U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MAFAC)

+ + + + +

ECOSYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE FOLLOW-UP

+ + + + +

THURSDAY MAY 24, 2012

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met in the Ravenna Room, Sheraton Seattle Hotel, Seattle, Washington, at 7:45 a.m., Dave Wallace, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT

DAVE WALLACE, Chair

TERRY ALEXANDER

JULIE BONNEY

DICK BRAME

PHIL DYSKOW

JULIE MORRIS, Ph.D.

ROBERT RHEAULT, Ph.D.

STAFF PRESENT
MARK HOLLIDAY, Ph.D., Designated Federal
Official
ALAN RISENHOOVER

NEAL R. GROSS

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

7:47 a.m.

CHAIR WALLACE: I was looking for three or four, two or three issues that everybody sort of focused on. We didn't find, as I see it, something that everybody was just fixated on.

So, the first thing I would like to do is think about, out loud, for all of you, to come up with a few that we think about. Now they end up being interrelated. So, one sometimes leads to one that we are actually not talking about because one impacts the other. But if we don't focus on it, we will never get anywhere with this process because all of those issues are actually very complex.

I just throw it open for discussion. We have 11; we had six, and if you would like, I will get into the right screen here and tell you which ones we dealt with.

We started off with OY. My machine

NEAL R. GROSS

just jumped over. So, we start off with ACLs and Optimal Yield. But let me just refresh your memory. We have stocks in the fishery which are those non-managed stocks within a fishery. Should they be managed, too? Should they all have ACLs, which just makes the world more complicated?

I won't tell you about some of the fiascos we have had because we have non-directed fisheries that are part of another fisheries management plan, and they are usually bycatch-only. And then, you exceed the bycatch on the non-directed fishery, which shuts down the directed fishery. In the Mid-Atlantic, we have that, in particular, as a squid fishery.

And then, we have mixed-stocks fisheries. The Northeast is very interested in the mixed stocks because of the groundfish.

Data-poor stocks, that is always controversial. You know, when you don't have good sites, you have good management.

And then, Acceptable Biological Catch rules. And then, rebuilding programs, I picked up the rebuilding programs because they impact all of them, especially if the rebuilding program is not on the right trajectory.

MEMBER BRAME: Are we trying to come up with specific recommendations or just that we think we ought to address this and here is the general area?

CHAIR WALLACE: Well, that is a great question because I don't think that we can really get into the weeds simply because we don't have enough time, No. 1. So, I think that we can just make general, broad recommendations of things that we think that they should look at. Or Terry keeps saying we should stay out of this.

MEMBER ALEXANDER: Well, the reason

I say we should stay out of it is because they

seem to be scoping for something that they are

not sure is something that people will look

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	at. So, I don't know if we should even
2	comment on it. Do you know what I mean?
3	Because that may add some validity to the
4	conversation.
5	CHAIR WALLACE: Okay.
6	MEMBER BRAME: I think they are
7	pretty sure.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MR. RISENHOOVER: Just last week, I
10	was looking at the number of comments we get
11	per year. In 2009, there is this huge spike
12	of the 250 comments we got. We are going to
13	get comments.
14	MEMBER ALEXANDER: If it is pre-
15	scoping, then that is where I was going with
16	it.
17	MEMBER BRAME: And another thing,
18	Terry, we are not talking about a lot of
19	people get worried about reopening regs. We
20	are not doing that. This is about
21	implementation.

WALLACE:

CHAIR

22

Just

the

1	groundrules for dealing with National Standard
2	1, you know, the guidelines, how do you deal
3	with it?
4	MEMBER BRAME: I would have the
5	same problem you have, that you were talking
6	about, perhaps reopening Magnuson. But I
7	think we definitely need to look at how
8	that
9	MR. RISENHOOVER: So, Magnuson, you
10	know, there is talk about reopening it or not
11	reopening it, and there are several bills on a
12	number of issues. Mark outlined some of that.
13	He didn't go into details. But there are
14	bills on rebuilding and bills on science, and
15	everything.
16	CHAIR WALLACE: Everything you can
17	think of.
18	MR. RISENHOOVER: So, part of what
19	we can do with this is, are there some changes
20	we can make outside of Magnuson? Again, we
21	can't change the basics of the law, but how do
22	we better implement the basics of the law? As

I said, do we need to amplify some areas, the OY/ACL relationship that we talked a little bit about yesterday? Do we need to revise the guidelines or should we revise the guidelines, are the kinds of questions we are looking at.

Or is there some guidance? You know, did one Council deal with their ACL issue in a particular way that we want to provide to others?

How do we help implement the Act with our guidelines is another kind of basic underlying question and rationale to this? Everything from did we get it wrong in the guidelines to what did we do absolutely right, that is the range of comments.

CHAIR WALLACE: So, the first thing that I would like the Subcommittee to think about this, the notion of the question that Dick asked, because I don't want to try to impose what I think should be. I am just the referee, right? And it is your decision.

So, are we going to talk in broad

NEAL R. GROSS

1	terms or are we going to get down in the weeds
2	and get into specifics? And do we know enough
3	to get into the specifics? So, it is open for
4	discussion.
5	MEMBER BRAME: Well, I guess the
6	first question is, should it be pursued? You
7	know, do we agree they need to do that or not?
8	That is the first question.
9	MEMBER BONNEY: I think they do. I
10	think they do.
11	MEMBER BRAME: I think they do.
12	MEMBER BONNEY: I think this is a
13	good outlet to see some changes, especially
14	knowing that there is a bill in the House and
15	the Senate that looks at this very issue.
16	MEMBER BRAME: Yes, a number of
17	them.
18	MEMBER BONNEY: Yes, a number of
19	bills. I think one of them, in particular, is
20	gaining some legs.
21	CHAIR WALLACE: Pam, what do you
22	think?

MS. YOCHEM: I am nervous about commenting too much since I am not as familiar with the nitty-gritty. But, from what I am hearing, I think the discussion is going the right way.

CHAIR WALLACE: Julie, now you have been around the Council process a while. So, tell us what you think.

MEMBER MORRIS: I mean, it is hard to figure out how in the time remaining today we can come up with comments. So, I don't know, to begin with, the timing of the comments.

CHAIR WALLACE: Well, the comments are due the 1st of August. I moved that back two weeks, just so that if we ran into a snafu, we had a little bit of time. And so, I said July 15. So, I was hoping to get some direction today, so that when we did it by a conference call, we have narrowed the scope of what we are going to talk about to a point where we just didn't get completely bogged

1	down.
2	MEMBER MORRIS: But we could have a
3	general statement saying let's go ahead.
4	CHAIR WALLACE: Well, that is true.
5	We can have a one-liner that says we think
6	that it is worth going through, and let them
7	do it internally, or they reject it
8	internally.
9	MEMBER ALEXANDER: I mean, looking
10	at that list of the six things that you picked
11	out, does anybody else think that anything
12	else on that list should be maybe mentioned in
13	a little note. "Yes, we probably should look
14	at this." I mean, if we are going to open it
15	up, then why not open it up to everything?
16	You know what I mean?
17	CHAIR WALLACE: Well, unless we are
18	going to make a really broad statement
19	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Yes.
20	CHAIR WALLACE: then, if you are
21	going to adopt everything, you are just going
	11

to have a broad statement. But if we feel

1	passionate about one or two that we want to
2	get into more detailed description but we
3	have a very short timeframe to deal with it.
4	MEMBER ALEXANDER: So, my fear,
5	this is my fear as somebody with a stake in
6	the fishery.
7	CHAIR WALLACE: Right.
8	MEMBER ALEXANDER: It is that they
9	are going to cherry-pick these 11 things.
10	CHAIR WALLACE: They already did
11	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Okay.
12	
	CHAIR WALLACE: because they
13	could have been 50.
14	(Laughter.)
15	MEMBER ALEXANDER: And the ACLs are
16	probably, as far as I am concerned, the most
17	important thing on here. Because those of us
18	with a vested interest in the fishery, that
19	have been there for a long time we have
20	already had the fight or the debate are
21	really nervous that our investment is going to

go away, which I think that is a reasonable

1	thing.
2	So, that is why I am thinking, if
3	everything is grouped together, if we get a
4	comment on it anyhow, then instead of
5	highlighting different things, that maybe we
6	should definitely look at everything.
7	CHAIR WALLACE: So, instead of
8	having maybe four specific comments, we should
9	have eleven general comments?
10	MEMBER BRAME: Why don't everybody,
11	what is important to us?
12	CHAIR WALLACE: Yes, well, I asked
13	that yesterday, right?
14	MEMBER BRAME: Yes. I mean, mine
15	is a similar one, but it is more about how
16	recreational fisheries should be managed
17	differently than how we are managing them now.
18	The current dataset
19	CHAIR WALLACE: Well, where does
20	that fall in this list? Well, then, that is
21	not in this list.

MEMBER BRAME: Yes, the ACLs and

1	Optimal Yields.
2	CHAIR WALLACE: Oh, yes, we are
3	going back. You are going to back to just the
4	allocation issue, not
5	MEMBER BRAME: No, it is not even
6	allocation. It is ACLs and Optimal Yields.
7	The current data does not support setting more
8	ACLs in pounds and numbers. Don't do it.
9	MEMBER ALEXANDER: But the law says
10	that they have to do that. So, that is not
11	MEMBER BRAME: The law says you
12	have to put a mechanism in place. I am not
13	proposing get away from anything. I am saying
14	that there is a different way or a better way
15	to do it.
16	MEMBER MORRIS: We are having
17	another Subcommittee meeting.
18	CHAIR WALLACE: Yes, I noticed that
19	we were losing participants quickly here.
20	MEMBER BRAME: Does data-poor stock
21	mean to me, that means the stock, you
22	essentially can't do a stock assessment If

you can do a stock assessment, then I guess this is for myself with the background that we don't have a lot of data, period, but we generally do stock assessments based on catch from one survey. In other places, I think that would probably be called data-poor stock.

But some definition of that.

DR. HOLLIDAY: If I could?

CHAIR WALLACE: Sure.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Just remember to keep this in context, because this is a start of a long, long journey. And so, the first principal question here is, is it even worth opening this door to do a revision? And so, if you say yes, that is an important piece of advice because it is indicating something is not right that needs attention.

Then, the agency has said there are 11 things there, and you don't have to come up with a comment specifically about that. It is just those are the ones that the agency has heard. Are there other ones that you think

NEAL R. GROSS

1	are important that aren't on the list? That
2	is sort of a check-in point. And then, of
3	those 11, do some rise to the top? And that
4	is pretty much all you really need to do at
5	this stage to advance the process of the ANPR
6	into the regulatory, you know, into the next
7	stage.
8	And so, I think it will help people
9	to maybe
10	CHAIR WALLACE: Yesterday we went
11	through all of that. We go all the way around
12	from Terry says this is not necessary, and
13	then everybody can think of some reason to
14	have one of them. And then
15	DR. HOLLIDAY: The devil is in the
16	details.
17	CHAIR WALLACE: Yes.
18	MR. RISENHOOVER: Or you could say,
19	yes, but proceed with caution and we think
20	some of these rise a little bit more to the
21	top.
22	MEMBER ALEXANDER: So, how would

1	you word something to what Dick is concerned
2	about?
3	MR. RISENHOOVER: You could say
4	look at how Councils have implemented ACLs for
5	recreational fishery, find best practices ir
6	that, or look at the foundational
7	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Or not.
8	MR. RISENHOOVER: or not, yes.
9	How has it worked? Where is it working? For
10	what types of fisheries do ACLs work? Again,
11	you can't remove the ACL requirement, but how
12	do we implement that effectively ir
13	recreational fisheries? You know,
14	accountability measures in recreational
15	fisheries, how should those be handled?
16	Again, maybe just some broad areas that you
17	think the agency should potentially focus or
18	in this review or get more information or, as
19	I said before, amplify on some of the terms.
20	CHAIR WALLACE: You had your hand
21	up.
22	MEMBER BONNEY: Well, I was just

thinking that I think most all of these are pointed to the idea that you are having stocks with poor information driving fisheries. Now, because it is being intercepted in the tracked fisheries, they are not on target; they are the bycatch-only. And so, because of the rigor of National Standard 1, you can't take more of a commerce approach to some of those management issues.

So, I guess my question is, do we have to have the rigor that is involved with National Standard 1? Can't we have some kind of a relief valve to take kind of a commonsense approach to some of those things that are just not part of norm?

And I don't know whether that gets us where we want to go, but, basically, from where we are at, revising National Standard 1 and trying to build relief where we are shutting down our main fisheries based on poor-data stocks that, when you really break it out, you can just look at a common-sense

NEAL R. GROSS

approach. Why are we worrying about that? Why are we spending all of this money and energy on something we know is no threat? We just don't have the hard-core data to stand up and say that, like they are trying to build through National Standard 1.

CHAIR WALLACE: Well, National Standard 1, you know, if you read it literally, it is pretty straightforward. If you actually go through and analyze what it says, then you have to have this litany of ideas on how you actually address all of the eventualities.

MEMBER BONNEY: Right. Exactly.

CHAIR WALLACE: And that is actually where we are. And some people don't think that it works, and there were at least 11 ideas. And I am actually surprised that somebody hasn't or a number of people haven't suggested other things that they think need to be addressed in this, but that is neither here nor there.

1 And so, how can we do something 2 constructive in addressing the original idea? Should the guidelines be reconsidered and 3 which ones are important? 4 That is what we are trying to decide. 5 MEMBER BONNEY: But I think they 6 7 are all important, and they are all kind of 8 interwoven. Well, again, WALLACE: 9 CHAIR 10 agree with that. So, then, what do we say? As a Committee, we should just say we think 11 they are all interlocked? The quidelines seem 12 13 to be specific, but, then, after the fact, there seems to be holes in it. And so, what 14 15 do we do to suggest that they fill these 16 holes? That gets down into the weeds, and 17 I don't know enough about it to get down in 18 19 the weeds. So, how about if 20 MEMBER ALEXANDER: we just say that we think that the 11 things 21

that they had were important, all important,

1	and maybe pick the top three things that we
2	could agree on to go to the top of the list?
3	CHAIR WALLACE: From New England, I
4	would expect you to pick the top three.
5	(Laughter.)
6	MEMBER ALEXANDER: And maybe add
7	something, maybe put a 12th one in there to
8	help with
9	CHAIR WALLACE: What is the 12th
10	thing?
11	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Well, what Alan
12	said about Dick's
13	DR. HOLLIDAY: Management of the
14	recreational
15	MEMBER ALEXANDER: Management of
16	the recreational fish.
17	MR. RISENHOOVER: Maybe some
18	technical guidance or additional review of
19	ACLs particular to rec fisheries may be
20	warranted or is warranted.
21	MEMBER BRAME: I mean, at this
22	point, Mark is exactly right. Should we do

1	this, yes or no? I think the answer is yes.
2	What should you look at?
3	I have a hard time pulling anything
4	out of. I mean, I could think of examples of
5	all of these. In rebuilding, look at some
6	biological point and in the species the mean
7	generation time is four years.
8	MR. RISENHOOVER: But, yet,
9	everything seems to gravitate toward 10,
10	because you can take up to 10.
11	MEMBER BRAME: Yes, that's right.
12	MR. RISENHOOVER: Or if generation
13	time is longer, then it seems a little bit
14	more biological debate.
15	MEMBER BRAME: I would reduce it to
16	biology. I think there would be some
17	biological parameters and rebuild it. It just
18	makes more sense. But that is just an
19	example.
20	And I would think this mixed-stock
21	stuff, especially in the North Atlantic and
22	the North Pacific mixed-stock fisheries, is

1	sort of getting to what your problem is. And
2	in the South Atlantic that has some validity.
3	The one that I am the most
4	comfortable with taking out is scientific
5	management uncertainty. In my view, they have
6	done a pretty good job of accounting for that
7	with the OFL, ABC greater than or equal to ACL
8	or ACTs.
9	MEMBER ALEXANDER: We have stocks
10	in the Northeast where there is 45 percent
11	scientific uncertainty. That is a huge amount
12	of money that we are leaving in the water
13	because of scientific uncertainty.
14	So, are you looking for three top
15	ones?
16	CHAIR WALLACE: I am looking for
17	whatever the three of you now can agree on.
18	MEMBER BRAME: I think we all
19	agree
20	MR. RISENHOOVER: Have them each
21	pick one.
22	(Laughter.)

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER ALEXANDER: You're king.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIR WALLACE: No, he's king.
4	MR. RISENHOOVER: Remember I
5	delegated "king" to you today.
6	MEMBER ALEXANDER: So, everybody
7	agrees that the data-poor stocks are
8	important?
9	CHAIR WALLACE: Yes, there are
10	three highlighted, right?
11	MEMBER ALEXANDER: And mixed-stock
12	fisheries or
13	MEMBER BRAME: If I had to pick
14	three, taking off my just recreational
15	fisherman hat, that is the three I would
16	CHAIR WALLACE: So, you would take
17	the ACL/Optimal, yes, and data-poor
18	MEMBER BRAME: And the mixed
19	stocks.
20	CHAIR WALLACE: And the mixed
21	stocks?
22	MEMBER ALEXANDER: See, I think the
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	data-poor should be No. 1, but I could care
2	less where it goes in the top three, but I
3	think that is if I had just a pure
4	recreational hat on, fishing and multi-year
5	impacts would be in the group. Overall, I
6	don't think important. We are not supposed to
7	be wearing that hat, are we?
8	CHAIR WALLACE: So, Julie, tell me
9	what you think over there.
10	MEMBER BONNEY: Well, I guess I am
11	wondering why we need to have
12	CHAIR WALLACE: You have to talk
13	up. I don't hear very well.
14	MEMBER BONNEY: Why do we need just
15	three?
16	CHAIR WALLACE: Well, I guess I
17	will say, and we actually have 12 now,
18	recreational fisheries management, you know.
19	MEMBER BRAME: Can I?
20	CHAIR WALLACE: Sure.
21	MEMBER BRAME: I don't think we are
22	excluding. The suggestion was just and it

may have been we could pick four, five, or six. Just pick some that you think are -- which pigs are more equal than other pigs in this Orwellian thing?

CHAIR WALLACE: And when I was asked, I picked the ones that I thought should be addressed and that that should be reduced.

I am like Dick; scientific and management uncertainty, I don't think that -- the science is the science, you know. We may not have the best science because there is no such thing as the best; there are no absolutes in what we do.

and then, the management uncertainty is up to the Councils to say how much risk is there. Because with the AMs, there is this penalty over on the other side for doing it wrong. And so, when you pick the number that is way too high and then it comes back, if it way too high, then you have to pay the consequences.

And so, before the reauthorization

NEAL R. GROSS

1 in 2007, you didn't have that penalty clause. 2 And so, there was no risk, and now there is risk. You have to make sure the risk --3 MEMBER BRAME: So, which three have 4 you decided are on the bottom? 5 CHAIR WALLACE: Well, these, three, 6 7 four, and six, they are numbered, but it was No. 4, which was No. 1 originally; No. 3 was 8 No. 2, and No. 6 was No. 3. 9 10 Go ahead. So, I think you MR. RISENHOOVER: 11 are going to say the 11 topics and emphases 12 13 outlined are legitimate things that you should take public comment. But, on those, we feel 14 15 these three rise to the -- for this Committee, 16 I think it is the way to say that. So, Julie, they are not excluding any. They are saying 17 you have got kind of the right mix, but these 18 three or so are a little bit more important, 19 based on the Committee's thoughts. 20 **BRAME:** And Ι 21 MEMBER am

comfortable. I mean, we don't have to add the

1	recreational ones as well. I mean, to me,
2	that fits right under
3	CHAIR WALLACE: That's right.
4	Because I will add that in the report.
5	MEMBER BRAME: It would be nice to
6	be in the report that that is one of the
7	things we talked about. It doesn't
8	necessarily have to be another one because it
9	fits under more than one.
10	MR. RISENHOOVER: Or apply those 12
11	things and look at them in the context
12	specifically of recreational fisheries.
13	MEMBER BRAME: Because the process
14	is that we will make a report to the whole
15	Committee, and then it becomes the Committee
16	that really decides what we are going to do.
17	We are just a subcommittee that sort of goes
18	through this. Once they decide what they want
19	to do, then we go on with the more detailed
2.0	
20	comments.
21	comments. MEMBER ALEXANDER: I am sure that

1	23, will have a whole different idea of what
2	should rise to the top.
3	CHAIR WALLACE: Well, that is what
4	I like about yesterday, because we had more
5	than half of the whole package there. So
6	that, if we can go to consensus with it, it is
7	almost a Committee of the Whole, then it makes
8	this a lot smoother because everybody has been
9	through the process.
10	MEMBER BONNEY: Okay. I am fine
11	with the three you have outlined.
12	CHAIR WALLACE: Okay. And are we
13	happy with the order? Or should we talk about
14	the order?
15	MEMBER BRAME: I don't think the
16	order matters.
17	CHAIR WALLACE: It doesn't make any
18	difference? Okay.
19	Agree with that? Do you agree with
20	that? Okay.
21	I guess we stand adjourned.
22	(Whereupon, at 8:16 a.m., the

meeting was adjourned.)

NEAL R. GROSS