## MARINE FISHERY ADVISORY COUNCIL

BARANOF HOTEL

JUNEAU, ALASKA

A0UGUST 12, 2004

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(JUNEAU, ALASKA - 8/12/04)
3	(1:00 p.m.)
4	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay,
5	everybody. We're going to get started on
6	committee reports.
7	MR. KRAMER: What Judy is handing out
8	to everybody right now are some notes that we
9	made as the recreational working group during our
10	meeting and the document that you'll need to
11	accompany these notes is the strategic plan draft
12	itself. So, if you will, please follow along
13	with me. It's fairly straightforward on our
14	comments here.
15	We began by just taking it a page at a
16	time and we first looked at the vision statement
17	and the mission statement and, as you'll see on
18	the handout from Judy, we made some notes that
19	say don't forget the state's tribes, et cetera.
20	We wanted to make sure that this included more
21	than just Americans because we have a substantial
22	foreign tourism industry. We also wanted to make

the point not to forget future generations. This strategic plan is to promote a healthy resource, not only for current users but for future users as well.

under the science The next goal statement, we went down again objective by objective and I'll just start with our objective Within this goal we felt like we number one. needed to define and/or replace the word exceptional because that was a bit ambiguous, so we may need to define that a little more clearly. that mean more fish, bigger fish, Does access. So we thought about changing that word exceptional to improve.

Something else we carried throughout this whole process was we did not want to set up staff to a position of failure, so we wanted to make sure this was realistic. I think it outlines a five-year time frame to begin with.

The next bullet on there is addressing
-- it mentions new and improved recreational
data. We wanted to make sure that the historical

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

and existing data is also considered and referenced in that process in some way to correlate the two.

The third bullet there, facilitate angler participation. One of the things we also want to stress there is cooperative research because not only can you garner more in different data through that, it's also a very great tool, vehicle for outreach and education. So we wanted to make sure that was included throughout.

There was discussion on stock assessments and the need to prioritize and look recreational species when determining which stock assessments NOAA fisheries is going to look So we wanted to make sure there was some at. mention in there about stock assessments, for determining which stocks process assessments performed on it in some involve the recreational constituents.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Can I ask a point of clarification? When you say stock assessments for recreational species, does that

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

is going to determine what 1 mean who 2 recreational species? Do we take the top ten recreational species across the country or do we 3 4 do it region by region? I think it's referenced 5 MR. KRAMER: 6 somewhere in here about identifying important, was the word, species in the various regions and that was discussed a little bit as well. 8 hard for me to speak for other areas other than 9 10 Florida because that's where my experience has 11 been in the past, but they developed a work plan 12 at the beginning of the year and identified 13 stocks and that was partially determined based 14 upon input from all constituents, recreational, commercial and other. 15 16 Bob, feel free to jump in at any point 17 here if you want to expound upon any of these 18 points. 19 Something that kept coming up that we 2.0 all agreed on was brought up, I believe, the day 21 before yesterday, was addressing better

utilization of existing committees, particularly

the advisory panels with the counsels. The feeling is that these committees have existed and have been under-utilized and have not met for various reasons, but if there's some way that we can make sure that those committees meet and provide input, that would be very beneficial.

And the fifth bullet there, I think it refers to doubling the amount of recreational atsea sampling. Again, we felt that changing doubling to increasing might be a little more appropriate because that needs to be thought about and we did not want to set up a mandate which did not necessarily have funding and may not be obtainable. So just a word recommendation change there.

Objective number two. Let's see. Within the text of this it refers fisheries information system and it's our understanding that this is an idea that does not have the necessary funding to implement as was designed and, therefore, there was talk about just removing that and figuring some other more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	obtainable way to accomplish similar goals. We
2	had in there change the second sentence to
3	development of regional recreational data
4	collection systems such as GulFIN, RecFIN, ACCSP,
5	WestPacFIN. There was a lot of talk about
6	understanding that these fisheries are regional
7	and look at data collection from that standpoint
8	and then figure out how to integrate those all
9	into a universal type approach where it would be
10	beneficial for staff from a federal standpoint.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think we left
12	out MRFSS.
13	MR. KRAMER: Yes. That was not
14	intentional though. Consequently, we had to
15	delete that first bullet there where it says
16	fully implement fisheries information system
17	because, again, it was our understanding that the
18	funding is simply not there and that may not be
19	the best approach to accomplish what we're trying
20	to accomplish.
21	The second bullet there, build
22	national fisheries information expert teams. We

changed national to regional. We also do recognize the need to compare regional information from region to region. You may want to expound, Bob, on that.

MR. FLETCHER: I just wanted to point out that there's some big differences and there's a lot of good things going on in the regions, in the various Gulf and Pacific and Atlantic state marine fisheries commissions. The work that is being done is focused on the regional needs and the regional variations. To try to force this system into a national box is not something that the regions are comfortable with. A lot of the people in the interstate commissions are not comfortable with. I think it's time that we recognize the value of those regional differences and just try to complete and continue development of the regional systems so that they We can integrate the information into a national database, but without forcing a national database and then try to force every region to comply with it, it's the wrong way to approach

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	this.
2	MR. KRAMER: I don't know if you have
3	thoughts along those lines, Bill.
4	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Not really.
5	I'm not bothered by the regional approach. I am
6	concerned about this long-term database and
7	national numbers, but I think we can work that
8	out. I think it's important to maintain the
9	long-term database for trends and stuff at the
10	same time. However we work the national into the
11	regional, we can talk about it.
12	MR. KRAMER: Okay.
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Rob.
14	MR. KRAMER: Yes, Vince.
15	MR. O'SHEA: Just to add to that,
16	Bill, I think the concern here was that the way
17	this was cast on the national level didn't
18	address any of the problems that we're having in
19	the regional level and I think that's where the
20	rub is going to be. It seems logical that the
21	first priority is let's solve these regional

problems before we put any money into a bigger

1	national program. Now, if the intent was for 
2	that FIS to get AKFIN, GulFIN, WestPacFIN, ACCSP
3	all up to snuff, if that's built into that, then
4	that would be a different thing, but that's not
5	what appeared to us and that's the problem we're
6	trying to get at. Thank you.
7	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Okay. Thank
8	you.
9	MR. KRAMER: My next comments there
10	under objective three reflect the same thing.
11	It's more or less the same thing all over again.
12	On objective four, you can see we added the
13	bullet there establish standards to facilitate
14	submission and use of socioeconomic data from
15	other entities; government agencies, trade
16	organizations, vessel owners. The intent there
17	was to create a system that makes it easy to plug
18	and play for some of these existing entities out
19	there to submit data into the system, thus
20	participating within a system.
21	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let me ask you
22	a question on four. In the discussion we had

1	earlier, I think Ken may be the one who brought
2	it up, something about every four years and
3	coordinate with national survey of I can't
4	read my own writing.
5	MR. ROBERTS: Hunting, fishing and
6	outdoor recreation. I've spoken to Michael and I
7	seem to recall also, after having thought about
8	it some more, that I think NMFS did buy some
9	extra questions added to that survey I think at
10	one point.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think we did.
12	That's why I brought it up. I think we did.
13	MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that's correct.
14	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: What about the
15	every four years? Did you all discuss that?
16	Because we did here. It was a question about
17	committing to every four years.
18	MR. ROBERTS: That kind of data, in
19	terms of expenditure, if that's the main thing,
20	probably every four years is good enough. I
21	can't see there would be big, structural changes
22	every four years. You couldn't just do with an

1	inflation adjustment in between.
2	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: That's fine. I
3	just wanted to make sure.
4	MR. KRAMER: Larry, you had a point?
5	MR. SIMPSON: I had a comment.
6	MR. KRAMER: Okay.
7	MR. SIMPSON: Just remember now this
8	is done in conjunction with the U.S. census. If
9	you're concerned about a two-month recall with
10	MRFSS, this is a 10-year recall or a five-year
11	recall.
12	MR. KRAMER: I think one of the points
13	that also came out in our discussions is when
14	speaking for the recreational community we have
15	lots of different numbers within our own
16	community out there. You have some numbers from
17	ASA, you have U.S. Fish and Wildlife, you have
18	different numbers regionally. So you end up
19	getting mixed messages. I know it would be a
20	helpful tool for me to have the source that we
21	can take to our congressional leaders and others
22	and say here's that socioeconomic data, this is

1	what it translates to in dollars and jobs and
2	impact. So the more we can help standardize
3	that, the better. A lot of that is the
4	recreational community's fault.
5	MR. SIMPSON: Firmly agree.
6	Socioeconomic data is important. What I'm trying
7	to say is the mechanism that hunting/fishing
8	survey uses is an adjunct to the census.
9	MR. KELLY: Right. The one that we
10	use though is adjunct to MRFSS, so we're not
11	dependant on that census data.
12	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, so we're not talking
13	about
14	MR. KELLY: No. This is something
15	better.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Oh, okay. You're
17	talking about that economic add-on stuff. Okay.
18	Great.
19	MR. KRAMER: Yes, Rod.
20	MR. MOORE: Rob, did you want to take
21	questions on your stuff while you're going or do
22	you want to wait until the end?

MR. KRAMER: I think we can do it as we go.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Would you mind jumping back just a little bit then, just to one comment you made.

MR. KRAMER: Sure.

On this question under MR. MOORE: objective in the science goal one about addressing the better utilization of existing committees, I know there are problems in some parts of the country where the committees don't meet and all of that sort of stuff and I agree with you completely, but there are also places full, where there is than full more representation involvement of the and recreational committee. Our ground fish advisory panel of the Pacific Council almost half members are recreational members. We meet at every council meeting. There's full involvement of everybody there. I just don't want you guys to leave the world the impression that everything is bad because there are places where -- you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	know, we try to get everybody in there and get
2	everybody's views fully heard and scratched out.
3	MR. KRAMER: We identified that as
4	this is more than likely a regional problem.
5	MR. MOORE: Okay.
6	MR. KRAMER: We also felt that some of
7	the onus is on the recreational community itself
8	for these things.
9	MR. MOORE: Yeah. That's a whole
10	other problem of trying to get the constituents
11	to be convinced to show up. But I just wanted to
12	make sure that you were looking at it more on a
13	region-by-region basis and not on a national sort
14	of thing because the Pacific Council really does
15	work a lot with the recreational community.
16	MR. KRAMER: That's a good point. I'm
17	on to the second page of the handout here. We
18	have delete or recast bullet number four and I'll
19	read the first part of the sentence there and
20	this is where that arose from. Develop improved
21	behavior-based policy models to cover the top 10
22	most important species. We weren't quite sure

what that meant. So we're either saying let's 1 delete that or redefine it, make it more clear 2 3 what we're trying to accomplish with that. I also think it's a 4 MR. FLETCHER: 5 mistake to try to put together a national list. 6 It's trying to compare apples and oranges. Back on the east coast those recreational anglers may or may not be commercial fishermen and in Hawaii. 8 So I think regionally is best here, more in 9 10 that have similar kinds of approaches. areas 11 There may be arguments about which is the most 12 important. How do you measure the most 13 important. I'd rather leave it at the regional 14 level rather than go to this national list. 15 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: That's 16 something that I haven't talked to Michael about, I think if you go back and 17 but I've read it. 18 look at the top 10 just by catch of recreational 19 species, most of the east coast stocks -- I mean 2.0 the top three or four states are east coast. 21 of course, if you look at the catch, you would

be....

1	MR. KRAMER: Those are landings?
2	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yes.
3	MR. KRAMER: Which may not necessarily
4	be indicative of
5	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: That's right.
6	So I think we have to look back at this one a
7	little further. I agree with you.
8	MR. KRAMER: Okay. I guess our next
9	recommendation is under you can flip over to
10	management goals and then we're under objective
11	number two. That fifth bullet down says make
12	ecosystem-based management a reality. That
13	sounds like a pretty tough challenge, so we
14	wanted to make sure we changed that to move
15	towards an ecosystem-based management by
16	adapting, et cetera. I think that's more
17	realistic.
18	MR. FLETCHER: Let me just comment.
19	One of the overriding thoughts that we approached
20	this discussion with was the idea of having a
21	realistic strategic plan with achievable goals
22	within the time frame of the strategic plan $\Delta$

lot of what we did could be related to that kind of direction. So I just wanted to let you know that was something we tried to look at all through this.

MR. KRAMER: Under objective three we had in there require regular meetings of these bodies. What that's referring to is we need to do a better job of getting these AP's that are associated with the councils that are not meeting and not contributing to meet and contribute. Yes, Rod.

MR. MOORE: Rob, on bullet number three under this objective, and I raised this the other day when Mike was giving his presentation, the schedule meetings to better fit times when marine anglers are ready or available to attend, I think that all meetings ought to be scheduled so that we can get as much participation by all constituent groups as possible. The thing that is concerns me going to have are we а recreational strategic plan that says schedule stuff for marine anglers and an environmental

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

schedule stuff plan that says for environmentalists, a commercial plan that says schedule stuff for commercials and the three may not always be able to meet at the same time. I'm not quite sure how you get across the point that meetings need to be scheduled so constituents can the maximum opportunity to participate without saying that it's this group constituents. of constituents or that group Maybe that is the thing to say, is schedule meetings to better fit times for constituents as opposed to any particular group.

I would just throw that out there as a suggestion for the committee. I'd feel the same way if it said this in a commercial plan. I mean it's nothing about commercial or recreational.

MR. KRAMER: That's a good point. Okay. We're down to -- I guess we can skip over to objective number six. Under bullet number four, we just wanted to make sure that we covered all t.he bases there and add interstate industry associations, commissions,

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	NGO's, any other contributing groups that may be
2	able to offer input on that.
3	Then over to the next page, page 11,
4	is the outreach goal statement. We looked at
5	objective number one, the fifth bullet down, says
6	educate anglers on the benefits of the essential
7	fish habitat program, the marine mammal
8	protection
9	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: You can tell
10	Bob Fletcher was in that meeting.
11	MR. MOORE: I want someone to point
12	out the benefits.
13	MR. KRAMER: Well, we understand that
14	there needs to be some education here. So maybe
15	if we just remove the word benefit and just say
16	educate the people on the contents of those
17	agreements.
18	That was just kind of a semantics
19	thing in here to make this more saleable, but we
20	understand what needs to be accomplished there.
21	The rest on down we had okay. The
22	final thing that we did was just come up with

some general comments for the plan as a whole and I'll just read those. I can't underscore this first comment enough. Success of this plan will be directly related to the agency's commitment to provide adequate funding and staff to implement the plan. None of this can happen unless we have bodies and budget. I know that may be competing with other things.

One of the issues that was brought up t.hat. oftentimes outreach education was constituent relations is not viewed as a core Law enforcement science, some of these program. things, are often viewed as the programs, but I would contend that this is a proactive investment and if it's done correctly, you can realize better budgets, more FTE's, because you are educating your constituents who can then work and lobby the Hill to get you the budgets that you guys need.

Along those lines, it was stated that we have to have some real concrete commitments there and we would like those commitments

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

reported back to us at the next meeting. So how are we going to do this? Are there going to be positions and components of the regional offices and the science centers that are involved in this? I think that's true for all sectors, commercial, environmental, whatever the relations are.

The next point we made as a general overall is the success of this plan is contingent on the performance measurement plan developed by the agency to track progress and identify problems. We felt that MAFAC should be included in this reporting as well.

A lot of times outreach education, communication, relations are non-quantifiable, hard to put your hands on, hard to measure, but we do feel there are many things in here that are measurable, are definable, and how these fit in your overall performance-based budgeting and that process needs to be clearly defined and goals set so we can see progress on this and that's it.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Thanks. You

2.0

1	were very helpful. Michael, are you okay, do you
2	got it?
3	MR. KELLY: Yeah, that was all clear.
4	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Mr. Chairman,
5	do you need a motion to adopt the report?
6	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah. I was
7	going to thank Rob and his group there for the
8	time they put in on it. We need a motion to
9	accept.
10	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I would move
11	to accept the report, along with the changes in
12	the discussion that we had.
13	MR. GUTTING: Second.
14	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: We've got a
15	second on the motion. Any discussion on the
16	report, on the motion?
17	(No discussion)
18	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hearing none,
19	all those in favor signify by saying aye.
20	IN UNISON: Aye.
21	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Those opposed
22	same sign.

1	(No opposing votes)
2	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Thank you
3	very much for your report. I believe bycatch is
4	up next.
5	MR. RAYBURN: I couldn't get this
6	projector to work. I was hoping you'd call
7	aquaculture first so Don could work on it.
8	MR. SIMPSON: While you're doing that,
9	Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment? Bill said
10	that probably the majority of the recreational
11	take would be along the east coast and that just
12	didn't ring right with me, so I checked
13	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: In the gulf.
14	MR. SIMPSON: Yeah. Because I checked
15	it out and four out of the ten would be in the
16	gulf and four out of the ten would be in the east
17	coast and then two of them are in the west coast.
18	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I meant that,
19	I'm sorry, because Florida is the number one
20	recreational state in the east coast and west
21	coast.
22	MR. RAYBURN: He just wanted to see if

1	the gulf was sleeping.
2	(Discussion about hurricane in
3	Florida)
4	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Ralph, car
5	you do without it?
6	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I can do it
7	without it. I was doing the PowerPoint while Rob
8	was getting the copies made. I guess I could
9	have done a hard copy for you, too.
10	Basically, we had our meeting. Jim
11	Gilmore, Rod Moore, myself and Larry were there
12	at the meeting. Chris Dorsett was invited and
13	participated with us. Alvin stopped in a while.
14	Bob Fletcher was on our committee as well, but
15	he was working on the rec fishing. Mel Moon is a
16	member of the committee, but he wasn't there.
17	We reviewed the agenda and the minutes
18	from the last meeting, the December meeting. It
19	was suggested that now that the transcripts are
20	online after the meeting, we could just validate
21	the minutes that were prepared after the meeting,
22	but no one had any problem with the way the

minutes came out from the last meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

We reviewed the technical publication that was mentioned when we talked about bycatch, the one evaluating bycatch. A national standardization for bycatch reporting, I think, or something along those lines. It was basically the same report of the Powers Commission that we heard in December.

The one suggestion we had, and I think about to go to press now, within that's acknowledgements, the first page of that, listed the people on the team, but we thought it might have been good to also include in there the fact that MAFAC had reviewed that study and found it to be appropriate. You can look at the language we had in our minutes, but we found that as appropriate methods of standardizing bycatch reporting. So that in the acknowledgement section of that pub would show that you had presented it to the advisory committee and they thought it was good. That was one suggestion we had on that. Otherwise no one had any issues

with it.

б

Since our committee also includes
or we took it upon ourselves and I think we
mentioned that at one of our previous reports
that we were also looking at marine protected
areas just to kind of monitor that process and
had set up for Mel to give a report on their
meeting that they had in April. He, of course,
wasn't here, but I had taken the minutes off the
website for the MPA Federal Advisory Committee
and we looked through those and saw that Mel was
involved in one of the leadership and one of the
subcommittees of that, primarily the one dealing
with national and regional issues, and he had
reported on that during the course of the
advisory committee. I think it was just their
second meeting. They had met in early April in
Key Largo, so it looked like from the notes they
were just basically getting organized with their
subcommittees and stuff. We're going to continue
to monitor that process. Folks on the committee
felt like it was important for us to do that.

discussed, based Wе also on the comments at the December meeting and what realized here, that MAFAC, after their review of bycatch, suggested that there be periodic updates to the committee on the progress being made and the implementation of the bycatch. That's pretty much what we did on Tuesday afternoon in that hour and a half discussion. The intent was to maintain that. The subcommittee felt like that important to continue that either i f it. was warranted а presentation before the full committee and, if not, at minimal, a written the progress being made on on implementation of the regional bycatch plans in our notes prior to the meeting to have that presented to us, our notebook materials.

We also engaged in a discussion, and it wasn't necessarily because Michael was here, on protected resources, but it seemed like, as we heard the discussion on Tuesday afternoon, a lot of the bycatch issues also had protected resources implications. So we felt like

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

committee would be interested in being engaged in the protective resources aspect of it to somewhat broaden our purview not to just bycatch but also include in that the protected resources. I talked to Laurie Allen a little bit about that during our last meeting.

We felt like that would be a worthy objective in our subcommittee and we also felt like in that same we would have issues with the essential fish habitat and basically ecosystems impact.

So we got into a discussion about what the purview of our subcommittee could be primarily as a result of some discussion we had that I'll reflect on later. Anyway, we felt like under protective resources that the bycatch subcommittee under the current structure would be a reasonable venue for that.

We also discussed what we'd like to have at our next meeting of the subcommittee. Suggestions were made that we have a response -- by that time maybe we could review the response

2.0

to the petition on coral in the northwest fisheries and what implications that may have and relate it to essential fish habitat.

We also discussed that there may be a good opportunity to get an update on the sea turtle longlining issues in the western Pacific and possibly with the focus on what may be a good concept for exporting some of the technology used in that to find a solution to that issue, exporting that to other parts of the Pacific area.

Finally, for a discussion item for our next meeting, we felt it would be good to have the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council discuss their progress in developing an ecosystem-based management approach to some of their programs.

Finally, at the subcommittee, because we had one of our members who would be retiring from service, we asked Rod to reflect on some of his experiences with MAFAC and give us some guidance. We really had that set for the last

2.0

2.1

thing on the agenda, but it turned out that every item we brought up Rod was able to express some reflections on MAFAC in the process. So I don't know why I even thought I'd have it on the agenda. I realized it was going to pretty well dominate the conversation for the period of time, but we thought that was a good venue and Rod probably deserved that last glory. As long as he wore his hat, he was able to speak. So it worked out pretty well.

The subcommittee expressed a great debt of gratitude, for all those in my class anyway that just got started in this process, for the leadership that Rod has given to MAFAC through the years and certainly that will be a void that I don't think we have any intention of filling. It would be near impossible.

Of course, the same goes for Dick and Bonnie as well. The impact that they've had and where they've brought MAFAC so now we can make it a usable group and with Bill's insight and his leadership of it as well make it very effective,

2.0

Т	make it where we reer like this is time well
2	spent for us.
3	So certainly from the subcommittee we
4	expressed a gratitude to Rod and we appreciate
5	the insight he gave us and some of the comments
6	I've made about where we see this subcommittee
7	going and the idea of even possibly a
8	restructuring of subcommittees so it would have a
9	broader venue in the future as we look at
10	reorganization with new members and staff is very
11	helpful to us. I'll be submitting the notes of
12	our meeting, but that basically is a summary of
13	it. I hope you enjoyed my PowerPoint.
14	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: You will have a
15	written report, right, so we can follow it?
16	MR. RAYBURN: Yes, sir, I have a
17	written report. I can download it now, but
18	Laurel just said I could go ahead and e-mail it
19	to her.
20	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Scott, did
21	you have a question?
22	MR. BURNS: Just a comment, Mr.

Thank you. I second your suggestion 1 Chairman. that at the next meeting we have some discussion 2 or presentation on the steps that have been taken 3 in the western Pacific to reduce the longline 4 5 bycatch of sea turtles as well as the export of 6 those techniques to other countries in both eastern and western Pacific. 7 As Bill mentioned at the beginning of 8 the meeting, that initiative is an area of active 9 10 collaboration between my organization, NOAA and 11 others. So if there's anything that I can do to 12 help with the preparation of that presentation, 13 I'd be happy to do it. 14 Thanks, Scott. These MR. RAYBURN: 15 items that suggesting for were we were 16 subcommittee to view and get some preparation for 17 that, but certainly any of those that you felt 18 would be worthy for the full committee, that 19 would be great with us as well. Yes, sir. 2.0 MR. MOORE: I apologize, I may have 21 missed it, but I believe we also discussed the

idea of the update we got on what's going on with

1	bycatch be included in the members' notebooks at
2	every meeting.
3	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah, I think I
4	mentioned that, but basically
5	MR. MOORE: Okay. I apologize. I may
6	have missed it there.
7	MR. RAYBURN: I thought unless there
8	was an issue that felt like it was significant
9	enough to receive an oral presentation, otherwise
LO	a written update at each meeting would be
11	appropriate to maintain that request of MAFAC to
L2	be updated on the bycatch implementation plans.
L3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I have one
L <b>4</b>	question for you. When you were talking about
L 5	the coral issues, were you including Alaska in
L6	that update on where they are with corals?
L 7	MR. RAYBURN: Yeah. As I understood
L8	it, and Chris really was the one who brought this
L9	to our attention as I recall, there apparently is
20	a petition now that will have been acted on by
21	the time we get to our next meeting, so we
22	thought an update on that and what the

1	implications of the petition would be. That's
2	what we're looking at.
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Good. I
4	appreciate that. Any other comments from your
5	committee?
6	MR. RAYBURN: Did I cover it, Chris,
7	Rod? Gilmore is at lunch.
8	MR. DORSETT: Yes.
9	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Good
LO	work. Appreciate the work. With that, we've
11	got
L2	MR. RAYBURN: Will you accept that or
L3	do we need
L <b>4</b>	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that
15	we accept the by-catch committee report.
L6	MS. RAYMOND: Second.
L 7	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Maggie
18	seconded. Yes.
L 9	MR. GUTTING: Ralph, one of the issues
20	that's sort of hanging out there is the zero
21	mortality rate goal in the Marine Mammal Act.
22	There is a fair amount of political churning on

1	that issue. It may be appropriate, depending on
2	what happens over the next couple of months for
3	the subcommittee to look at that issue. It's
4	part of bycatch, obviously. My thought is that
5	given the diverse membership of the committee and
6	subcommittee, that it might be useful to have a
7	discussion depending on how events evolve. Just
8	a suggestion.
9	MR. RAYBURN: Thank you.
10	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Any other
11	comments before we vote?
12	MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Gilmore might have
13	some comments on the report.
14	MR. MOORE: Especially about the part
15	where he volunteered to do all the work for the
16	next meeting.
17	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I was there
18	for that part. Okay. Again, thank you for the
19	report. All those in favor signify by saying
20	aye.
21	IN UNISON: Aye.
22	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Opposed same

1	sign.
2	(No opposing votes)
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Motion
4	carries. So Outreach Committee.
5	MR. DiLERNIA: We have our report and
6	ready to project, but I've got a feeling it's not
7	going to be up there. I can summarize the
8	report. I kept my notes, Mr. Chairman.
9	What the Outreach Committee did was it
10	reviewed the Fish 101, so to speak, that we were
11	given, which is behind Tab 6.
12	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, can I
13	suggest a short recess until we see if we can get
14	this thing working because it's kind of hard to
15	hear conversations with the cell phones going on
16	and everything else.
17	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: So you wait
18	until the guy with the loudest voice talks.
19	Yeah, we can do that. We're on break until we
20	get a computer.
21	(Off record - 1:48 p.m.)
22	(On record - 2:03 p.m.)

1 CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay, Tony. 2 DiLERNIA: Thank you, Mr. 3 Chairman. The Outreach Committee this met morning to review the document called Managing 4 5 U.S. Marine Fisheries, a Complex System Simply 6 Stated. We conducted a review and we came up with some comments that we'd like to offer to the 8 agency. 9 One of the first comments that was 10 that we all recognize that there made was 11 many documents of this type currently available. 12 We feel that in the final production of the 13 document that the agency will be using there 14 should be a review of those documents that 15 currently exist. 16 Because we know the timeliness of the 17 project, it has been suggested that if anyone has 18 any comments that they'd like to forward to the 19 agency, the track to follow would be to e-mail 2.0 them to myself and then I'll compile all the e-21 mails, try to summarize them if possible and

forward that entire package, e-mail that entire

package to Laurel, our executive director.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

Another comment was that whatever final document is produced, there should be a web-based site to support the paper document. There was a lot of discussion regarding the length of the paper document and how much of it should be summary, how much of it should be in detail and there was a general agreement amongst the committee that the paper document should be a brief, general introduction and overview and, for details, an individual should be able to refer to website where they get additional can information.

If I could skip down to item six, identify the audience. I offered the comment to the committee that I thought the audience of this document, individuals would be perhaps congressional staff, perhaps media folks, folks who were producing summary documents for someone superior to them, either a member of Congress or for an editor of a newspaper. Typically the individuals in those positions, entry-level

positions, are, let's face it, younger folks, folks in their 20's, early 30's. That age group communicates really a little bit differently than this table is average age around we. The probably around 50 years old. That age group communicates a little bit differently. They stuff. and click on most I'm still learning how to do that. Ι may be a slow learner, but I'm still learning how to point and click and learning how to use the web for information. I look at my students and the young folks around me and they rely on the web for a lot of information. So if that's the audience that we're talking about that this document will be used by, truly we need then to have a webbased site to support the paper documents.

We need to incorporate visual materials and photographs. The current document does not have any. It's clear that there's a need to have visual materials and photographs to liven up the document.

More detailed in this current document

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

plans that are listed are council in t.he We thought that it would be better if you simply had a listing of council sites because the councils continuously update their plans and whatever changes are being made to the plans. Rather than put this on paper and all of a sudden a few months later becomes obsolete, it might be simply to replace the council better section with a listing of council sites.

We had two questions. One question we have is when is this project scheduled to be completed. The person who is going to answer Ι quess just left the Ιf the room. completion date is after the next MAFAC meeting, the committee recommends that MAFAC have a second opportunity to review the revised document. the agency decides to take our recommendations and review and revise the document, we'd like to have another opportunity to review the final document before it gets put out.

So those are the comments that I have regarding this particular document, Managing U.S.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	Marine Fisheries, and I'd invite committee
2	members to add any comments that they wish. I'm
3	not sure if I missed anything or if they'd like
4	to add to what I've said. Maggie.
5	MS. RAYMOND: We talked a little bit
6	about how it would be nice to have an inclusion
7	of a reference to fishing gear, which I think
8	would be a web-based link. I don't know that one
9	exists that does that.
10	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes.
11	MS. RAYMOND: But just a simple
12	regional description of the basic commercial
13	fishing and recreational fishing gears are in
14	each region. That was the only other thing.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: Laurel, could you
16	please add that to our report? Okay. I see
17	you're doing that. Any other committee members
18	regarding this document? Rod.
19	MR. MOORE: Tony, two things. One,
20	there are a couple places, at least for the west
21	coast, that has some good descriptions or good
22	line drawings of commercial fishing gear. Pete's

1	website is one of them and there are several
2	others. I'll try to remember.
3	MR. DiLERNIA: This is exactly the
4	types of comments if you could send to me by e-
5	mail that I'll incorporate.
6	MR. MOORE: I'll try to remember to
7	find those websites and get them to you. The
8	other question I have, Tony, is did you guys look
9	at sort of the structure of this report? One of
10	the things that struck me was that it almost
11	seemed to bounce around, starting in one
12	direction and then abruptly shifting off
13	someplace else and then going back a third place.
14	Did you look at that at all or is that something
15	you want additional comments on?
16	MR. DiLERNIA: I'll take additional
17	comments on that. We didn't do that in detail.
18	If you go back to number one, many documents
19	currently available, once you begin to review
20	this document and compare it to many of those
21	other documents, I think whomever is authoring
22	the final product will begin to sense a bit more

1	of an order. Again, we recommend that this be
2	revised and reviewed and compared to other
3	existing publications. Scott.
4	MR. BURNS: Tony, did the committee
5	have views on which audience this document should
6	be aimed at?
7	MR. DiLERNIA: No. Those comments
8	regarding the young adults and all were my own.
9	I offered that on my own behalf. That was a
10	question we had for the agency, who would the
11	audience be for this document.
12	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Do you want
13	to respond to that?
14	MR. DiLERNIA: Yes, sir.
15	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think you
16	sort of hit the nail on the head. We get a lot
17	of questions from the Hill, a lot of briefings, a
18	lot of questions from you staffers and you people
19	that get involved in this as to what you mean by
20	this and what you mean by that and we end up
21	going down and doing a lot of 101's. When the
22	Congress committees change, we get the same

thing. OMB calls and wants to come down and talk are these about what terms. Sometimes council members, to be honest with you, don't of this background, have some so we would probably use it somewhat to that. But it's basically for public affairs people who call and say we read this scientific report and what does this term mean and that term mean.

So I think a lot of documents, you're right, are available and I'm not sure if we've reviewed those as well as we should to incorporate some of that and I agree with that, As far as schedule, I guess, it's number one. not really one -- it's a little later than I would have wanted anyway, but considering the comments that have been made here, I think the timing is based pretty much on when we get a document that people feel like it's reasonable. I would like to say that, yeah, we could probably take it back to MAFAC depending on when you meet. I would like to finish it before January the 20th just for personal reasons. I don't leave

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

hanging that I've started. 1 stuff So that's probably it. If nothing else, we can make sure 2 3 we send it to each one of you individually. Knowing the comments that were made 4 here and other things we're doing, I'm not sure 5 it would be much before then, but I'll have to go 6 back and talk to people that are working on it. I agree with most of the things you've said there. 8 I don't think I have any problem with anything 9 10 that's there. So to go back and address each one 11 of them, how long it would take, I don't know. 12 It's something I wish I'd already had done. 13 I think it's important to have it in 14 January when the new people come in because there will be a lot of changes. Regardless of who wins 15 16 presidential, there's still committee changes. A lot of committee changes. 17 There will 18 be staff members, new new congressmen, 19 senators, all those people. 2.0 DiLERNIA: Those inquiries will 21 probably start December 1st, even before folks 22 are on board, won't they?

1	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah. That's
2	why I say I'm concerned. But, either way, we'll
3	make sure that you all get to look at it one way
4	or the other.
5	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you.
6	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman.
7	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Vince and
8	then Rod.
9	MR. O'SHEA: Well, first a comment on
10	the gear thing. Atlantic States Commission is
11	working with endangered species folks to
12	categorize all the fishing gear on the east coast
13	as well as interaction with turtles. North
14	Carolina has already done that and I think the
15	gulf guys are thinking about doing that as well.
16	I'll send you information on that responding to
17	the gear thing. The stuff is already on the
18	shelf ready to go, I think.
19	The question on item one, many
20	documents currently available, it's built into
21	that comment the idea that whatever this new
22	document is that the definitions and the things

that are in existing documents, this new document 1 needs to be consistent with those definitions. 2 3 Did you guys discuss or kind of capture that idea? 4 5 MR. DiLERNIA: That's a good point. 6 think what we were trying to say was that there are good pieces that have been produced by other agencies out there and we agree NOAA should have 8 its own document that describes the 9 fisherv 10 management process. should not be left to Ιt 11 other agencies. Ι mean Sea Grant does 12 wonderful job of describing it. I've seen the 13 councils do their own work. 14 MR. O'SHEA: The commission's got one. The commission has. 15 MR. DiLERNIA: 16 But, at the same time, the agency should have its 17 own document. So while this is a noble effort 18 and it's a good, hard first strike, there's a lot 19 to be learned from some of those other documents. 2.0 If we could just pull those pieces together, you 21 produce an excellent document that the

agency could really just hold up there and say

1	look what we have.
2	MR. O'SHEA: Thank you.
3	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: To that point,
4	I think, too, we should reference those
5	documents, as many as we know. We should
б	reference them and say we've utilized these, but
7	you'll find a more thorough discussion and then
8	reference those.
9	I do think, too, one thing we didn't
10	do and what we should try to do is diagrams of
11	pictures of some of the more common gear. What
12	is a longline and this type of stuff. I think
13	that's something we should add to this, too.
14	MR. DiLERNIA: I know committee
15	members will forward things to me and I'll put it
16	all together and I'll forward it to staff.
17	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Thank you for
18	your comments.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: If I may, if there's no
20	other comments regarding this document, I'd like
21	to move on.
22	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: You've got

2	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you.
3	MR. MOORE: Actually, it's a question
4	for you, Bill. When this is finally put together
5	and you were talking about NOAA public affairs
6	and so forth using it, have you considered and
7	it may be something you want to run by the public
8	affairs folks sending this out as sort of a
9	press packet to various newspapers around the
10	country? One of the things that works real well,
11	a reporter gets a nice glossy packet, it's got
12	all of this stuff in it, so they don't have to
13	it's not like they have to call you to find out
14	what's an MSY. They've got it right there in
15	front of them and they can use it.
16	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: We're in the
17	process of doing it.
18	MS. BRYANT: We've got some of the
19	stuff. We've wanted to do that for a long time
20	and we're finally kind of getting freed up off
21	some other things where we can do that.
22	MR. MOORE: Yeah, I think once the

two more. You've got Rod and then Ken.

document gets done, it's a great thing to be able to send out so the L.A. Times, you know, oh, well, we don't really know what MSY is, but we're not going to pay any attention because we don't have any way to reference it.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Just to that point real quick. You know, we don't have public affair people. They don't belong to us, they belong to NOAA.

MR. MOORE: I do understand that.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: And what's happened is NOAA hasn't chosen yet to replace the head of public affairs. At the same time we lost one of the staff members there. They haven't replaced that person. So we've been working now with a two-person staff, Connie Barkley and Susan McKinna. They both do an excellent job. is really excellent in dealing with the public. But we're short two people and I'm beating on them like mad. Of all agencies to be short two people, not us because we have more of that than all the rest of them put together, and we're the

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	one's that are short-changed right now. They've
2	interviewed for the head and hopefully in the
3	next two or three weeks we'll have that person
4	back, the head of public affairs, and then we've
5	got to get some more help for him.
6	MR. MOORE: I do want to point out, as
7	I have in the past, that we're the advisors to
8	Secretary of Commerce and the administrator of
9	NOAA is our chair by the charter. I think we
10	could let him know.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Thanks for your
12	comments.
13	MR. ROBERTS: One of the things that
14	was sent out to us before the meeting says on
15	Fishing 101 the present plans call for additional
16	sections on ecosystem-based management and marine
17	aquaculture and some other things. I haven't
18	heard any discussion about between now and
19	January 20th, you really want to get this done by
20	January 20th. Bill, do you want those other
21	sections done?
22	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I don't think

we're	at	the	point	right	now	to	do	that,
persona	ally.	I	think w	e just	menti	oned	this	will
be a	livir	ng do	cument	and I	think	we	ment	cioned
that w	e're	look	ing at	aquacul	ture a	and,	as t	hings
develor	o, we	e wil	l add i	t to it	, but	I t	nink	we're
just s	econd	d-gues	ssing.	We're	just i	n th	e lea	arning
stage o	ourse	elf.						

8 MR. DiLERNIA: May I continue, Mr. 9 Chairman?

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yes.

MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you. The committee then turned its attention to some other items that we wanted to recommend to the agency. The first there is under additional committee The committee was trying to map out or work. plan work for the future for some of its future meetings, which part of its mission is to serve MAFAC and the agency. One of the recommendations was that the Rec Fish Implementation Plan that is currently being revised should also be finally reviewed by the Outreach Committee.

We also in our discussions thought it

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	would be helpful if we could get a report from
2	the agency regarding the reorganization of the
3	Office of Constituent Services. We understand
4	that the office has been reorganized and once the
5	final reorganization is in place, if there could
6	be just simply a brief
7	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: How about
8	changing the word reorganization to report on the
9	status of the Office of Constituent Services?
10	Reorganization carries on the Hill a different
11	connotation and we have to send it through to get
12	it approved and all this stuff.
13	MR. DiLERNIA: On the status. I have
14	no objection. Do any of the other committee
15	members? No. So then if we could simply change
16	that term to status.
17	MS. BRYANT: Got it.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you.
19	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I'm trying to
20	do it without it going through all that process.
21	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay. Item three. The
22	committee appreciated the fact that the OC

1	incorporated its comments in regards to the
2	current report to Congress. It reflects changes
3	that have been made compared to previous reports.
4	It appears that these changes are the results of
5	the comments that the committee made at previous
6	meetings. So the committee would like to express
7	its appreciation to the agency for accepting
8	those comments and making the changes.
9	Having said that, there are some other
10	documents that we'd like to comment on. In the
11	future, the committee would welcome the
12	opportunity to provide similar comments regarding
13	status of the stocks, living oceans and fisheries
14	of the U.S., are documents that the committee
15	hopes in the future will be able to review.
16	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Give you an
17	inch, you take a mile.
18	MR. DiLERNIA: I'm from New York.
19	What do you expect? We thought that the new
20	report worked out well. We were so helpful that
21	time, we'd love to be helpful again. Thank you,
22	Mr. Chairman. That's my report and I'll be happy

1	to take questions. Yes, sir.
2	MR. MOORE: To that last point, do you
3	want to add the NMFS budget in there.
4	MR. DiLERNIA: I'll be happy to report
5	whatever the committee recommends to me.
6	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Are there any
7	questions or comments for Tony on his report?
8	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let me just say
9	one thing.
10	MR. GILMORE: Just a comment and
11	that's I sent a note to the NMFS leadership about
12	this a month ago or so and I just wanted to say
13	it publicly, not as an Outreach Committee member,
14	but I very much appreciate the agency listening
15	to us on this status of stocks report, taking our
16	comments into consideration and going back and
17	really doing a zero-base budgeting kind of
18	approach, I thought, revisiting a lot of the
19	assumptions of how it was being done. I'm just
20	very grateful to you and to the other folks at
21	the agency for listening So I just wanted to

say that publicly in addition to the e-mail I

1 sent.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Just to Status of stocks has taken on sort of a life of its own. I think it is important we continue to work with that. That seems to be the one document that people are paying a lot of attention to. One thing I think is not entirely clear the way I like it to be is to go in and say, okay, this stock was over-fished, but it's not clear which stocks you're talking about at times, so I think we've got to continue to work towards a list of what is over-fished for one day when we put the FMP in place. So we've got to do it a little bit better.

The only thing I'd say, and I don't have any problem with this, is you meet so seldom, infrequent for some of this stuff, so the only thing we'd have to do is set up a mechanism where we send it to the outreach chairman and he's responsible to get comments or we send it to every member but you respond back to the outreach chairman what you want to do. We only need to

work the logistics out because we can't wait until you have a meeting sometimes with the report deadlines we get from Congress and other things, but we have no problem really. That's what you're here for.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Dick.

MR. GUTTING: Bill, on the last point, I think what struck the committee was these are major documents and expressions of the agency to the public large and they're radically at different in level of detail and format almost across the board. I think what the committee was interested in doing looking was strategically, not looking at individual an document as an editor would look at it, but looking more at what is the agency trying to communicate. Are there gaps there or are inconsistencies overall. In other words, just taking a look at the fundamental structure of these documents and the timing of these documents. Trying to make a more integrated communication, I guess.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I nave no
problem. There's one you haven't listed because
you don't know about it because we only did one,
but the annual business plan which I am having
a hell of a time getting this agency to do on
time. To me, the annual business plan would pull
most of these things together or these reports in
a format that's about 12 to 15 pages, no more
than that, that we could utilize, too. I would
like input on that. I was talking to him today.
He promised me a month ago that I'd have it and
six months ago I'd have it and we still don't
have it and I'm concerned about the format we're
using. It may be like Fishing 101, we don't know
the audience and we're not dealing right. We
need to put something out so the general public
can understand what the status of this fishery
is. Do we have a plan to move forward? If we're
failing here, then we should admit we're failing
here and we need to work in this area.

We'll probably have a draft in the next month and I will send it out to you. Again,

that's one I would like to get turned around. If
we could get this one out, then I think at the
January meeting maybe you ought to put report
format and give us advice on how to do them in
the future or something. I would not like to
hold this one up for months. I'd like to at
least get it current, but I think that one is one
a lot of these others people are not going to
read, the long and involved, but I don't think it
hurts to look at them. I want something that's
spiffy, that people will look at, that I can send
down to Congress and put them on the table for
people coming in, waiting to get into the
Admiral's Office or places like that.
MR. DiLERNIA: Mr. Chairman, I have
one other thing.
CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay.
MR. DiLERNIA: As chairman of the
Outreach Committee, I'd like to thank we have
one member that's outgoing, Mr. Gutting, and he's
provided a tremendous amount of support and
advice and as chairman of the committee I'd like

б

1	to thank him for his contributions to the
2	committee. Thank you, sir.
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Very good.
4	If there's no more questions for outreach, is
5	there a motion to accept the report?
6	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman. I move we
7	accept the Outreach Committee report with the
8	changes that were discussed during presentation.
9	MR. BURNS: Second.
L O	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Seconded by
11	Scott. Any other discussion?
L 2	(No discussion)
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hearing none.
L 4	Those in favor signify by saying aye.
L 5	IN UNISON: Aye.
L 6	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Opposed same
L 7	sign.
L8	(No opposing votes)
L 9	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Motion
20	carries. Thank you for your report. As everyone
21	knows, some of our members are leaving. I think
22	they've been very important to us and we're going

to miss them. Anyway, on with aquaculture. Don.

MR. KENT: We met earlier today. Our outgoing member, Bobby Brown -- or Bonnie Brown, I'm sorry, John Forster, myself, Ken Roberts, Elizabeth Sheehan. We also invited all of the speakers that attended. Most of them had to leave, but Mark Mensell (ph) and Don Bremner attended and entered into discussions with us. Of course, Linda Shawtis (ph) attended before she needed to leave. I'd like to say also that we're all going to miss Bobby very, very much.

(Laughter)

KENT: We were charged in meeting with collecting comments and discussing and coming back to the committee with recommendations relative to the expanded case. I'd remind everybody that the draft business case was developed as an internal document for NOAA to use as a rational in support of the proposed National Ocean Aquaculture Act. So, in that regard, we're going to confine these comments to that, then we'll talk about programmatically

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

larger concerns relative to the development of NOAA's role in marine aquaculture.

specifically, relative So, case, devised ways to demonstrate localized economic benefit. It's great to talk about the global need, the trade deficit, the desire to keep jobs within the U.S., the need to not over the next 25 years have an additional increase of \$5 million to the trade deficit, but there ought to be a way to kind of bring that down and make people represent the idea that these are jobs that will exist in a local community. The people actually performing the aquaculture and fileting fish and all that will actually be within communities in the coastal zone.

Also, the case discusses lightly the negative components or perceptions that exist out there about mariculture. Those maybe ought to be up to the front Potential brought end. conflicts environmental impacts, user and socioeconomic considerations. Again, these considerations, when you listen to some of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	talks we had yesterday, a lot of that revolves
2	around the idea that we don't want to have
3	something that the federal government comes in
4	and sticks outside the waters of our state, our
5	community and then we have to live with. What's
6	the benefit to us. So creating dialogue on a
7	regional level, on a community level, would be
8	extremely valuable on the front end of this.
9	Also, to let folks know, as this
10	document matures and becomes available, to let
11	folks know that this is an aside thought down at
12	the end, but really consideration on the front
13	end in NOAA's mind.
14	Also, we should expand on the catfish
15	example that exists
16	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Don, can I
17	before you move on. I hope you take this right.
18	I hate to see things put as negative. You start
19	off negative, then you're sort of in the hole.
20	Do you want to say negative or do you want to say
21	important issues that must be addressed? I mean,

to me.....

1	MR. KENT: The things that are
2	perceptually a problem. You heard yesterday the
3	socioeconomic considerations that were coming
4	across as a concern.
5	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: But all the
6	negatives, are they potential problems or
7	potential issues that need to be I guess I'm a
8	little concerned.
9	MR. SIMPSON: Sensitive of the word
10	negative.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: They may be
12	negative or they may not be until you examine
13	them fully. I guess I'm just concerned when you
14	refer to negatives. Maybe you're not meaning to
15	put negatives. Maybe you just mean to put those
16	type of issues up front. We can call them what
17	we want.
18	MR. KENT: Let me ask Bobby real
19	quick. Do you have an alternative thought?
20	MS. BROWN: I'll think of an
21	alternative. Here was my point. When I read
22	what had been put together, it was all pretty

1	sweet, sunny, and then you got to the appendix
2	and there was all the complaints. My point
3	and I agree with you, maybe there's a better way
4	to say this as a report to you because you're
5	going to then give this higher up. My point is
6	to deal with all of the questions and concerns
7	regarding open ocean aquaculture up front and not
8	to stick them in an appendix, to put them out
9	there and either debunk them, which is most of
10	the time, or say that, yes, this is the problem
11	and, guess what, it's already being worked on
12	here, here and here or to say we don't have a
13	clue how we're going to solve it, but we know
14	it's coming and so we're going to deal with it.
15	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I agree with
16	what you're saying.
17	MS. BROWN: So maybe there's some
18	other word we can come up with.
19	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I guess I'd
20	look at them as
21	MS. BROWN: Challenges?
22	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH:challenges

or issues that must be resolved or something like 1 that rather than -- yeah, I guess I wouldn't call 2 3 them all negatives. CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Challenges. 4 5 KENT: that acceptable to MR. Is everybody? I'll make that change. 6 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I know what you so that's okay. I'm just 8 mean now, 9 negative person, so I like the positive. 10 Expand on the catfish MR. KENT: 11 example to include real open ocean farming 12 examples. There are examples, not within this 13 We saw one yesterday. We saw the New country. 14 Hampshire example, but that's a demonstration 15 project. It's not an economically viable one, 16 but it's out there to demonstrate the challenges, 17 demonstrate the technology and also to deal with 18 some real questions that are developed over time. 19 There are Australian and Hawaiian tuna farms. 2.0 These are commercial operations and it might be 21 valuable to go back in and use those as examples.

Also, there's some environmental work, so this

expands beyond an economic document and starts looking at environmental questions. Those are considerations that also can be incorporated in.

Consequences of action and non-action. There ought to be a clear statement that comes out and says here's the dilemma that exists right now relative to trade deficit and relative to increased seafood need. This is the result of moving forward with NOAA as the lead agency would be and here's the downside of not doing that in a clear point/counterpoint sort of set up.

And then create incentives regarding diminished fee rate. This is one of the things -- we had about a full three and a half hour discussion today before we broke for lunch and a lot of it centered around how the state gets involved and how communities get involved. of the ways to drive it in a business sense is that if there's an anticipation of developing lease fees permit fees from commercial or operations, then maybe there's a way to diminish that burden on business by looking at a point

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

but make that consistent throughout. 2 3 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Can I go back to this open ocean farming example. I didn't 4 bring it up earlier and I'm sorry, but did you 5 6 discuss cages? Did you all discuss whether 7 that's really aquaculture or just these growing 8 facilities. 9 In all the considerations MR. KENT: 10 that have been voiced, you have -- actually, the 11 grow-out situation from a technological 12 standpoint and others are really no different 13 than most other forms of offshore aquaculture. 14 Granted, the juveniles are brought in from a wild 15 fishery and then raised. It's basically a 16 market-holding and a fattening process. 17 that's really not much different than what's 18 going in the situation of a shore-based on 19 hatchery, bringing juveniles out. John, would 2.0 you.... 21 MR. FORSTER: Yeah, that's exactly 22 right. The offshore component of that industry

system, which we'll describe a little bit later,

Τ	and cages has got a lot to teach us. The
2	difference between what we're talking about in
3	terms of totally control system of aquaculture is
4	the source of juveniles. If we're looking for
5	examples of offshore aquaculture now, tuna is
6	somewhere we can go to learn.
7	MR. KENT: It's global. It's western
8	Pacific, eastern Pacific, Mediterranean, off of
9	Africa now I believe as well, so there's plenty
10	of places that can be used as an example.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It's a big
12	issue. The total quota is probably 26,000 metric
13	tons, but we've got about 22,000 metric tons in
14	pens around the world.
15	MR. FORSTER: I don't think we're
16	advocating that that is a model for aquaculture
17	to follow, but it's an example of an industry
18	that is worth looking at right now and what we
19	can learn.
20	MR. KENT: Also, delete the
21	appendices. I know you're shooting for a 15-page
22	document, but there's a lot of information in the

appendices and they need to be incorporated into the document. The term carrying capacity used in there should probably be replaced to a different term. It's an inappropriate use of that term. And then move ocean policy recommendations into the text as an additional rational. There's a little box that describes the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policies recommendations and it's a little separate graph that ought to be put right in there as the text.

So, in looking at citing criteria, one of the discussions we had was on what involvement will local communities, will the states have on citing these locations in their waters. So we're sort of off the case now and we're talking into more of an operational level where things ought to go. We need to start talking about these kind of issues that come up and some strategies on how to communicate with the community on that.

So, in identifying sites for aquaculture, there can be two ways to approach that and they're not necessarily exclusive of one

2.0

another, but we're looking at aquaculture development zones, areas that regionally have identified as appropriate for been this and/or developing development criteria. In other words, we want to avoid this type of area, we want to avoid this type of conflict, we want to move it into this sort of area. This is where I think there's probably a lot of room for council action as well, council involvement, because in developing some of these criterion and looking at specific areas, you certainly don't want to put a farm right on top of a critical zone for recovering species.

Reinforce the coastal zone management act process. Make sure that there's a way with existing law to go back in and utilize the existing regulations as they pertain to how areas out in the EZ will interface with coastal zone management.

Ensure state input on the acceptability of aquaculture. Early on we're going to have to develop a protocol that lets the

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

they even want to have here? The governor was kind enough to come over yesterday and state that he thinks there ought to be a moratorium on the development of offshore aquaculture. He uses a lot of terms differently than I would use them and I think that's one of the things that NOAA maybe wants to do is work up a glossary so you clearly define mariculture as more than just shellfish culture.

So right now the state has made a decision and is there a need to go in any further with the state consider fin fish an offshore aquaculture or is it time to start a dialogue with them and find out the steps by which they'd be excited about it.

Input on site selection determined by the state. We certainly need to have the states have an input on this process up here. In order to manage this properly, we need to have that input from the state, either legislatively or executively mandated. Who speaks for the

2.0

individual state in its communication with NOAA relative to making these decisions.

Obtaining a permit. Back to this idea of one type of proposal might be a little more favorable than another from the standpoint of getting a break on, say, lease fees. So consider system to maximize benefit to a point An example on ownership. Is this a cooperative or is this an individual. Is this a sole organization or is it made up of a group of fishermen, a group of researchers, or processors or whatever. Or domestic versus foreign. a foreign corporation should be paying more for a license or a lease or a permit to work than a domestic corporation.

Integration with the local university.

Is there a connection there with the infrastructure available in the local community and meeting with local standards. Are you setting a new standard or are you consistent with what's available in the community already?

Elizabeth, did we get all those okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1 MS. SHEEHAN: Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2 MR. KENT: There's lots of examples.

MS. SHEEHAN: It was basically this idea of breaking out when Gunnar said we want to increase the benefits that aquaculture can have, so we wanted to say what do we mean by benefits and is there a way to sort of weigh that against each other. So it's a start.

MR. KENT: And then programmatic action items, things that we feel need to get done overall and moving NOAA's role forward. Consolidate all available technical and economic information. From that, there's lot of а different things that could be dealt with. Ιt was pointed out, even during the meeting, Larry sent us material and Vince has sent material, about what's being done regionally in developing codes for what ought to be going on in aquaculture in those areas. There's very large reports generated on economic prospectuses working in the gulf. Those sorts of materials need to get brought together. There's

tremendous amount of environmental studying that's been done on aquaculture.

We saw a presentation yesterday that talked in fairly general terms about concerns relative to environmental impacts and those are based in sort of kinds of locations as opposed to others. It's important as we start talking about developing the EEC that we bring information like Rich Langdon's up where he talks about not even being able to measure effluents considerations. So that sort of materials needs to get brought together and then develop the best response to environmental concerns.

We need to have NOAA develop a position relative to how it's going to be looking at criteria in evaluating the environment. What are the issues with being offshore versus an enclosed environment. Rod.

MR. MOORE: I was going to make a suggestion here, Don. In terms of developing best response to environmental concerns, you might also want to develop a best response to

2.0

economic concerns because a lot of what you're going to get are going to be economic concerns, especially on the local level.

MR. KENT: I used that as an example. just what popped up. But the point is there is a lot of material. As the office gets organized, you now have a coordinator and that's the second point here. The staff needs increase. It's not going to be done by one poor And it's going to have to be developed on a larger scale, but that's just an example. Economic would be another one. Citing would be another.

Conduct regional meetings, mimicking this forum and localizing representation where possible. I think everybody appreciated the breadth of what was represented yesterday. It would be valuable to go ahead and do that in other locations and ask input from representatives of those different communities, from the fishing community, from the environment community, when possible, regionally in those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	areas.
2	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Don.
3	MR. KENT: Sir.
4	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: To that point,
5	would MAFAC like to be involved in those regional
6	meetings, the Aquaculture Committee? That's just
7	a thought.
8	MS. BRYANT: Would it be a
9	subcommittee or would it be whatever MAFAC
10	representative might be in that region?
11	MR. KENT: How would you define a
12	region for NOAA? Would you use the council
13	regional structure?
14	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think to
15	start off we'd use council regions, I believe.
16	MS. BRYANT: That's where the
17	fishermen are.
18	MR. KENT: Would that be ar
19	opportunity then to bring the council in by
20	making it part of the council process in defining
21	it regionally that way?
22	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah.

1	MR. KENT: I don't think anybody on
2	the committee would think that's a bad idea.
3	Bonnie.
4	MS. BROWN: I don't think it's a bad
5	idea, but you might want to do something in
6	addition that also utilizes the ASMFC, CFMC
7	because ASMFC, for example, that's not the same
8	council. It's not just the council. I just
9	think you get a lot deeper into the roots of the
10	community.
11	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: The state
12	director is the only thing you have on the
13	council and on the commissions, both.
14	MS. BROWN: So I'd hate to just see it
15	limited to the council because I think you'll
16	miss out on a ton of
17	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: No, I don't
18	want to just limit it to them, but I would just
19	think the same regional structure we have with
20	the councils.
21	MS. BROWN: Right. But if it's
22	possible, since they've already got the plans,

1	they must have been thinking about it, so maybe
2	they've already talked to some of the, quote,
3	local talent.
4	MS. RAYMOND: Don, just to that point.
5	I think that's something that you ought to think
6	about doing whenever you have any kind of
7	regional meeting on an issue, just like with
8	those bycatch meetings. Contact your MAFAC
9	person or persons in that region and make sure
10	that they're there somehow or at least try to get
11	them there because I think that will be really
12	helpful.
13	MR. KENT: I think it would be
14	valuable for the agency in this new office and
15	this aquaculture coordinator to develop briefings
16	for the regions and come back out as they visit
17	the regions and talk about what's going on here.
18	There's a lot that needs to get done within the
19	agency.
20	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Just to that
21	point about staffing. We've got the coordinator,
22	we've got one other position that's on the street

now and I think there's a possibility of one other right up front. We're waiting for the coordinator to get on it. But also there's a plan to try to get this office better connected with, say, Manchester and Milford who are doing a lot of this work so they will have the benefit of the labs we have that are actually involved in aquaculture stuff now. We haven't had that and that's the goal, so that this team works with the Milford, Manchester and Gulf Bay.

MR. KENT: I think as this matures and opportunities afford themselves and people start coming to NOAA and saying, well, I'm interested in being down in the southeast, I want to put in a cage system offshore, it's important for the southeastern administrator to actually know what the issues are and how to deal with this internally within the organization.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I'm sorry I didn't bring the minutes from the leadership last week because we talked about this coordinate and how to coordinate both the science center and

2.0

1	regions, so there's a family put together to do
2	this.
3	MR. KENT: And then promote regional
4	demonstration projects using same incentive
5	criteria. Ideally, what you'd want to be doing
6	is utilizing local technology. All of the
7	factors we discussed relative to maybe decreasing
8	lease fees as a desirable situation are the same
9	sorts of things you'd want to try to promote in a
10	demonstration project.
11	I think Rich's was a great example.
12	We have the fishermen working with us. There's a
13	direct technology transfer. This wasn't just the
14	University of New Hampshire, it was a consortium
15	of people working together. Fishermen,
16	universities, technological folks. So that sort
17	of thing coming together would be very valuable.
18	
19	Then as the act moves forward, as
20	funding is available, then start selecting
21	regional demonstration projects that people car
22	go to and see and potentially understand a little

1	more about what's going on and realize
2	opportunities.
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Don, John has
4	a question.
5	MR. FORSTER: I just had a question to
6	go back to this question of interacting with the
7	agencies and resource limitations. There was
8	some discussion about how, if at all, the
9	resources at USDA can be helpful here and they
LO	are involved in aquaculture, they do have people
11	and, to that extent, it's a resource that might
L2	be available to NOAA as it moves forward.
L3	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: By the way, and
L <b>4</b>	I don't know if Linda discussed it with you,
15	there is an inter-agency aquaculture task force.
L 6	It was FDA, agriculture and I don't know how
L 7	many others, but we do have that internally now
18	that's operating. That probably needs to be
L 9	expanded some to move forward to bring in you
20	all.
21	MR. FORSTER: I'm thinking these
22	regional meetings with the councils, it would be

1	a help to build bridges if at some point one
2	could bring a representative of USDA to those
3	meetings who's kind of involved with this, people
4	like Gary Jensen.
5	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I'd like to go
6	back to the inter-agency task force so that FDA,
7	agriculture and everybody knows here's the
8	schedule and make sure they get their people
9	involved too.
10	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman.
11	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Rod.
12	MR. MOORE: I have two motions I'd
13	like to make. The first motion is that I move
14	MAFAC accept the Aquaculture Committee report.
15	MS. RAYMOND: Second.
16	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay, we have
17	a second. The motion is to accept the report and
18	it's been seconded. Any comments on it,
19	discussion.
20	(No discussion)
21	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hearing none,
22	all those in favor of accepting the report

1	signify by saying aye.
2	IN UNISON: Aye.
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Those opposed
4	same sign.
5	(No opposing votes)
6	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Motion
7	carries. Thank you for your report. I sat
8	through most of it and there was a lot of work
9	being done and a lot of good ideas came out of
10	it. Appreciate it.
11	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have
12	another motion.
13	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: This is on
14	aquaculture?
15	MR. MOORE: Yes, it is.
16	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Okay. Because
17	I want to say something when you get through.
18	MR. MOORE: One thing that the
19	committee did not bring up in its report was the
20	fact that NMFS was looking forward to going
21	forward with legislation and so forth and so on
22	and there's this whole question out there about

whether there's a need for some sort  $\circ f$ regulatory process for open ocean aquaculture and, if so, who's going to do it and that kind of thing, which is embodied in the draft legislation that Linda described to us the other day. think it would be appropriate that we make some comment on that. So I would move that MAFAC support regulatory authority over open ocean aquaculture be given by legislation to the National Marine Fishery Service provided that, one, legislation includes a means of taking account through a transparent process the full

granting open ocean aquaculture permits and, two,

that MAFAC, as the Department of Commerce's

statutory advisory committee, has the opportunity

to provide advice on the development of that

legislation.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. When

were you going to read it slowly?

economic, social and environmental impacts of

MR. MOORE: Do you want me to read it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

21

1	fast?
2	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Can we have a
3	copy of it?
4	MR. MOORE: I've got a copy here.
5	I've got it on my computer. I've got no way to
6	transfer it over.
7	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Do we have a
8	second?
9	MS. BROWN: I second it.
10	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Bonnie
11	seconded the motion. Discussion. Bonnie.
12	MS. BROWN: Transparent process, is
13	that meant to mean an open public process?
14	MR. MOORE: If I may, Mr. Chairman.
15	Yes. The comment that came up during the
16	discussion the other day is that, well, you know,
17	how are we going to know who's doing what or
18	deals being cut, blah, blah, blah. You know, we
19	ought to have an open public process.
20	MS. BROWN: That's what I want to
21	know.
22	MR. MOORE: Yeah. All of the impacts

1	are out there, are considered, decision is made,
2	people have an opportunity to comment.
3	MS. BROWN: As a point of illustration
4	in our discussions today, it was said a number of
5	times that we needed to lay out the maps, find
6	the places with conflicts and nix those to begin
7	with. That's a public process that should occur
8	way before something goes up on its federal
9	register and it's really a huge point. I'm cool
10	with it. I would just want to have a friendly
11	amendment if they don't understand what
12	transparent process is.
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I think they
14	understand that.
15	MS. BROWN: I mean really, way before
16	even something like what we just had gets
17	written.
18	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Look at the
19	process we've been using, particularly in south
20	Atlantic, for example. It's been very open,
21	meeting set aside, you put maps on the table,
22	people come in. That's the open transparent

	process. It takes a willie
2	MS. BROWN: Before it gets written
3	down there's even a draft.
4	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Yeah.
5	MS. BROWN: Okay.
6	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: In fact, first
7	off, I plan on having the matrix group try to
8	develop some criteria that will be then open to
9	discuss before we even get to that.
10	MR. KENT: I'm trying to visualize
11	this world where there's this dark room somewhere
12	where people are kind of figuring out where these
13	things are going to go and then the next day
14	you'll come out and there will be I mean it is
15	transparent. It's a public process. It's all on
16	federal register review. My only concern with
17	that is to insinuate that there's anything that
18	gets done in a timely manner that would support
19	the idea that people don't have an input.
20	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Don, you
21	haven't been at this long enough. We get accused
22	of that all the time.

1	MR. KENT: I'm just a babe in the
2	woods.
3	MR. MOORE: Don, just because you're
4	paranoid doesn't mean nobody's out to get you.
5	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Any other
6	discussion on the motion.
7	(No discussion)
8	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hearing none.
9	Everybody understands the motion. All those in
10	favor of the motion signify by saying aye.
11	IN UNISON: Aye.
12	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Those opposed
13	same sign.
14	(No opposing votes)
15	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Motion
16	carries. Thank you, Rod.
17	MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I just want to
19	say one thing real quick. I really want to thank
20	everyone, including the presenters, those that
21	are here, those that are not here. I thought
22	yesterday's discussion was excellent and I've

gotten about three phone calls today from news
media that picked it up for the comments and all.
I'm very impressed with it and really happy
because it's sort of the way I've been trying to
get us to go in that direction for three and a
half years I've been here. I thought yesterday
sort of brought it all together in what I thought
was one of the best open discussions we've had.
This is a tough issue for all of us and this
country needs to be part of making decisions. So
I just want to thank everyone, all of you and I
hope that you realize that your comments were
taken seriously. As we move forward, you need to
be involved and those comments will be taken
seriously as we go. I don't know where this will
end up. I have my own opinions, but they don't
matter a lot in this process. It's what the
American public wants. I think MAFAC took this
and really did what I think MAFAC was created to
do. So, all in all, I'm very happy and very
pleased with the way things went and the
discussion. So I thank all of you, MAFAC and the

б

public for participating.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

Bill, just a comment. MR. GUTTING: have no idea when that legislation might become publicly available. No idea when Congress may or may not hold hearings on it. My only suggestion is that when it does become publicly available, if there haven't been hearings explanations, that a forum like this, which is federally registered and is open, might be a good opportunity for you to explain it and to get some feedback from the committee. Every piece of legislation is going to have ambiguity uncertainties and you don't want to have people running off saying things because they have some agenda and perhaps have misinterpreted the language. So just think about if circumstances play out, the next MAFAC meeting might be a good forum to kind of continue the discussion.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: The last comment I'll make, since you're all here, there's been several letters from Congress and some of the NGO's have requested that we do an

environmental impact statement of this
legislation. That's under advisement. I'll tell
you my thoughts on it and what I've told people
is that it's a piece of legislation that we've
written that's like many pieces of legislation.
Once it gets to Congress, we don't have any
control of it. So that bill could be introduced
as we've written it, it could be modified up
front before it goes. To do an EIS on a moving
target, I think that would cause nothing but
problems throughout. Once the legislation is
passed, then I think we have to do an
environmental assessment. But to try to do an EIS
on something Congress is going to pass, I mean I
would just be shooting in the dark. So it's
under advisement of what we do and how we do it,
but that's my opinion so far. We need to let
Congress do what it does. I don't even know if
it would be separate legislation or part of
Magnuson. So then would I be doing an EIS or
Magnuson. We have never done this although the
law says that you can. We have never gotter

б

involved in legislative EIS's because we don't really have control at all. We're at the whim of whatever Congress does with it. I haven't seen many that have gone through without many amendments and modifications.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: If I could just sort of supplement the record to what Bill said. There were several groups on the west coast that were asked to sign a letter to Congress demanding that NMFS do a legislative EIS and a couple of us talked about it back and forth and we said, no, we're not going to do this. We're not going to make this demand. For one thing, Congressional process is so open and there's so much that's going to be going on there, it's silly to require an EIS up front on a piece of legislation that, as Bill says, is going to change.

But, second of all, there is a significant budgetary time and personnel cost to the National Marine Fishery Service every time

2.0

they have to write an EIS. To expend that amount of resources on something that is going to be radically changed by the Congress and, in fact, go anywhere is just may never а waste of taxpayers' dollars and it takes people away from doing other things that are important for fishery science and management. We said, no, we're not going to support it. So I think that needs to be part of the record. There are reasons not to support it.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: The last comment to that is a lot of stuff will be done by regulation. The legislature will give authority to do stuff. When do we the regulations, we have to do environmental an impact statement. We know that. So there will be environmental assessment done of the regulations, so it doesn't mean it's not going to be done. It's going to be done after you get the through authorizing legislation, then we, regulation, will have to do the environmental assessment. I'm not trying to get out

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

Τ	anything. It's the way we work.
2	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thank
3	you. Next we have Laurel, committee
4	administration and meeting.
5	MR. LEIPZIG: Just for the record
6	there is a science subcommittee. There's only
7	four members on it. Two of them weren't even
8	here, so Chris and I chatted and it was agreed
9	just to remind you that we had presented a report
10	at the Washington, D.C. meeting asking a number
11	of topics to be brought forward to MAFAC. So far
12	that has not occurred. So just put it back in
13	the hopper. If there's an opportunity that those
14	questions that were posed could be made as a
15	presentation at some future meeting, we'd
16	appreciate it.
17	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: We probably
18	ought to put that on the next agenda for January.
19	MR. LEIPZIG: And if there's any
20	particular issues that the agency has that they
21	would like to bring to the subcommittee, that
22	would also be appreciated.

One other. There was a working group
on capacity and Scott and I were the only two
members present and Scott had to take a phone
call, so he isn't present here. At the last
meeting, Scott gave a report about the
legislation that was proposed to modify the CCF
account, the capital construction fund. This has
not gone anywhere in this session. It will be
reintroduced. If there's specific comments from
the agency about that proposed legislation, it
would be nice to have that also made the
questions and comments made available to the
working group so that we could discuss it and
respond appropriately at the next meeting as
well. So, with that, I'm done.
CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Laurel has
some administrative stuff that she needs to take
care of.
MS. BRYANT: Actually, it was more of
a discussion. I mean Peter's thing leads into it
perfectly because I'd really like to talk about
the agenda for the next meeting. Now that Bill

has kind of established this new position for me, I'm going to be able to follow through more with staff and internally. I've talked a little bit with Alvin, a little bit with Bill and just wanted to kind of open it up for discussion, Mr. Chairman, on some of the things.

There has been some discussion today,

I know Michael Payne from our office headquarters
in protected resources is going to be discussing
fishery issues versus protected resources issues.

Bill, that's been something that he's wanted
MAFAC to look at and at least kind of discuss an
outline.

So, based on what Michael will be presenting today, kind of the original thought was that his presentation would be a precursor for a more in-depth discussion when you're in Hawaii, knowing that those issues are relevant over there. But then also, because of the aquaculture forum that we had at this meeting, Alvin said he would be interested. Т thought that something similar in Hawaii, noting

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

that they do have open ocean pens and they have some marine aquaculture projects occurring there, that that might also be important.

So I wanted to really kind of get a feeling, Mr. Chairman and Bill, just kind of a good discussion on what we want for the next agenda so that I can kind of do that in a timely fashion. There will be a lot of logistics with the next meeting that need to be taken care of as well.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: To that point, I'm not sure you'll be able to do all that today I do think even the Ocean Commission because report really gets to the president and some things come out of that, then we would need to probably bring some of those fishery issues back to MAFAC to discuss. We need to see the final report from the Ocean Commission and need to see what the administration position is on points for implementation. That is probably something we get into the timing of this meeting that things will start happening with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

think that would be something that you probably want to have some discussion on.

The Science Committee, by the way, may want to hear the report that came out of the committee that the admiral set up to look at science within NOAA because it does affect. fisheries. That may be an issue you would like to look at. I just got the letter from the Science Board to the admiral and one thing that really concerns me, and I didn't think it was coming out of this, that all the science ought to be the assistant administrator for research in the course of the admiral.

I don't know what that means totally, but what I thought they were talking about, and I thought they did not make the recommendation, was that all science would be under that person and they would determine what science was done. I really get concerned with fisheries when that happens because people don't really -- well, let's stop there. So I was a little surprised by that recommendation, but it may be that you

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	wanted to hear that. That's just my input. And
2	then I think as we move on a little bit and what
3	Magnuson does and this type of thing, we'll have
4	a better idea. It may be a little bit too early
5	to really do the whole agenda for next time.
6	MS. BRYANT: What do you think about
7	aquaculture versus marine protected resources?
8	Michael, if you've got something to say on where
9	you think protected resources and MMPA,
10	reauthorization and some of those things.
11	MR. PAYNE: I assume I'll have a
12	little bit of time at the end.
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yeah. Okay,
14	we've got Rod and then Vince.
15	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, this is my
16	last act here, committing everybody to doing
17	something else. I would like to suggest that
18	MAFAC consider at its next meeting and sort of
19	pass it on down the line to future generations of
20	MAFAC of maybe doing this once every three years,
21	spend half a day, a day, heck, you're going to be
22	in Hawaii, spend an extra day, looking at your

current structure of MAFAC and deciding if what you have fits for where you see yourselves going in the next couple of years and make modifications to the structure as need be.

When we set stuff up in 1999 and I've used this analogy with a couple of people, it's kind of like a rebuilding plan. We had to rebuild MAFAC, so we wrote the rebuilding plan and we wrote it in such a way that MAFAC got rebuilt. Well, it's rebuilt now. Now you've got to look at your long-term management. What we did in 1999 in terms of structure, in terms of function, terms of how you want committees to versus working groups, what committees you want jurisdictions of have, the to what those committees are. Those are things that worked great in 1999. They've been modified slightly since then. to look You may want at it, especially in the context of the ocean report coming out.

As Bill says, there's a lot of stuff there that you're going to have to be dealing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

with. You may want to spend some time just talking among yourselves. I would not suggest getting an expensive fancy outside facilitator. We tried that in 1999. After a day and a half we told him to shut up and get out of the room and we did it ourselves. Although maybe you want to pull somebody in from outside to sort of mediate the fights, whatever, but you ought to spend a day doing that and you ought to sort of pass that wisdom on to the next generation.

MS. BRYANT: On that note also I'd note that we're going to have a fairly large class that we'll be rolling out. They're going to be reaching the end of their second term next September. Not this coming one, but t.he September after September 2005. So just kind of a view of that institutional brain drain. interest of kind of providing continuity consistency and with Bill's, all his efforts initiated, it is something to kind of consider if we want it to continue to function.

MR. KENT: Can I ask a question? We

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	have four people that are rotating off. Do we
2	have four that are coming on at the next meeting?
3	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Yes.
4	MR. KENT: What is the proportion?
5	When we came on, I think there was 12 of us or 16
6	of us that came on. Do you need to shorten some
7	of us or lengthen some of us or what?
8	MS. BRYANT: We have attempted to do
9	that and I think that's something I'll be talking
10	with the doctor about. If we do need to, we may
11	need to try to stagger it, but I don't think you
12	can do that in any other period of time unless we
13	do it during the charter. But we did stagger it
14	at one point and we were able to keep the four
15	chairs and those are the four people going off.
16	At one point, it was like all 18 people. It was
17	really bad. So now we kind of have you in two
18	big chunks.
19	MR. DiLERNIA: A question, Mr.
20	Chairman. I was looking at the charter. I was
21	trying to determine when it expires and it seems
22	lika

1	MS. BRYANT: We just renewed it. It
2	will expire
3	MR. DiLERNIA: It was signed March 14,
4	2002.
5	MS. BRYANT: That's not the one that's
6	up on the Web. The one on the Web, Tony. It has
7	been renewed and it doesn't expire until 2006.
8	It's every two years.
9	MR. DiLERNIA: Okay, because what I've
LO	got here is dated March 14, 2002.
L1	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Vince and
L2	then Ralph.
L3	MR. O'SHEA: Thank you. Just sort of
L <b>4</b>	as a process thing here. It seems to me that
L 5	advice is most effective when it's asked for. I
L 6	like Rod's idea, but I think the other thing that
L 7	we might consider building in this process is
L8	having from Bill what he thinks his priorities
L9	are and what his concerns are so that we have
20	that as sort of a signal to set our agenda of
21	what kind of things we're looking at. We may
22	find things that we're really fascinated with,

but if it doesn't line up with what's on his radar screen and what's confronting him, I'm just not sure if this group is serving as much use as it could be.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think there's plenty of time before that meeting we could discuss it. If you all have something in particular you want, let us know. We need to see the lay of the land a little bit first, I think, as to what issues may come out and what may be some of the agenda items. The Ocean Commission I know is something that would need to be on that. There's no doubt about it. Internally, we'll be looking at some things.

I said this morning I think the fiveyear plan is something that I've restructured and
they're working on it very hard. That's probably
something we would want you to look at. I think
some of the report structure is something we
should take a look at and all these reports put
together.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Ralph.

2.0

1	MR. RAYBURN: I think just more of a
2	basic question on the next meeting. I have it
3	down on my calendar for the week of January the
4	10th. Is that still the situation? I heard
5	something about having to change that.
6	MS. BRYANT: That's what Gloria has
7	marked out.
8	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: My calendar is
9	pretty free then. It's up to you all. I know
10	there's an important meeting that a lot of people
11	would not be able to come that week.
12	MS. BRYANT: No, it's the next week.
13	MR. KENT: The World Aquaculture
14	meeting is the 17th.
15	MS. BRYANT: So this should still
16	work.
17	MR. KENT: So the 10th should work
18	fine for any of us that are interested in that
19	other meeting.
20	MR. RAYBURN: I just wanted to make
21	sure.
22	MR. KENT: Do we have a venue?

1	MS. BRYANT: We currently have it for
2	the week of the 10th with meeting on the 11th,
3	12th and 13th. I do not have a location yet, but
4	we've got the name of one.
5	MR. KENT: I mean part of the country?
6	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Hawaii.
7	MR. KENT: We're going to Hawaii? Can
8	I make a suggestion then as far as items we may
9	want to look at?
10	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Did you go
11	from I'm going to be available on the 10th to
12	you're going to participate in what's going or
13	the agenda? I'll put you on the list. Jim.
14	I've got like three ahead of you.
15	MR. KENT: Okay. I'm sorry.
16	MR. GILMORE: At the risk of usurping
17	some of Don's list, one thing I was going to put
18	on the list was we might want to, if the members
19	are interested, just alert Senator Inouye to the
20	fact that we will be there and be sure he and his
21	staff are aware and invited since he'll be either
2.2	the chairman of the Commerce Committee or the

. I ranking democrat.
-----------------------

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2 MS. BRYANT: And I'll be working a lot 3 with Kitty Simon and her staff.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Peter.

LEIPZIG: I appreciate Vince's comment about advice is probably best used when it's been asked for, but there's probably other times when problems arise and maybe it's good to give advice the other way as well. I talked a little bit with Laurel about this already and I'm not suggesting it necessarily for this coming agenda as an item, but I've been having some discussions with law enforcement folks on west coast, particularly with the state agencies, problems and they have and issues with interacting with federal agencies, be it with NMFS or the Coast Guard.

I would think that it would be an appropriate topic for MAFAC to have some discussion, perhaps closed door discussion with them about what those types of concerns are so that we can formulate some recommendations to the

1	agency to help facilitate their interaction with
2	each other because effective law enforcement is
3	so critical to fisheries management and to make
4	it effective we can't have problems arising
5	between these various agencies. So I just throw
6	it out there. At some point I think that would
7	be an appropriate topic.
8	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I've got an
9	idea. Like I said, there's a couple more
10	meetings and then you're going to have a whole
11	new group again. I think when I first got or
12	here we had enforcement and them come and give a
13	long presentation, which there was lots of new
14	members then. That was good for us, I think.
15	Did you have something?
16	MS. BRYANT: I was going to say, I
17	didn't know if you were talking about Hawaii, but
18	I guess you're talking at a future point and I
19	was curious to know if at all it would be good to
20	even kind of work with the councils on that and
21	kind of involve them.
22	MR. LEIPZIG: I don't know that

involving the councils per se is really that The council in our case, and I'm assuming that if it's occurring in the Pacific probably similar problems may be occurring with other states and other regions, but the Pacific Council certainly has an enforcement consultants group that would be a good body to perhaps make a presentation or express their concerns because it represents the three coastal οf states the Pacific as well as the Coast Guard and NMFS.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let me just address that. It may be better to wait. told Dale Jones to bring in all of the state or we go there, just a meeting with all the state law enforcement agencies and that is supposed to be being set up right now, so it would be good to get the results from that and then we could see what that -- but that is going to happy pretty shortly. We have enjoyed enforcement agreements with most states except North Carolina and But get their leadership together so we can talk about enforcement and the Coast Guard

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	will be coming to that meeting and there will be
2	a discussion of relationships.
3	MR. LEIPZIG: Sure. Some of their
4	issues have to do with just communication and
5	sharing of information and data.
6	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: It may be that
7	if you got some of these that you could give them
8	to me and I could make sure that they're put on
9	that agenda too. So that would be a way to start
10	that process and then get feedback after that
11	meeting takes place. So if any of you have any
12	topics, I'll make sure Dale addresses them.
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Dick.
14	MR. GUTTING: I just wanted to take
15	this opportunity to say that I thought your
16	staff, Bill, did a terrific job at this meeting.
17	I subscribe 100 percent to what Vince said about
18	the importance of having someone seek your advice
19	and it certainly applies to the overall agenda,
20	but it also applies to the kind of presentations
21	that are made.
22	Thinking about how Jack Dunnigan put

up some quescrons and r got the sense as a
committee member he was putting up questions that
he was wrestling with and wanted our input. It
sounds very simple, but let me tell you as an
old-timer that that has not been the case always.
We've had a lot of time spent conveying
important information, but it's the questions
that really count and there were a lot of
questions at this meeting. So I really strongly
encourage you that when you get your agenda you
try to focus your presentations around questions
that are on your mind that are timely, that the
members can give you input. I'm very encouraged
with the direction of this committee, you know,
just looking at it over the last couple of years.
I think you're really moving in the right
direction. But it all comes down to bringing
some focus and asking real questions and getting
input.
Just another sort of comment. When I
was with my trade association, National Fisheries

Institute, we had regional meetings and we always

б

had difficulty trying to get discussion going. Everyone here sees the agency from a different perspective and we all interact on a daily basis and have certain thoughts and views. I know we shared them with Bill in the hall, you know, he's where we think screwing up. Not personally, but the agency may be going off the wrong direction or the right direction or need. perhaps there's а Those hallway conversations are always going to take place and in many respects they're the most valuable part of being a member of MAFAC.

I get the sense sometimes it might be useful to have those kinds of discussions out in the open so that we can all hear because what may be going on in one region may or may not be of interest to others. What I see in Washington D.C. congressional level at the and the international level you all may not be seeing at the region. But having some kind of a feedback mechanism, I don't know how to do it because it shouldn't be a gripe session. This could very

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

easily turn into a very destructive, negative
thing. But somehow to get feedback from the
committee on basic not so much concerns, but
observations and comments about the overall
direction of things somehow on a regular basis
could be, if done right, very useful. But, Bill,
I think your staff did just a terrific job at
this meeting.

 $\label{eq:co-chair} \mbox{CO-CHAIR} \quad \mbox{DR.} \quad \mbox{HOGARTH:} \qquad \mbox{Me, too.}$  Thanks.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Larry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. SIMPSON: since Pete made his comment about enforcement, with a few exceptions, I think a lot happening of good things are far as as coordination in the gulf and we'd be happy to share those. It's а good picture, communications-wise, training-wise, field operations-wise, strategic plan-wise, cooperative agreement-wise. We're doing some things in the gulf that have proven very valuable and I think it's helped us, state, federal and Coast Guard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

So whenever that comes about with the gulf, we'd be happy to contribute in that regard.

The only other point I had, Mr. Chairman, was an agenda item. January, most of the dust is settled and I think a report, not a discussion of, but a report on budget, a report on appropriations for the past year and look forward for the next year. It would be an opportune time.

another very sensitive issue that at that time I'd like to bring forward and Ralph is helping me with quite a bit is the shrimp industry in the US is really going down the tubes and it's very difficult to deal with the issue. It's an old, established, very hard-nosed industry and now we're in the middle of the dumping suit versus the fishery and what could be done to help that fishery.

done things We have some at the request of the industry. We're going to try to put that out around August 23rd, just

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	discussion paper. I know the Gulf Council is
2	looking at shrimp. So we may want to bring that
3	forward.
4	MR. SIMPSON: It could be some
5	significant changes and it could be some not so
6	significant, but I'd like to see someone pull all
7	that together and that time frame in January
8	might be a good time frame to talk about what
9	happened with the money.
10	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: We can do it.
11	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Dor.
12	and Tony.
13	MR. KENT: I just want to say if we're
14	going to be in Hawaii and there was the interest
15	on the part of the committee, there is some
16	opportunities there for actually viewing some
17	interesting aquaculture operations if we were on
18	the main island, a trip over to the Oceanic
19	Institute would let people see some new culture
20	technologies. There is an offshore cage system
21	off Oahu. There's also on the Kona coast the

natural energy laboratory that has interesting

culture projects. They are permitting and installing a tuna cage off that coast, so there might be an opportunity for folks to gain some firsthand experience with that sort of technology.

There's a new CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: fishery complex that has been built. It's a state of the art auction. By then we will have a site selected that we're trying to build a NOAA facility that will bring all the NOAA facilities together. All the weather service and sanctuaries and regional offices and a science Hawaii and the Pacific Islands has a center. pretty exciting future right now. There's a lot of things being done there.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Tony.

MR. DiLERNIA: Thank you. Don sort of anticipated my question. If we are going to Hawaii, I was wondering what we could see in the way of those facilities and he did a great job of naming a few that I think would be very helpful for us. I, for one, would like to see them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I think we can
2	arrange one day for the meeting. They have a
3	facility to meet at the Oceanic Institute and you
4	get a tour.
5	MR. DiLERNIA: That's in Honolulu?
6	MR. KENT: It's outside, about a 40-
7	minute drive.
8	MR. DiLERNIA: But to build on Ralph's
9	question regarding the date, that's the date
10	that's been set. Now the location though would
11	be Honolulu then or we don't know that for sure
12	yet?
13	MS. BRYANT: At least my discussions
14	with Kitty so far, that's where it will be. It
15	will be in Honolulu.
16	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Do we want to
17	do anything about the next meeting, August?
18	MS. BRYANT: Once I get everybody's
19	electronic presentations, I'll get those on the
20	members area site. Also, Joe has been kind
21	enough what I'm going to start trying to do is
22	have the transcripts burned on CD's and I'm going

1	to start posting them on the site so members can
2	get it there and it will certainly be helpful for
3	me trying to get the summary done or the minutes
4	and then getting it out to you guys and then you
5	can immediately go there and check on things. So
6	I'm hoping that we can continually improve on
7	that process and I'll send you an e-mail. Thank
8	you, Mr. Chairman. That's it.
9	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: One other
10	thing since we started this thing of looking two
11	meetings ahead, right now we're kind of looking
12	at doing the August meeting in Seattle. If
13	anybody has problems with that, talk to Laurel.
14	MR. MOORE: Why do you have to do it
15	in August?
16	MS. BRYANT: Well, at this point, one
17	of the best business things too, and perhaps
18	we'll have a new administrator, Rod, I don't
19	know, but Bill has suggested that he definitely
20	likes this time of year because Congress is out
21	and then January because Congress is also out and
22	that makes it much easier for the administrator.

1	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: If you guys
2	don't mind, we'll just continue on. We've got
3	one more agenda item.
4	MR. LEIPZIG: Mr. Chairman, in terms
5	of the August meeting, as an alternative, it's
6	much cooler in San Francisco in August than it is
7	in Seattle. Throw it out for reaction.
8	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: As an
9	alternative?
LO	MS. BRYANT: Put Seattle or San
11	Francisco?
L 2	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: You're getting
L3	ready to go to Michael Payne and protected
L <b>4</b>	resources and this is my fault as much as anybody
15	else. Laurie Allen, who is head of PR, would say
L 6	very clearly today that she says most things in
L 7	PR it's the afterthought. We've finished
18	everything else and we bring protected resources
L 9	in now to talk to us. That's one of the things
20	PR deals with most of the time in fisheries and
21	all, is that it is an afterthought. They are
22	probably under the most strict mandates of

anything we have in the agency with the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act, which are both extremely tough.

Laurie and the new team that she's put together are turning that group around. So it's probably an issue that should be on the agenda in January because she is doing a lot of things with the jeopardy standard and listing and de-listing and things like that. So Michael will talk to you in a minute, but it is an important issue and getting probably more important each day with it's impact on commercial fisheries, but also in several instances it's impacted recreation.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Bill. I did have a PowerPoint presentation, but I think it went the way of the computer. However, after being here for the last three days, I probably would deviate from it quite a bit. I actually had more questions to ask you than I probably have solutions for you.

MS. BRYANT: They do have your PowerPoint.

2.0

MR. PAYNE: The PowerPoint is behind
Tab 12 if you want to follow along. Before I get
to that, I do have some other stuff. Many of you
don't know me. I'm Mike Payne. I've been with
the agency since about 1990. I came into
protected resources initially right around the
time that the 1988 amendment started what was
referred to as the Fish Fix. We did do the
reauthorization in 1994 and since then most of my
activities with the agency has been having to do
with fishery interactions and marine mammals for
the most part.
Right now I am the division chief for
the marine mammal and sea turtle division.
Historically, it was marine mammals only and
primarily dealt with the MMPA. I was the
division chief for four years. I then went to
the Alaska region and worked under Jim for the
last five years and I've recently gone back to
headquarters to work under Laurie.

Office of Protected Resources and I now have

Right now we've kind of realigned the

seabirds, turtles and marine mammals in my division. So I think I pretty much deal with anything that involves commercial fishing. So any regulations or anything that we do will go through me at some point in the process.

Having said that, I tried to think about the history of what I had done with the I don't think I had ever come to MAFAC for advice. Listening to you guys over the last two days -- there might be one exception to that. I think in 1997 we did a report on pinapeds and endangered salmon and how to deal with nuisance pinapeds in the northwest. This is the third time I've been involved with MAFAC and I think I might have talked about that the last time, which was about six years ago. So our office as a whole has not sought your advice. At the same time, I don't know that it's been something that's really been of interest to you other than the comments that I've heard in the past.

I will go through my presentation, I promise, but I really think as a committee you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

ought to ask yourself what's next. How do you 1 want to become involved in protected resources 2 3 I would have a lot of problems with this group doing it, but at the same time I would be 4 happy to be involved with this group. 5 I don't 6 know whether Laurie would assign me, but really likes to be involved in these discussions as well, so she might do it. 8 9 Over the last two days a number of didn't even talk about 10 topics that I in mу 11 PowerPoint you've talked about that probably 12 would be something that you would like to take up 13 in the context of protected resources as well. 14 Best available data. These are things 15 that we have arguments about internally even. 16 Under the MMPA, best available data may be a 17 little bit different than what we use under the 18 ESA. They do use different data and how that is used does affect commercial fishing. 19 data 2.0 There's no doubt about it. Right 21 now, and I didn't hear it 22 discussed yesterday, there is an administration bill that probably won't get through until after the election to reauthorize the MMPA that has in it -- well, I'll go over this, but part of the MMPA characterizes all commercial fishing into different categories depending upon their take of marine mammals. The administration bill will add recreational fishing to that list. That wasn't discussed in your discussion of recreational fishing. I don't know how many people know that. So rec fishing will become very involved in the MMPA if the current bill goes through in the next administration.

Increasing pinapeds has been an issue forever. The MMPA and the ESA deal very well with declining stocks, endangered and threatened species, but it really doesn't tell us what to do when pinapeds become nuisance in some people's opinion to their industry and their livelihoods.

I know that Dr. Hogarth has considered pulling together a committee several times to address this issue and for one reason or another we just haven't been able to get to it in the last 12

2.0

2.1

months, but I know that six months ago I was asked to go talk to some people about this very subject and other things have gotten in the way. So if it happens, it won't happen until after the election. It's a very controversial topic.

Whether you like it or not, he serves two constituent bases. The largest issues for the agency are fishing, but in all honesty, it's probably the smallest constituent base that we The two environmental statutes, ESA and have. MMPA, are nationwide and I think if he could authorize the lethal take of a pinaped today, I doubt if he would be able to do it before he signed his ink on the federal register notice. Other constituents would step in. Congress would step in. So it's a conflict that's built into the management of commercial fishing and protected species. It's just there.

But we need to address it somehow.

The only place where it's really a huge issue is in southern California and the western United States. Seals are an issue in New England, but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

the extent they are in southern not to California. We know that. 2 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: 3 Let me 4 interject here. I have really considered that 5 and I've looked at many ways to do it, but it is not politically from politics, but from the 6 American public it's suicide. I've been trying managing recovered species. It is very much a 8 9 controversial issue. If you talk to the American 10 public, 70 to 80 percent says you should not kill 11 any marine mammals. I'm concerned with how do 12 you do ecosystem-based management if you don't 13 ecosystem, which manage the are your 14 It's an issue and how we deal with predators. 15 it, I don't know. 16 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Cut in any time you 17 want to, Bill. The other topic, and he just 18 brought it up, but it's the next thing on my 19 list, is the idea of ecosystem management under 2.0 the MMPA. 21 Well, I have a little different perspective. I 22 don't believe that the MMPA necessarily is a good

model for ecosystem management. I don't believe single-specie fishery management plans are either. So I think there's problems in both statutes, but that doesn't make a solution for either one.

He is correct. When you don't remove the top predator, when it becomes a nuisance, that becomes an issue for ecosystem management, but there's a part of me -- and I don't want to get into this discussion. I think we could take the next three hours and I know everybody wants to go home. But that is something you might want It's one of those rabbit trails as to take up. some people call them. It's a lot of discussion without a lot of solution. But, nonetheless, MMPA and ecosystem management -- how do I want to say this. We do manage in terms of an ecosystem management but within the framework of the The statutes do not allow you to kill statutes. mammals directly. So that's kind of an oxymoron.

Bycatch. You talked about bycatch.

Right now we're developing a national bycatch

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

plan. We also have regulations within statute that require that we monitor bycatch for marine mammals. Historically, we've done Fisheries have their separately. bycatch programs, the MMPA, the Office of Protected Resource has а fund through Congress, MMPA directed observer programs. We're trying to do that as a national observer program now. working with national our program at headquarters, but that certainly is something you guys might be interested in. Somebody mentioned gear tech transfer. I'll get to that in a second, especially with the longline issues and sea turtles. That's certainly an issue.

Outreach. You had a list up there -I don't remember your name, I'm sorry. You had a
list up there of documents you would like to
review. One that we do every year which has all
this information in it that most people don't
read are the marine mammal stock assessment
reports. We're required to do them. They

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

outline our best information on status, RMAC's, current trends, PBR calculations, total human removals and how many total allowable to take basically under the MMPA. We get a lot of criticism on them because again the information that goes into those documents we call the best available data. Some people have exceptions to that.

So those are things that have been talked about here that aren't on this presentation, so I know that we can't really get into a discussion of protected resources here, so I'll take you to what I think we really should talk about and that is what's next. How do we give information to MAFAC or does MAFAC want information.

Looking at the structure of this committee, and don't take this wrong, please, I don't know if MAFAC is set up to handle protected resources issues. I know all of you deal with them. Some of you are actually experts from a legal perspective or otherwise on the MMPA and

2.0

I also know that several ESA, but οf the commissions, I don't know about the gulf, but I know the Atlantic and the Pacific have protected species staff. You might want to take this up as issue. When think MAFAC you about restructuring your organization, have a protected species person on here that can kind of counter the argument that the only good pet is a dead one. I mean that's an argument. That's one side the coin, but there is another side. οf YO11can't do that. You need somebody here to kind of balance those arguments when you qo into discussion.

I wish like hell we would have had a subcommittee this morning on protected species because then we could have sat down and figured out a lot of the questions that I'm asking you now. Do you want to deal with protected species? If so, how? Do you want to be involved at a subcommittee level? That would bring issues to you from my office that you could comment on. If Laurie tasks me with being your protected species

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

rep to this committee for the last five years in front of the North Pacific Council every meeting we had a protected species session. the entire council meeting was taken up with protected species for sea lions. But even when sea lions quieted down, I don't think I ever missed a meeting where I didn't have a two or three-hour presentation on issues that affect the council in the next six months to a Things like that. So they could be year. looking forward or ahead on what they wanted in their next meeting. So that's something you might think about.

And then, again, what is the role of MAFAC. You only meet twice a year. Our rules and regulations usually take a year to get through, but even now we have a very transparent -- somebody mentioned that word. It is pretty transparent. It didn't use to be, but it is now. We have a pretty transparent process. I don't think we implement any federal regulation that doesn't go through the council. It originates at

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	a region usually. We don't do any re-mammal
2	regulations anymore that don't go through a take
3	reduction team process or something like it.
4	Even though MAFAC isn't on those teams, certainly
5	state reps, commission reps, fishermen,
6	environmental groups are.
7	So it is a very public process.
8	Before we draft the reg we try to bring all the
9	information together and have people at least
10	have a discussion. It doesn't mean we're going
11	to agree at the end, but we at least try to have
12	that discussion.
13	Now, with that, I will go briefly
14	that's not a sermon. I would like to be involved
15	with MAFAC. I think Laurie would like to be
16	involved with MAFAC. Right now I don't know how.
17	I don't know at what level you want us here. I
18	don't know how we could bring information to you
19	that you could comment on. If there's a way to
20	do it, we'll do it. We'll make it happen.
21	If you go through my PowerPoint, what
22	I was going to tell you before I went off on that

little soapbox, there are four or five things that we do right now. I thought I was supposed to give you a list of current issues. That's kind of what I did, but the issues change every six months, so you would get a different list.

Gear technology, the first graphic. The second one kind of tells you what the next four are. I was going to talk a little bit about development, gear technology and fisherv interaction issues, which are primarily Section 118 of the MMPA and ESA with regard to turtles primarily, regulatory streamlining, which is a concept, policy almost, within our agency whereby all consultations done on any fishery management action goes through this process where we try to be up front. We combine the ESA and NEPA in the context of a Magnuson Act, Fishery Management Council framework.

ESA section consultations are still our biggest tool. There's no doubt about it.

When it comes to a listed species, everything requires a consultation and sometimes that's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

where the rubber meets the road and that's where the friction meets the road sometimes as well. We try to minimize that, but it happens. And then research permitting, which some people call the bane of everything because whatever federal action we authorize requires a permit.

The office has changed quite a bit in the last four years. Ideally, we would like to reduce mortality to listed species and marine Sometimes it becomes a reality that you mammals. can't do that, so we've shifted our thinking somewhat to reducing not reducing \_\_\_ interactions, but reducing mortality interactions. That is we're trying to rely more on gear technology.

A good example is the right whale take reduction team and everything the New England region is doing to try to minimize the mortality of northern right whales by commercial fishing gear in that area. It's a thankless task. It's much like leatherbacks in the western Pacific. A leatherback take, a right whale take can occur at

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

any time throughout the species' range any day of location. year, almost any It's something that's isolated with a pulse, so it's a very difficult thing to do. So rather than trying to minimize that one mortality, we're trying to use gear technology to minimize mortality from that one interaction.

A lot of information has gone into sea turtle technology in the last couple years and some of that is beginning to bear fruit. How you transfer that information to other longline fisheries I think is very important and probably going to be the backbone of a lot of the turtle recovery work in the next couple of years.

The thing that I am probably most familiar with, although I'm beginning to learn a little bit about turtles, is the MMPA and Section 118 which set up the current way to manage marine mammals under the MMPA. PBR came around in 1994 and those calculations and everything that comes from the 1994 amendments to the MMPA are basically the backbone of what we do now. Take

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

reduction planning is at the core of that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

We work with people to try to reduce mortality, injury, serious injury in fisheries that take marine mammals above certain level. If the commercial fishery takes marine mammals at a level that's considered negligible, we don't even bother with it. If it takes marine mammals at a level that is less than 50 percent of PBR, we're required to do a take reduction team with discretion and we try to look into ways to permit those people involved in that fishing so they can keep track of mortality. But basically since 1994 we've only interacted in a big way, we've only developed take reduction teams for those commercial fishing whose bycatch of marine mammals exceed PBR.

We're getting ready to do two more as a result of a court order -- actually, a settlement. We don't do them lightly. They're very expensive, but they do result in a lot of information transfer between the industry fishermen and

protected resources, so they're a useful tool.

So that's kind of what we've done and we'll continue to do it as long as there's a need, but, to be honest, we're down to a point almost 90 percent of the where commercial fisheries -- we just did a report to Congress on this -- are at a level where I doubt we can do anything to minimize bycatch. Which has some of our other constituents very upset because there is the ZMRG goal in MMPA, also а very controversial because people have different ideas about what that should be. But, in reality, the agency just chose to stay with the goal we've had or the definition of that goal that we've been using since 1994 and it won't change too much.

The fisheries that are currently under take reduction team review will stay under it until we get bycatch to a level where they don't need to anymore. Between 85 and 90 percent of commercial fishing in the United States is at a level that is considered acceptable or probably

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

won't come under any further protective measures.

Regulatory streamlining is something I think -- I don't know who coined the term. was either Rebecca or Bill. But it came about largely as a result of two or three serious interactions between protected species and commercial fishing about 1999. Αt that time Stellar sea lions and the groundfish fish Alaska was considered the number one problem in The Hawaii longline the agency. issue and leatherback turtles was if not number one a very close number two. I forget the third fishery that was involved in that, but I think it was a west coast fishery.

Built into everything we do now with commercial fishing we try to do it up front. It doesn't mean we skirt around the edges. It just means we work twice as hard in the beginning and hope the tail end works out because of it. We try to have a draft consultation completed prior to the draft environmental assessment which is required for the action to go forward. That

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

draft consultation doesn't have to be a full-blown ESA document. It's basically a thumbs up or thumbs down with regards to whether the alternatives in the EEA will result in jeopardy or not. A final biological opinion if necessary is required at the time the rule goes final.

But it's pretty successful. It's been used to mitigate a lot of thorny issues and the most difficult situations that we've had with Usually when we have an issue where a fishing. commercial fishery is getting ready to about going forward and we know it's going to result in jeopardy, Bill and/or Laurie sends out two or three people to wherever we go, Honolulu, Alaska or wherever. We sit down for two or three weeks in a room and we try to work something out so it doesn't end up in a train wreck. we've been pretty lucky. I guess the last two or three years we haven't had a train wreck. 2000 we did, but we all learned a little bit from the sea lion issue.

The last thing I was going to talk

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

about is research permitting. Most people really do not like -- I don't know how much of you are involved with research permitting, but there is a lot of mitigation, research on gear That requires permits. technology. Sometimes those permits take up to a year, which causes our constituents heartburn. There's couple а problems with this. It isn't really the MMPA that causes that. All of those authorizations require NEPA, they require consultation. That's usually where the bottleneck is. We're getting better at doing programmatic environmental assessments, programmatic opinions, such that in the future we hope the process will be shorter so that people can get their research, get out there and do good things for protected resources.

It's taken a long time in the past, but I think we're getting caught up. The guy who took over that position, Steve Leathery, took over that position when he was in a big hole and it's taken him a couple years to get back to ground level and I think he's beginning to see

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

above ground now. So good things are happening, but it just takes a while.

The other big initiative we've had which is interagency is something called Splash. It's a humpback whale assessment in the North Pacific. It involves several agencies, several NOAA offices, a lot of state agencies, a lot of researches, four countries. They just completed all those permits in a really timely manner to get that research out the door.

I think we're getting better. Largely because of Bill and Rebecca we actually have worked with fishing industry, commercial fishermen and the councils a lot more in the last four years than we ever did before that. I think that's the way of the agency in the future. not going to say we're here to help because I think most of you wishes we were not here at all, but we are here and we're here to stay. work together in the future I think a large part depends on kind of how you want to work together. I think we're open to trying to do anything you

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

would find useful.

б

I don't think we need MAFAC. The
office doesn't need MAFAC. We have a lot of
constituents who review our documents. We're
probably the most scrutinized office in the
agency. Even though people complain about our
data, any time we go forward with a regulation
I'll take that data up against any fishery data
we have. If we don't have data that good, we
don't go forward. We aren't allowed to. Having
said that we don't need MAFAC, I know damn well
we're not going to turn you away. We would like
to work with you if there's a way that you think
we can. We'll bring anything to you. We don't
write too many documents. We write a lot of
regs. The fact that you meet only every six
months, I don't know how you interact in between
your meetings or if you do. Do you want to
review our regs? I don't think you need to. If
you want to review our policies, we do one or two
a year. We'd be happy to review them through
you. Just tell us how and we'll try to make it

1 happen.

2.0

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I hope that was okay. I'm willing to take comments or questions or leave it up to you and the committee to discuss whether you want us on the agenda in Hawaii. If you do, I think it should be a discussion, if you'll allow me one more second, of how we work together in the future rather than just bringing forward a bunch of issues to throw at you. If you do want to work together in Hawaii, we'll make it happen.

So that's it for right now. Thank you for your time. It's been a long meeting. You've had a very productive meeting it sounds like. I certainly learned a lot and I appreciated being here even though we're kind of at the end of the agenda.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: The group has really changed a lot. I have to say the morale in protected resources was very low. They probably have one of the more difficult jobs in the agency. I think Michael said they don't need

you, but I think you will be a benefit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

The recovery planning is something we have not done well at so far. I think the understanding of listing and de-listing criteria which they're working on now is an important issue. The whole thing of recovery stocks, I don't know what you can do with it, but we're sure glad to listen to input on how you manage recovering stocks.

These are different issues than deal with in the rest of the agency so to speak. They are more mandated and we have less latitude, but it still could be a very open -- it could be a more open process, which it has been, and I think a better understanding of what the mandates are and what they have to do important. But they do a great job. I'm really pleased the way PR is moving right now.

MR. PAYNE: I do have one more, if I may, Mr. Chairman. When I said we don't need you, I don't mean we don't love you. It's just that many of the people that you represent we

already get comment from. We get a lot of constituent comment. We want to work with any group that's willing to make us better and I think we're open to that.

Another thing I forgot to mention is that I'm organizing a meeting with sanctuaries because right now sanctuaries and NMFS have an interesting relationship and we're trying figure out а way, at least for protected resources, not necessary the SF part of the house, but within protected resources what we can do within sanctuaries together to further what we need to do, primarily research and outreach. Laurel just reminded me, I'm very bad at this, but one area that you guys are probably much -you have to be better than we are, is how you get out to people. If MAFAC can be a mechanism for outreach, we can use you to get our information out for public review. That would be a real benefit.

One of the things we can use NOS and sanctuaries for I think is outreach as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	They do have interesting ideas about how to
2	manage fish and protected resources inside
3	sanctuary boundaries without talking to us, but
4	we're going to talk to them about that this fall.
5	If there's anything you have in that regard,
6	we'll take that message there too.
7	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I know Bok
8	was first. For some reason I know that.
9	MR. FLETCHER: I've been through the
10	congressional hearing obstacle course on this
11	issue over the years and what I've learned is
12	that there's really no chance to manage marine
13	mammals. There is no interest on the part of
14	Congress to do that. We worked hard on that
15	cooperative report that NMFS and Civic States put
16	together and it went absolutely nowhere. I mean
17	it was DOA.
18	But there is one little sliver of hope
19	for those of us who are being overrun by robust
20	populations which, as you said, Mike, is not
21	addressed in any way in that protection act.
22	That hope has to do with developing non-lethal

techniques for deterrents. We tried with the southwest region and we got stomped on by the California Coastal Commission. I still think that Jimmy Lucky is licking his wounds from that and he's not even there anymore.

I just want to say that there should way that this agency can look some encouragement to develop that as the only logical way for some of the industries out there to coexist. Then the other statement I want to make is we kind of have a somewhat unique opportunity because you're introducing an administration bill reauthorize the MMPA and I would hope that this committee would have an opportunity to on that draft language whenever that comment becomes available. Maybe the timing is right to discuss that in Hawaii as that may be shortly before you'll introduce it. So those thoughts.

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let me just respond to Bob real quick. I was at southwest region when we tried to do this non-lethal and I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

had a hearing to discuss this. I said something about the rational for trying to do this with California sea lions. They're a very smart animal. They know the sound of a boat when it goes out, they know the sound of a boat when it comes back, they know how to get in -- it's amazing what they do. So I thought something like a non-lethal deterrent would be very effective.

Mr. Chairman, Bob. MR. PAYNE: The MMPA bill that's before Congress right now or it will be before Congress. It depends on what happens in November. If the President remains the same, the Republicans will have a running I'm sure they'll do something fast. start. things change, it will probably be a couple year delay if not longer. It's the same bill that's been in front of the House for over three years. We haven't really changed it dramatically. problem is the last time it was reauthorized in '94 we really haven't changed our position in a number of years, but it's there again. I've been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

told by the House Committee people or the Senate Committee people that I deal with it's not going to be taken up now until after November for certain, so it's nothing new. I mean I'm sure you saw it when you were working with the Pacific States on that report. So it's not like we've done anything in the dark or kind of written things in the last year. We haven't changed much.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Ralph.

MR. RAYBURN: I just wanted to mention to some of your comments, Michael. When Laurie met with us in Washington at our first meeting elected chairman of I was the and Bycatch Committee, it seemed appropriate to me that protected resources would be engaged in Bycatch Subcommittee work. As Ι think mentioned this morning, we discussed that at our subcommittee session this morning about having more involvement with protected resources. I'm not sure if you were here for my short briefing on that, but I was suggesting to MAFAC that that

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

protected resource be included in the jurisdiction of that subcommittee on bycatch. Granted, bycatch is only an element of it, but even to broaden it, even if it's a name deal to broaden that out, it certainly seems to me that protected resources needs to be engaged in what MAFAC does.

I mean if we are the single advisory group to the Secretary of Commerce and we're all natural living resources under his jurisdiction, certainly protected resources should be there. I would certainly encourage your office's involvement in what we do and certainly would offer, absent any conflict here, offer our subcommittee on bycatch as a venue for you absent the full committee process to engage MAFAC.

You know, I don't think we're necessarily going to, as you mentioned, be in timely review of your regulations. You have constituency groups out there, but what we're intending to do with MAFAC, I think, based on the guidance of many of the senior people through it

2.0

1	is really to be more of a strategic body, so
2	where you have issues out there that are
3	strategic issues for protected resources and I
4	think that's where I would hope you would bring
5	that or Laurie would bring that to this committee
6	either at the full committee or subcommittee
7	level so that those could be hashed out with
8	whatever expertise we have within this group or
9	expertise we could generate and I think we could
10	be a factor and you would maybe find out along
11	the line that it is a good friend to have, being
12	engaged to MAFAC.
13	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Tony and then
14	Don.
15	MR. DiLERNIA: I couldn't agree more
16	with what Dick said regarding the best advice you
17	give is when it's asked for.
18	MS. RAYMOND: That was Vince. Dick
19	repeated him.
20	MR. DiLERNIA: So, as we're putting
21	together the agenda for the next meeting, because
22	we only meet twice a year and because our time is

so valuable, I would suggest that we wait a little bit and see the issues as they develop how we develop our agenda for the next meeting. That's all. We only meet twice a year. To try to predict at this point -- maybe I'm off base, but I'm not sure we can predict that accurately where we should be going six months from now. We have some general ideas, but not the specifics at this point.

CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Don.

MR. KENT: I was just curious, since we have representation and Bill referenced it was why did you go to the Coastal Commission and ask for clearance to do that? Your folks out of your laboratories go to coastal areas all the time and do research on marine mammals. Why in this instance was the Coastal Commission's permission sought?

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: We have to, by law, consult with the Coastal Zone Commission on most of the fishery regulations. A lot of times they don't comment. This one they chose to get

2.0

2.1

т	Involved in.
2	MR. KENT: What if they chose to get
3	involved in any tracking experiment that you
4	wanted to do. So what is the process for that?
5	When a permit gets published by one of your
6	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: That's probably
7	something we should discuss because I don't know
8	that I know the entire process. We do have to go
9	to the Coastal Zone Commission and get their
10	input on all regulations. We have to say why we
11	did it. We have to have a certain time frame to
12	respond. Don, I probably should know more about
13	the process.
14	MR. KENT: It's difficult, Bill. I
15	just know it's, again, back to this issue of
16	consistency with the Coastal Act. If the Coastal
17	Act or the Coastal Plan for California doesn't
18	really have an aspect of it relative to research
19	on marine mammals, then you're sort of allowing a
20	precedent to get set here that maybe you
21	shouldn't.
22	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Go ahead,

Dick.

2	MR. GUTTING: A point of
3	clarification. On the program, the way it runs
4	is the state comes up with a coastal zone
5	management plan and that is reviewed and approved
6	by the Secretary of Commerce and it's consistency
7	with approved coastal zone plans. So the
8	question in California for you is what's in that
9	coastal zone plan? Do they have an element of
10	the plan that deals with research? If it does
11	and the secretary has approved it, then you've
12	got consultation. But if it isn't in the plan,
13	there's no generic obligation to be consistent
14	with something that isn't there.
15	MR. KENT: If I may, I think what has
16	to be done then is that the state then has to
17	petition NOAA through NOS Office of Coastal
18	Resource Management for the ability to review a
19	permit for consistency to the coastal zone plan.
20	I mean it's back in your agency again.
21	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Coastal Zone
22	Management is in NOS right

MR. KENT: Right. But the point being that if that process isn't being followed and you're just jumping from both -- if you say yes, you can have review authority, then you're sort of establishing a precedent here. Anyway, that's something for your general council to look at, but I was just kind of curious.....

CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Something I need to know more about.

Maybe it is for general MR. PAYNE: council. Whenever we develop a regulation, at the time we go out with proposed reg, we write a letter to any state that may be affected by that regulation for consistency with the coastal zone management plan. Often we don't get back a reply or we get back something very short. All we're required to do is address it in our process. Ιf we're found to comment be inconsistent with something we've agreed to through a coastal management plan, then I don't know how we address it. So far we haven't. The letter that goes out says is this consistent with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

your plan, yes or no. Most of the time it is. 1 I've ever been involved with 2 don't think situation where something came back that 3 really inconsistent with the state coastal plan. 4 5 I think you did in the MR. KENT: 6 instance that Bill was referring to. In essence, them saying you're not going to get to do this with critters in our waters. Enough on that. 8 9 just wanted to ask the question. 10 CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I'll tell you 11 all in January or I'll talk to you before, but I 12 will trace that out. I know the coastal zone 13 management act was up for reauthorization, but as 14 far as the details I really don't know. I know we have to do it and we've done it. Usually we 15 16 can do it anyway, so I don't know why it stopped 17 I'm being honest with you. I need to go 18 and find that out why it did stop it. back 19 Unless it created something in Congress. 2.0 CO-CHATR MR. OSTERBACK: Т know there's at least two or three people at 2.1 22 table that were at MMPA in '94, including myself.

1	If you're asking should we do this, I'll tell
2	you right up front these meetings aren't long
3	enough. Because of what Mr. Payne has been
4	talking about, the sea lion issues and what have
5	you, came about more commissions. We don't have
6	the time. I'm telling you. You really want to
7	think about this before you jump on this one.
8	MR. GUTTING: You're being a lot more
9	blunt than I was.
10	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: I know what
11	the pain is that goes with it. Not this one, the
12	rest of it.
13	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: Let me just say
14	real quick, the only problem is the protected
15	resources, the MMPA, are very interwoven with
16	fisheries. It is more and more difficult to
17	separate them and I think too much in the past we
18	tried to separate them and we don't need to
19	separate them. They really need to be integrated
20	into the total picture.
21	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: With that, do
22	you have anymore?

1	MR. PAYNE: I could talk all day.
2	It's up to you all. Actually, I did think of a
3	couple of things, but I don't need to bring them
4	up now.
5	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Thank
6	you for sticking around and giving a report and
7	being real frank with us about needs and wants
8	and who loves who because that's where we're at.
9	Before we stop then, does anybody have anything
LO	else?
L1	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I just want to
L2	thank the people in the audience, the reporters
L3	and Don and Mark and Jim Balsiger, our regional
L <b>4</b>	administrator for sitting through the whole
L5	thing. I again want to recognize Dick and Bonnie
L 6	and realize you've been extremely important to
L 7	MAFAC and you will be missed because you've been
L8	very active.
L9	(Applause)
20	CO-CHAIR DR. HOGARTH: I again want to
21	thank Laurel and Judy. I think everything worked
22	extremely well. I thank all of you who attended

1	to take a week to assist us. We really do
2	appreciate it very much and it's very helpful to
3	us. It's been a very good meeting, so thanks.
4	MS. BRYANT: Mr. Chairman, I just have
5	one thing. This evening's event is not
6	mandatory. This is just kind of an on your own.
7	I guess it's like 20 bucks a head or something
8	like that. I spoke with the owner and he's
9	apparently got some shuttles, so at 6:00 o'clock
10	is when he's going to start coming up here.
11	MR. O'SHEA: Can we have a show of
12	hands of how many people might be interested in
13	going tonight?
14	MR. BRYANT: So pretty much it looks
15	like everybody.
16	MR. SIMPSON: Do we have a separate
17	room there?
18	MS. BRYANT: They're giving us the
19	banquet room. I've never been there. I don't
20	know what it looks like.
21	(Discussion about dinner)
22	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Ralph, you

Τ	nad something and then I've got something else I
2	want to do.
3	MR. RAYBURN: I didn't want to compete
4	the other night with the hat and the blindfold,
5	but I was concerned about these folks losing
6	their diplomatic travel status, so I brought some
7	official Texas passports for people. I put it in
8	the name of the chair. I didn't figure Rod
9	wanted to travel in his own name and then I've
LO	got one for the Dick and then one for Bonnie.
11	MR. MOORE: Ralph, I do want to say
L 2	that Alaska gives out passports and given the
L3	relative size of Alaska and Texas, if you cut the
L <b>4</b>	Alaska passport in half, you'll still have two of
15	them that are bigger than Texas.
L 6	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Okay. Since
L 7	we do have some folks that came and they spent
18	the whole time with us, do you have a last word
L 9	for us before we run off?
20	MR. BREMNER: Thank you. I do as a
21	matter of fact. On behalf of southeast Alaska
22	and the people here I have a couple books for Dr.

Hogarth's library. The first one is kind of like the bogeyman under Calvin and Hobbs' bed, you It's Abusing Alaska, it's a picture history of federal government's environmental management of the 49 states. This isn't meant as some kind of doom and gloom type gift, but line in there there's really one that says authority over the land must co-exist with responsibility to the land. That applies to our ocean and you've probably heard our comments. That's where they come from, this history.

The other one is the fun one. It's from 1950, Alaska Sportsman. There's an article in there for you to read about salmon in the trap. We had salmon traps. The Tlingit and Haida Tsimshian people had traps. We used traps, we used hooks, we used lines, every form of fishing we've had, but it's fun and exciting to read about our salmon traps. Tlingits had salmon traps in Alaska. I suppose if we lose all of our fishing permits, we'll probably be the first advocate for salmon traps. So thank you for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	coming.
2	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: Thank you.
3	Anyone else? The only other thing I want to do
4	is thank the staff, Judy and everyone, for
5	putting the meeting together.
6	(Applause)
7	MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, can I make
8	my last motion. I move we adjourn.
9	CO-CHAIR MR. OSTERBACK: So, with
10	that, we're adjourned.
11	(4:30 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	