U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MAFAC)

+ + + + +

COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY MAY 23, 2012

+ + + + +

The Joint Subcommittee met in the Ravenna Room, Sheraton Seattle Hotel, Seattle, Washington, at 3:30 p.m., Ken Franke, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT

KEN FRANKE, Co-Chair
GEORGE C. NARDI, Co-Chair
TERRY ALEXANDER
DICK M. BRAME
PHIL DYSKO
ELIZABETH HAMILTON
MICHEL LONGO EDER, JD
ROBERT RHEAULT, Ph.D.
DAVID WALLACE

STAFF PRESENT

MARK HOLLIDAY, Ph.D., Designated Federal Official

NEAL R. GROSS

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

JIM McCALLUM

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

(3:35 p.m.)

MEMBER NARDI: So I think a little background because there seems to be a little confusion in earlier -- in some respects, you know, why are we having this discussion.

I think it's a broad subject and based on where you are in your respective area geographically, whether you are in a rural community or a more developed community, the issues may be significantly different.

But speaking to provide some background from -- to cover a couple of those and then ask Ken to kick in because I know he's dealing with some significant issues in his area, the Working Waterfront, form our perspective in New England for example, runs the gamut from the city to the rural area and there's a number of areas, for example in Maine, where there isn't good infrastructure for offloading vessels, be it commercial, for

servicing vessels, be it commercial, recreational or aquaculture production.

So in farm some cases, а we started, we had to go many miles away to find the right infrastructure, spend lots of money hiring cranes because there wasn't a wharf, and we got together with some commercial fishermen, and we tried to find avenues where, if we shared the expenses and put in a wharf facility, a commercial wharf, then it would be -- those expenses would be shared but the benefits of the wharf would also be shared.

In other cases, the Working Waterfront is risks disappearing through development pressures, and I think we all know, once that happens you don't go back to a Working Waterfront.

So I think that's a little bit of the background why we're talking jointly in this committee, because we feel that the Working Waterfront is going to benefit the development and the maintenance of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aquaculture, the commercial fisheries interests and commercial and recreational fishing operations.

It's a shared need that we have. The issues are different for us, and so I'll, you know, for us, from my perspective it's trying to find the resources money, to leverage money through programs that could assist.

There was a program in Maine, for example, but it had a limited pot of money, and if you could essentially put up some waterfront property as capital or collateral, I mean, you could leverage that to get some money, if it sufficed to cover the cost of a commercial wharf.

In our case the land that was available was too small a sliver and the wharf we needed to put in was too expensive a wharf to be functionally a commercial wharf, so we didn't qualify.

And I think knowing the current

NEAL R. GROSS

1	budget situation, you know, I think there was
2	a bill I saw that was that a bill that was
3	put in and was shot down or is still in or
4	active, the Pingree Bill?
5	DR. HOLLIDAY: I think it's been
6	introduced but it's not likely to go
7	MEMBER RHEAULT: It hasn't come out
8	of Committee and it asked for new money.
9	MEMBER NARDI: It's asking for
10	\$250-\$50 million and so that's probably not
11	going to happen. So you know, that's what we
12	are handed with and Ken's dealing with some
13	more advanced issues in San Diego or
14	California.
15	MEMBER DYSKOW: I'm still confused.
16	Why is rec fishing involved in this
17	discussion?
18	MEMBER FRANKE: Why don't I take it
19	from there. Because we had a that's what
20	we were discussing right at the beginning of
21	this.

Digressing a little, I didn't

understand an hour and a half ago why we were doing this either. In California we have a battle over land use, something concerns, environmental groups wanting to put bike paths in the middle of National Steel Shipbuilding Company, competing concerns over marshland versus freeways and all that kind of stuff.

And so we created a Working Waterfront group a year and a half ago that has all of the big companies and the little companies in the vicinity of the county region and I know they've got similar all up and down our coast.

And the issue was exactly what this is about, is who's going to have access, how do you coordinate the infrastructure development to do those kind of negotiations or committees or exchanges of ideas, to solve some of the problems of access.

So what we were talking about right before here was what's the important product out of our group today? And as I understand,

NEAL R. GROSS

and keep me honest Doc Holliday, Ι understand it is, we need to come back with a recommendation or at least a discussion with a future idea of development of a recommendation that is focused on seeking out opportunities, funding opportunities, to help those areas need resourced and don't have the organizations resource, so that can developed so that a proper and fair forum can be created and funded to identify solutions to accessible share those of the areas waterfront. Would that be about right Holliday?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks. It is -what you both said is accurate. I'd like to
take it a little further to put it in some
context. You know, when the Chair discussed
the proposed addition of this item to this
agenda, the intent was to use this meeting as
a starting point, so if I were to correct
anything that's been said I don't necessarily
think that there's an action that has to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

concluded at this meeting on the topic of Working Waterfronts in terms of a final recommendation.

But the topic of Working Waterfronts has sort of this thread among a lot of different conversations that we've been having about commercial fisheries communities and recreational fishing access.

And there seemed to be affinity to try to look at what NOAA is doing providing access this of the area waterfront for commercial and recreational purposes, is it a shrinking environment where people cannot get access to the water because of competing interests for other uses, as well as the provision of goods and services that support commercial fisheries and recreational fisheries.

And so keep marinas for recreational vessels, goods and services, fuel, support, you know, things that are important to the sustainability of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recreational fishing and important aspects of that are being threatened by condominium-ization if that's the word, or the public access to waterfront sites and public access to the infrastructure to support recreational angling is being threatened, as development decisions for other potential uses are marching forward.

Similarly, on the commercial side, traditional wharfage, support services that are important to whether it's an aquaculture whether facility, it's processor а somebody's offloading or ship chandlery, a fuel ice plant, whatever, again, the competition between waterfront usages for supporting fisheries that are of interest to MAFAC is a challenge.

And so NOAA has had some efforts to try to look at this question of providing a policy perspective and a funding perspective to help communities plan for and preserve essential services, goods and services, and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

essential access for these kinds of endeavors, both commercial and recreational.

thought there Hence we was affinity sufficient to have these two committees meet together and look at are there common challenges, are there common concerns, and tee up, perhaps for the summer or for some future meetings, additional people we could bring in to talk about the issue, who -- the Sea Grant people here who are at UW, who are local, and they had a perspective on some of the national workshops that -- we were talking about that.

But if wanted to -- I guess the question in front of the committee is, this is singularly an area of concern that we've had some discussion of at past meetings and it has an implication for some of the goals and objectives.

We would use this meeting to have this discussion and to flesh out what would we like to be doing over a period of two or three

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

meetings to try to come up with, perhaps, a definitive, final recommendation.

So I don't -- I quess I'm being too long-winded but I would say you don't have to come up with the final answer today or present it tomorrow, but is there a work plan, things that you'd like MAFAC to get involved with, that would cross the budget, that would cross the grant program arena, that would cross policy arenas, that would cross policy arenas, that would talk about what NOAA is doing, the National Ocean Service is doing, the National Marine Fisheries Service is doing or could be or should be doing, in the area of Working Waterfronts. So I'm trying to provide some context to the reason why it's on the agenda. Are you raising your hand or just saying hi? MR. McCALLUM: No, I'm waiting for the next comment.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Okay, so Ken and George, did that help? And Phil, does that get to a little bit of your question or no?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I mean you seem --

MEMBER DYSKOW: My concern is we have a lot of new members on the rec committee. They obviously have ideas and they have issues that they want to discuss, and I hoped we wouldn't want burn up all of our time on this.

I don't even know that this is something that a fisheries service should be dealing with. I mean there's other entities that are probably more in tune with coastal development than the National Marine Fishery Service.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Fair enough. Terry and then -- I'm sorry, I shouldn't be doing the chair.

MR. McCALLUM: I did not hear your full exchange about the Working Waterfront legislation, and it's still pending, right. And the Congressional session is pretty short, but I know a little about the content, I know very little about the content of the bill.

You might want to -- either subcommittee might want to at least glance at it and see if it's of enough interest to encourage reintroduction early in the next Congress. DR. HOLLIDAY: Terry. Terry had his hand up. I don't know if you saw. MEMBER ALEXANDER: So, are we going

to discuss this or --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes.

MEMBER ALEXANDER: We are, okay. So, a little experience we had at home with The state, there was a Working Waterfronts. bond bill and the voters decided to help out with Working Waterfront properties because you know, some of the properties they had to buy and they're worth a couple of million dollars and the working people can't afford to buy the properties.

So they're matching the funds of People get together, groups of people. non-profit groups get together and get all kinds of money together and then the state

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

matches it with this money.

And the -- at home, once -- their one walk that they get by is kind of a -- it's not really a Working Waterfront wharf now, it's got a restaurant on it, which I guess isn't what my definition of what Working Waterfront it. My definition of Working Waterfront is there's actually fish coming over it, or there's boats being used at it.

So basically it buys tuna sometimes in the summer, and it has a restaurant on it. So if you wrap up the federal bureaucracy in it too, I'm afraid that it will even get diluted even more so it's not really a Working Waterfront. It's a place to look at, that we're calling a Working Waterfront. So that's my concern with it.

MEMBER NARDI: That it gets abused.

MEMBER ALEXANDER: Yes.

MEMBER RHEAULT: Just to Jim's point, the bill asks for \$25 million in 2012, \$50 million in 2013, \$75 million in 2014 and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	15. It's being proposed by a liberal democrat
2	from Maine in the Congress. It's not going
3	anywhere this year.
4	It has 17 co-sponsors in 2011, and
5	several more in 2012. It's dead on arrival.
6	It does provide money to purchase some of
7	these commercial docks and waterfronts,
8	Working Waterfronts, to prevent them from
9	being developed as condos, and it also
10	provides money for planning.
11	And with this Congress, it's not
12	going anywhere. It was supported by our
13	association as well as 25 other marine trades
14	organizations.
15	MEMBER FRANKE: So some of the
16	money is actually dedicated to purchasing
17	property to keep that accessibility open for
18	the commercial fishing?
19	MEMBER RHEAULT: If passed.
20	MEMBER LONGO: I should have
21	mentioned, this report calls it's Working
22	Waterfronts. I realize the important of

it's Working Waterfront access to ice places, transportation, et cetera, in terms of what makes a commercial community, and in terms of what makes a commercial community, and in the fishing communities that I come from, it's a huge tourism issue that we actually have a Working Waterfront like that. It's got enormous economic add-on to it.

The bill itself, taking a look at the language, I would have a real hard time with it, because one of the things it provides for us, not just rec or somebody else, I don't like the language of it because it refers to how things are getting, you know, wealthy people are buying property for God's sakes, you know, I really don't like that language.

But it also provides that other organizations besides rec groups or commercial groups or whatever can purchase the properly - NGOs -- and it doesn't necessarily say what then that property needs to be used, can be used for.

1	And so what is then access to
2	and so, it just opens up another window and I
3	just showed the photo as a cautionary tale to
4	the commercial fishing community because with
5	a great individual quota program on the west
6	coast and the trawl industry, but one of the
7	other things that's happened is that one of
8	the NGO groups has purchased up to the maximum
9	amount of legally shares that they are able
10	to legally hold under the program.
11	And so you give access to, whether
12	it's waterfront, quota share, whatever, to
13	people who aren't actually fishing it or using
14	it for those purposes.
15	So a cautionary tale, I throw it
16	out there, support Working Waterfronts, don't
17	know if it's appropriate for this committee.
18	But just some open comments on that.
19	MEMBER NARDI: Thank you. Terry
20	and then Liz.
21	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Another benefit

to Working Waterfronts are that the people can

get out and walk on the dock and see what's 1 2 happening and everything, but like, with our dock, our insurance company will not allow 3 people to walk down on the dock that don't 4 work on the dock. 5 you know the general public 6 7 doesn't get a chance to walk down on our dock. trespassing signs everywhere We have 8 no because of our insurance, our liability. 9 10 So you know, I think it's important that we support Working Waterfronts, whether 11 though 12 it's through NMFSCongress or 13 whoever, but you know, they don't generally end up to be what I envision as a Working 14 15 Waterfront or what you probably envision as a Working Waterfront. 16 They tend to end up as a picnic 17 place or, you know, and that some guys might 18 19 tie their skip at to go out to their boats or 20 whatever. So --MEMBER NARDI: Liz. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER HAMILTON:

22

I think the fact

that there's this political assessment that the bills is not going anywhere, maybe it would be wise to table it for a different time.

I think also just listening to folks, I think there's different viewpoints in the room, and it might be expanded different viewpoints if the whole group were here about what is a Working Waterfront.

Because what I'm hearing, just so
I'm a new person from the outside, I'm
hearing I want to lock it up for what I want
to lock it up but I don't want someone else
who can afford to buy, willing seller, willing
buyer property, I don't want them to do it,
but I want -- excuse me but I'm just going to
say it -- government money so I can do it, and
I'm not -- I'm just, it's not about what the
use, it's just sort of this overall principle
I'm hearing in my head.

And the other thing is, is that I'm thinking of Newport, and I think it's great

NEAL R. GROSS

that people ride their bikes around and stop at a fish shop and stop at Local Ocean, and so bike paths to me aren't a bad thing.

So I see our -- the kind of -- I see mixed use and how it works, kite shops and commercial fish sales and docks for sport fishermen to launch from, as we're all here to get along rather than I want to close it up for condos or I want to -- the steel people who don't want the bike path through, that wouldn't be very good for Newport, because you know, we want people who ride bikes to go to the coast, to ride their bike and then stop see what commercial and buy something, or fishermen live like, or go I'm going to book that charter boat, that looks like kind of neat, those people are coming off with fish and they're smiling.

So I'm hearing stuff and thinking, I don't know, I'm just sort of uncomfortable with what I'm hearing, honestly.

MEMBER RHEAULT: I just to want to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	point out my experience and that was where I
2	was forced to leave a marina because
3	recreational boaters were able to pay more for
4	their slips, they went to Dockominium and they
5	said we don't want any smelly commercial
6	vessels in this
7	MEMBER HAMILTON: Dockominium,
8	that's a new one.
9	MEMBER RHEAULT: Dockominium, yes.
10	MEMBER HAMILTON: I'll remember
11	that.
12	MEMBER RHEAULT: So, you know, if
13	you can't come up with \$250,000 to buy your
14	slip, you're out of here, and you take that
15	and you do that to 15 marinas, and suddenly
16	there's no place to land your fish. So no
17	docks, no fish. You've heard no farmers, no
18	food, no docks, no fish.
19	So that's what that's why I'm
20	supporting the bill. That's why I think this
21	is a critically important issue. We've seen
22	it happen in Portland. The fish pier got

bought up and built into a condo. That can be devastating.

Is it ripe for this time, this committee? Maybe not. I just think it's a huge issue.

MEMBER NARDI: Mark, go ahead.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So I think the -- I hope we're not losing context again of why this is on the agenda. This is not a referendum on the referendum on the Pingree Bill.

It's not you know, a particular decision that has to be made. It's -- this is that the Committee has an area expressed interest and concern about in the past. is investing money and time, or attempting to invest money and time. We heard yesterday from the Coastal Zone Management Program, they're expending 10s of millions of dollars in support of Working Waterfronts. So there are different points of view on this topic, obviously.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The question in front of these two committees is, is this something that MAFAC wants to advise NOAA on in terms of direction and policy for the future?

Should NOAA not be involved in this? Should the efforts that NOAA is doing continue? It's not, again, not a particular referendum on this bill or on a particular issue. It's teeing up and looking ahead to the future on future agendas.

Do we want to find out more about what's going on, or we don't think it's worth our time? That's fine too. But I don't want it to be misconstrued as the reason it's in front of us because of this bill. That's not the case at all.

MEMBER NARDI: No, I don't think I was taking it that way. I think maybe we need the benefit of the full Committee, we need to learn more and maybe we can have the Working Waterfront and try to invite experts or people that can present the various opinions --

DR. HOLLIDAY: That's the question in front of the committee. Do you want to pursue that or it's not a good idea to pursue that?

MEMBER NARDI: Because I think our issues where we're coming from, are different than Newport and that's different than other places in the country, and I think we need to see how we can address this logically for the benefit of all of us, instead of, you know, a myopic view on just Maine or California, you know, there's -- I think we need the benefit of learning how we can take advantage of what the resources are out there, you know, I don't even know what programs we could go after, and that's something that maybe staff could talk to us at a future meeting of what kind of funding is available and what kind of Working Waterfront directions the whole Committee feels is appropriate for MAFAC.

MEMBER FRANKE: I agree with you. I think maybe on a go-forward basis, as a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

group I'd recommend we seek to understand and see if there are opportunities that, run it through our Committee, where we can make a recommendation to the Secretary that could have some impact. But I have to be honest with you, my knowledge is so minimal with the information I have so far that I think that kind of education would really help me personally.

MEMBER DYSKOW: Ken. So we don't burn up a lot of time here, I think a good recommendation might be if staff is willing to undertake the challenge to ask for a report at an upcoming meeting on Working Waterfronts, available, what what resources are associations, whatever, are doing, and give us some information. We obviously don't have the information, but it certainly could be a topic that staff could research and present to us on at an upcoming meeting.

MEMBER FRANKE: I agree. Any further discussion? Well at that point then

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you'll have that for your recommendation from
2	our group and we'll go ahead and split into
3	sections and then continue with our
4	subcommittee meetings.
5	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the
6	record at 4:01 p.m. and resumed at
7	4:04 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1

NEAL R. GROSS