

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MAFAC)

+ + + + +

STRATEGIC PLANNING, BUDGET AND PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
MAY 23, 2012

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met in the Ravenna Room, Sheraton Seattle Hotel, Seattle, Washington, at 1:50 p.m., Tony Chatwin, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT

- ANTHONY CHATWIN, Ph.D., Subcommittee Chair
- GEORGE C. NARDI
- ROBERT RHEAULT, Ph.D.
- KEITH RIZZARDI, MA, JD

CONSULTANT TO MAFAC

- RANDY FISHER

STAFF PRESENT

- MARK HOLLIDAY, Ph.D., Designated Federal Official
- JIM McCALLUM
- ALAN RISENHOOVER

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

2 (1:49 p.m.)

3 MEMBER CHATWIN: You got it?

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: Yes.

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: Okay, so that's a
6 summary of the budget information that was
7 presented to us. It's the enacted level for
8 2008, 2009, 2010, and it has the President's
9 request for 2013.

10 And we, in the discussions in the
11 plenary we talked about providing input and
12 that the most -- best opportunity to influence
13 budget would be relative to the 2014 budget,
14 because of where the development goes, where
15 they are in the development of that budget.

16 And then the 2014 request will be
17 based on -- the starting point for that will
18 be the 2013 President's request and so that's
19 why we have that up there.

20 I think what I heard was two
21 desires by members of MAFAC. One was to
22 articulate their funding priorities to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 agency, and then the other one was to track,
2 over time, what those priorities were
3 incorporated into the budget. And the second
4 one is going to be tough, but we should talk
5 about that.

6 Are there any other items that we
7 want to discuss in relation to the budget?

8 (No response)

9 MEMBER McCARTY: So I think those
10 are two broad topics. So, the first one, you
11 could approach the issue of identifying '20
12 priorities in a number of different ways.

13 We were discussing how a practical,
14 a pragmatic way to do that, and Mark has a
15 suggestion on a tool which is just an Excel
16 sheet a bit like this, on which we could
17 capture the members -- members could input
18 their priorities under three different
19 scenarios, looking forward to 2014, and maybe
20 beyond, and explain -- if there's a difference
21 to what's on the 2013.

22 So if you're saying I want a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percent reduction in a certain line item under
2 a certain scenario, it would be good to
3 explain why. That's not -- each individual
4 member would explain why that's not -- why
5 that's warranted and where the increase is,
6 where you suggest an increase, again, explain
7 why that increase would be important.

8 What we would then -- and this
9 would be like a homework assignment, for lack
10 of a better term -- which, we would send out
11 this sheet and get everybody to fill it out
12 and then compile the results, and that's one
13 way to get to maybe a collective evaluation of
14 priorities for the budget, if -- depending on
15 how the results come out.

16 There was also a suggestion to talk
17 about guiding principles and I'm happy for us
18 to do that.

19 MR. FISHER: What I was thinking
20 about is, see the difficulty that I have, you
21 know, I have been on this committee a long
22 time. The difficulty that I have is I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know what some of this means.

2 I mean I don't know what's in
3 Marine Mammals for 44 million bucks, I mean,
4 what the hell is that, you know? So if you
5 get into a process where we are trying to
6 figure out what's important, the reason why I
7 bring up guiding principles, is you could have
8 something which says something like, "Support
9 fisheries management," and under that you
10 would have the process itself, you know, what
11 is the process?

12 It's the Council and it's the
13 states and it's something like that. And
14 there's the science, so you could go through a
15 thing and say and then you could identify
16 those parts of this thing that represent
17 science in terms of the management process,
18 and then there may be other principles.

19 You know, I don't know what kind of
20 principles -- I guess you could say a
21 principle may be support threatened and
22 endangered species, or something. I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know what. I mean, that's what I'm thinking
2 about, the kind of --

3 So that MAFAC would make a general
4 statement, because the concern I have is that,
5 and I don't know this for a fact, that the
6 agency may be given direction from the
7 administration that's not something that they
8 necessarily would support, but they are in a
9 box.

10 And what we need to be able to do
11 is tell the administration that we think
12 that's BS and that we think it should be a
13 little bit different.

14 Because we will never really get to
15 find out what they get to put in because of
16 the secrecy that happens through the budget
17 process.

18 So it seems to me that if we had
19 some overall big thoughts, and then we could
20 address some of the nuances of what's inside
21 of some of these things.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: So one thought on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 providing more information on what each of
2 these line items represent, is that perhaps we
3 could, before we send it out, I'm going back
4 to that exercise, because we have to kind of
5 do this in a systematic way, because there are
6 so many different pieces of information, if we
7 can organize that information in a way that
8 everybody can be on the same page, short of
9 having everybody go through the blue book and
10 read every line item.

11 Maybe we could provide a
12 definition. You had your hand up.

13 DR. HOLLIDAY: I did. But that was
14 -- so I've got to address the point that Randy
15 was making, in that I think the guiding
16 principles is part of the sequence of steps
17 that would naturally flow from looking at this
18 challenge of revealing priorities of the
19 Committee with respect to budget areas.

20 I think that is something that's
21 derived, as a -- necessarily -- and when you
22 say principles, I'm thinking things like we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 want to make sure that external funding is
2 proportional or equal to or held harmless, I
3 mean those are principles as opposed to a
4 specific you know, dollar amount or something.

5 So that would be revealed by
6 allowing the Committee to go through the
7 scenarios, and say that's something we've
8 derived and that's our interpretation based on
9 how you have made these declarations that
10 these programs are to be higher -- viewed
11 higher priority than others.

12 So that was one statement. The
13 idea of, you know, knowing, you know, one of
14 the flaws or one of the challenges, I should
15 say, in any of these processes is when you ask
16 people to reveal their preferences or their
17 priorities, there's a certain amount of
18 investment of their time and energy to know
19 enough about the NOAA budget to be -- to
20 provide valuable advice.

21 And so there some degree of
22 expectation that you are going to have to know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a little bit about what's in the blue book and
2 the blue book is not -- the blue book is the
3 NOAA budget. It's the short-hand for -- I'm
4 just checking, you know.

5 It's not at the line item level, but
6 there has to be some capacity so that you can
7 feel comfortable saying, "I understand what's
8 within here, not to the level of every sub-
9 activity or project or you know, program," or
10 -- but to some degree you have to have some
11 basic understanding.

12 So my message to the Committee has been,
13 if you want -- you keep asking do you want to
14 play and you know, advise NOAA on the budget,
15 in return you have to sort of, quid pro quo,
16 learn about how the budget is organized and a
17 little bit about its content in order for you
18 to be most useful.

19 The idea that we have talked about in
20 terms of this suggestion, and again, it's not
21 the only -- I don't think we have come to any
22 conclusion that we are going to do this, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one idea, following up from previous
2 discussions, is we want to try to engage
3 people in revealing the relative importance of
4 different investments that are in the NOAA
5 budget.

6 And so the starting point is, this
7 represents the current investment portfolio of
8 how dollars have been allocated and this
9 particular table was derived from the level of
10 information that MAFAC in the past has said we
11 are interested in these programs, and we have
12 derived tables to track that over multiple
13 meetings.

14 But even for the kind of project that
15 Tony is talking about, I think it's these
16 particular levels of detail below protected
17 resources, are too difficult for inclusion on
18 the exercise. I mean, you know that that is a
19 component of that, but we wouldn't be asking
20 for people to reveal preferences at a level of
21 detail which would be unreasonable.

22 That's my point, I think we have to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have responsible expectations about where
2 MAFAC members could be reasonably comfortable
3 making a judgment.

4 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, but -- and
5 that would be my point is we have this level,
6 but there needs to be an understanding in
7 protected resources, and this is the homework
8 Mark's talking about, that that is made up of
9 marine mammals, sea turtles, other protected
10 species, Pacific salmon, which is things
11 people can grab onto, and if you look at that
12 other table, you have a relative amount of
13 that.

14 Now, Randy is right, is it
15 absolutely going for what you think it may be
16 going? Maybe not. But then if you do an
17 allocation at the summary level, the other
18 one, you know that in protected species, the
19 next part, where you could get into Randy's
20 principles, I want to support protected
21 species for resources going up 10 percent over
22 the next three years. Whatever.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 But if that increase is all for
2 Pacific salmon, I think that Atlantic salmon
3 you should zero out. You want a little bit
4 more explanation of why you are doing -- what
5 you are doing at the summary level. Does that
6 make sense?

7 And if that Pacific salmon increase
8 of 10 percent, a certain portion of it would
9 be going to the states to continue work on
10 habitat conservation plans, or endangered
11 species Section 6 grants, whatever it is.

12 MEMBER RHEULT: How do we achieve
13 consensus on something like that, though?

14 MEMBER CHATWIN: So, the first step
15 is to capture people's input in a systematic
16 way, and what we thought is, the most
17 important part of the table exercise would be
18 the notes, the explanation of why, and that we
19 would tabulate those results and see how much
20 overlap or how many -- and bring that back to
21 the subcommittee for review, so that everybody
22 can see what are the different perspectives.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And from that we can have a
2 discussion on whether we could come to a
3 consensus or not. And it would just be a
4 systematic approach to -- we're talking about
5 everybody's values right. So it's -- I don't
6 think there's an expectation that we will
7 necessarily arrive at a unanimous consensus on
8 what the collective values are, but provide a
9 transparent path to getting there.

10 DR. HOLLIDAY: It's a tool that we
11 are trying to use to see if we can reach a
12 consensus piece of advice on budget from the
13 entire Committee.

14 So it's not the end in itself.
15 It's not the actual numbers. It's a tool to
16 help see where there's convergence and
17 divergence and what some of these principles
18 might be, if people are -- they may be in
19 disagreement about the relative percentage,
20 but they still have a principle of funding
21 certain areas at the expense of others, and
22 that's important information to convey to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 organization, you know, to NOAA and the
2 leadership.

3 MEMBER CHATWIN: So, just for
4 example, if you go through this exercise, and
5 the notes say for each of these that, let's
6 say in protected resources we want an increase
7 in -- and the notes might just say I want to
8 ensure that there's an increase in whatever
9 activities preserve the infrastructure
10 necessary to -- for the agency to perform that
11 task.

12 And that's not just the agency, but
13 it could be for fisheries management. And
14 that could come out as a core value, to not
15 erode the infrastructure, meaning -- I need to
16 think of this as management decisions, as
17 adjusted agency programs, but inside and
18 outside, how the fisheries management programs
19 get paid. If you cut funding in one area, you
20 might be eroding that ability to make good
21 management decisions. I don't know, but that
22 could be a synthesis from this specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exercise.

2 MR. FISHER: Yes, it's interesting,
3 you know, if you think about it, you said if
4 the Committee said the most important thing we
5 think is that we want do to things that
6 maintain fisheries, because that means there's
7 economic value. That means there's going to
8 be communities. That means a lot of stuff.

9 So what's your relationship with
10 that in marine mammals? I mean I don't
11 understand whether or not that number for
12 marine mammals or any protected resources is
13 because of the requirements of the law, or are
14 there things that are being done there that
15 are irrespective of the law, but they are just
16 being done because they've done them that way
17 a long time.

18 Those are the kind of things that I
19 don't know, and I would be interested in
20 having that discussion to try and figure out
21 whether there are those kind of things going
22 on, that you are driven by certain

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirements, obviously, but what leeway is in
2 there if the highest priority was to do
3 everything you can to make sure that we
4 maintain the fisheries that we have.

5 MR. RISENHOOVER: So, for marine
6 mammals for example, is that marine mammal
7 money being used to find more marine mammals,
8 or identify more interactions with fisheries,
9 to limit fisheries? Or is it being used to
10 reduce the bycatch of marine mammals and
11 fisheries and solve problems that support
12 fisheries?

13 Some folks may want more marine
14 mammal research just on marine mammals because
15 they're cool, right? Other people may want
16 research on population control of marine
17 mammals.

18 MEMBER RHEAULT: So if we craft a
19 bunch of statements that -- on our founding
20 principles and then have members say I agree
21 or don't agree with each of these, we'd
22 attempt to see what sort of consensus --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER CHATWIN: Well, I think that
2 would be part of the process but I think we
3 need to get to those statements first, and
4 then, that's, I think, half way between where
5 we are now and where our final recommendations
6 will be is have the first cut and see what
7 goes on then. So, one thought is if
8 we do develop, go down this tool, define the
9 tool and everybody having an opportunity to
10 input it and send it back in, we compile the
11 information and share it back out, we had a
12 bit of a discussion on whether we should do
13 this as a subcommittee exercise or whether we
14 should, from the get-go, get input from all
15 members and compile it.

16 And then we can discuss it in the
17 subcommittee, and put it out for people to
18 understand. So that's one way to go. Another
19 way is to do it just as a pilot. We'll do it
20 in the subcommittee and then share with the
21 full Committee how it turned out and then the
22 full Committee may like what they see or they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 may say, well, you know, I didn't have it
2 input and you should do it again. So that's
3 something we should talk about, how to
4 approach it.

5 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I think your
6 subcommittee is too small to have a meaningful
7 sample to do a pilot.

8 MR. RISENHOOVER: Or you could do
9 it and then use it as an example, you know, to
10 help them understand --

11 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Yes, that's okay.

12 MR. RISENHOOVER: There's something
13 to build upon.

14 MR. FISHER: I was trying to think
15 whether there's anybody that really knows a
16 lot about the budget that's not in this room
17 right now, you know, that's on the Committee.
18 The new people probably don't have enough
19 knowledge.

20 MEMBER RHEAULT: No, I wouldn't say
21 all the new people had no clue.

22 MR. RISENHOOVER: I mean, Dr. Bob

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down here knows because he's had his nose in
2 it a lot.

3 MEMBER RHEAULT: It's one of the
4 things I can say I do have some knowledge of.
5 When we get into the fisheries management,
6 I'll admit total ignorance.

7 CHAIR RIZZARDI: But the
8 aquaculture side, you've got that down.

9 MEMBER RHEAULT: And the budget.

10 MEMBER CHATWIN: So I'm not -- so
11 what do you think? Do you think we just do it
12 within a small group and then share it as an
13 example to the Committee, running the risk
14 that they might say, "Oh, it's a good
15 approach, but now let's do it with everybody."

16 Or do we just send it ought to
17 everybody and give everybody the opportunity
18 to at least provide input through that table,
19 fill the table exercise, and then we set it
20 aside and discuss it, and once we have done
21 that, and share it with the full Committee.

22 MR. FISHER: Either way works for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me.

2 MR. RISENHOOVER: I would just say,
3 you know, you've got to look at the makeup of
4 the subcommittee. You know, Randy has said
5 one priority. We have two aquaculture folks.

6 That might -- I'm --

7 (Simultaneous speaking)

8 MEMBER NARDI: I'm just sort of
9 working here --

10 (Simultaneous speaking)

11 MR. RISENHOOVER: A mole?

12 (Simultaneous speaking)

13 DR. HOLLIDAY: With respect to
14 participation in the Committee, there are six
15 members who expressed interest on serving on
16 the Strategic Planning, Budget and Program
17 Management committee.

18 Some of them are new members who
19 are going between these two subcommittees, so
20 it's more than the people in this room, I
21 mean, Terry, Michele, Patty, Martin and Dave
22 Wallace expressed interest in the workings of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the subcommittee as, in addition to another
2 subcommittee.

3 So they may not be present at this
4 particular point in time but the subcommittee
5 would be constituted with a larger number of
6 members than those present at the moment.

7 MEMBER NARDI: Is it important
8 enough to see if they want to come in here to
9 --

10 MEMBER CHATWIN: I think it's
11 important enough that I think we can make a
12 decision if we want to --

13 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, you're going
14 to be reporting out tomorrow. This
15 subcommittee will be reporting out to the
16 plenary and you can have this as an open
17 question that you have a piece of advice, but
18 you're going to vote on tomorrow the findings
19 and recommendations of this group, because if
20 there's a lot of sentiment against whatever
21 you come up with now, you'll have an
22 opportunity to refine that tomorrow in your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 report-out.

2 So I don't think it's worth drawing
3 people out of the other room right now. I
4 think they'll be -- whatever you decide today,
5 will be subject to review and discussion
6 tomorrow before it's voted on as a final
7 recommendation.

8 So whatever you guys can come up
9 with today as the starting point, I think you
10 ought to go with, and be prepared to explain
11 and defend that choice, and see what reaction
12 you get from the full Committee tomorrow.

13 MEMBER CHATWIN: Okay well I've
14 heard one idea there to just go from the get-
15 go with the full Committee, get their input,
16 and work it within the subcommittees, and then
17 I'm just adding work the results heavily then
18 discuss it within the subcommittee.

19 And once we feel that they are in a
20 format that is -- communicates effectively the
21 findings of that exercise, we'll share it with
22 the full Committee, in anticipation of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 next meeting, for a vote on whether those
2 represent the collective budgetary priorities
3 of MAFAC.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: So we should
5 develop a couple of straw man examples of what
6 we're looking for in terms of input.

7 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I had a little
8 sidebar.

9 DR. HOLLIDAY: So, I have a
10 question with respect to the process that you
11 are agreeing to, because I am a little
12 confused about which comes first.

13 The principles, are you proposing
14 to conduct an exercise to identify principles
15 first, and then have people conduct a
16 completion of a spreadsheet, or are you
17 proposing to have people conduct and fill out
18 a spreadsheet to identify priorities and from
19 that, interpret that to reveal the principles
20 that have -- are derived from that? I'm not
21 clear.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: That's -- the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 latter is what reflects my --

2 DR. HOLLIDAY: Because I think Bob,
3 I propose, hearing you, I was understanding
4 your proposal to be coming up with principles
5 first, and then have people go and apply those
6 principles to the spreadsheet. Is that
7 correct or am I misinterpreting?

8 MEMBER RHEAULT: Well, I was sort
9 of envisioning having people develop their
10 ideas about what should happen to this and
11 then providing a paragraph of justification
12 for that.

13 So my pet project would be, you
14 know, I think we should spend more on
15 aquaculture, and these are the reasons why I
16 think so.

17 Someone else might say I think we
18 need to spend more on enforcement. This is
19 the justification for that. And then if we
20 can find that members, it can be either the
21 subcommittee or the group at large, are
22 supportive of certain straw men, then they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 come into the final document, and if we fail
2 to achieve consensus on some of them, they
3 would fall out.

4 I don't think we can attack the
5 whole big picture, but I think we can make
6 specific, small recommendations about programs
7 that we think are either over- or underfunded
8 and justifications for them in nice, tight,
9 succinct problem statements that people would
10 be challenged to develop to convince the other
11 members of the committee.

12 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I think that
13 process is already under way to some degree,
14 and it's in the vision document. I had a
15 little sidebar with Alan here. Looking at
16 that list, it looks a lot like that I had
17 Heidi typing on the screen.

18 You know, of if we were to take the
19 vision document and, you know, realign it a
20 little bit to coincide with the headings that
21 we are using in the blue book and in the
22 budget documents, you'd have your analysis on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Vision, which would be laying out, here's the
2 trends, here's the analysis, here are the
3 things that MAFAC is asserting as priorities,
4 and then you could use that to coincide with
5 your budget analysis and --

6 MEMBER CHATWIN: Well, I think it
7 will be interesting to see if they do
8 coincide. I think one thing is to talk about
9 things that -- the Vision -- and the other
10 thing is whether people are going to put their
11 money where their Vision is.

12 CHAIR RIZZARDI: But if we can
13 figure out a way to put those two efforts
14 together, that would make a whole lot of
15 sense. And the timing is right, and we're
16 doing it now, and we've got a draft Vision
17 document that is being reworked, and if we go
18 back to that team and we say, "Please try to
19 do your latest version of the Vision documents
20 so it coincides with the headings that we are
21 using for the budgetary analysis," then we can
22 get some help, and get some direction.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER CHATWIN: And I think that
2 sounds good. I don't know if there's going to
3 be 100 percent overlap --

4 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I agree.

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: -- because when you
6 are talking about Vision you are talking about
7 maybe things that are not in the current
8 budget.

9 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I agree.

10 MR. RISENHOOVER: And it would be
11 interesting to know that we have a Vision for
12 MAFAC that we have no budget for. Does that
13 mean we need to establish a budget for it, new
14 money, or do we need to move money out of
15 lower priorities to that new -- new budget.

16 MEMBER CHATWIN: So, the three
17 different scenarios, we are going to have
18 budget scenarios, right, of growth or decline
19 or sequestration over a five-year period,
20 which will give you the bounds of by how much
21 in terms of percentage.

22 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, that was one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the things we were discussing before Bob
2 joined us, so maybe you want -- or I can
3 explain, you can explain what the --

4 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, if you could
5 explain, because you are more familiar with it
6 all.

7 DR. HOLLIDAY: So, part of the
8 model of how to proceed was scenario building.

9 And we as an agency had just gone through a
10 corporate scenario of a flat line after the
11 President's '13 request, a sequestration
12 scenario based on sort of a worst case, which
13 is a 20 percent reduction, and then a recovery
14 budget that would bring us back to the 2010
15 levels and which in Alan's presentation was
16 sort of our high point.

17 And the other element that's
18 important to note is that this is a five-year
19 exercise, so it's not just looking at 2014,
20 it's looking over 2014 over a five-year
21 period.

22 So it's the trajectory of future

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 planning as well, not just formulating budgets
2 in one year, as our baseline of -- a target
3 for the scenarios.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: So are we actually
5 going to attempt to put dollar figures on
6 these or can we just say that this is a
7 scenario where we think it should be more --

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: It's not --

9 MEMBER RHEAULT: and this should be
10 less, we are unhappy with what's going on
11 because, you know --

12 DR. HOLLIDAY: So I think the
13 discussion that we were having was not to try
14 to force it into dollar amounts but to
15 actually do more than just say increase or
16 decrease, in other words a science and a
17 magnitude and Alan's suggestion was on a
18 percentage basis.

19 We have this table that was
20 calculated that 20 percent of the current
21 resources are spent on protected. Over a
22 five-year period are you happy with that, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 do you want to see that change, and then if
2 you want to see it change or stay the same,
3 why? And that goes to your point about
4 explanation of change.

5 MR. FISHER: Well, here's another
6 process question. If we identify, and
7 everybody in this room probably has a pet
8 project that they think needs more funding,
9 are we also committing ourselves to find cuts?

10 MR. FISHER: Well, it's going to be
11 a no sum game, I can tell you.

12 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, that's
13 correct, because at the bottom, those
14 percentages have to equal 100.

15 MEMBER RHEULT: I'm just asking.
16 Because that's a much more difficult
17 challenge.

18 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, it's a more --
19 actually it's a meaningless exercise if it's
20 not part of the rule, I would suggest.

21 MR. FISHER: So what is the purpose
22 of this exercise? Is it to help build 2014 in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reality, because it's already in process.

2 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, it's not --

3 MR. RISENHOOVER: So part of it is
4 we should get this how do you use it. Right?

5 And when do you get it? So it comes to the
6 timing, perhaps a briefing or a paper to NOAA
7 saying we know you're developing '14 budget,
8 here's MAFAC's perspective, or to OMB, or to
9 the Secretary's office.

10 DR. HOLLIDAY: But if I may, part
11 of our prior discussions at MAFAC about how to
12 engage the group was when is the appropriate
13 month of the calendar to do this?

14 And so the '14 -- by the time MAFAC
15 conducts its exercise as you are proposing,
16 the '14 budget for the President would be
17 pretty much over and done with, and that's one
18 of the reasons we are looking at this as a
19 strategic exercise as opposed to a one-year
20 formulation, that if we are looking -- and
21 again, part of the reason for looking at five
22 years versus one year is because if we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to propose changes and losing programs,
2 or to building programs, you'd want to do that
3 over a period of time versus a one-year, so
4 that's the strategic rationale for five years.

5 It's both a practical one, so when this --
6 when we could have been doing this to have
7 maximum impact for the President's '14 request
8 could have been last October. That's when we
9 tried to do that. Now, if we are going to do
10 this during the summer, by the time we get
11 around to completing it, it's less optimal for
12 '14 but it's still valuable because it will
13 inform defense of the President's budget when
14 it's released and other things and see how it
15 reconciles.

16 Rather, I think it's more than just
17 the one year. It has value for more than just
18 one --

19 MR. FISHER: Well, the only reason
20 I bring it up is that you know, if MAFAC took
21 a stance on some of these issues, we could use
22 it in -- even though the '14 budget is out, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 could still help that process.

2 You know, I mean, what goes on on
3 the Hill, goes on on the Hill. And you know,
4 that's reality. I mean the Senate came out
5 with what I think is a great idea and I would
6 hope that MAFAC would support that, and that
7 it move the satellites to NASA and get them
8 the hell out of NOAA, because NASA needs
9 something to do anyway, and so it would be a
10 good idea.

11 You know, those are the kind of
12 things that --

13 DR. HOLLIDAY: Right, I was simply
14 responding to the question about affecting the
15 President's '14 request and that the optimal
16 timing to do -- affect that content, as
17 opposed to -- that's just the starting point
18 in the '14 process.

19 MEMBER RHEAULT: And your feeling
20 is that we should have this to NOAA by August,
21 to best affect the process?

22 DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm saying take

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whatever time is necessary, but realize that,
2 for the FY14 President's budget, by the time
3 this exercise plays out, many of the decisions
4 that go into the President's budget will have
5 been decided.

6 Randy's point is perfectly germane
7 because that's the starting point. That's not
8 the ending point, you know, the President
9 delivers the budget and then all sorts of
10 additional steps, where this information would
11 be extremely valuable to have, beginning when
12 the President releases his budget in February
13 of next year, '13, whatever year that is.

14 Right? So the President releases
15 the budget in February, and I'm just saying,
16 our deadline for getting the '14 budget into
17 NOAA to go to DOC to go to OMB to become part
18 of the -- that deadline is you know, within
19 weeks, right? So --

20 MEMBER RHEAULT: That's what I was
21 asking.

22 DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. But it's still

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 valuable information that could influence '14
2 but we should be mindful that we want this to
3 influence future budgets just like we want the
4 Vision 2020 to affect planning out-year
5 strategic decision-making over a course of
6 many years.

7 MEMBER CHATWIN: So what's the sign
8 from the subcommittees? Are we happy with
9 this approach of coming up with this tool to
10 capture that, and from the capture of people's
11 values and through their comments on their
12 rankings and then that would then inform what
13 could be at least aware of some consensuses
14 which could become principles or even
15 recommendations from MAFAC on budgetary
16 priorities, and it could also highlight areas
17 where there isn't consensus, where we do
18 discuss that further as a subcommittee and
19 just see where, you know, it goes?

20 CHAIR RIZZARDI: What's the timing
21 for circulating something like that?

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: So we need to, let

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me just get the prototype of the school, I
2 think what's going to take this time is to
3 come up with a description of each of the line
4 items, so that folks have some understanding
5 of what is captured by them at a broad level.

6 But I mean ideally we would send
7 this out, where are we now?

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: The end of May.

9 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes.

10 CHAIR RIZZARDI: So we're talking
11 about, we've got a list of 10 areas and we're
12 going to prioritize them 1 through 10, and add
13 up the rankings, or what's the -- no?

14 DR. HOLLIDAY: I think we are
15 basing -- the recommendation was basing it on
16 percentages. We would revise this table that
17 you see on the screen --

18 CHAIR RIZZARDI: And let people put
19 the percentages in.

20 DR. HOLLIDAY: That the percentages
21 would still have to add up to 100 --

22 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. HOLLIDAY: would be over a
2 five-year period, and three scenarios, and
3 have those percentages for change based on
4 people's relative priorities for these areas,
5 having been informed by the content of what
6 these things are presently.

7 MR. RISENHOOVER: So, what I did
8 just real quick here is, that's a higher level
9 than what Mark did -- reinforced at our
10 leadership council.

11 So if you have those areas, and as
12 Tony said, we need to explain what's in
13 protected resources, that other table, this
14 full table shows you there the general
15 categories. We need to provide some
16 additional explanation there.

17 We've got all the budget trends
18 over time, and so what I did was just added
19 some columns, and based on the President's
20 budget, looking at that Senate mark and the
21 House mark, under a level budget scenario, I
22 allocated the percentages.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So right now protected resources is
2 19 percent of our budget. I just put them
3 down to 17, just as an example. Fisheries I
4 reduced to 15, and I put that additional
5 investment.

6 So even under a level scenario, I
7 increased our investment in science, just to
8 show it totals 100, so that 100 percent is at
9 this eight eighty level, the level scenario.

10 Twenty percent decrease, I just
11 added it up to 80. And then you can see where
12 I took some more from protected species, from
13 fisheries, comparing the 35 to the 31. I
14 decreased science less relative to the other
15 things. I think I cut aquaculture in half.
16 The other activities, I cut that in half.

17 Under a 10 percent increase
18 scenario, I invested a little bit more than we
19 currently have in protected species. I kept
20 fisheries management level. I invested quite
21 a bit, seven percent more, in science.

22 I tripled aquaculture from what it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was now to the one percent now. I said triple
2 that to 15 percent, or 15 million instead of
3 the five.

4 So just as an example, that's how
5 it works, at a very high level.

6 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I think it makes
7 Mark's point very important, though, about
8 people needing to have some degree of
9 sophistication with what this is really about,
10 because to do that percentage kind of game
11 does require some working knowledge.

12 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, and I just
13 did it, because we went through the exercise
14 last week. But for science, I could then
15 explain you know, under a level scenario, I
16 have increased the relative proportion of
17 science and I believe that that science should
18 be invested in cooperative research, protected
19 species research, whatever.

20 I can specify that where I think
21 those additional investments need to be, and
22 maybe we reduce funding to the Pacific states

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for their data collection programs, just
2 whatever -- whatever the shifts are.

3 And people could then, based on
4 their level of knowledge, specify how they see
5 that going.

6 DR. HOLLIDAY: So Alan, the final
7 column, is that relative to any particular
8 fiscal year?

9 MR. RISENHOOVER: I did it relative
10 to this one, to the '13 --

11 DR. HOLLIDAY: Oh, I know, but what
12 does it represent, '14, '14 through '18, '18?

13 MR. RISENHOOVER: It was a singular
14 year. Now that's the other thing we have to
15 talk about, is do we want to do this over a
16 period of time? Are we looking just at what
17 we think should be the '14 budget, or as we
18 did with Mark the other week, look at it '14
19 through '18?

20 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I think you
21 probably want to do both. You can do both. I
22 like the one-year window that keeps it easy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for MAFAC members. But for a lot of folks
2 this is, the budget game is going to be
3 entirely new.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: But do our
5 priorities change? I mean on the front of
6 both?

7 MR. RISENHOOVER: Well, I think you
8 can almost get -- and that's where Randy's
9 comments are important. When I did the
10 exercise with the leadership council, I
11 started messing with numbers, and then I said,
12 well, that's no way to do it.

13 So I sat down and then I wrote out
14 what I wanted. Over the four-year period, I
15 wanted our investment in -- I don't remember
16 what I did now -- I want our investment in
17 science to increase, over that four-year
18 period, under all scenarios.

19 Under all scenarios, I wanted
20 fisheries management to stay level or be
21 reduced to the higher rate than PR if it was a
22 reduction scenario.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Under all scenarios I wanted PR to
2 remain level or increase slightly. So I did,
3 much as Randy did, is I drafted out my guiding
4 principles over that four-year period, and
5 then tried to apply them

6 Aquaculture for example, you know,
7 under a reducing scenario, keep it level. Or
8 under a level scenario, reduce it a little
9 because it's not a money problem.

10 But if I'm going to have 10 percent
11 increase over four years, I want to have a
12 relatively increase in it than other programs.

13 Something like that, just to help --

14 MEMBER RHEULT: So the percentage
15 is -- the answer is yes. Depending on the
16 different budget funding levels, your
17 priorities do change. The percentages do
18 change.

19 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right. Based on
20 my priorities, the funding levels change.

21 MEMBER RHEULT: I get that, that
22 was my question.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. RISENHOOVER: Not based on the
2 budget my priorities change, although that
3 happens. That was just an example to show we
4 then would need to decide it's over --

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: Exactly, so there
6 are two things. One is to get a sense of
7 priorities, and the other one is whether --
8 it's the implementation of those priorities,
9 really, how you do it over a period of time.

10 MR. RISENHOOVER: And does it need
11 to ramp up quickly and then level off or does
12 it need to ramp up slowly? Some of it's our
13 capability, you know, you can only absorb so
14 much increase for specific activities,
15 perhaps, because you've got to hire people or
16 whatever.

17 MEMBER CHATWIN: And I'm not sure
18 if MAFAC needs to get into that, you know,
19 whether -- because that's more an operational
20 matter, and whether we as a body need to come
21 to a consensus on whether something has to
22 ramp up quickly over time and then stabilize

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 or --

2 MR. RISENHOOVER: But that's
3 something you could allow the MAFAC person.
4 If they have that level of sophistication,
5 knowledge, or belief, but if --

6 MEMBER CHATWIN: But they put it in
7 as a comment.

8 MR. RISENHOOVER: That's a comment.

9 MR. FISHER: Did MAFAC ever support
10 catch shares?

11 MEMBER CHATWIN: I don't recall. It
12 seems like we did, way back when.

13 MEMBER RHEAULT: Some members did.

14 DR. HOLLIDAY: As a Committee?
15 Yes, the answer is yes.

16 MEMBER CHATWIN: We provided
17 comments on the policy and we felt the policy
18 was a good one, and we made some
19 recommendations for new entries.

20 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, and so
21 that's one other thing we've got to be careful
22 on, you know, what is in that catch share

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 money? People need to understand, if they're
2 saying, well, we need to make sure the
3 observers for the West Coast are continued at
4 or above or whatever level, well, they need to
5 know that funding is in that catch share line
6 right now.

7 MEMBER CHATWIN: Mark?

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: So, based on what
9 you're saying, I think that last column should
10 represent 2018, those three yellow columns, is
11 what do you want it to look like in 2018.
12 Because you're saying we don't want to see
13 the trajectory but we know after five years.
14 Otherwise, I mean, what happens, you're going
15 to be giving out programs, you're going to
16 terminate them in one year? I mean I think
17 you can't, from a practical standpoint, just
18 like you said, you'll have difficulty
19 absorbing a 10 percent increase in one year,
20 it's going to be hard to eliminate five
21 programs in one year without some pretty
22 Draconian personnel and other changes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And so allowing that to ramp down
2 over a period of time leads me to believe that
3 your intent would be to have that, after five
4 years, that's what you want it to look like.

5 For our leadership, we force them
6 to look at a trajectory for each year, but in
7 the implication of this, I think the out-year,
8 strategic view is five years from now where do
9 you want to be, and that comports with sort of
10 the idea of looking at a strategic vision
11 document of what's the direction and five
12 years from now, what do you want this to be
13 looking like, or in the case of 2040, it's
14 eight -- or it would have been how many years.

15 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, and it would
16 be kind of nice to keep the 2020 Vision even
17 though it's still eight years away, and then
18 have this sort of exercise tie into that
19 Vision.

20 I think it's unrealistic to try to
21 tie in a budgetary vision for a '40 Vision?

22 DR. HOLLIDAY: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CHATWIN: Right. Then it
2 would -- in 2020 these are the areas that we
3 think are important, this is how we would like
4 to see the budget.

5 DR. HOLLIDAY: And actually,
6 thinking more about it, it has more
7 durability. I mean, it's -- it helps not much
8 through the '14 cycle, but it's advice, until
9 you change -- circumstances change and you
10 revisit it, it could be used as input when we
11 start the '15 cycle in the fall.

12 MEMBER CHATWIN: Right. Yes, and
13 it's something you can track MAFAC's
14 recommendations against, right? Just for this
15 body I think it would be of interest. This is
16 these -- these are the percentages that we
17 want to strive towards, and maybe that next
18 year's budget has now gone in a completely
19 different way, and then we can have a
20 discussion about why, what can we do.

21 DR. HOLLIDAY: We could turn it
22 into a performance measure.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, see? I'm
2 thinking about that. So -- how do we like
3 this idea? And what are we doing talking about
4 2020 instead of 2040?

5 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Well, I'll have a
6 little sidebar with Martin as soon as possible
7 and I think we start talking about aligning
8 the topics in Vision with the headers in the
9 budget, and I think it can stay 2020. I
10 agree. I think an eight-year outlook is far
11 enough in advance and I think anything beyond
12 that is us guessing anyway.

13 And we're already talking about
14 some pretty big issues getting added on there
15 anyway that we didn't even anticipate five
16 years ago. We weren't talking about some of
17 these things. So --

18 DR. HOLLIDAY: It's two
19 administrations' worth of time. In dog years.

20 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I'm okay with the
21 name. I really like the idea of aligning the
22 two efforts. I think the timing is important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and it might help to have our members see the
2 draft of the Vision document that's going
3 around when they undertake this exercise.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: That puts us back
5 several months.

6 CHAIR RIZZARDI: That puts you back
7 a couple of weeks. Well now, the first draft
8 of the Vision document we are talking about
9 now going out June 15.

10 DR. HOLLIDAY: But that's subject
11 to change. But that draft is --

12 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Correct, I'm
13 looking at it as more of an educational issue,
14 and that's an opportunity to have the members
15 who are about to engage in a fairly
16 sophisticated exercise, have a little bit more
17 foundation to do it.

18 MEMBER CHATWIN: And I think that
19 sounds good, but I think that there's
20 practical challenges.

21 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I understand.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: And we probably

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to keep those two coordinated but in
2 parallel.

3 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Okay.

4 MEMBER CHATWIN: Just because we'll
5 need to come up with a very succinct but
6 informative summary for each of these line
7 items, and we'll know what they were thinking
8 of when they provide their input.

9 CHAIR RIZZARDI: So by June 1, we
10 can have some sort of document that goes out
11 to the MAFAC members to go through this
12 exercise? Is that what we're talking about?

13 MEMBER CHATWIN: June 15?

14 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Well if we're back
15 to June 15, then it's the same time that the
16 first version of the Vision document is going
17 to go out.

18 MR. FISHER: So what happened when
19 Bob wants to increase aquaculture by 42
20 percent and I only want -- and I want to
21 decrease it buy 10?

22 DR. HOLLIDAY: So the first step in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that is you're going to reveal the divergence
2 of opinion of members. That's the first step.

3 Then, as part of our principle of the
4 Committee, we see if we can reach a consensus
5 recommendation. That's in our handbook of
6 guiding principles for MAFAC.

7 And if we can't reach a consensus,
8 we have the opportunity to have a majority and
9 minority report out of the findings of the
10 Committee.

11 So it's not going to get lost, but
12 the options range from, you know, we need to
13 know that there's convergence or divergence,
14 we need to do something about it, if we can,
15 to reach consensus, and if not, we still
16 represent the values of the individual member
17 components.

18 MR. RISENHOOVER: Right, and then
19 the leadership council exercised -- or
20 indicated -- they showed us that range, of min
21 and max. So for example on this one you would
22 see that Randy took whatever line it was to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 zero and whoever it was took it to 40 percent,
2 you would see that there is a very high range
3 there.

4 We had one line, I don't remember
5 what it was, where it was -- it looked like it
6 was just completely level, and then you looked
7 at that min and max, and they were two camps.
8 They were funded twice as much and zero.

9 So the testing didn't show the
10 difference.

11 DR. HOLLIDAY: Keith, to your
12 question, I would, I would be hesitant to say
13 -- we have three working days in the office
14 after this meeting before June 1st. So I
15 think it would be very optimistic for us to
16 recover and get this out to the Committee on
17 that Friday.

18 MR. RISENHOOVER: Understood.

19 DR. HOLLIDAY: But we would
20 certainly work as diligently as humanly
21 possible to get it out as soon as practicable
22 after that, the following week or so. But I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't think it would happen by Friday, June
2 1st.

3 MR. RISENHOOVER: And all those
4 lines are described in the budget narrative,
5 so we would have something to work from. We
6 would just need to make sure it's --

7 DR. HOLLIDAY: Well, that's my
8 point, is it's not just as simple as taking
9 this table and emailing it. There's got to be
10 sufficient work and feedback from the
11 subcommittee chair that meets the standard
12 that we have agreed to, and have staff --
13 sufficient staff time to get it right

14 CHAIR RIZZARDI: And then what kind
15 of turnaround time will the members have once
16 they receive this thing?

17 MEMBER CHATWIN: Oh, I think a
18 couple of weeks. I don't think they need a
19 lot more than that. I mean, in less than
20 that. It can be done in 30 minutes. You did
21 it in how many?

22 MR. RISENHOOVER: But that was much

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 simpler, higher level --

2 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, but I think
3 two weeks is enough. I don't know -- what
4 does the subcommittee think? If you leave it
5 for a month, people are going to do it in the
6 last few days anyway.

7 MR. RISENHOOVER: Exactly, that's
8 why they invented the last minute.

9 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I'm thinking,
10 curious, what we are asking members to do
11 anyway is to submit their individual comments
12 on the version of 2020 that's floating out
13 there on the web right now.

14 So the two exercises can coincide.
15 Let's go back, read the Vision document just
16 so you can see where MAFAC was, today. Yes,
17 this is changing, yes, it's going to be
18 subject to editing, but it's going to give you
19 some sense of our general direction.

20 And then undertake this budget
21 effort and have both of those efforts done by
22 June 15. Now, they're working in parallel.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 They're going to send their comments
2 separately on the Vision document and they're
3 going to send the response on this budget
4 exercise.

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, but it's just
6 the timing. We need to get this out to
7 members by June 15th.

8 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Well, I thought
9 June 1st is impossible but a week after that
10 is not. Mark, do you mean two weeks after --

11 DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm looking at the
12 week of June 4th, get it out to by that -- by
13 the 8th of June, which is a Friday. I don't
14 know how much time people are -- that it's not
15 that hard to do, it's that if somebody is on
16 travel or away and they have other
17 commitments, giving them a week to do
18 something is a pretty --

19 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I understand.

20 DR. HOLLIDAY: short period of
21 time.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: That is Capitol

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Hill Oceans Week so I don't know how many --

2 DR. HOLLIDAY: That first week of
3 June. So do you want us to cook the seafood
4 or do you want us to do the spreadsheet? Jim,
5 you've got to barbecue the numbers.

6 Why don't we, Tony and I try to
7 talk about this offline in terms of its
8 caliber --

9 MEMBER CHATWIN: Sure.

10 DR. HOLLIDAY: So it's part of the
11 presentation after the full Committee
12 tomorrow, we'll have something as a straw man
13 at least to talk about, and then we can --
14 other things on your agenda for this
15 subcommittees meeting now, or continue the
16 discussion, but I mean there's a time frame,
17 let us kind of step back and --

18 MEMBER CHATWIN: Work it out. Yes.
19 I mean we have half an hour left of this
20 subcommittee and we need to -- what, reorg?
21 Is that okay?

22 MEMBER RHEAULT: I'm a new guy, I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to shut up.

2 CHAIR RIZZARDI: I can tell you
3 from my hallways and my lunch conversations
4 there's a lot of folks who believe that we
5 should speak up on reorg. This is a body with
6 some expertise and some knowledge and yes,
7 there's politics involved, and yes, there are
8 people who want to do their own thing, but
9 this agency -- this, maybe should at least
10 make its voice heard on what we think of the
11 issue.

12 I think there's a lot of consensus
13 for that.

14 DR. HOLLIDAY: Unfortunately they
15 didn't come to this subcommittee meeting, and
16 unfortunately we don't have proxies, so I
17 don't think we have to do nothing.

18 MEMBER CHATWIN: That does beg the
19 question of what do you want to do?

20 DR. HOLLIDAY: People vote with
21 their feet.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: What do we want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do about the reorg? What do you want to do
2 about the reorg? I'm chair so I'll wait for
3 your opinion.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: I know aquaculture
5 is an insignificant part of the whole process
6 but I can tell you that if we get slumped
7 under Fish and Wildlife it will be a disaster.

8 MEMBER CHATWIN: To that point, I
9 was -- Fish and Wildlife Service, here's the
10 org chart for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
11 And I was looking at -- I was looking at it to
12 see where NOAA fisheries fit and where it
13 could fit, and honestly, I don't -- it didn't
14 jump out at me.

15 CHAIR RIZZARDI: It doesn't. There
16 isn't.

17 MR. FISHER: I met with the GAO
18 folks. They came to the office and stuff and
19 my impression was that they sort of didn't
20 agree that it was a great idea either. I mean,
21 kind of reading between the lines, you know,
22 to tell you the truth, because what we talked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 about what they were concerned about. Well,
2 did the agencies work together, and I said
3 yes, at least in the Pacific Northwest they
4 definitely work together and that's not a
5 problem, they've figured out how to deal with
6 salmon and they've figured out how to deal
7 with other stuff, and so it's not a big deal.

8 You've got joint rules over the
9 place, you've got joint policies all over the
10 place, and there's plenty of interagency
11 coordination.

12 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Well that's kind
13 of the, we went through all that stuff, but
14 they didn't ask anything that was, like, an
15 impossible question. They didn't give me the
16 impression that they were strong on suggesting
17 that that was going to happen, either, by the
18 way.

19 MEMBER CHATWIN: So one way to
20 approach this is looking at whether there's a
21 good fit structurally. Another angle on this
22 is supposed cost savings.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I was looking at the budgets for -
2 - the overall budgets for the different
3 departments and Commerce is one of the
4 smallest, and talk about fisheries, there's a
5 lot of money that goes to fisheries, not
6 relative to its mission but relative to
7 everything else, it's a drop in the bucket.

8 And so I'm not sure that that's
9 where the government can get most of its cost
10 savings from, or insignificant cost savings.
11 So that's another way we can approach it.

12 Really, I was looking at what Mark
13 put up as a -- not that one -- they had --

14 CHAIR RIZZARDI: The Forest
15 Service?

16 MEMBER CHATWIN: Pardon?

17 CHAIR RIZZARDI: If you look at the
18 Forest Service one?

19 MEMBER CHATWIN: No, the -- yes.
20 Is this on it? This is the one, actually.
21 See this table? This is how they assess the
22 implementation step. I thought if we need to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provide guidance, and a position on this
2 reorg, it would be useful or maybe helpful to
3 GAO if we kind of structured our guidance
4 based on what they used to structure their
5 recommendations, and provide input.

6 Now we might, I think the practice
7 is more an institutional thing on their end,
8 but the implementation step has a lot to do.
9 Mark?

10 DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm just -- you
11 don't have to automatically -- I just want to
12 let you know I want to be recognized when
13 you're done. So I'm a creature of habit here.

14 So I appreciate that, you know, there's
15 different ideas of how to approach this
16 question, and what's MAFAC to do about it.

17 With regards to the GAO study I
18 think it investment and time. There's the
19 nine questions, and Randy, you can -- I
20 presume, from what I've heard about people who
21 have been interviewed, they are still using
22 those nine questions from their entrants and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the stuff that I posted as the basis for their
2 discussions, you know. Are there
3 opportunities for, you know, other
4 duplication, are there opportunities for
5 improvement, where do they work well together,
6 where they don't work well together.

7 And you could answer those
8 questions from MAFAC's perspective and then
9 provide an answer through the lens of MAFAC,
10 as one product to deal with reorganization for
11 this GAO perspective, and sort of be done with
12 the GAO route.

13 But on a more strategic scale, you
14 may as a Committee want to opine about the
15 validity or the integrity of NOAA and NMFS or
16 standalone, you know, these larger public
17 policy questions about the role of living
18 marine source stewardship responsibility as a
19 statement of MAFAC principle or
20 recommendation.

21 So in terms of organizing your
22 thoughts about how to respond, it's sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 like the GAO is the ongoing, if they come
2 around and we want to have an opinion
3 expressed by the Chair or anybody else, you
4 can look at those questions as a starting
5 point, given the general characterizations of
6 the transformation, or not. But --

7 CHAIR RIZZARDI: So I want to move
8 on. My personal sense of this whole thing,
9 the incremental shift of NMFS into Interior I
10 don't think makes a whole lot of sense.

11 I don't see the alignment, I don't
12 see the vision, I don't see it sitting in with
13 the mission. If you were to take a bigger
14 picture and start reorganizing multiple pieces
15 of the government and start talking about true
16 transformation of the government and how they
17 need a new, environmental institution, then
18 I'd have a whole different viewpoint of this.

19 If we were going to the other GAO
20 study and talking about the Forest Service
21 moving and the USGS being moved and pieces of
22 the Department of Energy being moved and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 pieces of NOAA being moved, then I'd have a
2 whole lot more support for this new concept of
3 a Department of Natural Resources or a
4 Department of the Environment or whatever it
5 would be.

6 You know, why does the Army Corps
7 of Engineers do 404 permitting? You know,
8 let's talk realistically about whole-scale
9 change. That's a different thing.

10 But incremental movement of one
11 agency into the other just because they both
12 implement the Endangered Species Act, on a
13 personal level, no, I don't think that makes
14 any sense, and I'm not convinced that this has
15 come about for much more than political
16 reasons.

17 That said, you know, I don't know
18 if we want to be so sophisticated as to make a
19 two-step statement. Maybe the only statement
20 that MAFAC wants to make is we oppose this
21 move, it doesn't make any sense, it's
22 incrementalism; or, maybe, MAFAC does want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 say we would only support it if it were a
2 holistic reform that looked at all these other
3 issues.

4 And that's the kind of dialogue I'd
5 like to see us have.

6 MEMBER CHATWIN: And I think we
7 should.

8 CHAIR RIZZARDI: And by the way,
9 what I just laid out is exactly what I sent
10 out in my blog. I've put my position out
11 there pretty clearly, but I realize it's
12 nothing more than my opinion at this point.

13 MEMBER CHATWIN: So somewhere in
14 between there could also be the thinking about
15 -- so where I was going to go with this was to
16 talk about culture and my read on the
17 Department of Interior is that they lack a
18 value of stewardship of the oceans.

19 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Sure, you go
20 through GAO list, you don't see those elements
21 in Interior right now.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: Right, they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already have jurisdiction over a large amount
2 of marine areas, but they have close to no
3 capacity for it. All the coastal refuges have
4 very few actual marine focal species. It's
5 very much, as the name suggests, a land-based
6 agency.

7 So I, thinking just on ocean
8 governance, I think a standalone oceans
9 department would be in order to work and that,
10 if we are going to move anything, we should
11 move the Bureau of Oceans from Interior into
12 NOAA as a standalone.

13 So I'm all for having this big
14 discussion.

15 CHAIR RIZZARDI: See, I just think
16 that for purposes of MAFAC, the easier step
17 right now is to have this body be able to say
18 we do not agree with the movement of NOAA
19 fisheries into Interior for these reasons.

20 Alternative visions, I think, are
21 going to be harder to flesh out consensus on,
22 and to shape agreement on. Now, that doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 mean don't do it, it just means, you know,
2 recognize the limits, and maybe for today we
3 can get general consensus on okay, the
4 incremental step of just NMFS into Interior we
5 disagree, and then we start having a dialogue
6 over do we make this alternative statement.
7 And, again, I put out the concept that we need
8 that work plan of how are we going to go from
9 today to the next meeting and have something
10 that we can finalize by the next meeting, and
11 that will be another piece of the trick.

12 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, I think if we
13 are going to be putting out a Vision, new
14 Vision for 2020, I think there's an
15 opportunity there to see what would be the
16 best.

17 In 2020 do we still want to have
18 all these different -- do we still want to
19 have NOAA -- do you know, do we still want to
20 have decisions about siting facilities in the
21 ocean made by Interior with consultation to
22 NOAA?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Do we still want to see all the
2 revenue from off the shore, the OCS, go into
3 primarily terrestrial and freshwater
4 conservation?

5 I mean these are issues that I
6 think are important for marine governance that
7 we could take a stab at, which is a step
8 shorter than saying how do we reorganize the
9 entire federal government around environmental
10 laws or around the environment as a whole.

11 But it's part of a vision, was
12 called for to a certain extent in the Oceans
13 Commissions, but it hasn't been acted on
14 necessarily.

15 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Which would be
16 very easy for this body to point back to and -
17 -

18 MEMBER CHATWIN: So on the issue of
19 taking a position on the move, or the GAO,
20 what's the pleasure of the subcommittee? Do
21 we want to suggest a resolution, a
22 recommendation for a vote tomorrow?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So let's work on some language.

2 DR. HOLLIDAY: That means you're
3 above and beyond everybody else.

4 MEMBER RHEAULT: If they're going
5 to do it anyway. I want to go to ARS. It's
6 USDA, it's really just a poor fit. We are a
7 much better fit with Ag than we are with Fish
8 and Wildlife.

9 And there's no place in Interior.
10 We'd be much better off under Ag. So it's
11 certain elements like that, but I don't know
12 that we want to get down into the weeds like
13 that.

14 I think that there's going to be a
15 broad consensus to recommend against a move,
16 and if not I'm coming up with language for
17 why, and I think you've encapsulated some of
18 the rationale for what you said verbally.

19 MEMBER CHATWIN: Okay. We have 15
20 minutes to come up with some language and a
21 recommendation.

22 And who are we recommending this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to? I mean our recommendations are to the
2 Secretary of Commerce.

3 DR. HOLLIDAY: Part of your
4 recommendation could be that MAFAC be
5 providing this to the Secretary in the hopes
6 that this is a way to the General Accounting
7 Office program reviewers in the context of
8 their study.

9 They may or may not decide to
10 forward it, but that's your intent.

11 MEMBER CHATWIN: So in that case, I
12 mean, I think a short resolution does convey
13 the message, but it does not really -- you
14 know, a statement saying we don't like it is,
15 you know, it's not very helpful. Or maybe it
16 is, you know, Mark, what do you?

17 DR. HOLLIDAY: I don't think this
18 by itself is terribly helpful. I think for
19 the record there has to be some basis or
20 rationale that for GAO to recognize it, I mean
21 it's just like a postcard comment that we get,
22 I hate NMFS and all you stand for.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 He didn't tell us why, we had no
2 opportunity to fix something.

3 MEMBER CHATWIN: You can't respond.

4 DR. HOLLIDAY: We can't respond.

5 So I would, I mean, you are sort of on those
6 crossroads of, between now and tomorrow is
7 there sufficient time to craft something that
8 makes sense, or in terms of a statement, or
9 can you craft something that includes the
10 principles that you want in a statement and
11 have that voted on and then you have the
12 luxury of some time to put together something,
13 but you don't have to reconvene to vote on it.

14 You know what I'm saying? It's --
15 you can agree on the principles that you want
16 incorporated in something and that's the basis
17 of your action in finding it.

18 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, and my
19 understanding of your guidance earlier today
20 was not -- was that this was something that we
21 would want to accomplish. A position on the
22 reorg. was by the next meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. HOLLIDAY: That's what I'm
2 saying. I don't want you to be putting
3 yourself into distress mode of trying to get
4 something done between now and tomorrow,
5 whatever, yes.

6 MEMBER CHATWIN: Like 10 o'clock
7 tomorrow?

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: Nine o'clock
9 tomorrow morning.

10 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Yes, because I
11 don't think that -- change on this subject is
12 not going to happen between now and October.
13 NOAA Fisheries is not moving to Interior in
14 September. So --

15 MEMBER CHATWIN: And the GAO study
16 you said was on a different time line?

17 DR. HOLLIDAY: They're unlikely to
18 get something out before October, November,
19 but their data gathering is taking place now,
20 so they are going to be continuing that
21 through I'd say mid-summer and then they are
22 going to go off and begin to write the draft

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and vet their report internally, for the
2 remaining two months, is sort of my guess.

3 So in terms of having maximum
4 value, before they put their pens to paper and
5 stuff, I mean you're talking the middle of the
6 summer to get something out to them. I
7 wouldn't wait until October. So if you have a
8 process or you can panel a subcommittee or
9 some interested members of the subcommittees
10 to work on something, draft that and then we
11 could -- it looks like we'll be holding at
12 least one conference call for other reasons.
13 We can have an agenda of items that require
14 final vote and approval of the committee
15 between meetings.

16 MEMBER CHATWIN: All right and some
17 hope of coming up with or presenting this or
18 highlighting this, was that this gives us some
19 structure.

20 And what I would encourage members
21 of the subcommittee to think about is, given
22 your perspectives, where can you develop or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 articulate and argument why we see using this
2 framework here, where, is it a cultural think
3 or is it -- you know, wait -- I just think
4 that if this is how they think, and we provide
5 them their input along the lines that they
6 think, we don't have to answer -- provide
7 information for every bullet.

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: Right back at you.

9 MEMBER CHATWIN: Right? And just
10 say hey, given your best practices, using your
11 best practices as guidance, this is the input
12 we were going to provide and our
13 recommendation based on that is that we
14 recommend it doesn't happen.

15 DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, my only comment
16 on that is there's different ways to interpret
17 this. It's like, once GAO has recommended that
18 this go forward, and these are the steps that
19 an agency would follow -- or Congress had
20 recommended that this happen -- these are the
21 steps that GAO recommends to the management to
22 do.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CHATWIN: Oh, so the nine
2 questions.

3 DR. HOLLIDAY: All I'm saying is I
4 think, you know, you have to be careful how
5 they would interpret it, because they would
6 say, oh, well, you're endorsing what we're
7 saying and you're not really getting to the
8 heart of it, which is don't get to the point
9 where you would be implementing.

10 All right, so that's where you're
11 trying to prevent the implementation of the
12 recommendation to merge the two agencies. I
13 think these findings go along the lines,
14 you've already decided that you are going to
15 go forward, now we're giving you the right way
16 to do that through these key steps and making
17 sure management is on board, well, yes,
18 management is on board because all of you told
19 them it's going to happen. That's the
20 management buy-in. It's not grassroots, it's
21 after the fact.

22 MEMBER CHATWIN: So where are the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nine questions?

2 DR. HOLLIDAY: In the -- the
3 entrance conference, the nine questions are in
4 on. Starting with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, so, and
5 again --

6 MEMBER CHATWIN: So this is what we
7 should use.

8 DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm just saying that
9 that's one framework to put it in terms that
10 they are looking at, you know, functions and
11 responsibilities that you know, you don't
12 think are broken or you think are doing things
13 that make sense, don't need further fixing
14 because of -- via a merger, you could point
15 out on your own. And the drawbacks that Keith
16 and others, you know, you were just saying
17 verbally what some of these things were.

18 MEMBER RHEAULT: Right, and I would
19 like to, like try and capture those and I'm
20 just typing as fast as I can. You mentioned
21 that like the core values in marine
22 preservation, it gives a relatively small

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 financial savings because of the funding
2 levels. What were some of the other points
3 that I can't recall that you laid out? I
4 thought they were very eloquent.

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: Well, I was just
6 saying like the -- we have a number of coastal
7 refuges in which -- where they would have
8 already have had an opportunity to exert
9 stewardship over the marine environment, and
10 they don't really do that. So --

11 CHAIR RIZZARDI: The lack of an
12 ocean ethic without the Department of Interior
13 which is a primarily land-focused agency, the
14 boats issue and the assets issue and how those
15 things get accounted for, how does office of
16 general counsel provide support? Do they even
17 have the expertise within the Department of
18 Interior to lend the support necessary for
19 NOAA fisheries, the National Oceans Commission
20 --

21 MEMBER RHEAULT: How do we want to
22 capture these if we are going to talk that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fast and I'm typing away, you want to send
2 them all to the Chair?

3 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Yes, that's what I
4 think. Send them to the Chairman. I'll send
5 all mine to the Chair, you send yours to the
6 Chair, and Tony, if you put together a straw
7 man.

8 MEMBER CHATWIN: Yes, we'll do the
9 same process as with the previous discussion
10 and we'll --

11 MEMBER RHEAULT: When do you want
12 them back?

13 MEMBER CHATWIN: June 15th keeps --

14 MEMBER RHEAULT: What about
15 tonight?

16 MEMBER CHATWIN: Tonight, yes, come
17 on.

18 MEMBER RHEAULT: I mean come on,
19 that's a sentence or two.

20 MEMBER CHATWIN: Okay, I want them
21 by tonight.

22 CHAIR RIZZARDI: You're a slave

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 driver.

2 MEMBER CHATWIN: Do you have
3 anything to contribute?

4 CHAIR RIZZARDI: Is it tchatwin?

5 MEMBER CHATWIN: anthony.chatwin.
6 Yes, anthony.chatwin. Do you know we have
7 nine minutes left? Okay, send them to me by
8 tonight. Tomorrow I will have something to
9 share related to the -- either a motion or the
10 basis for a document that we will decide on in
11 the conference call. Is that all right Mark?
12 I mean, depending on what folks send in.

13 Okay is there any more discussion
14 needed on this issue?

15 MEMBER RHEAULT: I just need the
16 second half of your email address.

17 MEMBER CHATWIN: It's nfwf.org

18 MEMBER RHEAULT: N-F-W-F.

19 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the
20 record at 3:07 p.m. and resumed at
21 3:35 p.m.)
22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com