot of things I've heard that I think we will probably talk about it when we go back, you know, as to who is involved

2.1

and Council's involvement. You know, there are a lot of things that have to be looked at, and we're well aware of that. If you want to do aquaculture and, particularly, food production, you have to look at size limits and bag limits, how you get exception from the Council to that, how you documented that. But I think it is, I think, the beginning of what I feel like is going to be a good there's one thing dialogue, and I want Subcommittee to look at today. Is this the type of forum we want to have across the country, or how do we go about continuing this open dialogue to really get input because I personally think -- you know, it's much more than I expected to hear.

I thought the discussion on both sides is very good and, you know, I think people have valid concerns about aquaculture and where the U.S. is going in it. But I also think it's time for this good, open discussion and so if we do go in and NOAA gets involved in this -- which I feel like we will -- that we've listened to the people and we've put together a process that reflects the

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

concerns of, you know, the American people. And so I really do want to thank you very much for it and, you know, I told the Admiral that I would try to get something done here. The Admiral is very interested and so is Secretary Evans. We've discussed this many times, and I think it's something, you know, we want to go but we want to know how we're going and where we're going.

And, you know, Ι think the infrastructure continuing -we're to lose infrastructure along the coast for commercial industry and for the fishing industry, as a whole. And so I think when you talk about economics you look at the infrastructure and what you can do it does sort of push some of it offshore but I think you still have to look at inshore, where we can do some things on land in closed cycles too -- also systems. So I want to thank you all and tell you that we're dedicated in NOAA Fisheries to make sure that we don't leave anybody out in this process -that it's an open process and that, you know, we want to continue a good, open dialogue and we are.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| I would have to say that I am committed             |
|---|
| to seeing this through because I personally think   |
| aquaculture along with wild production go hand in   |
| hand and we need to be looking at that and how we   |
| do that. I have to admit I am concerned when I      |
| you know, when you talk about, you know, like,      |
| summer flounder where our population is getting to  |
| an all-time high in summer flounder. The price is   |
| going down. Would we want to do aquaculture to      |
| drive potentially the price down ever further,      |
| things like that? There are issues that I have to   |
| really have bothered me somewhat, too. So I         |
| think, you know, we do have a lot of issues to      |
| this, but that doesn't keep us from moving forward  |
| because there's many things we do with enhancement  |
| enhancement is a vital part of this and we're       |
| operating hatcheries all over this country and I    |
| think that this will lead us to do a better job     |
| even with the enhancements, hatcheries and all that |
| we have.  |

Let's stay turned for further discussion, but I would like for this group to tell

| me how you think that the dialogue should continue. |
|---|
| What's the best way to continue the dialogue        |
| because I think we have to do. But I just thank     |
| each one of you for coming. I thought each and      |
| every one of you did a great job of really          |
| presenting your ideas and your concerns and your    |
| recommendations, and that's what we need. And so    |
| it's a wave. We have to address it. The U.S.        |
| can't stick its head in the sand as we watch every  |
| other country just get more and more involved in    |
| this and we're a country of technology and we're a  |
| seafood country and I feel like we're just getting  |
| left out and I don't think from my perspective,     |
| we don't want to hurt our commercial industry, but  |
| I think it goes hand in hand with fishermen who     |
| have not been able to continue in the industry and  |
| it gives them a way to go. And if we operate it     |
| right as we can in this country and get fishermen's |
| input and public input I think we can have an       |
| extremely good seafood program in this country      |
| that's both wild and aquaculture. So I really look  |
| forward to seeing us continue the dialogue, and     |

| 1  | thanks very much.                                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Where                |
| 3  | we need to go now is figure out tomorrow's         |
| 4  | schedule. Do we have rooms, or how are we going to |
| 5  | break up?  |
| 6  | MS. BRYANT: No, we don't, but I'm                  |
| 7  | hoping that we can have, like, one or two here.    |
| 8  | There is the whole area along the hallway coming   |
| 9  | here we can go. So I figured, you know, like we    |
| 10 | have other ones, we can use those spaces. I can    |
| 11 | check in to see if we have                         |
| 12 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let's check and              |
| 13 | see what we can get.                               |
| 14 | MS. BRYANT:some additional                         |
| 15 | rooms  |
| 16 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.                      |
| 17 | MS. BRYANT:if needed. But I                        |
| 18 | know last time you guys pocketed yourself in and   |
| 19 | around all kind of around the hotel. So we         |
| 20 | didn't worry about it too much, but we car         |
| 21 | certainly check into it.                           |
| 22 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. So the               |

| 1   | order of business then tomorrow is we'll come in  |
|-----|---|
| 2   | here and then figure out where we're going to go. |
| 3   | We should know by then. Does everybody know which |
| 4   | Committee you're on, I hope?                      |
| 5   | MR. DILERNIA: What time in here                   |
| 6   | tomorrow?   |
| 7   | MS. BRYANT: I'll get a printout.                  |
| 8   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Pardon?                   |
| 9   | MR. DILERNIA: What time in here                   |
| 10  | tomorrow?   |
| 11  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: 8:30.                     |
| 12  | MS. BRYANT: But it's not full                     |
| 13  | Committee. That's that Subcommittee. So if        |
| 14  | Subcommittees wanted to meet                      |
| 15  | MR. DILERNIA: Well, the Recreational              |
| 16  | Working Group was talking about meeting from 8:00 |
| 17  | to 9:00. But if that's from 8:00 to 9:00 I can't  |
| 18  | chair then the Outreach. I can't start Outreach   |
| 19  | till 9:00 o'clock.                                |
| 20  | MS. BRYANT: So then Outreach wouldn't             |
| 21  | start until                                       |
| 2.2 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: That's fine.              |

| 1  | MR. MOORE: Start Outreach at 9:00                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | o'clock.  |
| 3  | MR. DILERNIA: All right.                          |
| 4  | MS. BRYANT: Yeah. I mean, it's up to              |
| 5  | you guys.   |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: But that's                |
| 7  | fine. You can do that.                            |
| 8  | MR. DILERNIA: Okay.                               |
| 9  | MS. RAYMOND: First we have to                     |
| 10 | first, we have to, I think I mean, is every       |
| 11 | Committee going to meet? For example, is the      |
| 12 | Bycatch Committee going to meet? Is there         |
| 13 | something   |
| 14 | MR. RAYBURN: Yes. I'd like for them               |
| 15 | to meet. I sent an e-mail out                     |
| 16 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay.                                |
| 17 | MR. RAYBURN:last week on it.                      |
| 18 | MS. RAYMOND: All right. So we're                  |
| 19 | going to have the Aquaculture Committee is        |
| 20 | obviously going to meet. The Recreational Working |
| 21 | Group is going to meet.                           |
| 22 | MR. DILERNIA: Bob.                                |

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

| 1   | MR. FLETCHER: Yeah, and we're going to              |
|-----|---|
| 2   | meet at 8:00 o'clock.                               |
| 3   | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Does the National                |
| 4   | Standard One Working Group have to meet?            |
| 5   | MR. MOORE: I don't see any reason why               |
| 6   | we have to, no.                                     |
| 7   | MS. BRYANT: I can't imagine, no.                    |
| 8   | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. So there's only                  |
| 9   | now, what about the presentation on IFQs? Do you    |
| LO  | want some response back from MAFAC on that; and, if |
| L1  | so, who is going to do it?                          |
| L2  | MS. BRYANT: From my perspective, there              |
| L3  | was such a dialogue and I actually already got      |
| L 4 | feedback even from Jack. He left it. So I think     |
| L5  | partly Joe and I were talking. He's going to        |
| L6  | try to get me those transcripts STAT. So maybe by   |
| L7  | the end of next week or something like that Joe is  |
| L8  | actually going to burn them onto a CD for me so     |
| L9  | that I can get that out to Jack's folks and I can   |
| 20  | get it out to you guys.                             |
| 21  | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. So nothing here?                 |
| 22  | MS. BRYANT: If you want to do                       |

| 1  | something, you could do it at follow up or post     |
|----|---|
| 2  | facto, I suppose. But I feel like it was a good     |
| 3  | dialogue yesterday, and probably the next step is   |
| 4  | compiling that together and then giving it back to  |
| 5  | you guys to respond to.                             |
| 6  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: And one thing or              |
| 7  | that real quick. I think in all sincerity, there    |
| 8  | is probably nothing going to happen on the Hill for |
| 9  | that, and the January meeting of MAFAC is where I   |
| 10 | think we'll have an opportunity to really get and   |
| 11 | look at Magnuson reauthorization, as a whole. We    |
| 12 | should be able to bring that forward to look at the |
| 13 | whole package for Magnuson reauthorization.         |
| 14 | MS. RAYMOND: I'm just trying to see if              |
| 15 | we have any conflicts, and the only conflict that   |
| 16 | we have then is you're on the Recreational Working  |
| 17 | Group and   |
| 18 | MR. DILERNIA: And Outreach.                         |
| 19 | MS. RAYMOND:Outreach. Could I                       |
| 20 | push Outreach back to 9:30 to give the Rec group    |
| 21 | more time?  |
| 22 | MS. BRYANT: Oh, I would think so. I                 |

mean, it's up to you guys. When do you start full Committee meeting, Maggie? When do we have it, at 1:00?

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah, we don't come back in full -- you know, once we -- once everybody decides what time your Committees want to meet in the morning, we've got till 1:00. So it will be like after lunch we will come back into a full.

MS. BRYANT: And then report out, each of the Committees report out to full Committee.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Real quick, can I say one more thing, and I'll be quiet. >From our perspective -- my perspective -- I really liked the further input on the Recreation. I thought there was a lot of good discussions and somewhat of a little bit of -- I'm not sure where, but I mean I think it was good and I think we need to just sort of bring that to some sort of recommendations to us. I think the Aquaculture really was, so far, absolutely the highlight, I think, of these three days and we need to move -- we moved that and now

2.

| 1  | we need input on how ya'll think we should move   |
|----|---|
| 2  | forward with that. Fishing, very simple. I've got |
| 3  | lots of comments, lots of I'm not sure. All, I    |
| 4  | will go back and review those. If there's any     |
| 5  | further comment of that, it's fine. But the       |
| 6  | brochure that Ralph gave me I will take back, and |
| 7  | I'm not sure where we go we that. But I think if  |
| 8  | we (indiscernible) may want to look at that       |
| 9  | and   |
| 10 | MR. DILERNIA: Fishing made simple is              |
| 11 | what we were going to do                          |
| 12 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Okay. Good.                 |
| 13 | MR. DILERNIA:101. If you want                     |
| 14 | us to do that then tomorrow, we still will.       |
| 15 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah, okay.                 |
| 16 | Yeah, thanks.                                     |
| 17 | MR. DILERNIA: Okay.                               |
| 18 | MS. RAYMOND: All right. So you're                 |
| 19 | still going to meet at 8:00? The Recreational     |
| 20 | Working Group is going to meet at 8:00?           |
| 21 | MR. DILERNIA: Yeah.                               |
| 22 | MS. RAYMOND: Okay.                                |

| 1   | MS. BRYANT: And Michael Kelly was                  |
|-----|--|
| 2   | going to join you in on that.                      |
| 3   | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. So do you know                  |
| 4   | where?   |
| 5   | MR. FLETCHER: Well, we'll just                     |
| 6   | probably out in the hall there, since it's a small |
| 7   | group.   |
| 8   | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. But some last                   |
| 9   | time, people wanted to know where other Committees |
| LO  | were meeting in case they wanted to sit in. So     |
| L1  | since ya'll are meeting                            |
| L2  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Why don't you                |
| L3  | come in here?                                      |
| L 4 | MS. RAYMOND: But they're meeting at                |
| L5  | 8:00.  |
| L6  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Come in here and             |
| L7  | we're going  |
| L8  | MS. RAYMOND: Right.                                |
| L9  | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH:to try to                     |
| 20  | work on small rooms. If we know how many we need,  |
| 21  | we'll try to work on it tonight and make sure we   |
| 22  | have them.   |

| 1  | MR. FLETCHER: Well, we'll be starting               |
|----|---|
| 2  | at 8:00 before you all are getting in here, though. |
| 3  | MS. RAYMOND: Right. Well, so you                    |
| 4  | can   |
| 5  | MR. FLETCHER: We can just say in here?              |
| 6  | MS. RAYMOND: Right.                                 |
| 7  | MR. FLETCHER: Okay.                                 |
| 8  | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. So 8:00 o'clock                  |
| 9  | the Recreational Working Group will meet here, and  |
| 10 | everybody else will meet here at 8:30 and, by then, |
| 11 | we should have some more information about rooms or |
| 12 | if we feel it's comfortable enough to break out in  |
| 13 | here and people stay in here or whatever. Just so   |
| 14 | everybody knows. Tomorrow morning everybody will    |
| 15 | know where everybody else is so if you want to go   |
| 16 | to another group and sit in or something.           |
| 17 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: The hotel, seems              |
| 18 | like we could work it out with them so we can put   |
| 19 | something on the door by in the morning as to where |
| 20 | we'll be meeting.                                   |
| 21 | MS. BRYANT: If you guys want separate               |
| 22 | rooms, we need to know kind of how many you might   |

| 1  | want.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Well, we                  |
| 3  | need  |
| 4  | MS. RAYMOND: Well, I have                         |
| 5  | MS. BRYANT: Because we've got this big            |
| 6  | room. There's the meeting space out there.        |
| 7  | MS. RAYMOND: We have Aquaculture,                 |
| 8  | Outreach, Bycatch                                 |
| 9  | MS. BRYANT: And Rec Fish.                         |
| 10 | MS. RAYMOND:and Rec, but that                     |
| 11 | won't be at the same time. Rec will be first, and |
| 12 | then those people                                 |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: You need three.             |
| 14 | So only two more rooms.                           |
| 15 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It would be two             |
| 16 | more rooms.                                       |
| 17 | MS. BRYANT: And make them relatively              |
| 18 | small, I assume.                                  |
| 19 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am, because               |
| 20 | they fit, like, less than 10 people.              |
| 21 | DR. BROWN: Do we not have a list of               |
| 22 | who is on what Committee?                         |

| 1   | MS. BRYANT: I do, Bonnie, and it's not            |
|-----|---|
| 2   | printed out.                                      |
| 3   | DR. BROWN: It's not in here?                      |
| 4   | MS. BRYANT: So, I right.                          |
| 5   | DR. BROWN: Okay.                                  |
| 6   | MS. BRYANT: So I will go print one                |
| 7   | out.  |
| 8   | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. So are              |
| 9   | we all straight on the                            |
| LO  | MS. BRYANT: All that stuff is on the              |
| L1  | Web page. I never worry about it anymore.         |
| L2  | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. Also, somebody                 |
| L3  | gave me these glasses. I don't know why they gave |
| L 4 | them to me, but                                   |
| L5  | MR. KENT: I'm sorry. Don found those              |
| L6  | in the back of the room. So they might we may     |
| L7  | want to leave them at the front desk, okay?       |
| L8  | MS. RAYMOND: Okay. And there's no                 |
| L9  | dinner on the whale watch?                        |
| 20  | MS. BRYANT: Oh, there is no dinner on             |
| 21  | the whale watching, but the whale watching        |
| 22  | folks   |

| 1  | MR. KENT: Is there liquor?                          |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. GUTTING: False advertising.                     |
| 3  | MS. BRYANT: Well, there was a dinner                |
| 4  | cruise for 120 a person, and then they have the 105 |
| 5  | without the dinner cruise. So, the bus, we've       |
| 6  | arranged transportation for you. It comes, I        |
| 7  | think, at 6:20. Judy they actually brought up       |
| 8  | all the tickets for folks that are going on the     |
| 9  | whale watching. So see Judy. She's got your         |
| 10 | tickets. And, let's see, you'll have time to be     |
| 11 | able to eat before you go on the cruise. The        |
| 12 | cruise is from 7:00 to 9:00.                        |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: And if you need               |
| 14 | me in the morning I'll be in early, and then I have |
| 15 | to go do a Washington Post knock-down drag out on   |
| 16 | why fish is in such bad shape and why we're         |
| 17 | screwing up the world, and that probably will be    |
| 18 | about an hour and then I've got to go make a phone  |
| 19 | call.   |
| 20 | MR. MOORE: Why don't you just bring                 |
| 21 | the reporter in here, Bill?                         |
| 22 | MR. SIMPSON: So, Laurel, the                        |
|    |   |

| 1  | transportation for whales is what time?           |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. BRYANT: I think it's 6:20 6:15,               |
| 3  | 6:20 be down in front                             |
| 4  | MR. SIMPSON: 6:15.                                |
| 5  | MS. BRYANT:and they'll pick you                   |
| 6  | up and take you.                                  |
| 7  | MR. DILERNIA: 6:15 out front.                     |
| 8  | MS. RAYMOND: We're not done yet.                  |
| 9  | We're not done. We're not done.                   |
| 10 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Wait a minute,            |
| 11 | guys.   |
| 12 | MS. RAYMOND: We haven't adjourned yet.            |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: The other                 |
| 14 | thing I want everybody to start thinking about is |
| 15 | the January meeting with dates when people are    |
| 16 | going to be available and then, from there, start |
| 17 | thinking about the next meeting.                  |
| 18 | CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: But you think               |
| 19 | about January that I have to resign on January    |
| 20 | 20th, and I'd sure like to be with you again.     |
| 21 | MS. BRYANT: And, right now, we've got             |
| 22 | the second week targeted for the meeting in       |

| 1   | January, which I think is January 11, 12 and 13 or<br> |
|-----|--|
| 2   | something like that.                                   |
| 3   | MR. MOORE: Well Bonnie, Dick and I                     |
| 4   | agreed that you guys ought to be in Dubuque, Iowa.     |
| 5   | MS. RAYMOND: So on the subsequent                      |
| 6   | meeting, after we try to get everybody straightened    |
| 7   | out for January to find three days when everybody      |
| 8   | is available we need to think about where and when     |
| 9   | the next meeting is.                                   |
| LO  | MR. RAYBURN: Well, Rob had volunteered                 |
| L1  | to host us. Rob?                                       |
| L2  | MS. BRYANT: Yes. I thought it was                      |
| L3  | Florida.   |
| L 4 | MR. KRAMER: I'll host the Winter 2006,                 |
| L5  | I guess. I guess it's the                              |
| L6  | MS. RAYMOND: Right.                                    |
| L7  | MS. BRYANT: No.  |
| L8  | MS. RAYMOND: Well, we don't want to go                 |
| L9  | to Florida in August.                                  |
| 20  | MS. BRYANT: Oh.  |
| 21  | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. We'll go                   |
| 22  | Hawaii this year, and then we'll go Florida            |

| 1  | MR. FLETCHER: How about Maine?                    |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. BRYANT: Florida next year.                    |
| 3  | MS. RAYMOND: He's going to do Florida             |
| 4  | in January of '06.                                |
| 5  | MR. MOORE: You guys need to remember              |
| 6  | that you're going to have a bunch of new members  |
| 7  | coming on. You're going to have an orientation in |
| 8  | D.C. at some point.                               |
| 9  | MS. BRYANT: That was my suggestion,               |
| 10 | Ron. Yes.   |
| 11 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: That would be             |
| 12 | the meeting after this next one?                  |
| 13 | MS. BRYANT: It would have to be.                  |
| 14 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah.                     |
| 15 | MS. BRYANT: Or we'll have to have one             |
| 16 | up front for them separately for the new members. |
| 17 | We haven't jigged that one out, yet.              |
| 18 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: You didn't do             |
| 19 | that for us. You just threw us to the wolves.     |
| 20 | MS. RAYMOND: No, we had a big                     |
| 21 | orientation.                                      |
| 22 | MS. BRYANT: No, we didn't. You guys               |

| 1                    | got an orientation in D.C.  |
|----------------------|---|
| 2                    | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Did they?   |
| 3                    | MS. BRYANT: Yeah.   |
| 4                    | MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Chair, don't we have   |
| 5                    | to meet in D.C. on one of the two meetings?   |
| 6                    | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah.   |
| 7                    | MS. BRYANT: We tried, but that  |
| 8                    | decision was made at the last meeting where you   |
| 9                    | guys decided go to Hawaii.  |
| 10                   | MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, but if you go to   |
| 11                   | Hawaii, then the next meeting would be D.C., right?   |
| 12                   | MS. RAYMOND: Except that the  |
| 13                   | subsequent meeting is actually when a whole bunch   |
| 14                   | of new people are coming in.  |
|                      |   |
| 15                   | MR. RAYBURN: Oh, I see.   |
| 15<br>16             | MR. RAYBURN: Oh, I see.  MS. RAYMOND: So that actually might  |
|                      |   |
| 16                   | MS. RAYMOND: So that actually might   |
| 16<br>17             | MS. RAYMOND: So that actually might not be Florida. That might be D.C.  |
| 16<br>17<br>18       | MS. RAYMOND: So that actually might not be Florida. That might be D.C.  CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Which is fine.                                      |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19 | MS. RAYMOND: So that actually might not be Florida. That might be D.C.  CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Which is fine.  MS. BRYANT: Well, we would be we do |

| 1  | MS. RAYMOND: So, anyway, think about a            |
|----|---|
| 2  | place for and the date, and I am assuming Bill    |
| 3  | still wants it in the summers because it's easier |
| 4  | for him. So come back tomorrow with your          |
| 5  | suggestions and we'll go from there.              |
| 6  | MR. KENT: May I move for adjournment              |
| 7  | for the evening?                                  |
| 8  | MR. GUTTING: Recess.                              |
| 9  | MR. KENT: Recess.                                 |
| 10 | MR. MOORE: I object.                              |
| 11 | DR. BROWN: Second.                                |
| 12 | MR. KENT: You would.                              |
| 13 | CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Hope                |
| 14 | you guys find some whales.                        |
| 15 | (Off record)                                      |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |