U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

OCTOBER 27, 2011

+ + + + +

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee met at 8:30 a.m. in the Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, 400 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, Heather McCarty, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

HEATHER D. McCARTY, Chair

TERRY ALEXANDER

PAUL CLAMPITT

BILL DEWEY

PATRICIA DOERR

PHILLIP J. DYSKOW

EDWIN A. EBISUI

MARTIN FISHER

KEN FRANKE

STEVE JONER

JULIE MORRIS

GEORGE C. NARDI

TOM RAFTICAN

KEITH RIZZARDI

VA'AMUA HENRY SESEPASARA

DAVID H. WALLACE

CONSULTANTS TO MAFAC:

RANDY CATES

JOHN V. O'SHEA

STAFF PRESENT:

MARK HOLLIDAY, Designated Federal Official

HEATHER SAGAR

JOSHUA STOLL

ALSO PRESENT:

FORBES DARBY

RUSS DUNN

JUDY GAN

ERIC SCHWAAB

| CONTENTS |
|---|
| Public Comment Opportunity |
| Heather D. McCarty, Chair14 |
| Remarks by Eric Schwaab, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS4 Ecosystem Subcommittee Report and Discussion Tom Raftican |
| Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Management Subcommittee Report and Discussion Heather D. McCarty39 |
| Break |
| Protected Resources Subcommittee Report and |
| Discussion |
| Mr. Rizzardi162 |
| |
| Lunch |
| Lunch Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion |
| |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |
| Commerce Subcommittee Report and Discussion Steve Joner |

| | Page 4 |
|----|--|
| 1 | P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S |
| 2 | 8:34 a.m. |
| 3 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Where's my |
| 4 | microphone? |
| 5 | MR. SCHWAAB: They took it away, |
| 6 | huh? |
| 7 | CHAIR MCCARTY: I will. I can do |
| 8 | that. Welcome back to our third and final |
| 9 | day. I am so happy to have next to me Eric |
| 10 | Schwaab, our fearless leader. |
| 11 | We missed you really bad, so I'm |
| 12 | glad you are here. Thank you for coming. |
| 13 | MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you. |
| 14 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Make a few |
| 15 | comments? |
| 16 | MR. SCHWAAB: Absolutely. Thank |
| 17 | you Heather and given the point in the meeting |
| 18 | where you are, I won't go into any sort of |
| 19 | great detail around prepared remarks. |
| 20 | But I first want to apologize for |
| 21 | not being with you the past couple of days. |
| 22 | Things have spun up again, shockingly, in New |

England, and that's -- so I spent a few days at a council workshop with about 150 other people, focused on next steps on the sector program up there.

I do think that you know, while it certainly is a more intense version of what we are dealing with from a fisheries management perspective around the country, it's pretty instructive really, because while there has been some, I would say, a vocal minority that has been critical of things going back to before the sector program was implemented, the interesting thing about the workshop was, it was very encouraging in the sense that fishermen recognize what the sector program has done for them, in helping them to move through some fairly tight catch limits.

So as you know, the requirement to end over-fishing and to rebuild stocks that led to imposition of pretty tight catch limits, and in a you know, multi-species groundfish fishery, that's problematic, same

as it is in the trawl fishery on the west coast and other places as well.

But sector management really came in as a way to sort of give fishermen the freedom and some additional tools to work around those limiting stock issues.

And it really is paying off that way and I think, again, despite the rhetoric, you know, fishermen are beginning to see that.

So you know, if you go back to 2007, the fishery on the whole was, 2007/2008, was catching about a quarter of its cumulative tack for all of the species.

In 2009 that went up slightly. In 2010, the first year under sectors, it went up again, and I think it's pretty clear it's going to go up again.

So basically fishermen are getting better at working around the limiting stocks and taking fuller advantage of the healthier stocks and they are using sector-based management to do a better job of that.

So most of the focus over the last couple of days was on you know, how do we tweak that sector management program and make it better.

I mean there are still legitimate, you know, concerns about big boats versus small boats, and fleet diversity and consolidation and the like.

But there is a clear path forward that a lot of the fishermen are beginning to appreciate.

So you know, we have talked a lot about turning the corner. We see you know, the progress that we have made as noteworthy, and certainly we haven't made that alone. I mean, we've -- it's you know, the councils and the fishermen around the country that have made that progress.

And you know, I know that sort of on your agenda has been you know, some other really important issues. When we talk about - you know, when we talk about turning the

corner internally, one of the things we say is you know, you can turn the corner on ending over-fishing and rebuilding stocks, you know, stabilizing sustainable fisheries in some fashion.

Well, as you turn that corner, you look ahead, and you look down the road and you see some other really big things. And I know you have talked about our habitat blueprint, and we'll talk about that a little more.

You know, I know you continue to, to express great interest and provide us great input on ocean policy-related issues and that encompasses a wide range of things.

You know, we still look at sort of one aspect of habitat, which is kind of temporal in nature, and that is the changes that are coming about as a result of some of the climate issues.

So all those things are out there, and are really a big deal for us, and I know you've been talking about that, and we

appreciate your continued input.

So let me -- I will stop there
other than to say that from a scheduling
perspective, I will be with you until a little
after 11. I have to go across town. I'll be
back around -- around a little before 2, and
then I'll leave again about 4.

So you know, I'll be here for a couple of the breaks, for those of us that haven't had any time to catch up, and I think later on, you know, I hope to recognize some of the longstanding members for whom this will be the last meeting, and you know, they are of course -- you know who you are.

And you were on the Committee when I was on the Committee, so that's particularly special for me. And I will say that it is great, you know, with all the travels and all the places I go, coming and spending time with you guys is like, is very comfortable, and it's like being you know, home.

So thank you for that and thank

you for what you continue to do for us. So

let me stop there, Madam Chair. If there's

anything that anybody particularly wants to

ask about and there are a few minutes, I'd be

happy to do that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. SCHWAAB: Or we can move on with your agenda.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. It would be nice probably to open it up just for a couple of minutes, but I don't want it to be, you know, a rap session right now. Otherwise we won't get through our agenda.

So if anyone has burning issues or burning questions for Eric. Burning?

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, it's more -he was talking about the place that he went,
and you know, according to all the analysts on
amendment 16, it said that we needed to
consolidate and NMFS wanted us to consolidate,
and now consolidation is just a really bad
word up there. How are you guys handling

1 that?

MR. SCHWAAB: So I think in some respects it's a question of pace and degree, and you know, the endpoint ultimately is not so much up to us as it is to the community.

And so for example one of the things that came out of the management review that we conducted up there was a need for a long-term vision for fisheries across the region.

And you know, if you don't know what you are managing to, then you know, how do you know how to get there?

And the council has actually taken on the charge and the challenge of developing a vision. The mid-Atlantic council has been working on this, some of you know that; the New England council is now committed to undertaking some kind of a visioning exercise.

And you know ultimately, you know, how much fleet diversity do you want, how much community diversity do you want to preserve,

and at sort of what -- and what sideboards do you then need to put in place in the management systems to sustain that?

You know, because clearly the other end of the spectrum is you know, you just let the market take its course, and that's clearly not where we want to go, or anybody wants to go with most of these fisheries.

You know, there are some continuing needs for some sideboards to get to sort of an appropriate place. But what that place is, really has to come to us from those communities. It's not something that we should be imposing or dictating.

MR. ALEXANDER: It just seems like the council of New England wastes so much time working on stuff that nobody really cares about except for two people in the room.

You know what I mean? And it's taking away valuable time.

MR. SCHWAAB: And that was one of

the things that we talked about. You know,
the council has an incredibly challenging
workload, and you know, if you have 10
priorities -- there was actually a question
yesterday from the groundfish -- from Terry
Stockwell, the groundfish committee chairman
who said well, I need you to prioritize your
priorities so we can know what to work on.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks.

MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I wanted to now announce that the public comment opportunity is available. I am not seeing any public, though actually Eric, we did have quite a lot of public at this meeting for a while.

MR. SCHWAAB: Okay.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So it was actually good, and nobody said anything. So I think is that all we need to do, is just make it available and ask if there's anybody in and if there isn't, then there isn't?

And then Mark has several

announcements that he would like to make and then we will move into the subcommittee reports.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thanks Heather.

This afternoon we are going to go through the election process and Heather asked me to identify who the nominees were.

We received it yesterday. We accepted nominations for the Chair and Vice-Chair. We have two nominees for Chairman. In alphabetical order, they are Tony Chatwin and Keith Rizzardi.

We have two nominees for Vice-Chair. In alphabetical order they are Martin Fisher and Dave Wallace.

So we will conduct the election this afternoon and we will have paper ballots, and by majority vote, elect two officers for the committee.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Question, did we talk about whether each of those individuals should make a short statement publicly before

DR. HOLLIDAY: That wasn't part of

5 | --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. That's fine, completely fine. I think there is plenty of opportunity to speak individually with folks. So I'm sure that's going to happen. Thank you.

Then you had another --

DR. HOLLIDAY: A couple of administrative issues. If you haven't gotten me back your statements, non-disclosure or foreign agent and you are able to sign them at this meeting, I'd love to take them with me.

If not, I'll bug you in the email over the coming weeks to respond to them.

MS. DOERR: Were we all supposed to have them filled out?

DR. HOLLIDAY: We handed them out on day one, so see us during the break time,

I'll just -- you weren't here when we handed them out. I'm sorry.

We are also going to talk about time and place for meetings for next year.

We'd like to get agreement on dates, what days, and general venue, location, east coast, west coast, particular state or city.

Josh sent out a reminder email to people for a Doodle poll that we initiated a week or 10 days ago. Only 11 people have responded so far. These are the dates that we identified that did not currently conflict with a council meeting, a commission meeting, or other international organization meeting that we felt MAFAC members might have a potential conflict with.

So if you can, look at your -- if you have your computer with you, look at your email, click on that link, link to Doodle poll before we have our afternoon discussion, and have your calendar, review it, it's pretty straightforward. We'll try to do our best

this afternoon to nail down the dates and the preferred locations.

Two other items, quick items. I sent an email out this morning with another link to a budget document. When the budget committee reports out we are going to conduct -- more details about that but just if you have a computer, this would be a handy reference.

It's the NOAA blue book, the NOAA budget. It contains descriptions of these line items that we will be talking about in the budget. So if you haven't seen an email and you have a computer with you, you might want to browse through that at some point so you have it for reference.

The last item, we found, it looks like a charger like maybe for an iPhone or something. I don't know. If someone is missing --

MR. CATES: That might be mine.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you.

202-234-4433

CHAIR MCCARTY: I have a question 1 2 Mark about the new members. Do we have 3 anything? Eric, you might know, as well. 4 Where are we at with that process? 5 MR. SCHWAAB: We're just moving a package through. 6 We have got a set 7 recommendations. It's just a matter of 8 clearing them through and then --9 CHAIR MCCARTY: Do you anticipate that 10 relatively soon? MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, I would hope 11 12 within a matter of weeks. 13 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, great. 14 determined by the way, Eric, that we are going to do a half day sort of training session for 15 16 new members. 17 MR. SCHWAAB: Oh great. 18 CHAIR MCCARTY: That was one of 19 our recommendations from last time, and we are 20 carrying that forward. So the next time we 21 meet -- you guys meet -- the new members could

come half a day early and have a preparatory

22

1 session.

MR. SCHWAAB: I think that's a really good idea, and it's, as you know, pretty substantial cohort, so it'll be important.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. Yes. I'm

excited about that. We are first going to

hear from the ecosystem subcommittee. Just

catching you up as we go, Eric, we dumped a

huge amount of work on this subcommittee, and

Tom graciously worked through it all.

I think almost all of the subcommittees had two meetings in order to get through everything that they had on their plate. So that's where some of the real work is done. So Tom, thank you.

MR. RAFTICAN: You bet, and really, thanks to the folks on the committee.

We only met twice, the first time we had

Keith Rizzardi, Dave Wallace, Julie, Paul Clampitt.

Paul participated and then we met

again yesterday with Dave again, Julie Morris again, and Patty Doerr. So -- and that's you know, you have got a lot of people spending an awful lot of time.

2.0

As far as recommendations go, let me jump quickly to the middle of the report.

We don't even have to go to -- follow-up upon the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Task Force recommendations.

We crafted a letter on that, and basically what it was, was a follow-up to the work that we had done last summer, and a special thanks goes out to Keith Rizzardi on that. He did the lion's share of the work.

But took a look at the Gulf task force recommendations, came back, saw whether it fell in line with what we had asked for, and came through with some other recommendations.

We voted on that yesterday, as you all know, and that was sent off, and that was because of the Gulf Coast -- the timelines,

the deadlines for submission of comments.

So this got in yesterday, it got in on time, and Heather, thanks for getting that off and crafting it. Mark, thanks for the support on that.

That brings us back to the other elements that we looked at, and this is particularly on Tuesday. We heard a report on the Habitat Blueprint, and after receiving the briefings, we had substantial discussions on how to proceed forward.

And these are the recommendations that the subcommittee came up with. Consider the following with defining geographic priorities.

One, initial projects should have a high likelihood of success by demonstrating the value of how with habitat conservation, the agency will garner long-term support for the blueprint. Success will breed success. Projects should build off and complement existing programs.

A lot of this was done in recognition of the extreme budget priorities that the agency has at this time, and you know, how do you craft projects that A, number one, are going to work well, but also have a chance of succeeding.

Projects should consider the transferability of components the U.S. has learned in technology science, increasing the relevance to future projects.

Make sure that they are economical forward, projects should coincide with species and suites of species that will benefit directly from the habitat improvements.

And again, you know, it makes it easier to pin your success on something that we can see in this working.

Some of the projects should account for species that occupy multiple habitat types over the course of their life cycle.

This is, and we got into a little

bit of this in particular in the Caribbean,
that you know, it goes from mangroves to deep
ocean, and all of it is important.

The agency should also recognize
the need to collaborate, coordinate the status
in order to successfully manage, improve
coastal and marine habitats, more clearly
define the scales at which the geographic
priority areas will be established, more fully
understand how existing marine spatial
management overlays with priority species, and
more clearly articulate the value of habitat
restoration to the coastal communities.

And that last one probably is going to be extremely important and again, getting back to the budget priorities, NOAA does a very good job, NOAA fisheries does a very good job and I think this goes directly to what Eric was just saying, that after the yelling and screaming subsides and everybody sits down to see what's actually on the table, it's like, well this could work, let's see how

1 we do it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Not only are economic values important, I think one of the things that was brought up in our meeting was the fact that the social values, the societal values are extremely important for coastal communities, and especially coastal fishing communities, and we need to make sure that that is part of the blueprint.

Moving on to Blue Carbon. It was an interesting -- there was a real good give and take on the Blue Carbon debate, back and forth, you know, it was -- everybody's really strong on habitat but you know, there were a number of different outlooks on carbon.

We came with these up recommendations -- continue to look at the role Blue Carbon and Blue Carbon markets can play in protecting habitat, incorporate Blue Carbon into the habitat blueprint when and where appropriate, and encourage the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to include ecosystem

services into their standard cost benefit analysis.

Carbon markets are going to evolve, recognize them and let's look and see where the work that NOAA is doing actually plays well into this, and how do you capitalize on that, I think was one of the big things that's important, and I think that fits overall into all of the recommendations on habitat or excuse me, on Blue Carbon.

Moving down, ecosystem subcommittee recommendations on a Caribbean strategy. We put together kind of like an overall statement that I think is -- it's very -- I think clear, and goes to the point: MAFAC support for a coordinated Caribbean strategy is contingent upon no new resources being required to implement that strategy.

Therefore the problem statement as to why NOAA is proposing the strategy needs to be sharpened to be clear that NOAA will be leveraging and coordinating existing resources

and not creating a new program that requires new funding and capacity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The goal should be to realize cost savings within NOAA's current Caribbean activities that can be reinvested into the regional Caribbean strategy.

And we understand where the budget is. It was quite clear to us where it is. It was quite clear to us where the budget's going.

Working together, you know, our first, my first instinct was what are we talking about creating a new program here?

This is insane.

But I was kind of overruled by the people in the committee who said hey look, if this is really important do the to coordination, why don't you try to utilize existing resources and come back and put together -- put some of those resources into the overall strategy, and by doing that, you can leverage some of the concurrent programs,

and come out -- actually come out with some savings on this thing, but more importantly come out with a good overall perspective on it, number one, and then act on it, on that long-term vision.

Specific comments regarding the proposed goals and objectives -- goal one, objective two: if progress has been made in the first two years, priority watersheds should be identified in the document.

Objective three: if progress is to be made in the early years, this document should list the species in need of recovery, and the Caribbean habitats.

Objective four -- again, this is in the first couple of years -- species selected for genetic studies and hydrodynamic modeling should be identified in the document.

Let's know exactly what we are talking about.

Goal three objective: need a stronger emphasis on documenting the social dimensions of community resilience.

Other areas that should be included within the strategy: a better understanding of Caribbean Sea circulation currents that are important to delivering resources to the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic -- extremely important.

And you know, the circulation is going to have impacts, habitat impacts and beyond, you know, throughout the entire region.

There was a map included within the strategy but however, it wasn't really clear what was on the map. A list of Caribbean countries should be included in the document. The map is insufficient to determine which islands and countries are included in the strategy.

And also, a recommendation that I don't know that, you know, it's easy to make recommendations -- sometimes it's kind of difficult to follow them: the Caribbean

strategy should include the collaboration with Cuba.

This is incredibly important right now on habitat issues, on resource issues, but in particular as we are looking at the potential for drilling within the straits of Florida, it's about time that we kind of started talking to our neighbors about this and put together a comprehensive plan.

Questions?

(No response)

Can I get a motion to adopt these

13 recommendations?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

MS. MORRIS: I so move.

MR. WALLACE: Second.

16 MR. RAFTICAN: Discussion? All in

17 favor, aye?

(Chorus of ayes)

MR. RAFTICAN: Opposed?

20 (No response)

21 MR. RAFTICAN: So carried. Thank

22 you Madam Chair.

congratulating the committee for all of the hard work they did and the good recommendations. I didn't participate in it and I am impressed with the amount of work you done along with quys have your recommendations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I was on the Blue Carbon discussion. There's a couple of things there that came out yesterday in the presentation that I wanted to suggest as recommendations but didn't have a chance to participate in that committee discussion.

And one of them, and this is from their slide presentation, would be to ask that NOAA provide science to quantify the value of ecosystem services, to facilitate the development of markets for their trading.

So I mean that's an area -- in the spirit of limited resources, the more we can stimulate private investment and public conservation, the better.

I think that's wise public policy

and a role that NOAA can play to facilitate that private trading is providing the science to help quantify the value of those services, whether it's -- frankly if it's carbon, water quality, biodiversity, nitrogen, all of the above.

I have a selfish interest in shellfish and nitrogen trading, but I think for Blue Carbon as well and all of these, it's an area that NOAA could contribute significantly.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Bill, are you proposing an additional motion, which would be completely fine.

MR. DEWEY: Yes, I was proposing an additional recommendation. I was trying to craft another one here and I didn't have a chance before you called for the vote there so

CHAIR MCCARTY: And just a word on process. Tom, that was fabulous, and I wish I could do that, but after the committees make

their reports, the gavel comes back to me --1 2 MR. RAFTICAN: Okay. 3 CHAIR MCCARTY: -- and I'll run the discussion and then take the vote. 4 5 that's how it's going to work. MR. RAFTICAN: That's fine. 6 7 CHAIR MCCARTY: We don't have to 8 re-vote unless people have objections to what 9 was already passed, but we certainly can talk about additional pieces, if that's okay. 10 So, if you'd like to make a formal 11 12 motion, one at a time I think might be better. MR. DEWEY: Okay, well I would 13 make that as a formal motion, that that be 14 added as an additional recommendation. 15 16 CHAIR MCCARTY: Could you state it 17 succinctly please? 18 So, that NOAA provide MR. DEWEY: 19 science to quantify the value of ecosystem 20 services to facilitate the development 21 markets for their trading. 22 CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second?

| | Page 34 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. RAFTICAN: I second. |
| 2 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, it's been |
| 3 | moved and seconded. Is there any discussion |
| 4 | on this? I think it's been spoken to. All in |
| 5 | favor of this additional motion say aye. |
| 6 | (Chorus of ayes) |
| 7 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Any opposed? |
| 8 | (Pause) |
| 9 | Randy, are you serious this time? |
| 10 | MR. CATES: Yes. |
| 11 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. |
| 12 | MR. CATES: I think we are just |
| 13 | getting in an area that is a bit unknown and |
| 14 | controversial. |
| 15 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. The motion |
| 16 | passes with one objection. |
| 17 | MR. CLAMPITT: And I object. |
| 18 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Two objections. |
| 19 | I'm sorry. So there's two objections. |
| 20 | MR. DEWEY: So just further |
| 21 | discussion, and this would be more to the |
| | |

third bullet there, and one thing that was

22

presented in Roger's PowerPoint yesterday is that there's policy needs in that when we are doing NEPA review, we are not evaluating coastal carbon in that NEPA, when it impacts on coastal carbon.

And he was suggesting that there needs to be policies adopted so that that's a consideration when you are reviewing coastal development projects.

And I don't know that we have -if that's been captured here, if that was
discussed by the committee or not.

MR. RAFTICAN: I think the concept was discussed and I think that --

MR. DEWEY: I guess, to put it out there, the reason I am -- again the reason I am thinking about it is somewhat selfishly, and not so much -- well, it's both. It's both from a concern about the negative impacts a project might have on carbon, but also if there's projects proposed that can offset that carbon, that that should be considered in

1 their NEPA review as well.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So we run into this challenge when we try to get new shellfish farms permitted and we go into federal consultation because we need core permits -- that's our federal nexus and all we are evaluated for are the negative impacts of the shellfish farms. have trouble getting the services to recognize the beneficial effects that the shellfish provide, whether it's nitrogen mitigation or water clarity.

And so trying to get policies in place that clearly state you need to look at both the negative impacts and potential beneficial impacts -- granted there's not a lot of projects they look at that probably have a beneficial impact.

I would argue that shellfish farms are one and somewhat unique and that's probably why we have so much challenge getting them to look at that side of the equation.

But that's a frustration for us.

1 MR. RAFTICAN: Bill, I think we 2 tried to capture that and encourage the Army 3 Corps of Engineers to include ecosystem 4 services including carbon sequestration 5 their standard cost-benefit analysis, and I think that this -- I'm not sure that 6 it 7 totally quite helps --8 MR. DEWEY: It definitely gets --9 MR. RAFTICAN: But I mean if that 10 was the exact quote, this is what we are doing, there are net gains on some of these 11 12 things and where appropriate, incorporate 13 them. 14 CHAIR MCCARTY: Bill are you happy 15 with that? MR. DEWEY: Yes, I think that's 16 17 fine. That captured my concern. CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, if you want 18 19 to amend it and add a few lines --2.0 MR. DEWEY: That's fine. 21 CHAIR MCCARTY: -- that would be

22

appropriate.

Page 38 1 MR. DEWEY: That's fine. Thank 2 you for the discussion. 3 CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there any other additions or revisions that people would like 4 5 to make? 6 (No response) 7 Okay. That's great. Thank you to 8 you and your committee. That was awesome that 9 you got that done. Appreciate it. The next one is the one that I 10 chaired, and I have the jump drive right here. 11 12 I wasn't able to get online long enough to 13 send it to you. I apologize. 14 It's also on the screen, whichever works. I think it's on the jump 15 16 drive. I'm kind of a Mac neophyte, so I think 17 it's on that, but I'm not entirely sure if that's where it was saved. I know you do Mac 18 19 so --2.0 MR. STOLL: Okay. Let me just see 21 here. 22 CHAIR MCCARTY: So we'll take a

Page 39 brief stand-down while we do this technical 1 2 stuff, a cup of coffee, whatever, very brief. 3 (Whereupon the aboveentitled matter went off the record at 9:07 4 5 a.m. and resumed at 9:10 a.m.) CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, we're coming 6 7 back to order. Mark and his staff are passing 8 around a couple of matrices that were provided 9 to the subcommittee -- just one right now, but we are going to talk about the second one too. 10 11 But we can put it up on the board 12 right? Okay. And while Josh is getting the recommendation ready for us to look at, Phil -13 - Phil has agreed to make this report for the 14 committee, so that he can hand it back to me 15 16 when he's done. 17 MR. DYSKOW: You want me to just 18 use your computer? 19 CHAIR MCCARTY: Absolutely. You 20 want to sit right here? 21 MR. DYSKOW: I can sit right here.

Okay.

CHAIR MCCARTY:

22

he is never going to come to another meeting without his computer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DYSKOW: The strategic planning budget and program management subcommittee, although we talked about number of issues, we have three specific elements that we wanted to bring to the full committee, one of which I am going to talk about briefly and then defer to the end, because Eric has given us an extraordinary opportunity to help prioritize the NMFS budget prior to it getting far enough downstream that that comment is moot.

So I want to spend the most time on that, but there are two issues we want to address before that, and if you could scroll down a little bit please.

Let's see. I guess one more, to item number three. There are two motions that we want to bring before the full committee.

The first one is as budgets are reduced -- we assume that they will be, but even if they

stay the same, there are many, many pulls and tugs on that money.

2.0

We, MAFAC, recommend that NMFS protect the core programs that are required to efficiently assess, manage and sustain fisheries.

As an example, as the NOP is implemented, as other programs like the Caribbean strategy come forth, we want to make sure that those core programs are properly funded and whatever money remains, get delegated to those non-core projects.

So that was the first motion that we had, and we can take these one at a time.

We can open that up for discussion right now.

So if you could just stay on that one please, number three.

Any discussion on that? Anybody have comments?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Phil I'm going to do that part, so --

MR. DYSKOW: Oh okay, I'm sorry.

MS. MORRIS: Thanks Phil. Do core programs required to assess, manage and sustain fisheries, include things like habitat

20

21

22

and protected species, things like that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DYSKOW: Our concept was that core activities that there NMFS is involved in without which the fishery is put into peril. We are talking about things like fishery management and enforcement. talking about accurate fish assessments, and we are taking a very macro look at that and not drilling down into those specific projects.

We all have areas that are near and dear to our heart that are important and should be respected in the budget. That said, I'll give you an example of what the concern is.

Let's just say that Eric gets a budget proposal back from Congress and he is asked to cut 20 percent. If he cuts 20 percent from every area, he has a -- he ceases to have a viable program within NMFS.

We are recommending that those core areas where we are out of business

without, be protected, and that those non-core areas get addressed as far as budget reductions.

In other words, in an environment where money is going to be critical, we want to protect the core programs, perhaps at the expense of non-core programs.

I'm not going to name one as an example, but it may mean we stop doing something as opposed to cutting regulatory activities or fish assessment activities that are core to our very being.

MR. JONER: I guess one man's core is another man's extravagance, so I guess on behalf of the commerce committee folks or the aquaculture folks, would the aquaculture -- office of aquaculture be considered a core program?

MR. DYSKOW: Well, Steve, let me answer that question differently, and I'm not going to give you a direct answer, but I'll say this.

The last portion of our subcommittee report would be a matrix that was developed by Dr. Holliday, where each of us will get to score our own personal priorities as to the NOAA budget.

There are some core activities that they are required by law to provide and I would say those are off the table. We can't eliminate them.

However each and every person in this room would have the opportunity to use this matrix form to determine for themselves what they think the priorities are. That would then go back to Dr. Holliday and that would be MAFAC's recommendations of where the key areas are.

So if aquaculture is measured as a key area, then it is so noted.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's an explanation that we need to make right away

Phil, that what is being handed around are those matrices or at least one of them, and

1 it's addressed in our number one up there.

If you could scroll down so people could read number one and number two, I think that would be explanatory. No, the other way, sorry.

Oh, I guess -- number one and number two explain these matrices that Phil is referring to.

MR. DYSKOW: I wanted to address the other two areas first so we would have the most time on that, but to answer your question, the subcommittee didn't identify those core areas.

Dr. Holliday will indicate, and he has volunteered to be proctor during this process as we fill this out, which programs are very difficult to touch, and then you as a member, Patty as a member, Julie as a member, Keith as a member, all of us will get an opportunity to help establish those priorities through our own vote.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think Keith had

Page 48 a question. 1 2 MR. DYSKOW: Does that make sense? 3 MR. JONER: Yes it does. I just -4 - I didn't see aquaculture on there. I quess 5 that would be other activities so when we fill this out, do we put what other activities are? 6 7 MR. DYSKOW: There are -- there's 8 a blank space at the bottom and I am sure that 9 Eric would -- if that is an area that is not 10 addressed to your satisfaction, you could certainly write it in at the bottom. 11 12 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, and Keith had a question. 13 14 MR. RIZZARDI: My question really was to Eric, and I'll ask it openly. 15 16 CHAIR MCCARTY: Please do. 17 MR. RIZZARDI: Which is, in light 18 of this table, I am not fully understanding 19 the need for the specific MAFAC statement. 2.0 This table seems to capture the way to do that

I have been through this exercise

21

22

assessment.

on my end in my agency, so I understand exactly what they are doing. This seems the responsible way. So I am just looking for some feedback, what do you guys want?

MR. DYSKOW: I was thinking the same thing as I was speaking, that this exercise may supersede that motion. Madam

Chair, how do you feel about that?

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think that we need to more fully explain the process that we went through so that people understand how we got to this place.

And if you don't mind, so I can do that, and then maybe Mark wants to jump in.

We were faced with prioritizing items on a budget. There are so many ways you can do that.

You can go really macro. You can go at a really high level. You can go down to line items. You can do whatever people ask you to do.

But all of that takes time and not

only did we not have time in the subcommittee to do that, but we felt that it was more appropriate that the full MAFAC committee get the opportunity to do that.

So Mark provided us with two matrices, the one that you have in front of you -- may I -- is this one and he indicated that it was used internally to sort of determine where people's major emphases were.

And he provided this to us as a tool in order to get to what we felt were the top priorities if you had to cut money.

And so this is a really high-level, you know, group, protected -- protected species research -- fisheries research, fisheries mapping and so on, as you can see.

That's the one that we filled out during our meeting and we felt that it was possible for the rest of MAFAC to fill it out during this meeting, not right now but before the end of the meeting.

So, arriving at what MAFAC

believes are the core missions and functions
that need to be protected in the budgetcutting process is a longer process than we
had time to do, you know, on the spot.

And so the motion was to address - everybody kept saying we have got to protect
the core programs, we have got to protect the
core programs.

It remains to be seen what MAFAC believes those core programs are, and it's a very difficult thing to start with if you don't have anything in front of you on paper.

So that's what Mark provided. He provided a second matrix that goes down into - not line items exactly, but way more detail based on the budget outline that we got from Gary Reisner.

And it gives people an opportunity to get way more specific about the programs and the functions that they want to prioritize.

So it's a little unwieldy, but the

second recommendation is to use that second matrix, which I believe you already to put on the screen for us, that has much more detail, throughout the whole budget.

We just had a little piece of the budget as an example and we rate them against each other and again, Mark told us that was used as an internal tool as well.

And so he recommended that we use those tools to try to arrive at what MAFAC will recommend as the most important places to put money, if that makes sense to everyone.

Now this may not be the way to get there --

MR. DYSKOW: -- that you didn't mention. There are certain activities that NMFS is required by law to provide and to implement.

Those have to be identified before we can do a lot of ranking and I think most of those -- Mark, correct me if I am wrong -- in item A.

And what we had suggested in committee, is that NMFS fill out the priority for item A since most of those are areas that they are required by law to provide.

So that we would start with item

B. We can't eliminate an activity that they

are required to provide by law. So we had

requested that NMFS fill out the first column.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I would like to ask you Eric if that is the best way to do this.

MR. SCHWAAB: Well, maybe I would sort of back up a little bit and provide some additional context. You know first of all when we did this exercise internally, so this sheet, these program areas are the major budget lines, and maybe you knew that already.

So there are a lot of things obviously buried inside in some of those that are, you know, in and of themselves very important to you know, sort of programmatic activities and you know, a good example that

was already brought up here was aquaculture.

So at some level, sort of you lose that. When we did this exercise, this was done across all the NOAA lines, so it was as much about assessing relative importance and values between say the fisheries service and the ocean service or satellites, as it was about sort of digging down a little more deeply into the priorities that we have.

The second thing I would say just by way of sort of context is, and it's really sort of a macro perspective that we have tried to bring to this is balance in two ways.

One is, you know, we look at our activities as falling into sort of three major categories, some of which are very interrelated, of science, service and stewardship.

So it would -- and stewardship includes a lot of the management activities that we either undertake directly or fund in other places, councils, some inter-

jurisdictional, some state-related activities.

And so we kind of approached this, and I would say this was not only fisheries service-specific but NOAA-wide, in a way that suggested that we needed to maintain some balance across those different areas.

I think that's sort of inherently understood when it comes to the work we do, because without science, you can't affect your management actions. It's maybe less clear in other places.

But I also think that there is
another way in which we have to look at
balance that probably would be important for
you to think about too in giving us some
advice, and that's sort of the balance between
meeting the demands of the day and preparing
for some of the challenges of the future.

So you know, if you think about some of those big issues that loom on the horizon, and if we ignore them solely to just simply continue to incrementally meet the

demands of the day, we'd do so in a way that probably is not particularly strategically -- not very -- not strategically smart and is going to come back and bite us pretty quickly.

So, you know, I think in part sort of the question is -- and we've got these statutory mandates. But the statutory mandates also have in some respects a lot of room for you know, a range of responses.

And I'll use you know, the example that I think many of us are familiar with and that's providing the best available science to make fishery management decisions.

Well, if we decrease the frequency of surveys, then the uncertainty in assessments goes up, and that gets factored into management decisions, and therefore quotas go down in a lot of cases.

Now that's a perfectly legitimate response under Magnuson, but it's not very smart business. So you know, it's this sort of range of issues that we are trying to

balance as we make some of these decisions in what is very clearly a declining budget environment.

And so we have to make decisions in that reality. We at the same time we have to inform -- we have to inform the, you know, the appropriators about, from the educational perspective, the implications of some of those decisions and we do that internally as well, when we make choices across NOAA.

So I think in some respects, the advice that we need most from you, that would be most useful, is sort of that kind of macro advice, you know, here's how we see, you know, these competing demands.

Here's how, you know, here's how
we see, you know, across program areas, across
sort of the science-service-stewardship
continuum.

And then you know sort of over time, the sort of inter-generational strategic challenges that we face. And so that doesn't

lead to necessarily a real clean filling out of the boxes, but it does I think suggest a real opportunity for some -- some perspectives that you might share with us.

2.0

And so how to best -- how to best gather that input, I guess I would still leave a bit to Mark and to you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right.

MR. SCHWAAB: But that's the sort of the context that I would put the challenge in.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Well, thank you, and that's very helpful, because we were working at your request to try to give you something that was useful and we didn't know how deeply you wanted us to get into the budget line items and separate sections.

This was really macro. If -- if we did fill this out, there might be a way forward to reaching a consensus. But if we have to discuss all of the mission and all of the programs at this meeting, I don't think we

1 are going to get there.

Because around this table there are competing interests, and not competing unless you are cutting the budget. But you know, they are all important to some people and some constituencies.

And my guess is that if you have sort of a wide-ranging discussion over what's important for everybody around here, then you are going to have a tough time arriving at a consensus recommendation.

MR. DYSKOW: Heather, I have a recommendation on how we might proceed with that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, let me just finish --

MR. DYSKOW: Sure.

CHAIR MCCARTY: If I could. Mark provided this tool and that's what we fastened on because it's sort of a concrete way to kind of focus on that macro level. Sorry, go ahead.

MR. DYSKOW: The purpose of our objective number two was to protect the core programs within NMFS. That was the motion that we were discussing.

We can amend that to say that there's a recommendation of MAFAC to protect core programs of NMFS as defined by the collective results of this matrix survey that everybody in the room will get to fill out.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's right.

MR. DYSKOW: If we would amend it to that point, that would then become the budgetary direction of MAFAC. Now, if aquaculture comes up, number one, then Eric has to weigh that again to see if that outweighs fishery management, fishery research or something else.

It may skew the results one way or the other based on the makeup of MAFAC, but it is nonetheless the collective response of MAFAC.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks Phil.

1 Tony.

DR. CHATWIN: Yes, I had a question. I understand the interest in having a tool through which we can capture our collective priorities. But I haven't heard anything about how, once you have everybody fill this out, how you are actually going to summarize and synthesize and calculate what actually is our collective priorities.

Given the matrix number two, which seems fairly complex, I would imagine it's not going to be easy to synthesize that. And if we haven't really thought about that aspect of it, well I'd like to hear if we know how we are going to do that and how long it takes.

MR. DYSKOW: Well, as Heather mentioned earlier, it -- with the long form which you see right here, it was our intent that that would be addressed via an audio-conference because of the complexity of filling it out.

These are the documents that NMFS

is using to provide feedback on their budget, so our request, would I imagine be folded into that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We don't get to decide the NMFS budget. We are being asked for input on the budget and these are the tools that they have prepared to get our input.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Eric would like to make that another comment and then we will go to Julie and then to Randy.

MR. SCHWAAB: So thank you. So I would perhaps put another way of looking at this on the table, and that is, you know, something that has come up already in the context of your, you know, of your habitat discussion and it's really been inherent in our habitat blueprint thinking.

And that is, you know, how do we do business effectively more or more efficiently? it might be that, for So example, when look this isn't we and something that necessarily translates into --

immediately sort of into a table like this.

But you know, when we think about advancing aquaculture in a flat or declining budget environment, well what are the strategies that should rise to the top of the list, and which ones that perhaps, that might be more expensive or less effective, would move to the bottom of the list.

It's the same thing we are thinking about. You know, we have these habitat challenges that we want to -- we want to address more aggressively.

But we know that we are doing that in a declining budget environment, so how do we use the science and the technical expertise that our staff brings to the table to leverage, to align resources from other places, to perhaps, not just from a NMFS perspective, but regionally with a bunch of other partners, get to a better outcome.

Stock assessments, you know, survey methodologies is another example of

that, and we are going to likely, assuming we get something close to our '12 budget, dedicate even in these tight times a chunk of our expanded stock assessment money to looking at alternative technologies so that we can you know -- so that we can find ways to do the job that we are doing more efficiently.

And you know, there are examples of that that are not sort of on the water survey examples, things like alternative methodologies for computing stock assessments and the like.

I mean, you're going to write down our programs and you can identify areas where we have to sort of rethink our business model, and so I would also suggest that that's maybe an area where some input from the committee might be particularly useful, because when you start thinking about those, you know, alternative approaches, it's, you know, the power of -- of broader thinking that really is going to help us get there.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. You know what, just a comment and then we will go to other people and try to answer Tom's question.

I haven't forgotten it.

I think, you know, we grasped this as a way of getting to some really concrete things. What you are talking about now is more philosophical and much harder to formulate I guess.

But we can certainly take a crack at it right now. I mean we did not do that kind of philosophical discussion in the subcommittee, other than to try to imagine the worst scenario, and how you might cut back to the bare necessities.

And that was kind of where we were going in the subcommittee, so we didn't address the sort of more philosophical, business model type of approaches.

And I actually do wish that you had been there because I think it would have been very useful to get that up front. You

know, I do think this is still a valuable tool and I'd like Tony's question to be addressed, and Mark, and then we will go to the other folks -- Julie, Randy and Bill.

2.0

So you talked about how this would be compiled and vocabularized and put back together.

DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm listening to the discussion this morning and I'm thinking that we are taking some of this out of context about what the objective was for this meeting and perhaps pushing a little too far too fast.

Yesterday when I discussed this with the subcommittee I was characterizing this as research, that my attempt was to bring some tools to the table because over several meetings, not just the last meeting but three or four years' worth of meetings, the committee has been asking about how do we get more involved, more engaged in the budget process of NOAA and the management of the fisheries service.

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

And I always had Gary come and give his descriptions about where the budget is, but there has never been an opportunity for you to express your thoughts about what the priorities are.

And based on Gary's presentation about what's happening in '12 and '13, the importance of setting priorities seems to be now more and more you know, our top concern about how do we make these choices.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So we brought to the table for the subcommittee to try on for size different of looking ways at prioritization and my point, or my objective was to look at what was doable by the committee, what their interest and level of knowledge would be, in order to help express your preferences.

But it wasn't a done deal that one of these was you know, preferred and these were just options to be considered about how

we could capture your input and then use that in subsequent advice to NOAA and then to the department.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So you know, the technical aspects of what do you do with data that you collect with a tool, the tool is just that. It's a means to get towards an outcome of having a discussion about what these core programs are.

I mean the tool's not going to reveal that. That's the starting point for you to discuss so this is my thought of how this all fits together is that if you use a tool to help have a starting point for the discussion about what you think the priorities are, what you think the tradeoffs are, and then you have at some level of granularity, could be a mission level, this is at the line item level, the one that you have in front of you, the third one, this is the other spreadsheet that we looked at, was some line items, but it was only part of that breakout sheet that you asked Gary to maintain for you.

1 conducting So are we some 2 research, what's feasible, what's possible, and how -- how do you turn that into advice, 3 through discussions, not -- we 4 is 5 calculate the geometric mean of the responses 6 from the committee and then feed that back to 7 you and say here's where there seems to be there seem 8 differences. Here's t.o 9 similarities in your responses. And that's

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It's not -- your advice is not a calculation.

Your advice is the deliberative process of
looking at where you think things are
important as a group, and see hey, we are all
on the same page and we have widely different
interests, why is that?

the departure point for further discussion.

That's how we use tools like this in prioritizations to reveal where people are and where they could go and find common ground and where their differences are, and explore it.

So when I started my little

soapbox here, I said, taking it a little bit out of context, the intent was not to come and surprise anybody today with an exercise that says you have to fill this out in an hour, this is going to be your advice to NOAA.

No, it's -- this is the starting point, an accumulation of interests that you have said how can we better provide some input, and we haven't been able to get traction on that for a number of meetings.

This was our attempt to provide a different way of looking at it.

Phil yesterday said, well, another alternative is just so we can start brainstorming on what we know, what are our critical or core missions, and you know, we just have a round-robin discussion. That's another way of getting at the same issue.

So these are just -- think of them as tools, but they don't replace your -- and that's why I was cautioning yesterday that we had an hour for this on the agenda today, and

I was a little concerned about trying to squeeze this into that interval.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So we're not.

DR. HOLLIDAY: I think, Tony, you know, we have this as a mechanism to see what it looks like, and if we don't think it's appropriate, our research says we don't want to operationalize it and take it any further.

But there are -- there's a lot of detail in the budget, you know, what's within a particular area, what's mandated, what's not. I mean these are all things that you are not going to resolve in an hour.

But it's a starting point for further discussion that could set up subsequent meetings or webinars that you know, suggest --

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think that's a very good explanation, and basically, what you are hearing is what we all heard and talked about at subcommittee level.

We didn't anticipate that we were

going to get to the end of this process at this meeting, hence our recommendation in number two, to go through a process, some of which could be done through that second matrix that we had up on the board a minute ago, to get to the real details of each of the subcategories.

And we acknowledge that in order to do that, there would have to be experts on line to help us get to that understanding so that it is like a huge opportunity, like Phil said, for us to participate much more fully in the budgetary process, and to understand more fully what the budget really contains and where the money is and what it goes towards.

So hence our suggestion for this webinar, and that was Phil's idea, the idea that we would get on the webinar in a format that we can all participate in, if you have interest in doing so.

And so we are just throwing that out as an idea for getting MAFAC membership up

to speed basically on what is really in the budget and where, so that we can give realistic advice going forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I appreciate Mark explaining that because that's how he explained it to us and it was hard to capture that in these little paragraphs.

So you know, this was just our shot at starting that process. The only thing we could agree on was this motion, which is number three, and that is sort of a starting point.

Phil said earlier But those as core programs are up for discussion. What are the core programs that are required to efficiently assess, manage and sustain fisheries? could include Ιt habitat protection. It could include aquaculture. could include all kinds of things and it probably does.

But we didn't think that in this meeting, in an hour, we could arrive at those

specifics. So we are suggesting kind of a process to get there, with Mark's help, which I thought was well-explained a minute ago.

So I hope that helps and I'm sorry we didn't get more explicit when we put this up. But it's a complex thing. So we will go to Julie, Randy and then Bill.

MS. MORRIS: I like the process as Mark just described it, as he put it, this as a good first step in that process. But it's real important that we have ample opportunity to discuss the results of this first step in the way that Mark described.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you.

MR. CATES: I think Mark mentioned the question -- the question is twofold. Are we voting on -- are we filling these out today, and if so, if we come upon a category that we are unfamiliar with, do we leave it blank? And what does that blank mean? I want to make sure I don't fill out a hanging chad or anything.

See, I'm not comfortable about commenting on something that I know nothing about, so I typically would leave it blank, but if that blank means something, what is that?

DR. HOLLIDAY: So I mean, before we go too much further with the spreadsheet, it's not a test. There are no right answers.

And so if your answer is blank it's important information that people didn't understand it enough to complete it.

And that will be noted in how we interpret the results. The point you made about not knowing what's in a column, one of the things I was thinking about overnight is, we have information that describes what is in these columns in the NOAA budget. So the top level, or each row -- excuse me, each column is equivalent to a line item and each of these line items is described in what we call the NOAA blue book, the NOAA budget, and that was the link that I tried to send around this

morning so that as you fill this out, you need to have these references because you can't just -- you don't know what's in these columns, I don't know what's in these columns, I have to go back myself and say what are other -- what's included in other activities, and there's a whole lot of very important things in there, and there's a whole lot of congressionally-directed programs that are in there.

It's a mixed bag but you have to know what's in there and it may be at too high an aggregate level to make you know, a very precise judgment because some of the things, you might say, are very important and other things within that category are not.

And that was what we were trying to test and this is what I call granularity, you know, how much detail are we going to ask you to try to evaluate.

But if you lump things too big, to, you know, grow, the advice you give is

going to be watered down and sort of meaningless.

If we ask you to get too specific,
then it's, you know, it's not something that - you are getting into the weeds of a program
or an activity, and I don't think that's
necessarily what you -- where you want to be
either.

You want to be some place, at some level of comfort where you can make your advice meaningful to the leadership.

MR. CATES: I just have to follow up on that comment. I appreciate us having the opportunity to do this. I mean over the years I have looked at our local office in Hawaii and I have been amazed at the growth and how big of an entity it is now, and it just -- it seems so inefficient.

I am constantly going my God, look at what this has got to be costing us. So I think there's huge room for being more efficient, just on our local levels, and then

1 save some money, I mean real money.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Randy.

3 Bill?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, like Randy, I've MR. DEWEY: come here on the committee I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the budget. Personally I think this tool is not going to provide us a lot of valuable input. I mean we have got a lot of diverse opinions, obviously, on the committee, and I am just not so sure that this exercise is going to produce result that is truly meaningful for NOAA personally. That is my own observation.

I think, harking back to what Eric said, I think there would be value in having further discussion about each of these columns in the programs, and then from this body, which is you know, a representative group of stakeholders, hearing back some of our philosophies on where we think within these programs might be the highest priorities to focus on, that you know, I would -- I think

through some discussion, whether it's webinar or here, you know, we could get to some agreement.

I know within aquaculture, I think, you know, in a few minutes, we could come to agreement on where that program should focus the resources they get.

And I suspect in each of these other categories, with the wealth of knowledge around the table, you could help, from a constituent standpoint, give NOAA some perspective of where we think the priorities are within those programs.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So what you are suggesting Bill, then, is that instead of using this tool to compile everybody's ideas, one, two, three, four, five, in a ranking, you want to rather talk about these issues now, and we have quite a bit of time because that first section is so efficiently dispatched, we could do that, and rather than trying to say this is how MAFAC feels as a whole, give Eric

the benefit of our discussion, and that in itself is valuable, and that could be a really good first step to take at this meeting.

And then further, to consider -and I'd like to hear from you on how deeply
you want us to delve if we do decide to do
kind of a webinar format and really get into
the nitty gritty of the budget, which I think
is a good idea, and that's what I have been
hearing from a lot of MAFAC members as long as
I have been sitting at this table, is that
they want to understand that better, and
participate in it more fully.

So I really think that that is a good recommendation personally, but I see that at this meeting, it would be valuable to do what Bill is suggesting rather than try to do the exercise, you know, sitting at the desk kind of thing. So I think that's personally a good way to approach it right now.

Randy and then Steve and then Richard.

1

2

3

MR. FISHER: I agree with what Bill and Randy were saying. I think, you know my experience of being here -- 15 years I have listened to the same discussion and after a

4

5

while it gets a little bit frustrating to tell

6

you the truth.

7

couple of thoughts, and that is I think there

But a couple of things, I have a

They do but this -- the devil's in

9

8

are some basic obligations that NMFS has and

10

they don't show up on this thing.

11

12

the detail. So the question I would have of

13

Eric is what is really useful to you because

14

you are already working on the 2014 budget in

15

putting something down 16 on those sorts of

17

things and I'd be curious to know what those

18

are, and when the cuts really do

reality, we already heard that, so somebody is

19

depending on what they are, do you really care

20

what we think? I mean that's the other thing,

21

because you are not going to have some

choices, but you do have some choices.

22

1

2

3

i

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

And what I worry about is not only is the federal government hurting, but the states are hurting maybe even worse, and some of the stuff you do is going to really affect every form of fisher and maybe we should have a big discussion that says are you going to protect things that ensure that fisheries can continue because that's really what your job is, or are you going to worry about aquaculture, or what are you really going to do, because that seems to me to be the big issue that I think people are kind of thinking about, because when you talk about core, what is core? You know, is core the fact that we have got to keep people fishing because it means money to the United States of America and we all should eat fish? Probably yes.

So I mean I think there are certain things that you can cut out that aren't core, but I guess my question is, are you going to let us play the game, and if so, what's the best way to do that in the real

1 world?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Because we could spend a lot of time talking about it here, and it goes nowhere. It never has.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Would you like to address that Eric?

MR. SCHWAAB: I would, I'm just trying to think about how. So, I think, you know, I would first suggest that while we have had some budget challenges in the past, and I recognize your point about sort of having these conversations over a period of 15 years, I think everybody would recognize that we are in a whole different place this time, and trying to figure out how we are going to continue to conduct core business with substantially less money this year than the year before, and potentially substantially less money the year after, is not a problem that we are going to solve by lopping off some extraneous programs.

So while -- and there's part of

me, you know, when you for example, Randy, say well you know, let's cut these things out.

Well, I'd love to hear what you guys think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

those things are.

And I don't mean that -- I don't mean that facetiously or sarcastically, I mean I mean that in a real way. But I don't -- I think this situation is not dissimilar to you know the national budget situation where there's this sort of you know, there's a scale of response that doesn't necessarily match up with the -- what we can cut, you know, say we cut the aquaculture program, well that's \$8 million. That doesn't really do anything for us in the big scheme of things. I'm not saying we shouldn't -- we might not at some point be in a place where we weigh the value of the aquaculture program at \$8 million against you know, some, a couple of surveys.

But that's not going to solve a \$100 million problem, and \$100 million problem means you know, we have really dramatic

reductions in you know, ship time, we have you know, we are cutting core staff that are dealing with, you know, with consultations that allow, you know, business activities to continue.

And so to me, I mean it's the right conversation to have, but it's really about you know, how we -- you know -- how we both sort of cut around the edges if you will, but then also sort of reposition in some core areas, because we are not just going to get there by cutting around the edges, and I don't know if that helps.

MR. FISHER: Well, yes, it helps - you know every \$8 million in the pile adds
up to something after a while, you know, it
really does.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, right. Right.

MR. FISHER: You know, what I'm concerned about are things like you know, the basic gathering information around the commercial fishery for instance. I mean, if

you cut \$100,000 out of my pie, then I am going to go down to the states and cut it out of their pie, well then there goes all the commercial data on the west coast, down the tubes.

So it's really about -- you know it's evaluation between \$100 or 100,000 that affects me, or \$8 million that affects him or whatever, but it all makes some difference, but some of it makes a bigger difference than others, and I think that's what we need to deal with.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So Randy, I would ask you, if you had to identify what you think the core, essential functions are, what would you say?

MR. FISHER: Well I think you could start with what runs a commercial fishery, I think that's pretty important.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So surveys,

MR. FISHER: Surveys, yes.

programs, and the question was asked by Julie and others, does that include habitat protection, does it include, you know, protected resources and so on. Maybe it does, but if you had to prioritize, maybe it doesn't.

You know, if you had to cut to nothing and then add on, you know, what you really needed, start from scratch, it may not include, you know, all of those things. It just depends on how much money you've got and how efficiently you use it, which I think is one of those things that Eric is concerned about. Is this helping? I think you know where a lot of us are coming from.

I have Steve Joner, and then Randy, and then somebody else --

MR. JONER: Heather, I'd like to answer the question that you just asked Randy, and it's the same answer, and that is when I think of the core program, I think of the stock assessment as probably core because that

1 really drives everything, everything on there.

If we don't know the status of these stocks, then everything else suffers.

And when Eric, you used your example of if management -- if we have across the board deductions, you know, we might have to cut out a couple of surveys, and I know you didn't mean that literally, but I think it's --

MR. JONER: Okay.

that literally.

MR. SCHWAAB: I mean we are already cutting back.

MR. SCHWAAB: Oh no, no I mean

MR. JONER: Okay, okay, I'm glad you put it like that because you know, I -- I am often frustrated by the inflexibility of the assessment, the survey and assessment folks, to take advantage of the fishing industry's offer to help, and you know, there has been some change in the northwest region, on the west coast, they have been a little bit more flexible and adaptive to incorporate the

1 fishermen.

But the problem I see -- and we see this with halibut as well -- we have got standardized methods, and we will not violate these standardized methods, you know, it's -- come on, who made the standardized methods?

You did. And they didn't come down on the tablets, like we saw the other day, you know.

(Laughter)

And the fishermen here, I hope, I hope you agree with what I'm saying, when we are told that well, we can't do it this way because it won't really tell us where the fish are.

Hey come on, the fishermen can catch a guy in a little rag-tag skiff and go out and catch a fish, so when we are told that well, it has to fit our standardized method, so change your standardized method.

And so rather than talking about cutting out two assessments, let's talk about changing the assessment methods and let's talk

1 about incorporating, being -- improvising.

You can still get the same answer with a different method. So I just -- you know to me again, the core is the assessments because that answers everything here as far as protected species, how that's going, habitat, all of that and we just need to really find a way to make sure that we don't drop any assessments.

We need to -- we need to change, maybe change the way they are done, not assessments but surveys --

MR. SCHWAAB: Surveys.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. JONER: The surveys, make sure they are all done.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Do you want to come in there?

MR. SCHWAAB: Well so for example, we have already, because another part of this, remember, is not just the NOAA fisheries budget, but OMAO which runs the ships.

And we have already seen a pretty dramatic reduction in our ship time and our response to that has been to prioritize the surveys that support the stock assessments over for example some of the, you know, the more system-oriented surveys, and frankly over some of the protected resource surveys.

So I think -- I mean that's been certainly a short-term reaction that has I think been along the lines of Steve, what you are suggesting.

But I also don't think that that is -- that's -- it might not even necessarily be sustainable even if we maintained that prioritization.

I also think in the big scheme of things, that prioritization has the potential to come back and bite us and has the potential to come back and bite fisheries, because you all know for example how quickly protected resource issues and predicted resource uncertainty can have an effect on fisheries,

that it might be in respects more dramatic than increased uncertainty.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Oh yes.

MR. SCHWAAB: And so you know, those are the challenges that we are struggling to balance in a dramatically declining budget environment, and so there aren't easy answers to this. Additional perspectives and insight help.

Ideas help. New approaches are certainly a big part of our thinking. But they can't -- they don't emerge overnight necessarily, and they don't transfer into sort of a scientifically-valid new assessment overnight either.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Can I ask a question Eric? What Steve said brought to mind the idea that many people have had in Alaska of participating -- of industry participating in surveys and participating in that process and paying for part of it, basically, saying you know we are going to

self-assess, we are going to tax ourselves in order to access the resource.

And I don't know if you have had any big conversations about that at your level, but in the regional sense, we have been doing quite a bit of that in Alaska.

The problem being, is that many science folks don't believe that the industry should be involved in that sort of stuff and so they are resisting it because they are worried about the credibility of the data that comes from industry-funded, industry, you know, cooperative ventures in that way. I don't know if you have had those conversations.

MR. SCHWAAB: So there are several parts to that.

18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. SCHWAAB: And the answer is

20 yes to all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. SCHWAAB: I mean, the -- you

know, the first place you look at, the first place you look is at the platform for an officially independent survey right?

And certainly you know, we utilized lots of different, you know, platforms including commercial vessels.

Then the second piece of that is you know, how do you factor differently fishery-dependent data into the assessment process.

And then the third piece is the piece -- the part about who pays, right? So if the you know, industry gets squeezed to the point where they say well wait a minute, you know, this uncertainty is bad business, and bad business to the point that we are willing to dedicate a, you know, a portion of the you know, of the value of the catch to getting, you know, a more precise assessment, thereby allowing us to set catch limits closer to you know, closer to alarm.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right.

MR. SCHWAAB: You know, I think, 1 2 you know, we have seen that happen in places, 3 I mean you know, research set-aside programs is a sort of -- an early example of that but I 4 5 could clearly see that kind of a discussion emerging probably. 6 7 CHAIR MCCARTY: Well, I think it 8 has to. 9 MR. SCHWAAB: Yes. 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: I think it has to. Not just in research, but even in restoration 11 12 for example. You know, habitat restoration. We talked a little bit about that. 13 14 The private industries who in the results of that could 15 interested 16 participate in doing it, and pay for it, and they are going to have to I think. 17 That's just my opinion. So thank you. That's good. 18 19 Randy Cates, Tony, Paul and Terry 20 is who I have. 21 MR. CATES: Α good very

I think this is quite valuable.

22

discussion.

So every business, every household has had to budget and make cuts.

The way I view this is it's quite simple: there are certain things that you invest in the future. Aquaculture I would categorize as it's an investment into the future.

In my office, I have a sign right above my desk, it says 40 percent into the future, and I put -- normally I put about 40 percent of my time and resources into the future, either looking at a new site for aquaculture, a new technology, whatever it is, a new business, and I have had to cut back on that.

So I will probably make my colleagues unhappy, but one of the first places I would cut is aquaculture, and I say that because I haven't been very happy with what I've seen the use of the money in the last 10 years. I think we have done a poor job.

And so unless the administration is going to be willing to change and invest into aquaculture that is going to promote jobs, I say cut it, and I have been very vocal about that for years, that the direction we are going has been the wrong direction.

We have been investing in satisfying environmental groups. We have not invested in creating a business or an industry and unless we are serious, let's pull back until times are better.

Having said that, if we identify
the core areas, which I agree on, what I have
heard so far, I really agree that that's what
needs to be protected, in those core areas we
have also got to be looking at making it more
efficient. It can't be just surveys are
important and then business as usual, go on,
it's how can you do the surveys more
efficiently and get the same results, knowing
that you are cutting other areas.

So it's never easy, but I put that

on the table. I think that if we are going to

be at this stage, then let's be serious about

it.

MR. SCHWAAB: I would just -- no,
I don't need to comment.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, we have Tony, Paul, Terry.

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you. I like the way the discussion has evolved and I think that -- and the best support we can give is to focus on outcomes and focus on what it is we would like to see coming out of the surveys in a reduced -- coming out of meaning what they produce in a reduced budget scenario.

I don't think we are the bestsuited folks to go dive into the NOAA budget
and say we should cut this program or that
program.

I think from the user perspective we should be able to offer advice on things that we would like to see continue being used. So I agree with Randy's fisheries observation,

that the stock assessment survey is important information --

2.0

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. CHATWIN: Right, but I was going to say that you might want to consider from the perspective of what keeps the fisheries operating and it did come around with Eric's comments to protected resources, but I think that's just as important.

Because if you value the council system and the opportunity for input on management that that offers, you don't want the Magnuson act to be subsumed by other acts that are out there.

So I think you do need to pay attention to protected resources and the cuts that have happened there already, are of concern, and I think it would be a good thing for MAFAC to comment on that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So you would then advocate for protected resources to be close to the core list, is that what you are saying?

DR. CHATWIN: On the core list.

CHAIR MCCARTY: On the core list.

And I missed what you said earlier because of the noise in the hall. Did you say you don't like the idea of MAFAC going into the line item sort of category?

DR. CHATWIN: Yes, I think -- you know I think to do that, a detailed NOAA budget is available. We can go into that and look at that and individuals around the table can look into that and come with recommendations they want.

I don't think it's a wise use of our time to do that, because the agency is the one that's best positioned to look across that budget and see where they can afford to have cuts.

I think it's important for the agency to hear from its constituents what are the services that they value the most, and then leave it up to the agency to figure out ways to provide those services in reduced

1 budget scenarios.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you very much. Jump in any time Eric, if you want to comment.

MR. SCHWAAB: Sure.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Paul.

MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you. Just thinking about fisheries that I'm involved in personally where I can see the agency save money, I'm involved in a halibut fishery in Alaska. Well this year, they got involved in the trawl rationalization.

We leased a trawl port -- it was pretty successful, and just looking at the data that has to occur to make these things successful, and the way they are going about it, you're talking about, I mean we have to have 100 percent -- in order to keep track of every species that we are responsible for.

And I just -- I don't think that's really true. I think they could -- I don't see the electronic equipment that can observe

us in integrated fashion, I mean -- I talked to a gentleman here the other day, and I'm sorry I don't remember his name, and he said there was a little pilot program going up north, but he didn't sound very enthusiastic about it.

And I was just thinking you know, in Canada they have already implemented these things and I think you can -- with a mix of observer coverage -- because in the old days, I mean, I was an observer back in the '70s, 10 percent was -- I mean we covered an entire foreign fleet with 10 percent.

I'm not saying it was completely successful, but you know, between a mix of onboard cameras, BMS and some percentage of observer coverage, I think you know, you can gain some real savings, I mean, in the cost of training these observers, in the cost of managing the program. It just seems to me that's kind of a real low-hanging fruit, I know, a little bit of investment there is

1 going to pay off.

And I don't see a lot of enthusiasm for that, but I -- and I have a hard time understanding why there isn't more rapid adoption of what's been successful in Canada.

The other thing is we are being charged three percent for data -- well, for the management of our IFQ fisheries up north, and every year we have been getting back about 1.4 to 1.5 percent, almost half of it.

And so you know the guys have been pretty, really kind of bought into that because you know, it's nice, to actually get the check back at the end of the year and they go hey, you know, they didn't waste this money.

I mean we all expected, three percent, they are going to take that and next year it's going to be six, and so we have been pretty happy that it's you know, they are being responsible with the money, and there's

not even really any talk, I mean I think if fishermen want to have a successful data collection, a successful program, they should buy into it a little bit, I mean, they should -- some of that should come off.

And you know, I'm not suggesting anything too radical, but the combination of the things, you know, it should be -- you should be able to make some savings.

And then the other thing is, is the Halibut Commission, I think is one of the most successful organizations collecting data out there, and if you watch the way they operate, you know, they do a lot of shorebased observing, you know, where they are at the fort, they measure the fish there, they take the species composition out of the catch, they, you know, they do their collection.

And then they do a combination where they -- they charter industry boats, and I know we do that in the sablefish fishery, there's a couple of cooperative trawl surveys

1 that go on every year.

But those surveys are really narrow in their scope in that they hit their grids, and it's important. But I just think there's a real -- enough -- you know we are collecting this detailed data on the boat, I mean we have observers on the boat.

And we fill out these logbooks and not much is done with that information. I mean, I've asked, you know, what do you do with that?

Well really it's only used for enforcement. I mean if they suspect somebody is poaching and they look at their logbook and see if there's some kind of you know, discrepancy.

But I really think you know, especially if you've got a camera on the boat, you know, you operate like you do in Canada, now all of a sudden that logbook becomes very valuable for fishing data and you have every boat in the fleet collecting good quality

1 data.

So I guess, that's -- I just think
I see -- I don't understand why we are not
adopting this book.

MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you. So I can make a couple of comments there. You know we are, and whether it's fast enough or not I guess is debatable, you know, pushing hard on some of these electronic monitoring options.

I mean they run the gamut right, from just simply 100 retention dockside monitoring and the cameras are used as essentially a big brother to you know, for enforcement purposes, to you know, the range of you know, where you are actually using sort of cameras and other technologies to measure fish, and to procure you know, more robust data.

That's the place where I think we are having sort of the biggest challenges in sort of crossing the threshold to utility. We are actually going up to archipelago in

November -- the 14 ? I thought it was the following week.

MR. CLAMPITT: Maybe still it is,

yes, the 23.

MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you. You scared me there for a minute. And I am going personally because you know, we want to look at you know we keep hearing about this sort of, you know, what they are doing in Canada, and we want to sort of match up the sort of the reality with the rhetoric, and get a sense of you know, whether we are pushing fast enough.

And so we are going to do a trip
up there for that purpose, in addition to a
lot of the other things that are going on,
like the pilot project in New England which I
don't happen to view as a little pilot
project. It's a substantial pilot project and
it's an important one.

But you know, the last thing I would say, just about the 100 percent, I mean

my recollection is that the 100 percent observer coverage dictated for the trawl IQ was a council decision, not necessarily something that the agency dictated or pushed.

MR. CLAMPITT: That's right and they only went to 20 percent, and 10 percent on the long lines, and if it's a fight between the long line fleet and the trawl fleet, you've got 100 percent on the trawl.

MR. SCHWAAB: Okay. So just so that you know, we'll own the ones we own, but you know sometimes it's not just us.

MR. CLAMPITT: I think we have a new reality.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, 100 percent coverage in the Alaska fisheries that have rationalized is demanded by the council process, almost always, and in some cases 200 percent, and that's the price people pay for having the rights to those fish. That's the way it's looked at in a sense, you know, that's kind of the tradeoff.

You are going to have the rights to the fish, then we are going to watch everything you do, and that's the way it's being discussed at the council.

MR. SCHWAAB: And I do think that this is going to be an area where -- this sort of, this whole box is an area where we are all -- the agency, the councils, the fishermen -- are going to spend a lot of time thinking about and talking about cost benefits in the coming years because of the pressure.

CHAIR MCCARTY: But you still agree that observers is kind of a core issue, no? I am assuming.

MR. CLAMPITT: I think we can observe the fleet more efficiently.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. SCHWAAB: I don't doubt that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, I was just going to say, to your IPHC model, you know, the IPHC is a successful model, you know how they get a lot of their money?

Page 111 1 MR. CLAMPITT: Yes, they sell the 2 fish. 3 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. They catch the halibut and they sell it, and they make 4 5 millions and millions of dollars off their own 6 managed resource, and that's how they fund 7 their programs. that's a 8 So model t.hat. is 9 established in the halibut fishery. I'm not so sure that it would work in the fisheries 10 that you are talking about but it is a model. 11 12 So -- is it? Okay. That's one 13 place mentioned. 14 MR. SCHWAAB: I'm going to step 15 out. 16 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Terry and 17 then Keith and whoever else. 18 MR. ALEXANDER: Just a general 19 thing, now that Paul mentioned it, I have been

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

efficient way to count fish. They weigh it on

up there, seen it work, and it's a really

the fixed gear boats. So far they haven't

20

21

22

been able to figure out how to do it on their trawl boats, but their fixed gear boats, yes.

We did this industry-based cod survey -- I'm kind of agreeing with what Steve said -- about letting the boats do the survey work.

We did the industry-based cod survey. We put 800 buoys in over four years.

We had chief scientists on the boat.

There was always -- it wasn't NMFS staff but it was the state of Massachusetts staff, or independent scientists on board each vessel.

And when we got done with that four years of data, really good data collected, it still wasn't allowed to be used in the models and stuff, and I didn't understand it, because you know, we had perfectly qualified people there counting the fish, and they did use the yellowtail, they did a yellowtail survey too, and they -- I believe they used that into the model there,

1 you know. Dave?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 MR. WALLACE: I'm sorry?

3 MR. ALEXANDER: The yellowtail 4 industry-based survey, did they use that in

5 the model, the assessments?

MR. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes. But they wouldn't use cod data. So I mean they kind of cherry-picked it, and I didn't quite understand it. So that sort of makes me nervous about wasting our money on industry-based boats. And I'm one of the guys that did it, so --

CHAIR MCCARTY: It goes to that credibility issue.

MR. ALEXANDER: Right.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And the acceptance by the establishment. Thank you. Keith.

MR. RIZZARDI: I guess three observations. The first big one is echoing a point that Bill made earlier, we are all stakeholders so everybody here is asserting

their self-interest and self-preservation and their bias.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

You know so of course then my next point is some of my bias is legal in nature. I look at that first line on this chart, to what degree is a program required, and you get into it statutorily the whole analysis of is compelled, is it a statutory maybe which then leads you to think that hey, you need to make budget discussion coincide with this legislative strategy, because it may be in some instances that you have a mandate that can be modified to be less of a mandate, and you may be able to ease the limitations and not have the trap where you have to do something that maybe you don't think is a priority and you'd rather have more funds for something else. So there needs to be some thought given to how the budget debate fits with the legislative angles.

And then we have been talking a lot about the programs approach, but I'd also

need for a species by species approach. You know, on a protected resources issue, you might say that one population of salmon is critically endangered, but another one is really not, and maybe you don't need to dedicate as much effort to a different -- to one species versus another.

Now that requires you to drill down at a whole different level of the budget, and it also requires some easing on the legislation, all right? But there does need to be some assessment of is this an acute need, or is this a moderate need, and that's in here at the program level, but my point is it needs to be at the species level as well.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So, does that go for like protected marine mammals as well as for fish species?

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes, I mean I even think it would apply in fisheries. You may decide that in some fisheries, you know, some

populations can get by with a lot less regulation than others, you know, and that requires some careful thought, but it's sort of an extra layer on top of the analysis that's already taking place.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Can I ask a question then? How do you feel about the issue in number two there, about going into the webinar process in the next few weeks and going into the more detailed budget?

MR. RIZZARDI: I like it.

CHAIR MCCARTY: You like it?

MR. RIZZARDI: I think if we are really going to engage in this process, I think we should have a webinar, I think we should have access to NOAA staff who can educate us on it. I think this exercise would be very hard for MAFAC. I don't think we have the knowledge to really do this at the level that staff could do it. But it might be a good discussion starter for us, and if we are in that webinar context with staff walking us

1 through, I think it could be helpful.

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: That was the plan.

That's what we talked about, having staff

4 there and getting into the detail from them.

5 MR. RIZZARDI: I'd also note if we

6 are going to do that, it would be nice if we

th

7 could do it before December 8 , that way we

would have the value of all the long-time

9 members --

8

10 CHAIR MCCARTY: That's the plan.

11 MR. RIZZARDI: still --

MR. DYSKOW: You're getting right

13 back to where we started.

MR. RIZZARDI: Okay.

15 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, that's the

16 plan.

MR. DYSKOW: I'm interrupting.

18 CHAIR MCCARTY: No that's okay. I

19 have got Dave over here, but you go ahead.

MR. DYSKOW: The purpose of this,

21 if we don't have all the necessary

22 qualifications, we still have your

preferences, and I think that's what's important and what we have been asked for isn't to evaluate NMFS's budget form an internal perspective with all that information, but externally what do we think?

And most of the discussion comes right back to where we are with this motion, do we want to recommend that NMFS protect the core programs that are required to efficiently assess, manage and sustain fisheries? Is that what we want their core activity to be? And at some point Madam Chair, we either need to vote on that motion or withdraw that motion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, I agree, and nobody actually made the motion yet. So -- but if you would like to, I would entertain that.

MR. DYSKOW: Since we have other things to discuss, I would like to move that as budgets are addressed within NMFS, MAFAC recommends that NMFS protect the core programs that are required to efficiently assess,

manage and sustain fisheries, that that is our core area of focus. It's broad but nonetheless that's where the committee is and we would like to ask the question of the full MAFAC committee.

CHAIR MCCARTY: All right, and second -- it's been moved and seconded. Now we will discuss that. If you want to speak to it more you can right now, but I want to go to Dave because he had his hand raised earlier.

But if you have any more --

MR. DYSKOW: I didn't mean to

interrupt your process. I'm sorry.

14 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Dave?

MR. WALLACE: Well, I guess we

16 have a motion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

17 CHAIR MCCARTY: We do.

MR. WALLACE: So, and I think that

19 I just seconded it.

20 CHAIR MCCARTY: Several people did.

MR. WALLACE: But all I was going

22 to say is I know a little bit about NOAA's

budget. I've been paying attention to it for
years.

I couldn't tell you a thing.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. WALLACE: If I spent a huge amount of time -- Julie is over here looking at it right now in the detail, right? But you just have to be careful, and Eric pointed that out, you cut one thing and you get an unintended consequence over somewhere else and you say well I didn't realize that was an effect. And the NMFS staff understands all this minutia and asking us to understand that on the fly is just going to give them a bunch of useless information in my opinion.

Do I -- I don't have any problems with the motion. That's pretty straightforward you know, because the law requires them to deal with the core issues and you know, so we are going to have to deal with fisheries management, we are going to have to -- that depends then on very good science and

assessment and an analysis of that, and then you get into the other mandates you know, Endangered Species Act, marine mammal protection act, all the protected species, but they all influence fisheries in one way or the other. And so you know, this would be like voting against motherhood, but it's still not -- it's going to happen no matter whether we make a motion and pass it or not. So you know, so I call the question -- let's vote on it and move forward because we have a lot of things to do.

CHAIR MCCARTY: We have until 10:45 and I'm going to allow it to go until then. So if you don't mind. There are several people that we haven't heard from. I think we are still speaking to the motion in the broad context so I think it's appropriate that we do that by additional comments.

If for example people want to list, at risk of not making it easy, we could list the core functions that we have been

motion to include those, so that people know without having had the benefit of this discussion what we are talking about as a group when we say core functions. We could do that and I can't make a motion or I would. So if others feel that that's important to do, I would entertain an amendment to that effect.

Was Julie first or was it Bill?

MS. MORRIS: Bill was first.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Bill and then Julie.

MR. DEWEY: Well, just speaking to the motion, I agree with Dave, I mean this is motherhood and apple pie. It's pretty much a no-brainer. I don't know how helpful it is to NOAA, but I would agree. It's not a bad statement for NOAA to make in support of it and so I would agree that we should move this motion, and I have another one I'd like to put on the floor for consideration after we have done that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, how do you feel Bill about additional information as part of this motion, so that there's some capturing of this group's feelings about what the core programs and functions are?

MR. DEWEY: Well, I mean I spoke to that earlier. I think in response to Eric's query, I think that that's a place MAFAC should go, you know, and spend some time on these -- each of these columns and let us as constituents share our thoughts on it. I don't know if we can come to consensus around them, but even just capturing some of the discussion might be valuable for NOAA.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I've been trying to capture the discussion as we went. Julie.

MS. MORRIS: I think the way this is structured, we can all project our own meaning onto it. So I don't think we need to go into discussion that would delineate whether protected species are part of a core program or not. My concern about the motion,

I just want to clarify, the word protect as
the verb kind of suggests that we want
everything to stay the same, and I think what
we want is greater efficiency in terms of data
collection and timeliness, and we are always
pushing for more efficient and better
processes in these core programs and I would
hate for this to be interpreted otherwise.

MR. DYSKOW: We can amend it to say focus on instead of protect.

MS. MORRIS: Or prioritize or something like that.

MR. DYSKOW: Focus on it I think would be a way of doing that, because we don't know what the budget number is and our intent is not to protect the current budget, but to focus on those core areas.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Julie do you want to propose an amendment to this?

MS. MORRIS: I think that Bill has a suggestion a response that's fine with me, so you could do it as a friendly amendment.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay and what is

exactly the wording that you are suggesting?

MS. MORRIS: Focus on, instead of

protect.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, is that a

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, is that a friendly amendment Phil?

MR. DYSKOW: I'm sorry?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is that a friendly amendment? That's a friendly amendment?

MR. DYSKOW: Well, it's sort of a point of order. We have a motion and a second on the floor. Do we vote on that or -- because we didn't have the discussion period, we could amend it to use a different term as opposed to protect.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Well, the rules of order that I follow, the motion is on the floor, it's been seconded. We are discussing it and someone is proposing an amendment. But if you take it as a friendly amendment, then we don't have to go through the voting process. Because you made the original

motion, if you agree to what she suggests, as
a friendly amendment, then you say I take that
as a friendly amendment and we don't have to
vote on current language.

MR. DYSKOW: Well if we change protect to focus, I take that as a friendly amendment.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks. Did you have a comment Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: Yes, I just don't want us to be saying something we don't mean.

And it can be read that as you reduce your budget's focus on these core programs to reduce the budget. That's kind of -- I just want us to be very clear on what we mean, okay?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Can you suggest some language that might make that more clear?

MS. MORRIS: Well, my suggestion was prioritize --

22 CHAIR MCCARTY: Well.

1 MR. DYSKOW: Well, I think that 2 would be certainly -- that would solve both of 3 your issues. CHAIR MCCARTY: So I take it that 4 5 you are open to a friendly amendment of the 6 language to read what exactly? 7 MR. DYSKOW: To do what? 8 CHAIR MCCARTY: You are okay with 9 friendly amendments to clarify the language 10 and I would like to note what that clarifying language is. 11 12 MR. DYSKOW: Well, if we can agree 13 on prioritize, that certainly preserves the 14 intent of the motion. 15 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, thank you. 16 Tony, does that deal with your issue? 17 DR. CHATWIN: Yes, I think so. It's our issue. Should we be recommending 18 19 something that we are trying to -- the 20 opposite of what we said. 21 CHAIR MCCARTY: But you're okay

22

with that?

1 adequate funding.

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: Switch those, 3 switch adequate and maintain.

MR. DYSKOW: Move adequate.

a multiply-amended motion by friendly amendment. Is there further discussion on this motion?

PARTICIPANT: I can't hear you.

10 CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there further
11 discussion on this motion or any further

13 If not, we will vote. All in

amendments to be brought forward?

14 favor of this motion please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

16 CHAIR MCCARTY: All opposed?

17 (No response)

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, the motion

19 passes with no opposition. Thank you.

20 As far as what else we may
21 accomplish here to help Eric, I think I am
22 going to ask him if capturing the discussion

that we have had in writing would be an adequate outcome for you. We decided apparently that we are not going to add any more language to this to describe what we believe the core programs might be by name, for a variety of reasons which I am fine with.

I would as I said earlier, probably do that but nobody has come forward with that. So what we have is a list that I have been keeping and I'm sure the minutes will reflect what some of us have agreed the core programs might be, as well as some of these other suggestions for efficiencies and for collaborative work with industry and so on and so forth. I just gave you what I have got on my list and if people want to argue with it, we don't have time.

MR. DYSKOW: We have one more committee motion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes we do, and

Bill also has another motion. I think we will

go to him first. I have leverage other

agencies and industry, and then I have research, surveys, data collection, address the business model and seek efficiencies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And then I've got a long list of things under that that are my personal observations, things like travel and training and what we spend on councils and all of those things, because it's a lot of money. And then I've got identify core programs and I've got under that stock assessment and surveys, fisheries management, observers, VMS, electronic monitoring, council process and protected resources.

That's what I have on my list as trying to capture -- I don't think we reached any kind of consensus on whether aquaculture was on that list, though I heard some people say yes and some people say no.

And then, you missed something that Keith said, which --

MR. SCHWAAB: He was just whispering it to me.

1

2

3

4 5

б

7

8

10

11

12

with that?

Bill.

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: I thought he might be, and I think it's really valuable, the idea of what is mandated and whether a legislative strategy could be approached to ease those mandates in some of those areas. I think that is extremely important, and he also talked about a species by species approach in addition to a programmatic approach to seeking whatever you need to cut or do or focus on. So that's what's on my list, and I think that's kind of capturing it. Are you okay

MR. DEWEY: So, this may not be in if people are just comfortable with order forwarding our notes from discussion, but one of the points that you mentioned earlier, Heather, I picked up on, is a thought that has been going through my mind as well, and so I was going to propose a motion that would read: MAFAC recommends that NOAA fully explore options to encourage private investment, in parentheses, in kind, in cash, in

MR. RIZZARDI: Your goal is to

22

1 | flesh out the list of core --

MR. DEWEY: Not necessarily and I said that options should include but not be limited to. I mean other people here may have some great ideas to add to the list or disagree with my ideas. I just threw them out there, so --

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think more than the core programs, you are identifying opportunities for collaboration on covering costs of some of the important functions.

MR. DEWEY: That's what I was trying to --

CHAIR MCCARTY: I like the idea of putting in a motion form. That would be my opinion. I think that's much more helpful.

Keith. It hasn't been seconded,

MR. RIZZARDI: I understand. I

think I like the idea of going here, I'm just

I l'm considering the timing of where we are

right now, and I'm thinking about if we are

going to have the teleconference and the budget discussion.

I'd like to see that kind of language evolve out of the budget discussion. So after we have been through the exercise of, as a group, drilling into this a little bit more and chewing on it, I think we have had a big discussion and I think it's 10:45 and I think if we really start down this path it's going to be a lot longer, with people tacking on their bullet items.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Well I guess I have to disagree with that, but it hasn't been seconded, so could you read it again Bill?

MR. DEWEY: So MAFAC recommends that NOAA fully explore options to encourage private investment, in parentheses, in kind, in cash, in conservation, resource assessment and management and research.

Options should include but not be limited to payments for ecosystem services, resource assessments to enhance stock

assessments, increased use of commercial vessels for stock assessments, in lieu fee, wetland, estuary restoration.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second for the motion?

DR. CHATWIN: I'll second it.

CHAIR MCCARTY: The motion's been made and seconded. If, like Keith fears, this is going to be a long discussion, we don't have time for a long discussion. I think it's pretty self-evident that this is a good thing to explore, but that's just my own opinion.

That's my comment on it. Eric?

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, so I actually think this sort of the flip-side of cutting and what I read this as -- and I think it's an important statement -- which is that you will have to look at other business models that leverage resources from other places and not get into an exhaustive list, but these are illustrative of the kinds of -- and I think it's a valuable statement to have on the

1 table.

2.0

CHAIR MCCARTY: I'm glad you think that. I do too. Bill.

MR. DEWEY: I just want to respond to Keith's recommendation, in that I see this a little bit differently than the discussion of each of these areas and what priorities are within them. This is over and above that.

This is a recommendation, like Eric suggested, kind of a different business model here, to be thinking outside the box for other ways to get your work done.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I agree. I think it's more of a policy-type discussion rather than a detailed budget discussion. It's a direction to go.

MR. RIZZARDI: Okay.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there any further discussion on this? Keith.

MR. RIZZARDI: Well, if that's -if this is the path we want to go down, how
about things like increased reliance on

1 private research monitoring and data? There's 2 lots of organizations out there that are doing work in these arenas. Should be we reducing 3 how much NOAA is generating and being more 4 reliant upon private sector data and maybe 5 6 paying for that private sector data, where it 7 will still be less money than what NOAA is 8 expending on the cost of their own to look at 9 the program. 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: Maybe. Maybe that could be part of the investigation. 11 12 MR. DEWEY: I think it's worth adding to the list. 13 14 CHAIR MCCARTY: Absolutely. Go 15 ahead and add it. 16 MR. RIZZARDI: Increased reliance 17 on private research monitoring and data. 18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Did you get that 19 Anything further? If not, all in favor Josh? 20 of this motion, please say aye. 21 (Chorus of ayes) 22 CHAIR MCCARTY: All opposed.

Thank

1

(No response)

2

3

CHAIR MCCARTY: It passes.

Let's go to the second part of our you.

4 report.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DYSKOW: We have one other area that the budget committee was tasked to address and that was the National Ocean Policy and the position of MAFAC. We have done a lengthy critique of the draft via audioconference, and during the session Ι believe it was Tuesday morning, we were asked additional and encouraged to generate comments, and there was a vehicle for doing I think we got an email address where we could address individual comments.

The committee had one comment we wanted to make after the presentation. we recognized is when we looked at the implementation of the National Ocean Policy, many stakeholder groups have already hit the ground running and they have massive resources and they are intimately involved in the

process, be they oil exploration organizations, be they natural gas, there are elements that are already deeply entrenched in the implementation of National Ocean Policy and are carving out their turf.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Our champion to represent fishing interests in the NOP development and implementation process is Eric. We don't have any other skin in the game as fishermen. what we recommended is that -- I wish you'd get back to where we started -- so what we proposed is that it is the intention and belief -- as an addendum to our comments -- it is an intention and belief of MAFAC that NOAA will act throughout this very challenging implementation process as a vigorous champion of the interests of fishermen, and we identify fishermen in the broadest sense.

In other words we want NMFS's position to be very clearly within the rollout of the National Ocean Policy to be champions of fishing interests, that we don't get shoved

aside by these very powerful oil interests or natural gas interests or wind farm interests or anything else.

We don't have skin in the game individually. Our skin in the game is through NMFS and through Eric, who sits in a powerful position, and we want him to champion fishing interests and I would classify fishing in its broadest context.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Would you like to make that motion?

MR. DYSKOW: I will make that motion, but then we can have discussion on the motion --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. You are making the motion. Is there a second?

MR. FISHER: I second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: The motion has been made and seconded. Discussion. Tony,
Bill, Tom. Sorry? I'm sorry. Julie and
Patty.

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you. I am a

supporter of the motion but I want some clarification. If we are intending the NOAA team and Eric, we probably should say NMFS.

MR. DYSKOW: Right, we would mean NMFS.

DR. CHATWIN: Okay, and I was just curious to learn more about whether you had a discussion of what you mean by a vigorous champion. And again, I like the language, it's just --

MR. DYSKOW: This is almost going to go forward as the Oklahoma land rush or the California gold rush as various elements carve out their piece of the National Ocean Policy. We want a champion to make sure that fishing, whether it be commercial, whether it be recreational, whether it be other forms of aquaculture, although that is addressed separately in the NOP, don't get pushed aside.

And where this enters into the discussion, is a wind farm area going to be exclusive to wind farms and prohibitive of

fishing? If you look at some of the charts we were shown, a lot of that turf that is being contemplated for these other activities is turf currently being used by commercial fishermen or recreational fishermen. How is this all going to be carved out? And right now we don't have skin in the game individually. We have that skin in the game through NMFS, and we want them to vigorously champion fishermen, not these other interests, because that's the only method and vehicle we have.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And I think you know, Eric mentioned it could be NOAA and NMFS, I mean it could be both, both, NOAA and NMFS.

MR. SCHWAAB: I don't think that you would find any objection at the NOAA level to taking on that role.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, so that was Tony. We have got Bill, Tom, Julie, Patty, Keith.

1 MR. DEWEY: Madam Chair I would 2 like to offer a simplified substitute motion. CHAIR MCCARTY: Go ahead. 3 That would read MAFAC 4 MR. DEWEY: 5 recommends that NOAA/NMFS champion the 6 of fishermen aquaculture interests and 7 throughout the NOP implementation process. 8 CHAIR MCCARTY: That's not just 9 simplified. You added stuff. 10 MR. DYSKOW: Our assumption was that aquaculture was addressed in the National 11 12 Ocean Policy Act in different areas, where fishing is less defined. 13 14 MR. DEWEY: Or not at all. 15 MR. DYSKOW: It is mentioned, 16 twice, I was told, but it isn't defined to the 17 aquaculture is and frankly we extent that 18 can't attach aquaculture to everything. 19 risk we have here is that fishermen's rights 20 are not being addressed adequately and we want 21 to make sure that fishermen's rights are.

I got that.

So I

CHAIR MCCARTY:

22

seconded. Now the way I approach substitute

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been made and

21

22

motions is that if this passes, it's not an amendment. It carries the whole thing. We don't go back and look at the original motion again.

That's -- is that acceptable to people?

MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, are you saying there's no more discussion?

what I said. I said that if the substitute motion carries, then it carries the original motion too, that's all, unless somebody else thinks of it differently. I know different bodies follow different processes, so -- Tony you are frowning.

DR. CHATWIN: I don't have a poker face. I'm just trying to understand, so once we pass the motion to -- if the motion to substitute passes, then we'll have to take a second vote to --

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: No. No. Carries 22 the original vote in other words it substitutes for the original motion so the original motion goes away. If the substitute motion does not pass, then we go back to the original motion. That's the process that is familiar to me. Patty, do you have a question on process?

MS. DOERR: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MS. DOERR: So does the original motion include one, two and three or just number one?

CHAIR MCCARTY: No, it's just one, just the underlined portion. The others are just discussion points that we had during our meeting. Do you have a process question Andy?

MR. CATES: Did we have discussion on the second motion or the first motion?

CHAIR MCCARTY: We have now, since it's on the floor, discussion on the substitute motion and then we will take a vote on the substitute motion. The substitute motion can also be amended.

1 MR. CATES: I raised my hand for 2 discussion. 3 CHAIR MCCARTY: Discussion, go think, since we 4 ahead. Well I have 5 substitute motion on the table, the other 6 people who wanted to speak, unless they are 7 speaking to the substitute motion, would be 8 superseded by the people that were speaking to the substitute motion. So that would be you, 9 10 I quess. Unless Tom, Julie, Patty and Keith 11 12 want to speak to the substitute motion. Do 13 you? 14 Tom, do you want to speak to the 15 substitute motion? 16 MR. RAFTICAN: No, actually Keith 17 answered my question. 18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Julie, do 19 you want to speak to the substitute motion? 20 MORRIS: comment would MS. My 21 address either motion. 22 CHAIR MCCARTY: I didn't hear you,

1 I'm sorry.

MS. MORRIS: My comment would be germane to either this motion or --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Go ahead then. Go ahead.

MR. DYSKOW: I'm sorry we can't hear you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: She said her comment is germane to either one, so I've asked you to make your comment.

MS. MORRIS: Oh, okay. Well I am new enough on MAFAC that I remember what our charge is. And our charge is to advise the Department of Commerce on all living marine resource matters. And so this motion, whether it's Bill's or Phil's, focuses specifically on fishermen, and I would be more comfortable if it embraced our entire charge, which is all living marine resource matters.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think that's a very legitimate comment and I would ask that if you feel that way, that you might make an

1 amendment to the language.

MS. MORRIS: I can't amend a substitute motion until the substitute motion has become the main motion.

MR. RIZZARDI: But he could accept it as friendly.

MS. MORRIS: He could accept as friendly that we include the interests of living marine resources, especially fishermen and aquaculture.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So your friendly amendment suggestion would be champion the interests of living marine resources, especially fishermen -- where did it go -- I think you can amend the substitute motion because once it passes you can't go back, so Randy, can you help us with this, Randy Fisher, do you know? Do you know?

MR. FISHER: No.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, sorry.

MR. DYSKOW: Tony's got a point of

22 order --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Let's get this on 1 2 the board so we can see it. MR. DYSKOW: Just to, while they 3 4 are doing that, we would have to approve as a 5 friendly modification Bill's comment, and I 6 think I would do that, and also Julie's if 7 that would speed things up. I think they are 8 both good amendments. That phrase at the end. 9 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, that's --10 MR. RIZZARDI: Interests of 11 fishermen, aquaculture and living marine 12 resources. 13 Josh, can you move that clause at 14 the end? Living marine resources comes at the end of -- so it's fishermen and aquaculture 15 16 and living marine resources. 17 PARTICIPANT: Fisherman comma 18 aquaculture and other marine resources. 19 MR. DYSKOW: And Julie I think you 20 said especially fishermen then aquaculture. 21 MS. MORRIS: That's what I said,

but Keith just made a different grammatical

22

1 suggestion, which is fine.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 MR. DYSKOW: I liked your original one better.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Keith you're on the list.

MR. DYSKOW: I think the intent of the original motion was that there are other interests that are perhaps looking after some of these other elements, but fishermen are particularly under-represented in the process, so we wanted to charge NMFS and NOAA specifically with looking out for the fishermen. interests of But we have no objection to them looking out for other interests as well. Obviously that's a better motion. But I do think we want to maintain your earlier suggestion about emphasis fishermen and I guess aquaculture.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, here's what we are going to do. We are going to not have people speak out of order. Number one. So, that will make this a lot easier. But if you

want to do an amendment to a substitute motion, we can vote on it and this is the language that Julie has accepted, right? And Bill has accepted.

5 MS. MORRIS: He accepted as a 6 friendly.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right, I understand, so we don't need to vote on it if he's accepted it as a friendly. You can vote against the motion, the substitute motion, Phil, if you would like to do so.

Keith, you're up for a comment.

MR. RIZZARDI: I like the second motion, the substitute motion with the changes. I like the fact that fishermen come first in the list, which I think helps make Phil's point, that we are trying to emphasize the fishermen and the duty to the fishermen. I also prefer the second motion to the first because I am a little uncomfortable with the stridency of the language in the first motion.

Thank you.

I have

CHAIR MCCARTY:

1 Randy and then I have Martin.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Thank you. MR. CATES: I have a comment and a question. The comment is you know, throughout MAFAC, in my time on here, fishermen and aquaculture is really blended to one thing. I mean we kind of are supporting each other in many ways. An example of that is aquaculture is defined under Magnuson-Stevens Act as fishing. It's been incorporated and that's been evident in Hawaii with a recent offshore permit. So I would have been fine with the original amendment. I'm fine with the second and I'm fine with the third. To me it's all the same thing.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yay, thank you Randy.

MR. CATES: The question I have would be for Eric. Since we are asking you to represent our interests, are you comfortable with that, in any of those aspects?

I mean I don't like telling
somebody to --

1 SCHWAAB: Absolutely. MR. On 2 behalf of NMFS as well as NOAA, I think we will happily take up this cause and this 3 4 charge. 5 MR. CATES: And I only ask that -you should never ask somebody to stand up for 6 7 you unless they are willing to, so thank you. 8 CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks for asking 9 that question. MR. SCHWAAB: And I hope we have 10 done that so far, but we'll keep at it. 11 12 You've done CHAIR MCCARTY: 13 great job. Martin. 14 MR. FISHER: I'd like to call the question. 15 16 CHAIR MCCARTY: I think it's 17 appropriate. 18 MR. CATES: Second on that. 19 CHAIR MCCARTY: So all in favor of 20 the substitute motion, which reads: MAFAC 21 recommends that NOAA/NMFS champion the 22 interests of fishermen, aquaculture and living

CHAIR MCCARTY: We are now going
to have a report from the protected resources
subcommittee.

MR. RIZZARDI: Do you want to go back on the --

6 CHAIR MCCARTY: Pardon?

7 MR. RIZZARDI: Do you want to go

8 back on the webinar item?

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: You can bring that up. Keith has brought it to my attention that we did not actually agree on the process going forward as to whether we wanted to do a webinar, and such, and he's correct. We took a break instead and Keith, if you'd like to address that, that would be great.

MR. RIZZARDI: I was looking at the grid that NOAA's staff has been working with, and for us it would mean a 10x7, 70-item grid that we would be evaluating.

I am a little concerned that this might exceed our capacity as a body. It's a level of detail that's pretty tough for us.

That said, we could try to work our way through it, use it to gauge where there's some consensus and where there's some sharp disagreement and then use it to steer our the talking points.

Or the other opportunity is we could take this document and try to trim it down a little bit, maybe eliminate some of the questions and figure out how to use it.

The bottom line is we need to figure out what tool we are going to use to steer ourselves through a webinar if we are going to do one.

And I wanted to open up a little bit of a conversation on that. My suggestion is we try to take this document, trim it back a little bit, maybe knock off a few of the questions and then just give it a shot.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Would that mean you are volunteering?

MR. RIZZARDI: I'm willing to work with staff and try to do that, yes.

1 CHAIR MCCARTY: So what Keith is 2 saying is he things there's value in having a webinar as 3 sort of proposed from the we subcommittee, but that he believes that this 4 5 particular makeup has too much complexity and 6 he is volunteering to simplify it in some way 7 and propose that we use a slightly different 8 format, and would work with staff, probably 9 both MAFAC staff and budget staff, to do that. 10 That's the proposal. Is that 11 right? 12 I'm volunteering MR. RIZZARDI: unless somebody else is willing to do it. 13 14 CHAIR MCCARTY: And you may need 15 help too, so let's just discuss that very briefly. And let's do try to keep it brief 16 because frankly I let that other discussion go 17 18 on pretty long. 19 So I thought it was useful while 20 Eric was here to do that, but -- Bill, do you 21 have a comment? 22 MR. DEWEY: I'd just reiterate

what I said before. I am not sure there's

value in trying to keep up with a number in

each of these categories, even if you reduce

the list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

You know I think there's more value personally in taking each of columns and having a discussion you know, and drill down a little bit into the budgets in those and what the programs are within those, and then you know if there's -- each of us has individual opinions or experiences that we are aware of things that are a waste or opinions on what should be focused on, that that just come out in a narrative discussion under each of those, so that they get hopefully some meaningful input from stakeholders, you know, on expenditures in each of those different columns.

I'm just concerned that we are not going to come up with a meaningful numeric ranking that's going to have any value, and I think that that - the narrative discussion,

like we are fleshing out in more detail the same discussion we had earlier when Eric was here, in my opinion might produce more valuable results.

CHAIR MCCARTY: On a webinar.

MR. DEWEY: Well yes, webinar, however you want to do it, you know, we don't have time in today's meeting to accomplish it, but you know, in the next few weeks if there's a process the committee wants to reconvene, and have that discussion, I think there's some value in it, in some sort of a structured discussion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Julie.

MS. MORRIS: I think it's useful to have sort of the individual nominal ranking on a simplified grid, not as a way to create a MAFAC ranking, but as a way to identify where we have a lot of convergence and resonance about things, and where we have divided loyalties.

And then I think that informs the

discussion that we have on the webinar. It doesn't dominate the discussion. It doesn't set our priorities. But it helps us figure out what are the areas that we really should be talking about in order to figure -- where should we focus our discussion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

7 CHAIR MCCARTY: Anyone else? 8 Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: I'd like to express support for what Julie just described. It wasn't clear to me that it was going to be done in the format of send this out to all the individuals prior to the call, collect their information prior to the call, synthesize it, and then have a call to discuss the results. That to me is a lot more appealing than having a discussion like -- having a discussion on the table.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So you're saying then the value that you see in having webinar, you see the value of having some kind of forum before it, and having that

1 available at the webinar?

DR. CHATWIN: Yes, and just to be clear, I only see value for the webinar if you do some preparatory work ahead of time.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

DR. CHATWIN: Otherwise, there are alternative ways to get there. We could use a subcommittee structure, have the discussions within them and each subcommittee come in.

But some prep has to happen.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, I hear you, and Bill is saying that he thinks rather than -- you can probably do both actually. You could have the prepared pages, page, whatever, and have it done ahead of time, and then come in and discuss and have the sort of free-ranging discussion as well.

DR. CHATWIN: Yes, precisely.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. So -- do you want to make a motion Keith?

MR. RIZZARDI: What I'd like to do is to create some flexibility. I'd just like

And then we have the committee heads. That's what makes up the executive committee.

MR. FISHER: So is that a motion?

MR. RIZZARDI: That's my motion,

MR. FISHER: I'll second it.

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been moved

and seconded. I think we have all heard the motion. Is there general agreement?

Is anybody opposed to that?

22 (No response)

12

13

14

15

16

yes.

MCCARTY: Hearing 1 CHAIR no 2 opposition then it passes. Thanks Keith. And 3 now let's go into your ecosystem, I mean your 4 protected resources. 5 Thanks for doing that. MR. RIZZARDI: So for our protected 6 7 resources meeting, we had members of NOAA 8 staff. We had Angie, I forget her last name -9 10 DR. HOLLIDAY: Somma. 11 MR. RIZZARDI: I'm sorry, Mark? 12 DR. HOLLIDAY: Somma. 13 MR. RIZZARDI: From -- the Chief 14 of protected species who came and talked to us and was willing to answer questions. 15 We had a pretty strong discussion of the Hawaiian monk 16 17 seal and a pretty controversial discussion. Some of our members have voiced 18 19 their concern about the historic relocation of 20 some Hawaiian monk seals to the main Hawaiian 21 islands.

as

laid

out

here

for

And

22

background, the Hawaiian monk seal is an endangered species. It is listed as endangered.

When it was originally listed in '76, it did not at the time identify the species as breeding on the main Hawaiian Islands.

But in 1994, there's NOAA documentation that NOAA relocated male Hawaiian monk seals to the main Hawaiian islands, and the population has in recent years been growing in the main Hawaiian islands.

Because the species is listed as an endangered species, NOAA also has a duty to designate critical habitat. They are going through that process right now.

So they are currently evaluating the scope of their proposed critical habitat, and it is a large amount of critical habitat in the current proposal. It circles the main Hawaiian Islands with an exception for Waikiki

1 Beach and the military.

That proposed designation is very controversial, and some of our members are concerned about the tension between the need for Endangered Species Act consultations down the road, and the effect that would have on anything that has human interactions with the Hawaiian monk seal.

So if you could scroll down to the conclusion. At this point, we don't -- we are not sitting here with a pile of science in front of us, and it's not my belief that it's our job to second-guess NOAA.

But what we are doing through this conclusion is encouraging NOAA to carefully evaluate the science and the economic harms, and consider whether some of the currently proposed areas either do not meet the critical habitat criteria, or could be excluded from the critical habitat designation.

In the end, this motion is basically saying NOAA be cautious, and

exercise the authority that NOAA has under the Endangered Species Act based on the science and the analysis of the economics.

And I know that Randy and Ed both wanted to have some discussion of this item.

This is my effort to finesse what was a very controversial discussion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Keith.

I will say at this point that Cathy Foy is the chairman of this subcommittee, and Keith is acting on her behalf.

Cathy Foy sent me an email yesterday saying how sorry she was not to be at the meeting and offering to do any and all kind of work that we might assign to her

before December 8 , as she always does, and she asked me to say hello to everybody for her. So I want to take that opportunity.

th

Thank you Keith. So, discussion?

MR. EBISUI: Thank you. I'd like to add just a little bit to the background.

This is very concise, very well-written, it's a very good report.

But I think there's a few details that I would like to mention, and that is that -- that is that in the 1994 relocation, it wasn't -- it began in 1994 and it continued since then and they were not limited to only males. Females were brought.

The other point I'd like to add is that in the proposed designation for the main Hawaiian Islands, it encompasses all of the populated islands, all of the shorelines and all of the islands except for military installations and Waikiki Beach.

It also expands the designated area from shoreline to 20 fathoms, to shoreline to 273 fathoms. So the size of the designation that is being sought is multiple - at least 10 times, 15 times larger in terms of depth range than it was -- than it has been.

So I thought I'd mention that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Randy.

MR. CATES: I'd like to add for discussion a couple of points. One is that this is a type of issue I think MAFAC is best at. And during our discussion yesterday some comments were made that to me were startling, and I think other members should think about their regions and their areas and that is if you believe in climate change and your area is going to be changing, one example was given yesterday that NOAA may need to pre-designate areas where species might be moving and make those essential habitat, even though they are not there.

In the case of Hawaii, we have a situation where these animals were brought to an area, and now that area is going to be -they are proposing to make it into essential habitat, and that is a, in my opinion and in the opinion of our governor and our legislators and our state, as well as a lot of citizens, a very dangerous and aggressive take

of a big portion of our state.

Every bit of shoreline as Ed said, will now become essential habitat, and that has a lot of implications. It has implications on commercial fishing, tourism, any commerce and I just put it out there for this body to think about, is that really the - could we give advice on doing it in maybe a better way or a different way?

And the answers that we got back yesterday were, well, we are mandated by law to do this. I don't see that. The law can be interpreted differently, and management practices -- NOAA has a variety of options.

In the past, the option that they chose was a more precise area of protection where the animal landed on the beach, it was a temporary protected area. To now jump into we are just going to take everything and any commerce has to go through that process, is very scary for us in Hawaii.

So I open that up to -- for

1 discussion. Is that appropriate?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: So you're suggesting that in addition to this advice, that we go further into a more general discussion about how those kinds of designations are made and what the process is?

MR. CATES: I think it's a topic that should be thought of, discussed at MAFAC, not only just here today, but also in the future. As things change, what's the implication, what's the economic implication?

I mean how far do you go in the name of protection? How far are we willing to compromise and I don't know what others feel.

I'd like to hear what others feel. But to start moving a species into an area and then declaring that essential habitat is very alarming to me.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are there other comments on that? And I just want to go back to Ed's comment for a minute. Did you want that male -- to say male and female?

| | Page 173 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. EBISUI: I'm sorry? |
| 2 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Do you want to |
| 3 | correct the actual |
| 4 | MR. EBISUI: No. No. I was just |
| 5 | supplementing. I think it's fine. |
| 6 | MR. RIZZARDI: And I understand |
| 7 | that's the perspective on that. I did do some |
| 8 | research and I have not been able to find |
| 9 | documentation online showing the relocation of |
| 10 | females. |
| 11 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. |
| 12 | MR. RIZZARDI: So I simply stayed |
| 13 | silent on the point rather than make it one |
| 14 | way or the other. What is clear is that there |
| 15 | were the males that were relocated and I had |
| 16 | the documentation to support the point. |
| 17 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, I just |
| 18 | wanted to check that because I neglected to do |
| 19 | that. You don't that's fine. |
| 20 | MR. EBISUI: No it's not |
| 21 | necessary. |

MR. CATES: Can I make a third

22

1 point?

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: Sure.

MR. CATES: One quick thing on that, that is alarming to me at this meeting was that the head of protection of species didn't even realize that they had moved the animals. And that's alarming that the head of NOAA, of protected species division, didn't realize that their agency was bringing these animals.

I can tell you for a fact, personal knowledge, that they were bringing females in, because I was providing food for these animals, for females.

So there's a bit of a discussion on what they were bringing, but the facts remain, it's online, that they were bringing these animals in.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Tony.

DR. CHATWIN: So, I'd like to agree with Randy and then I think this is a topic that needs to be addressed. It's the

type of issue that, I agree, MAFAC should have expressed an opinion on, and it should be that it was -- that opinion should be the result of a concerted effort to review previous such designations and how that has affected fisheries and the economics.

And that's going to be -- what we need is more than one day and one meeting because when I see this statement here, I wonder, although it's, I think it's crafted well, I think well, isn't there a mandate already to consider potential economic harms when designating habitat?

If there is, there's no harm in us saying that again, but that's already a mandate which I think the agency would be looking at.

Criteria that possibly don't meet criteria for habitat critical designation -- I would like us to have a discussion about what are those criteria, and why might it not be meeting it or not.

But I think MAFAC should be commenting on whether those are the right criteria or not, as opposed to a specific case where based on information provided by a couple of members, they -- there's a belief that it does or does not meet those criteria.

I think it's difficult for me to take a position on that. CHAIR
MCCARTY: On this.

DR. CHATWIN: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. So for example, if this were a motion, you would vote against it?

DR. CHATWIN: Well, I am looking forward to hearing more of the discussion, because I don't think I have much information right now to make a decision on which way I would vote.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Well, let me just say that there is no motion on the floor. So this is the conclusion from the subcommittee and if it's going to become a MAFAC action, it

needs to be made into a motion and moved and seconded.

So just to let you know, if that's what you -- if that's the will of the group, that's what -- that's how we do it. So just -- thank you Tony. Paul.

MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I was at that meeting and I think the controversial discussion was that they had taken the animals from a place that they were never historically at and moved them to one, and then declared it critical habitat.

Now there were some arguments going back and forth on that, but what came out of that that was interesting was the comment that Ms. Somma made, was that in the future, if they feel that climate change is causing a degradation in habitat for a protected species, that they may have to declare a critical habitat in an area where an animal had never normally been before.

And that can mean I mean, that has

1 a lot of impacts, a lot of possible impact.

So I would add language that would ask for a

3 clarification on that policy. I mean, if it

4 is policy, because if that's going to become

5 the new strategy, then wow, I mean that

6 changes the whole game.

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It's difficult enough as it is, but now we are going to have people who are just going to start -- I mean the lawsuits will fly.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So in order to add language to that, it would need to be a MAFAC motion.

 $\label{eq:mr.clampitt: Right, well -- I am} % \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. I mean I understand what you are saying and I think that would be fine if you want to put it on the floor. Mark, you had a comment.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Just to Paul's question. About a year -- exactly a year ago, Jim Lecky came to discuss critical habitat

designation as a feature of the Endangered

Species Act to this committee.

species.

The definition of critical habitat that was described -- I wasn't at the meeting but in the notes, critical habitat designation if it's outside of the geographic range is defined in the statute, so it's not a policy that is defined as this is a specific area that is outside of the geographical area occupied by the species, that is determined to be essential for the conservation of the species.

So that's the -- that's the -MR. CLAMPITT: Occupied by the

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ RIZZARDI: It also allows -- the statute also allows --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Outside of the geographical area occupied by the species at the time it is listed, on a determination by the Secretary that such areas are essential to the conservation.

So you can designate areas outside the geographical area occupied by the species at the time that it's listed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That's specified in the act, so it was a point of clarification that sounded like it might be helpful for your discussion and in answer to your question.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So it's a statutory requirement.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Definition, it's a definition of what critical habitat is.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Keith, and then Julie.

MR. RIZZARDI: I want to address two points that have come up in discussion. The first one is Tony's point are the criteria for critical about what habitat. In the federal regulations, it lays out factors they can consider -- space for population growth, food, water, air light, minerals, cover shelter, for sites breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring,

and habitats protected from disturbance and ecological protection of the species.

So there's a series of regulatory factors, and all this conclusion was designed to do was say carefully evaluate that language in light of the particular facts here, without asking MAFAC to formally decide one way or the other, but just simply say to NOAA, hey be cautious, be judicious in the way you apply this.

The other point is there is a process in the Endangered Species Act called the designation of experimental populations.

Section 10(j) allows for reintroduced populations to be given a special designation where they get different kinds of treatment.

It may not require the designation of critical habitat. It may not have the same take requirements. There are different rules for 10(j) populations.

In this particular instance, the Hawaiian monk seal was not named a 10(j). So

that flexibility is not available to NOAA in this context and they are applying the rules as they exist.

And then the last point I wanted to make is that the Hawaiian monk seal is considered the most critically imperiled species. I mean there is nothing higher on the list right now.

It is in tough straits. The numbers have fallen, and especially in the northern Hawaiian islands, and that's why the protection of the main Hawaiian Islands population is being considered important.

So there are competing perspectives that are at work here, and again, my goal was to give some flexibility and deference to NOAA to make the decision based on the science and the economics.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Keith.

I've got Julie and Randy.

MS. MORRIS: So critical habitat designation is always very controversial

because it gets in the -- gets in the face of the way people are using water or land and private uses and recreational uses.

And so it's not surprising that it would be controversial in the main islands of Hawaii.

And my understanding of critical habitat designation is it primarily restricts federal actions in the designated habitat.

And so the way that that usually gets its bite is if you need a permit from the Corps of Engineers to do a dredge and fill or something like that, it becomes a factor in the consideration of whether you get the permit or not.

But it doesn't prohibit all activities, and there's all kinds of -there's all kinds of activities that go on in critical habitat that are not interfered at all by the designation of the critical habitat.

If there is an interaction with

fisheries, then we have a whole biological opinion thing that NOAA does, where they look at the activity and they figure out -- you all are familiar with that.

So I think that I don't know -- I really don't know the details about the Hawaiian monk seal, but it's -- it seems like it may not -- that the reaction may be a bit of an over-reaction to the critical habitat designation.

And I have had experience in Florida with the experimental population designation. When they reintroduced whooping cranes in Florida, we used that. It's a good technique. I don't know why it wasn't used in this situation. It may be because of the critically endangered nature of the monk seal.

But you know, whooping cranes are critically endangered. So that is certainly something that NOAA should consider if it's not too late.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Consider what,

1 exactly Julie? I'm sorry.

MS. MORRIS: This idea that if they are introducing monk seals into a new part of their habitat and they call it the 10(j) category that Keith was talking about where it's an experimental population, then the critical habitat is not designated, and there's not these restrictions on land use because it is viewed as an experimental population until it becomes established.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And they didn't do that?

MR. RIZZARDI: Correct.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I see. I see what you mean. Thank you Julie. That was interesting. I've got Randy and then I've got Ed, and you know, ideally we would have a motion that we would be working towards or not if you don't want to, but I'm just saying we are not going to do much more discussion unless there is motion to do something from MAFAC.

So it would be good if somebody 1 2 could formulate something. If they intend to 3 do so, I would like to see it relatively soon. 4 Randy. 5 MR. CATES: Either Ed or I I'm sure will put it up for a motion. 6 7 CHAIR MCCARTY: I can't hear you. 8 MR. CATES: I'm sure, why don't we 9 -- I don't mind putting it up for a motion. MR. EBISUI: Second. 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. It's been 11 12 moved and seconded that MAFAC adopt this as their advice to NOAA. 13 14 MR. CATES: I'd like to make a couple of comments for discussion. Number one 15 16 is, for everybody to understand, the area 17 where monk seals normally reside, is 18 monument. 19 There is no -- there is nothing 20 else in the very large area other than nature. 21 It's the largest monument I think in the U.S.

And they are taking these animals

22

and putting it in a very condensed area. You all have been to Hawaii. You know what Waikiki Beach looks like.

So it's not in a situation where the animals are interacting with humankind and we are just going to protect them. We are taking them from a pristine area and putting them in another area, instead of fixing, or trying to do protection in the area that they are in.

And that's -- I think the controversy is they could probably do better by doing that.

Secondly, I heard yesterday and I heard today that well critical habitat only affects federal projects and consultation.

Let me give you -- share briefly what that really means to us. When I was trying to build a fish hatchery on land where we would drill a well and draw seawater up, utilize the seawater, and put the seawater back in a well, and that water would never get

1 to reach the ocean.

Because I was getting a federal loan, it required a review which delayed me up to two years, because the staffer decided that somehow this may affect dolphins, whales and turtles in the open ocean.

It took Dr. Hogarth coming to Hawaii to listen, to explain to him how that might affect dolphins and whales and turtles. So it does affect commerce. It will affect huge amounts of our industry.

Bill probably can share -- shed light on what that really means in his area, but it's not a light deal. This is not a minimal thing and it's just a process of you fill out the application and then you go on your way. That's not what this is.

This is a big thing and we are talking about the entire shoreline of a state, not a small area.

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Randy.

22 Ed.

1 MR. EBISUI: Thank you. Just,

Randy already touched on it, but I think the rub is that these animals reside in the monument, which is uninhabited.

Federal scientists declared the monument before it was designed as a monument pristine. Unfortunately the monk seals can't seem to thrive in a pristine environment.

So they have relocated them into a heavily-populated, heavily-used part of the ocean and that's really the rub, and there are consequences because if there is a federal nexus to any activity, then you have to go through this consultation process in order to continue that activity.

We have not only fishing but all kinds of other uses for the oceans and beach that do have federal nexus. So it's rather alarming.

The animals that were -- many of the animals that were removed from the northwestern Hawaiian islands and brought to

the main Hawaiian islands were brought because they did things like males would get together and mob and injure females. It's kind of counterproductive to survival of the species.

Males would also try to mount pups. So you know, we have kind of -- we, the main Hawaiian Islands, have been colonized by these aggressive deviants, for whatever reason.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So I hear.

MR. EBISUI: And because of -- now because of the human interaction with these seals, the seals have even come down with virus infections that were transmitted through human contact.

You know, so there's all kinds of things that are going on. It's just -- I -- personally I think what needs to be done, what should be done, is to figure out why the seals are unable to thrive in a pristine environment. That's the key, not relocating, not relocating them to an area that they have

1 never historically lived.

Randy pointed out during the meeting that the native people, the Hawaiians, don't even have a word for the monk seal because they were not part of the populated islands.

So anyway it's kind of alarming for those of us that live there.

CHAIR MCCARTY: We'll take one more comment and then we need to move on.

MR. DEWEY: So I would also like to share that the critical habitat designation is significant and will have an impact when you have a federal nexus for sure.

And certainly for us in Washington

State we have been -- we are living proof of

that with aquaculture. We have Army Corps

permits for our shellfish farms and we have

listed species galore throughout the Puget

Sound and it has complicated our life to no

end.

Lots of consultant fees, lawyer

fees, we haven't had new farms permitted in

Pugent Sound for over four years now, and a

lot of that is due to the critical habitat

that we deal with with our salmon species and
so on.

So you know, it is a big deal, for some, not for all, you know, but it will definitely have an impact on the economy there.

And I just wanted to speak in support of the motion and maybe ask for clarity that this piece is specific to the monk seal. I presume it's specific to the monk seal?

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. RIZZARDI: It is. That's because all the background is above it. We are just going to make this the motion and we will insert the language that it's specific to the monk seal.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, so Mark is concerned about a couple -- or something and

I'd like him to address his concerns.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. HOLLIDAY: It's an observation. We were -- as a body we don't normally at a particular fishery management manager in action that's in front of the public for debate as a proposal.

So mу concern is the precedent that we are looking at an ESA action that is in front of the public for comment in particular area, and we are focusing whether or not it's beneficial and whether or not it is appropriate.

That's a public comment process that's -- a consultation process that is going to be open for another 60 days. Is it something that MAFAC wants to take on as a comment on a specific action under the ESA?

My sense is in general you are asking about -- if you think that ESA needs reform, or there's a legislative impediment that needs fixing, those are the kinds of things that MAFAC normally would advise the

1 Secretary on.

If you are going to take -- if you know are proposing to take an opinion on a specific regulatory action, I think that raises a lot more concern in the future about how MAFAC conducts its business and the responsibilities of the parties involved and the direct impacts on their business or in their community.

So I think there's sort of a tension here that you are raising important issues, you want to make sure that these considerations are done, and the motion, I don't have an opinion because my opinion doesn't count. So I'm not offering it pro or against the motion.

But I'm just observing that we don't normally talk about amendment seven to the New England groundfish plan has adverse impacts on these communities, and we are for or against it or advising NOAA to do something different.

And if we see there is something we don't in principle like the way this legislation is playing out, and we want to comment on that we need to reform in that as opposed to make it a regulatory action, I think there's a difference in how that advice would be utilized.

I am looking forward to how we take this information in that public comment process. It's a difficult --

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's a difficult thing. It's a very difficult thing. I understand your comment and I appreciate your bringing it up.

I think there's kind of three levels. There's the really big level at the legislative activity, potential reform of the ESA and so on and so forth, and then there's the kind of regulatory layer, where the ESA is interpreted in certain ways by the agencies, not just this agency, but other agencies, and then there's the specific examples of what

1 that does on the ground so to speak.

So there's all these different layers and which layer does MAFAC address most effectively, and you know, I hear you. Randy.

MR. CATES: I agree with you Mark.

I don't think -- at least I'm not proposing
that we, MAFAC, comment during a comment
period for this particular issue.

Our advice should go to the Secretary of Commerce for future things.

What's going to ever happen is going to happen during this comment period.

It does -- this issue does make me think about how NOAA does things in the future. Back in the '90s when they were moving the animals, they didn't really come to the public and get comments on whether that would be appropriate or not.

Looking back in hindsight, I think it was a wrong thing because we wouldn't be having this discussion. If they never brought the animals to the main Hawaiian Islands in

the first place, it wouldn't now be looked at as being designated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So you know, hindsight's easy to look back and -- but how NOAA does things is very critical and it's always -- and I think at least in Hawaii, it's really building distrust, this and other issues. It's really building a major amount of distrust of, well, we are just going to do this little thing, it won't impact too much, to today, it's a big deal, and people are getting -- we are getting divided I would say, much more than I have ever experienced.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So the motion is still the floor. on We are adding specificity so that people know what we are talking about if they haven't seen background. So that's all that's happening there and that's not really an amendment. That's just making it clear. So I'm not calling it an amendment. That's just the way it needs to be.

Okay, Ed.

MR. EBISUI: Thank you. I think

there's an implicit policy that's the question

here, and that is NOAA was directly

responsible for bringing these seals to the

Main Hawaiian Islands. It was a NOAA -- I

believe it was NMFS Protected Species that did

that.

So I think in a way this addresses that, you know, it kind of questions whether or not those kinds of translocations as they are termed, are really appropriate in all circumstances.

So you know, as long as it's not - as long as we are not prohibited from
bringing this to the Secretary, I would ask
that we do bring it to the Secretary.

CHAIR MCCARTY: You know, my Chair decision would be to allow this to go forward and could be corrected later. Without having NOAA General Counsel here to offer their advice on whether it's appropriate, I would

say that we should let it go forward. So that's what I'm going to do. I'm going to let it go to a vote.

So it depends on how the vote goes, but that's my judgement at the moment.

MR. RIZZARDI: To follow up on Randy's point and Ed's point, one alternative would be to have the protected resources committee take up with NOAA the bigger issue of 10(j) populations, and the use of section 10(j) for relocated populations and for dealing with issues of climate change in the long-term, and that way we would be speaking to the larger policy issue, as opposed to the more narrow issue of the Hawaiian monk seal.

Because there is recognition as to what happened here, but what NOAA's staff would tell you here is look, it's not a 10(j) population.

If it wasn't designated that way, they have a statutory obligation, they have to do critical habitat, they are going down their

path and this is what they are doing, based on the science that exists.

What you guys are suggesting is well maybe you shouldn't have gotten yourself into that situation, maybe you shouldn't have gotten yourself into that situation. Maybe you should have used 10(j) in the first place.

Maybe in the future NOAA should be looking for opportunities to use experimental populations to modify the way the Endangered Species Act gets implemented, and that's where some policy judgment is and that's where there's an opportunity for MAFAC to speak.

That's a very different issue from the one that is on the table here, so Mark's point is correct. This is MAFAC definitely making a statement on a particular species and a particular rule, as opposed to the larger context.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think Keith that you are right about the Protected Resources

Subcommittee taking up the larger issues. I

was going to suggest that anyway, regardless of whether this goes up or down.

I think that's an important discussion for them to have, and then to bring it to MAFAC. I don't know how it will fit into your future schedules, but I would suggest that the subcommittee take it up as soon as possible and look at the NOAA/NMFS implementation of the ESA and including specifically section (j) population issues.

So I would suggest that we ask that to happen, you know, in future meetings. Maybe between meetings the subcommittee could get together and talk about it. That would probably be a good idea, regardless of whether this goes up or down, so that would be my thought.

Bill and then I really want to wrap this up.

MR. DEWEY: So, listening to the discussion and particularly Mark's point that this is a bit of a change for us to speak to a

specific amendment, I wonder if a more generic recommendation that might be a fit would be something along the lines of MAFAC recommends NOAA protected resources fully explore all management options for restoring species in their native range and habitat before resorting to relocating species outside those areas and designating new critical habitat beyond their historic range.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Just quoting an idea.

Yes, I see that CHAIR MCCARTY: you are. And I do think that's great. I also think that it would probably be even better to have the subcommittee get into the details of before that make that sort of we That would be sort of what I recommendation. would think.

I think I am just going to bring it -- I'd like to bring this to a vote, and we are way past the time that we need to go to lunch because we have to be back here at one.

I don't want to rush this. I

think we have had a pretty good discussion.

Unless you have new information or astounding ideas to offer, I want to bring this to a vote.

MR. RIZZARDI: How about rather

MR. RIZZARDI: How about rather than voting, we refer it back to the subcommittee for the more full discussion, to include the 10(j) issue and to take this up in further detail at the next meeting?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Well, this motion is on the floor, and we are going to bring it to a vote. Unless somebody moves to table it, which I do not encourage.

I think we need to vote it up and down. All in favor of this please raise your hand.

(Show of hands)

18 CHAIR MCCARTY: I'd like the staff
19 to count the hands please.

20 (Pause)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: All opposed to 22 this please raise your hand.

| 1 | (Show | of | hands |
|---|-------|----|-------|
| 1 | (Show | οÍ | hands |

2 MR. RAFTICAN: I'll abstain.

3 CHAIR MCCARTY: All abstaining,

4 yes, sorry, thank you. So what's the vote

5 Mark?

7

8

9

DR. HOLLIDAY: Twelve yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Twelve yes, two no, one abstaining. It passes. Is there

other business in this area to talk about

10 before we break for lunch? I think that all

of this has been really good discussion, and I

12 think that we have a lot of material that

13 needs to go to the committee.

So I encourage that to happen. I don't know whether you need a motion on that,

but I would say that we need to have that as

an agenda item at the next meeting, and that

in the interim that the subcommittee, if they

so decide to perhaps meet and talk about it to

20 present some ideas. I don't know.

21 Terry, you are looking to speak.

MR. ALEXANDER: What is the time

1 frame on these guys' issue, I mean, do we have 2 enough time in order to be able to comment through teleconference or whatever? 3 they looking at making that critical habitat? 4 5 CHAIR MCCARTY: I would say that MAFAC, individual members of MAFAC 6 comment on this, and I think you can probably 7 8 get that information from Ed or Randy or 9 anyone of our staff, and I would encourage 10 individually, because I people to do that don't think the time frame is going to allow 11 eventual 12 the development the of MAFAC position, nor do I necessarily think it's a 13 14 good idea. Julie, do you have your hand up? 15 MS. MORRIS: No I do not. MCCARTY: 16 CHAIR You're just 17 scratching. 18 MS. MORRIS: I'm just --19 (Laughter) 20 Massage, okay. CHAIR MCCARTY: So 21 with that I would like to adjourn for lunch 22 and I would like people to eat and get back

| | Page 206 |
|----|--|
| 1 | here by one if you can. Otherwise I think we |
| 2 | are really pushing it this afternoon. |
| 3 | (Whereupon the above-entitled |
| 4 | matter went off the record at 12:10 p.m. and |
| 5 | resumed at 1:06 p.m.) |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

1:06 p.m.

2.0

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you for getting back here almost on time. We have a lot to do. I don't know how long your presentation is going to be Bill. I understand you are going to give it in Steve Joner's place?

MR. DEWEY: Yes, he asked me if I would do that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. So we are going to do the Commerce Subcommittee report and are you anticipating a full hour on that Bill?

MR. DEWEY: No.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And then we're going to do the Recreational Fisheries

Subcommittee report and Mr. Franke has told me that he is anticipating half an hour.

So that's wonderful. We need -perhaps we don't need half an hour for the
election of the Chair, depending on what

1 happens, which I hope is smooth.

The other thing is that we need to talk a little bit about subcommittees and that process of putting your name in if you want to be the subcommittee chair.

So we will do that after we do these next two reports. Okay? So Bill, are you up?

MR. DEWEY: I'm up.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, go for it.

MR. DEWEY: I would work from the committee report that I sent you. I emailed it just for the MAFAC now so everyone, it should be popping in their emails, if they have their emails opened.

And Josh I emailed it to you late last night. I didn't send it out to the committee at the same time I sent it to you, a little after midnight last night.

MS. DOERR: Everybody awake?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Hi Judy. We are

22 just starting up again.

MR. DEWEY: So our Chairman Steve

Joner had a conference call he had to get on

and asked me if I would deliver the Commerce

Subcommittee report.

So the commerce committee met

twice, once on the 25 and then again yesterday, a little bit larger group on the th

.

Also, we were joined by a member of the public, Zack Corrigan from Food and Water Watch. And in the discussion yesterday, we decided to meet again, just because we hadn't had the benefit of NOAA and Commerce's updates on their implementation of the aquaculture policies, so we wanted to meet again and discuss whether additional recommendations to consider.

Both days we had a good discussion regarding implementation of the aquaculture policies, and we offered the following findings and recommendations.

So that the first finding

essentially is just that you know, the discussion that NOAA had gone through and extends the public process and adopted these policies back in June, and one of the key points we want to make in this finding is that, you know, during this two-year process, the advancement of marine aquaculture in the country is essentially brought to a halt while the policies were debated.

And that forced some unfortunate things you know, and people that were experiencing that uncertainty, were investing in aquaculture outside the country instead of here.

And it's important now that those policies are in place, to try to reverse that trend and the recommendations reflect that.

So we were pleased that a number of MAFAC's recommendations during the public comment process on those policies were adopted and that's captured there in the finding as well.

So first recommendation is to make

up for lost time in investment in domestic

marine aquaculture, MAFAC recommends that NOAA

and Commerce urgently implement the

aquaculture policies adopted in June, and in

particular the initiatives launched in

conjunction with them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

These first three recommendations sort of go together and are all along the same topic, so I'd recommend we maybe consider all three of those in a motion if that's appropriate, Madam Chair.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. the DEWEY: So second recommendation is that NOAA office of aquaculture and a representative from the Department of Commerce provide regular updates to MAFAC on implementation of the aquaculture policies.

And then the third recommendation is that NOAA work with MAFAC to update the 10-year plan for marine aquaculture to serve as a roadmap for implementing their policy, and

that updated 10-year plan should incorporate 1 2 both long-term actions nearand and measurable outcomes of success, which was --3 4 that was part of our comment letter -- that 5 latter guidance was part of our comment letter during the policy development. 6 7 So if appropriate Madam Chair, I 8 would ask for a motion to adopt those three 9 recommendations. 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: You can move that. 11 MR. DEWEY: I can move that, I 12 would move that. Is anyone awake? 13 CHAIR MCCARTY: The move's been 14 seconded to accept these three recommendations from the subcommittee as recommendations for 15

MAFAC. Discussion? Speaking to the issues?

MR. ALEXANDER: No. No, I was

just going to say I don't know if you saw

Randy raise his hand.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I did not. Randy?

MR. CATES: I seconded.

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: I heard that. Go

1 ahead.

MR. CATES: I have comments. I think it's important, and thanks Bill for including that, the language that we have lost ground and companies have gone away and it's been a long delay of stalls and I just don't think we can afford that any longer.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Do you want to speak to the motion? Bill, do you want to speak to it at all?

MR. DEWEY: No.

DR. CHATWIN: I am supportive of the motion, but I just wanted to learn more about the lost investment, if there is, is there documentation on it or --

MR. DEWEY: George isn't here, but he worked -- George Nardi has been working with companies that are investing overseas instead of here because of the uncertainty.

Taylor's our company, in the last actually six or seven years, our company has invested \$15 million buying farms in British Columbia

because we can't get farms permitted here in the United States. So that needs to turn around.

DR. CHATWIN: I agree. It would be helpful to those issue if that sort of loss of investment here got documented in a paper or a white paper, report, something, studied.

And again, I am supportive of the motion, I am just saying, it would be good to get that information out.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Detailed as a backup appendix or whatever. That's a good idea.

DR. CHATWIN: That's to educate.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right. Randy.

MR. CATES: To the point of investment, there's another issue as part of that. I can tell you, in Hawaii I had in the last five years about five serious investors come wanting to either partner up or interested.

Of those five, three have gone out

of the U.S., and the number one reason was permits, how long it took. There were two reasons -- permit and choice and species.

The other part of that is -- and not many people know that our government has invested in aquaculture technologies that were purposely transferred overseas.

NOAA has a joint collaboration with the Korean government and they came on my site, and I watched in a matter of years of probably four or five meetings in Hawaii, looking at our technologies, going back to Korea, investing in it, I come to find out that if the U.S. government was part of a project that was funding the whole thing.

So we kind of have a situation where we have taken our technology and given it overseas, and we have actually taken through agreements, of funding foreign countries and it just -- always just puzzled me, why we have done that. But we have. And now Korea has got a pretty large, I think the

had been a meeting last week of these various

And it was indicated that there

21

22

agencies to discuss implementation of the policy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

specifically solicited And Kris input from MAFAC for specific recommendations on how they could facilitate aquaculture policy implementation and there -- because we don't really fully understand the -- what those agencies are and what their capacities might be, the recommendation speaks to that, that we recommend Commerce convene a meeting via teleconference including NOAA office of aquaculture staff to gain а better understanding of the resources available within the Commerce agencies to facilitate the development of MAFAC recommendations utilizing these resources.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I just have a clarification. This is Pete Jones guys, he is from Alaska.

MR. JONES: Hello.

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Does that include
22 MAFAC? That meeting that you were talking

1 about?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 MR. DEWEY: Yes. Yes, that would 3 be the intent.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, would it be
all of MAFAC or just the Commerce
subcommittee? What's the intent there?

MR. DEWEY: The intent was the Commerce subcommittee. I think when we discussed it it wasn't to -- certainly I think within the committees interested, that you welcome this that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. I'm just not entirely sure that's totally clear.

That's why I asked. Are you making that as a motion?

MR. DEWEY: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second?

MR. FISHER: Second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been made and seconded, and with the understanding that it's a MAFAC-inclusive meeting, is there comment on that? Keith?

MR. RIZZARDI: Do we need a motion, even a resolution on this? I mean isn't this nothing more than saying we want to have a subcommittee teleconference with NOAA staff? Couldn't we just do that internally without the process?

CHAIR MCCARTY: We can.

MR. RIZZARDI: Because I think it's a good idea. Don't get me wrong. I am all for having teleconferences. I think we should do things in between the meetings that we have to stay abreast and get educated and have the subcommittees do more.

It's just, I'm just questioning, do we need to get this formal?

MR. DEWEY: It's up to the Chair how she opts to deal with it. I think it's helpful as we -- as staff develops this list of actions that come from the committee, if the things that they need to do as follow up to the meeting are all succinctly made in recommendations, this may be easier for them

to track them, but it's up to the Chair how she chooses.

2.0

CHAIR MCCARTY: I agree.

MR. RIZZARDI: Is this intended to go beyond MAFAC or is this just MAFAC? MAFAC and Office of Aquaculture, or is it open to other members of the public?

MR. DEWEY: It was intended to be MAFAC Commerce Subcommittee, other MAFAC members that might be interested, Office of Aquaculture and the Commerce agencies, Commerce and the appropriate agencies, to have this discussion so we more fully understand the resources that are available.

Kris Sarri asked for recommendations. We don't know what recommendations to make because we don't understand what resources they have available to bring to the table.

So in an effort to flesh out or understanding better, we would make -- I would, presumably the subcommittee would then

come back to the full committee with recommendations on what we should recommend to Commerce.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And just in answer to your question, I do find that it's more effective to have a motion if it requires action by staff or anyone else. It just makes it more clear that that is the will of the body, rather than the haziness of just a report.

So that would be my recommendation, and it was made as a motion.

MR. RIZZARDI: Okay.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So the motion is on the floor. Patty and Julie.

MS. DOERR: It's more of a clarification question. At the end of the findings, we can facilitate policy implementation. Do you intend to include -- was it your intent to include the shellfish initiative in there as well, or more of this -- the focus --

1 MR. DEWEY: I see your point. 2 Obviously, it would include the -- not just the shellfish initiative. 3 There's three 4 initiatives associated with policy, so 5 might be appropriate to add to the end of that 6 finding and associated initiatives, just to 7 capture that. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. DOERR: Yes, just to manage the shellfish initiative. The restoration portion of the International Shellfish Initiative, I think it makes for a very well rounded document -- initiative, and so I just don't want it to get lost.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, do you want it as a friendly amendment?

MR. DEWEY: Well, it's not part of the motion, she's just suggesting an edit to the committee report findings, which I think the committee would say is consistent with our discussion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, so no change to the actual motion? Okay.

suggested the teleconference. So that was the

22

been working on implementation of the DOC policy so I think that's your intent, to follow up with EEA, there's other bureaus.

MR. DEWEY: But do it efficiently in one call if we can, and my recommendation - - this doesn't have to be part of the motion - - but obviously some of us are aware that Kris Sarri is moving on to a new job in the next couple of weeks.

So we ought to at least tee this up if possible before she leaves, so she can delegate it to somebody before she moves on.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So you weren't kidding on the two weeks. I got it.

DR. HOLLIDAY: And I think that we can forward the recommendation we have in the next two weeks.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are there other comments, clarifying or otherwise? Okay. Is there an approval of this without voting? Is there anybody who opposes this motion?

DR. HOLLIDAY: It is missing

1 something.

4

CHAIR MCCARTY: So we should put

in there the Commerce Subcommittee and MAFAC.

MR. DEWEY: So after staff?

5 CHAIR MCCARTY: Sure.

6 MR. DEWEY: Yes, after staff,

7 insert and the MAFAC Commerce Subcommittee.

8 CHAIR MCCARTY: Now it makes it

9 very clear. Yes. Thank you. So is there any

opposition to the motion as it is currently

11 reading?

12 (No response)

13 CHAIR MCCARTY: Hearing none, it

passes unanimously. How many do you have

15 Bill?

16 MR. DEWEY: Maybe another four or

17 five.

18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Oh, okay. Well I

19 just wanted to get an idea of --

MR. DEWEY: You gave me an hour

21 and I told you it would be less.

22 (Laughter)

CHAIR MCCARTY: I'm just checking,

for how long we can spend on each one.

MR. DEWEY: So that the next finding was just related to 2020, you know, obviously we have initiated a process to update it, and since we were always meeting when that group was meeting, we wanted to make sure we captured the aquaculture amendments for 2020 that we thought needed to be made.

So that's what this motion is specific to, that -- that MAFAC committee staff and the Commerce Subcommittee update the 2020 vision document to include implementation of the NOAA and Commerce aquaculture policies, the 10-year plan for marine aquaculture, and updated aquaculture production statistics, and that the aquaculture-related recommendations should also be amended to be consistent with the updated aquaculture policy.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are you making that motion?

MR. DEWEY: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second? 1 2 Randy seconds. I have a question Are you anticipating that 3 this. subcommittee members would be working on these 4 5 things? 6 MR. DEWEY: With staff yes.

> CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, good. Because you know, the updating is a little

easier than the adding to, and so I think it 10 would be really effective, and that was kind

of my understanding of that. 11

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DEWEY: Yes, we just didn't have a chance, because you guys were meeting when we were meeting, and presumably we will hear your report -- presumably you didn't finish your work in all the updating either, so --

CHAIR MCCARTY: No.

MR. DEWEY: there will be an opportunity here to bring that portion in. But that was the intent, was the subcommittee would work with staff on those revisions.

| 1 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I did report to the Vision 2020 Subcommittee |
| 3 | that that's what you were going to do, so I am |
| 4 | glad that you had the same impression. |
| 5 | And so we anticipated hearing from |
| 6 | you and also hearing from the Recreational |
| 7 | Subcommittee, which we are going to do next. |
| 8 | But my understanding is the |
| 9 | Recreational Subcommittee needs extra time to |
| 10 | make their recommendations, that's right on |
| 11 | Vision 2020, is that right? |
| 12 | MR. FRANKE: I didn't hear |
| 13 | anything about that. |
| 14 | CHAIR MCCARTY: We'll talk about |
| 15 | it. And I'll talk about the Vision 2020 at |
| 16 | the end of these reports too, very briefly. |
| 17 | It's not on the agenda, but we are going to do |
| 18 | it anyway. |
| 19 | Is there any opposition to this |
| 20 | motion? |
| 21 | (No response) |
| 22 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, hearing |

none, then it passes unanimously. Thank you,
Bill.

MR. DEWEY: So the next three findings and recommendations are related to research and research direction. So this next finding is specific to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program.

It has included aquaculture as a priority to fund projects that encourage the development of environmentally and economically sound aquaculture, relieve fishing pressure and food market availability.

These funds, the committee discussed how instrumental these funds are to implementing several of the recommendations in both the NOAA and Commerce policies, and as such, we offer the following recommendation:

That while challenging in the face of budget reductions, MAFAC recommends NOAA minimize the use of SK resources to fund internal NMFS programs and instead direct them as they are intended to fisheries and aquaculture research

1 and development.

There's been a tendency in the past, for those who aren't aware, for the agency to use these SK funds to support the administration of the agency, and this is the statement by MAFAC, that it's a priority that they be used the way they are intended.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second?

Is that a motion?

MR. CLAMPITT: Second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been made and seconded as a motion, that recommendation paragraph. It strikes me that this goes beyond aquaculture if I may say, to more of the general statement about the use of funds from that SK program, and I know it's an issue in a number of places.

MR. CLAMPITT: In Nation's Fisheries.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I'm sorry, Paul?

I think Mark wants to clarify something and then we will go to you.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Bill, does the recommendation -- are you speaking to the \$30 million total in SK funds, part of which have been appropriated by Congress as an offset to the NOAA budget, or the balance of the funds beyond the offset that are then used for grant programs?

There's a -- \$30 million is what we received in SK funds from the duties and Commerce then says of that amount, a certain part of that is offsetting in the appropriation so we don't -- it's not NOAA's choice. It's a Congressional choice how those SK funds are used as an offset.

And the balance, the remaining balance is then what the SK fund has to use to do the grant programs. So I wasn't sure if your --

MR. DEWEY: So does that remaining balance ever get used by NOAA for other than the grant programs? Is it -- who makes the decision? Is it Congress or NOAA that makes

the decision to use this money for administration?

DR. HOLLIDAY: That's my question, the clarification I was referring to, the remaining balance or you're asking us to go back to Congress and work on the offset question?

MR. DEWEY: So, I don't think our intent was to ask you to go back to Congress and work on the offset question. But I am asking you a question in return, just for clarity, is that remaining portion, does NOAA use a portion of that, do they make their own internal decision to use a portion of that for administration?

DR. HOLLIDAY: For administration of the program? Not all of that money goes towards the grants. But it's not going to the Weather Service or to other, you know, fisheries activities or programs.

MR. DEWEY: So this is an important clarification for me because I have

1 been under the impression that it was NOAA's 2 decision divert to SK monies towards administrative offset 3 and you are saying 4 that's not the case, that it's Congress that 5 tells you to do that?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. HOLLIDAY: I'm not sure I want to --

MR. DEWEY: Do this on the record?

CHAIR MCCARTY: I was just going

to ask Pete Jones because he is a budget guy,

but he's gone.

DR. HOLLIDAY: It's not a --

MR. DEWEY: It's not a discussion we want to have here.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The majority of the time, the offset is directed by Congress so that is trying to clarify. what I was Occasionally NOAA does direct funds from SK to be used for a non-SK purpose. But the routine use of -- I don't want to universally state that it's never happened or never will happen again, I trying to for but was just

purposes of understanding the recommendation and carrying that forward, I don't know if I clarified --

MR. DEWEY: To be honest, the subcommittee didn't drill down into that level of discussion. So I can't say for sure what the will of the subcommittee was. We did not -- did not have a discussion about asking NOAA to go back to Congress and deal with it there. That wasn't part of our discussion.

think, Mark, that the general understanding, right or wrong, in public, is that quite a big chunk of the SK funds do get diverted away from the SK grant program, and that may be an incorrect assumption, but that is what people think. And so I think they were acting on that assumption, and if it's incorrect, then we certainly need to look further into it, but if indeed that is happening, this is what you are addressing.

MR. DEWEY: Well, as I was looking

for language to build into the findings and the motion, just a little bit of Googling, there's obviously other people under that same impression out there on the internet because that's a widely-held position on multiple websites --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, it is.

MR. DEWEY: -- that that's what

happens.

DR. HOLLIDAY: That's why part of the reason I bring it up is because there is, I believe there is a general misunderstanding of how the SK process works and the use of SK funds as an offset. That's another public policy call that people take exception to under the existing -- under the original SK act, they -- Congress had the authority to use that as a --

MR. DEWEY: Well, it's a sensitive area. It's controversial. It's a policy-oriented matter. It may be something that MAFAC wants to put on a future agenda for

No.

CHAIR MCCARTY:

22

1 MS. MORRIS: We're going to --2 okay, so I was wondering Bill, if we are going 3 to vote on it now, whether you would be sympathetic to what I think the main thrust is 4 5 which is to maximize the funding for the grant 6 program, and that kind of sidesteps the issue 7 of whether or not NOAA is misdirecting the 8 funds. 9 CHAIR MCCARTY: Good point. So 10 are you suggesting that as an amendment? MS. MORRIS: I'm asking Bill what 11 12 he thinks about that. 13 MR. DEWEY: So you are suggesting 14 a different way to word it? 15 MS. MORRIS: Yes. 16 MR. DEWEY: I'm open to 17 suggestions. MS. MORRIS: So it would be MAFAC 18 19 recommends that NOAA maximize the amount of funds dedicated to grants for fisheries and 20 21 aquaculture research and development. 22 CHAIR MCCARTY: SK.

Page 239 1 MS. MORRIS: From SK. 2 MR. DEWEY: So I don't think I 3 would consider that a friendly amendment. think it's important to call out the concern 4 5 that, you know, at least our perception is 6 these funds being diverted are 7 administrative purposes which isn't 8 intent. 9 CHAIR MCCARTY: That's fine. We 10 can also put it on the floor as just a regular amendment, if you'd like to have it voted on, 11 Julie? 12 13 NOAA maximizes MS. MORRIS: 14 recommends NOAA maximize the amount of SK 15 funds dedicated to aquaculture and fisheries 16 research grant program. Is that the proper 17 language? Is it a grant program? 18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. 19 MS. MORRIS: Okay. 20 CHAIR MCCARTY: So is that your

That

would

be

MORRIS:

suggested amendment?

MS.

21

22

1 substitute motion.

2.1

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second?

MR. CLAMPITT: I can second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, it's been made and seconded as a substitute motion to the original motion from Bill. Do we have comment on this substitute motion? Yes, Terry?

MR. ALEXANDER: That sounds kind of open-ended to me. What about something like minimize administrative costs on -- does that mean the same thing?

CHAIR MCCARTY: I don't think so because it implies that there have been multiple instances or at least some instances of that happening, and I think Julie's point is not to call that out, and so that's why she has suggested a substitute motion. So what you would be arguing for is much closer to the original motion, if wanted to say it like that.

So the substitute motion can be

voted up or down. If the substitute motion passes, then it carries the original motion, and if it doesn't pass, we go back to the original motion and can have further discussion and then we will vote on the original motion. That's how it would go.

Now, Tony, I think you had a question earlier about how substitute motions work and you are used to a different process. So did you want to bring that up now, processwise? No. Okay.

So we are using that process at this point. If you want to change it later down the road you can. So we are going to put the substitute motion up for discussion and a vote. Is there any more discussion on the substitute motion?

I think we have clearly distinguished between the two. All in favor of the substitute motion, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

If staff could count that.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Seven.

CHAIR MCCARTY: All not in favor of the substitute motion, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIR MCCARTY: So the vote was -are there any abstentions? You are
abstaining. Two abstentions? Three? Four?
You don't -- so three abstentions, is that
right? Phil? Tom? Okay. All right.

Okay, so the vote then was --

DR. HOLLIDAY: Seven for --

CHAIR MCCARTY: The substitute motion is seven for and six against. So it passes. The substitute motion passes, and that carries the original motion.

MR. DEWEY: So our next finding was in response to requests Mark had put out prior to the meeting relative to NOAA's Sea Grant Aquaculture Program requesting input for their thematic priorities for FY '12 grant programs and, Mark, you indicated the time of deadline for those -- that input was before

this meeting, but since you raised it again at this meeting, we are presuming that you got an extension for that input. So --

DR. HOLLIDAY: We got an extension because we were meeting so close to the deadline.

MR. DEWEY: So based on that the committee comes forward with the following recommendation -- subcommittee comes forward with the following recommendation that MAFAC recommend NOAA advise Sea Grant that implementation of the technology transfer and shellfish initiatives to implement the aquaculture policies should be priorities for their FY '12 grant programs.

Some particular priorities that would facilitate implementing these initiatives include continuing research on the environmental effects of aquaculture to inform policy and permit conditions, smart designs for aquaculture technology for extensive and land-based recirculating technology, research

to identify areas appropriate for aquaculture siting which minimizes users conflicts and maximizes appropriate biological and physical parameters. Coastal marine spatial planning is one potential tool. Self-sustaining, forprofit demonstration/training projects in various regions can also serve as research centers and economic stimulators.

Social science research including but not limited to public perception of aquaculture, the effects of domestic aquaculture on market price, and the impacts of floating structure aquaculture on adjacent upland property values.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is that a motion?

MR. DEWEY: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a second?

MR. CLAMPITT: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been moved and seconded. I have a couple of questions.

Is this list coming from somewhere else, or did you just generate it at your --

MR. DEWEY: 1 We generated it at our 2 first day subcommittee meeting, so it wasn't intended to be all-inclusive. These were just 3 some of the ideas brought forward. We felt it 4 5 was important to capture them because it was part of the subcommittee deliberations. 6 7 Nice work. Other CHAIR MCCARTY: 8 comments on this motion? 9 (No response.) 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: No comments? No opposition? Is there any opposition to this 11 12 motion? 13 (No response.) 14 CHAIR MCCARTY: Seeing none, it 15 passes unanimously. MR. DEWEY: So the final finding 16 was relative to stakeholder input for research 17 18 priorities for NOAA different NOAA 19 aquaculture -- or NOAA grant programs. 2.0 So the finding was that they lack 21 a routine stakeholder process for soliciting 22 research priorities for fisheries and

aquaculture, and the recommendation was that 1 2 recommends that MAFAC NOAA and their appropriate granting entities consult MAFAC as 3 4 a representative stakeholder advisory 5 committee for research priorities prior to releasing research proposal solicitations. 6

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is that a motion?

MR. DEWEY: Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. RIZZARDI: Second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there a discussion, or do you want to speak to it, Bill?

MR. DEWEY: I think it's pretty self-explanatory.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Is there any comment on this? Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: I have a question of Bill. When you were thinking of, how do you think the process would work? Is this based basically on our professional understanding of what the research needs in our respective fields, or would we do something more thorough

and seek research priorities from councils and broader fields?

MR. DEWEY: There wasn't a lot of discussion on how in actuality it would occur. It was a recognition that, you know, we are a broad representation of stakeholders that would be appropriate to offer input on these priorities.

Whether we, you know, hopefully it would happen with a process that gave us enough time for that review that we would be able to go back to constituencies and vet those priorities, provide some meaningful input.

We didn't discuss the details of what that process might look like, and that may be something MAFAC wants to take up in the future, particularly if NOAA opts to take us up on this recommendation.

DR. CHATWIN: So if I just may. I agree. I think this is a body that could have constructive input into the issue of research

priorities but I wouldn't want it to rely only on our individual prioritization of research needs.

I think there are a lot of bright minds in this country that have put a lot of thought into what research needs are in our fields of interest, and I would like this body to be a way that we could enhance the -- or confirm or reaffirm the importance.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So if I am understanding you Tony, you are suggesting that the motion, as it reads, where it says as a representative stakeholder, it would be like one of the representative stakeholder advisory committees, so stakeholder groups or however you wanted to put it. Is that kind of what you mean? Not the only one.

DR. CHATWIN: I guess the uncertainty I have is how much of a representative stakeholder group we are because I think there are research needs that Sea Grant might be, this is for Sea Grant,

right, a number of granting agents have their specific priorities which may or may not match well with the stakeholder groups who were presented here and I just wanted to know what process we were thinking about. I think we need to develop that some more.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So I'm -- excuse me for questioning you. I'm just trying to determine whether you are saying that you would oppose this as it now reads, or whether you would like to suggest a change that would make it more in line with what you are saying. That's all.

DR. CHATWIN: I mean, I don't oppose it, what I'm saying, I support it but I want to make sure that it goes beyond us just saying you know I like this priority, I don't like this priority.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Thank you. George.

MR. NARDI: The intent when we were doing this I believe was that as it reads

and what Heather I think was getting at was representative, MAFAC а not the as representative, so it was to take advantage of the body that's here to help augment stakeholder input, you know I'm sure NOAA's not going to rely just on the MAFAC input but just to make sure there is another component and some broad comment on it and make sure we capture the representation that's here. It was just one of the things we could do to make sure this stakeholder input is reaching out to a point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: That was my point Thank you. And I am glad that's how George. you presented it. So that clarifies that for me. One of the things that Ι immediately thought when I saw the finding, was that that just isn't true in my neck of the woods, and I don't know how it works in other regions, but in the North Pacific, the regional NOAA, you know, takes great pains to through go extensive stakeholder process to determine

1 their research priorities.

It's done every year through the council process, and several other processes. So I find that not true, that finding is definitely not true in the Alaska region for NOAA.

So I don't know what happens in the other regions, whether it's similar, that the council process does that, do you know, or Vince do you know? Randy or Vince?

MR. FISHER: The councils get very involved in all research priorities. They basically invent their own priority list through the council process that goes to NOAA. If I were voting on this, I would probably vote no on it and the reason I would is because if somebody gave me that and I was Eric I wouldn't know what to do with it.

CHAIR MCCARTY: In terms of the

process.

MR. FISHER: Yes, the process.

22 CHAIR MCCARTY: Vince can you let

us know, did your councils, did they have a similar process?

MR. O'SHEA; Yes, in fact I think
I sit on a couple of those committees that
help guide those priorities, you know, provide
the state input to those. So yes. I'm a
little surprised at the finding as well.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. DEWEY: So, appreciate that input. That is actually helpful. Keep in mind that the people we had sitting around the table were aquaculture-focused and this is where we have the frustration that there isn't a national process.

So Mike Rubino actually raised it with us, you know, USDA has a routine process they go through. It's a national outreach where they sit stakeholders down, bring them to meetings, sit them down and formally go through a process to identify priorities for aquaculture research nationally.

NOAA does not have a similar

process. So you could potentially amend this finding and recommendation to be specific to aquaculture and add national in front of stakeholder and make it more palatable to the group and more accurately reflect what the subcommittee discussed.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I think that would be a good idea, because as it stands, I don't think I could support it. Are there any other comments? Is that okay with you guys if we amend it to reflect reality? Okay. Keith.

MR. RIZZARDI: I have just an observation and a recommendation, that the language is I think appropriately soft. It's not a mandate. It's not an absolute. It says NOAA should consult with us, and you know, that could include a couple of emails to the people who are involved in aquaculture, hey, what do you think of this proposal.

That seems pretty reasonable to me and seems to be a good idea. So I like the wording in that it's not a directive mandate,

that allows the flexibility but it makes the point which is there's experts sitting in this room and it would be nice if you consulted this.

MR. DEWEY: Well, to be clear we were appreciative that Sea Grant reached out to MAFAC and solicited that input. We just want to encourage it to continue to happen in the future, and if there's other grant programs other than Sea Grant, the Commerce SBIRs or other programs that offer grant funding for aquaculture research that you might reach out to them and say hey, you've got a stakeholder body here that can provide you input.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Right, and I am fine with the amendment as that reflects what I know to be true. Mark.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So, just following up on Bill's comment, the reason Sea Grant reached out was a result of the recommendations. If you go back to the action

table, this was one of the findings that you 1 2 had, that you want to be more involved in the 3 grants processes, so they heard you and they 4 were reaching to get that kind of 5 solicitation.

MR. DEWEY: Well I'm glad we're being consistent and we are being heard. That's great.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. DEWEY: Another win for MAFAC.

(Laughter)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. HOLLIDAY: So I think the focus is, with respect to aquaculture, I think we are trying to build on that, SBIR is another example. And it's that aquaculture could be subject to their solicitations.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are there other comments? Julie.

MS. MORRIS: Can we stick the word aquaculture in the recommendation maybe before research proposal solicitations?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

1 MS. MORRIS: Are you going to have 2 a sense of the frequency that NOAA releases aquaculture research proposal solicitations? 3 4 CHAIR MCCARTY: Every year, I 5 think. 6 MS. MORRIS: Is it annual? Is it 7 monthly? 8 MR. DEWEY: Ιt depends on 9 appropriations. For this aquaculture 10 initiative it depends on appropriations, whether it's annual or not. 11 12 DR. HOLLIDAY: It's difficult to 13 say because some of our grant programs are 14 exclusively aquaculture. Other are more 15 general in which aquaculture is one category or several, so general solicitation for all 16 17 NOAA grant programs and at the beginning of the fiscal -- in the middle of June, so it was 18

21 And so maybe -- I take the point -22 the point I take away is that the

a broad agency announcement of all the grant

19

20

programs.

aquaculture, being recognized in announcements

for grant programs ought to be front and

center and when they are looking at the

stepping forth, developing their proposal and

solicitation, consulting with MAFAC as an

entity is where you are hoping to insert the

advice of counsel.

8 CHAIR MCCARTY: Additional

DR. HOLLIDAY: I don't know how you figure out that in the writing but I mean that's how I understand it and how we take the intent of your recommendations.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's what I understand it to be. Is that everybody's understanding? Are we okay with this one?

More discussion or anything?

So, is there opposition to this as a motion?

20 (No response)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

comments?

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Seeing none, it 22 passes unanimously.

| | Page 258 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. DEWEY: That's it Madam Chair. |
| 2 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you. And |
| 3 | Ken, you are up next, right? |
| 4 | MR. FRANKE: I am. |
| 5 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. I need to |
| 6 | take a short break and talk to a couple of |
| 7 | people, so if we could do a short stand-down |
| 8 | of maybe 10 minutes while you are getting set |
| 9 | up and ready for this one, I'd appreciate it. |
| 10 | Yes. |
| 11 | MR. JONER: Madam Chair. Eric had |
| 12 | to take off at the end of the national ocean |
| 13 | policy discussion, and if it would be |
| 14 | appropriate, I want to ask him a question. It |
| 15 | won't be threatening. It won't be like the |
| 16 | hearing. But may I ask a question on that? |
| 17 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, of course. |
| 18 | MR. JONER: Since we have eight |
| 19 | minutes left in our |
| 20 | CHAIR MCCARTY: In your hour? |
| 21 | MR. JONER: We did not yield our |
| 22 | time yet. |

1 (Laughter)

To my colleagues in Washington.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Let me just say,

4 he said he was going to here until four.

MR. JONER: Okay, well it was really good news for me and probably others on Wednesday when Jessica gave us a report -- was it Jessica who did that? Yesterday? Yes.

And said that -- it was the first time I've heard it expressed that way -- that NOAA is -- favors having the councils represented on the regional planning bodies.

And then I understand that that statement was made by Dr. Lubchenco in the hearing yesterday. So I wasn't aware of that, you know, that she said it at the hearing.

It's -- we have clearly been favoring that for some time. I think there was a period where it appeared that it was a done deal the other way. I think that's less apparent now, so there's still some -- you know, it is still an issue that is in play and I would go a step

further than that we favor it and say that we
have been actively supporting it.

MR. SCHWAAB: Right, I think that's --

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's what she said. And everybody went yay.

MR. JONER: And she also said we need to continue to actively push on that, so what recommendations -- where do we push? Who do we talk to?

MR. SCHWAAB: So you know, the decision-making on trying to -- you know this is a decision that is going to get made under the auspices of CEQ. They are well engaged in the process now, and ultimately -- I say under the auspices of CEQ, ultimately it's the National Ocean Council and a collection of sort of cabinet-level officials that sit there.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And other people mentioned, maybe Mark, maybe somebody else, during that discussion, that there was a legal

issue and that the legal folks were involved in determining whether it was appropriate or legal or whatever for the councils to be actually having a seat on those regional planning points.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, so that's been part of the deliberation. I think it's less an issue you know -- that's less a point for engagement than it is just a point of information, that there's a -- if there's a you know, if there's a will there's a way, and we seem to be sort of trying to establish the will so that then there's an impetus to find the way.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Fabulous.

MR. JONER: Well I think we've made it clear that we also strongly support that and that's why it was encouraging to hear that word we support having the councils involved.

MR. SCHWAAB: Time for a group

22 hug?

| | Page 262 |
|----|--|
| 1 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. |
| 2 | MR. JONER: Well, and then move |
| 3 | the hug out of the room and that's why we are |
| 4 | wondering |
| 5 | (Laughter) |
| 6 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you for |
| 7 | bringing that up. It was very heartening and |
| 8 | we appreciated it, in fact, her, and all of |
| 9 | NOAA, while she was here. |
| 10 | MR. SCHWAAB: It's probably been |
| 11 | not as apparent as it should be, but she has |
| 12 | been working really hard for fishermen and she |
| 13 | doesn't get the credit for that that she |
| 14 | should get, but she has been. |
| 15 | CHAIR MCCARTY: She gave a good |
| 16 | presentation. |
| 17 | MR. JONER: Thank you. |
| 18 | CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Now we are |
| 19 | going to take a short break. |
| 20 | (Whereupon the above-entitled |
| 21 | matter went off the record at 1:57 p.m. and |

resumed at 2:08 p.m.)

22

Page 263 1 CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks folks. Any 2 time you are ready. 3 MR. FRANKE: Got your stop watch 4 out? 5 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. 6 MR. FRANKE: Anyway, first of all 7 they just passed out a draft document. That's 8 a compilation of the regional working plant 9 and I'll get to those in a minute. 10 Very good work that they preparing those and I'll explain a little bit 11 12 in more detail. 13 Talk louder Ken. CHAIR MCCARTY: MR. FRANKE: I'll talk louder. 14 15 behalf of our subcommittee we would like to 16 preface our comments, with our appreciation 17 for the work, effort of Russ Dunn and Forbes 18 Darby and their staff in moving the 19 recreational fishing and strategic planning 20 method along.

from MAFAC, they have successfully engaged

Based on previous recommendations

21

22

their constituency groups on a national level.

They have designated regional recreational

fishing coordinators and they have moved

forward with developing regional action plans,

which are those draft documents that were just

passed out to you. They are still a work in

progress but getting close to the end.

During our subcommittee meeting,
Russ Dunn and Forbes Darby provided a high
level view of the initiatives they undertook
this past year, as well as the work in
progress.

Present by webinar were the members of the recreational fishing working group who have engaged to help advise the MAFAC Recreational Fishing Subcommittee.

So I believe that in total we have 17 regional experts from throughout you know, the United States and the Pacific who are in that working group.

Noteworthy in their presentation was the summary status of the MRIP program.

NOAA has already started using some of the data in the MRIP program. They are rigorously testing the pilot programs by verifying records, determining best sampling mode, angler logbook or diary for quality data, looking at public and private land fisheries.

There was also an informational briefing on the regional action plans, which are before you. Each region worked with their constituency groups to develop these draft plans.

The plans had a common theme by direction kind of digress, and we had the summit, 177 regional leaders, industry experts. They put together their laundry list of here's what we need to do to move things forward and get a little bit better organized, the very basis of we'll call it critical infrastructure, giving that necessary feedback to Forbes and Russ.

From there they ended up engaging the -- and selecting their regional

coordinators for the development of these plans.

And what's key is these plans, once they put together the initial framework, they didn't stop there, they went back to the constituency groups and the rec fish working group and said okay, what do you think?

And that was where some good dialogue occurred. We met in Seattle and more information was exchanged. So they are putting together a good step forward in revolving the impact and imparting the ultimate decisions.

And the other thing is, is from MAFAC, and I had talked offline with our committee at the last meeting, we were hoping to see measurable things, what can they legitimately get done in a reasonable amount of time and legitimately know that they are going to have funding and resource in order to accomplish the goals.

Looking at that list, I went

through it line by line, I think they are doing a pretty good job. Some of those projects were existing projects, but it is clear that we are getting some order to how we are proceeding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So each region worked with their constituency groups to develop the draft plans. The plans had common themes of the following five items: improving recreational fishing opportunities; improve recreational catch, effort and stock status data through the MRIPs; improve recreational socioeconomic data -- we have a number of regions that are going through an economic analysis right now, I know where I come from, my home, Southwest Center has been working for nine months now coming up with that document and we have political leaders waiting to use it to further some of our efforts and agendas in our region.

Final two items, improve communication -- within that item especially,

we had asked the rec fish working group in our webinar please go back to your constituency groups, get some volunteers, mobilize them and let's get the NOAA coordinator a resource list of here's everybody in your turf that you need to get connected with, and then also if they want to set up a contact system in order to get some dialogue going, great way to do it.

I know in our region we hired an intern for a couple of days. By the time the intern was done we had 400 user groups and we handed it out to the Southwest Center to get them engaged with everybody, so a good way to go it.

Ultimately, we would like to see this ultimate network so that the recreational coordinators and Russ and Forbes will have a mechanism to go directly to them.

The final item was institution orientation, making sure that there's people involved and engaged who really want to be the coordinators and really want to work

furthering the recreational fishing items that are on their work list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Emphasis on the regional action plans is placed on region-specific initiatives that were actionable, measurable and which had a reasonable expectation of success.

Examples from the regional plans are follows, and these are iust priority, just picked out, just to give you a flavor for the items that were in there -the Alaska saltwater Alaska, conducting support fishing economic survey, the Atlantic HMS, improved timeliness of estimated landings from large pelagic survey, going through to the availability of information for fishery management; northeast region, move forward with dam removal and fish passage projects. number of the regions had restoration projects as being real important.

Northwest region, implement hatchery reform the program is funded through the Mitchell Act.

Pacific Islands, reduce postrelease mortality of recreational caught
swordfish.

Southeast region, create fishery-dependent survey in the U.S. south Atlantic to index the abundance of red snapper and other lead fishes.

Southwest region, research and test sea lion depredation methods.

It was noted that in most cases, dates of completion were identified. That was one of the things that you know, we really wanted to see is due dates, how much is this going to cost, and you know, the path that was going to be followed to get the job done.

At the conclusion of the briefing there was an open discussion on future actions. It was clear a tremendous amount of effort had been put forth by the regional coordinators in the development of their plans.

While the themes were nationally

consistent, the actionable items were specific to the region.

2.0

As an ancillary comment, the subcommittee had reviewed the Vision 2020 document prior to this meeting. One of the actionable items for the group was to communicate with the working group and incorporate the aforementioned themes into the future revision of the Vision 2020 document, so that whatever we were envisioning for the future was in fact consistent with what NOAA's staff was working toward.

That way at the end of the road, the paths are going to cross.

This work will proceed and will result in recommendations at the next MAFAC meeting. What we intended to do was take all the information we obtained in this webinar, plus any written comments. We are going to have another conference call and then at the next MAFAC we should be able to come forward with some recommendations and text for the

recreational component of the Vision 2020 document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

During the course of the open discussion, there were two important factors brought forth, one especially actually several especially from the Alaska region, recognizing the recreational NOAA staff were now implementing strategic process, there was a concern that in order for these initiatives to be successful, they needed fiscal security and management council support.

And that was where the impassioned cries came so to speak from a number of the people, where they either had one person on a council or nobody to go to, and there was a concern on their part, is anybody looking out for their interests.

One gentleman from Alaska, and keep me honest here gentlemen, because you were on the calls with us, but he was explaining that now that the sport fishing halibut regulations had come out in Alaska,

they were limited to one fish and then they would have to go -- one halibut, and what is the limit, 36 inches?

MR. DYSKOW: Thirty-seven.

MR. FRANKE: Thirty-seven inches and that was it for the day, and they could go and fish some other rockfish species. Very tough to bring tourists from outside Alaska to come up and try and catch one fish.

So that was just an example of one of their concerns. It was commented repeatedly from various regional working group representatives that they were concerned at the minimal representation or actual loss of representation at the management council level.

This was discussed in a previous

MAFAC meeting and resulted in a previous

recommendation that there should be equitable

representation for all parties at the

management councils. We received the same

commentary from the southeast representatives

1 as well yesterday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

To conclude, the subcommittee reviewed the comments of the meeting, and has two recommendations to bring forward to you all for MAFAC to consider.

Number one, that there is a restatement that MAFAC encourages there to be equitable representation, to include sport fishing on the management councils. A number of seats were lost recently which is getting us down to either one or none, depending on what council it is.

And then the second item is, MAFAC recommends that NOAA incorporates in budget process consideration of recreational fishing initiatives. We understand the budgets are tight. We just would like to encourage that there be consideration given to Forbes and Russ, and the meager resources they in the form of a currently have regional coordinator who is collaterally-assigned a That person has got a full-time job. person.

They have no budget necessarily dedicated directly for their purposes and a part-time ancillary job is to try to hit the pavement, go down to the docks and engage in dialogue and come up with some solutions.

So that was the basis for those two recommendations. At this point, Madam Chairman, I would like to turn it over for discussion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you. I am going to ask Ken, if you want to make those recommendations in the form of motions, and if you do intend to do that, now would be the time, and I think it's best to separate them, and make one motion and then the other, if that -- if you intend to make those as motions.

MR. FRANKE: That would be fine.

The first motion would be a statement that

MAFAC encourages there to be equitable

representation, to include recreational

fishing, on the management councils.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, stop there. 1 2 Let's just do that one first. And then I

3 would seek a second for that. Do you second it Tom?

5 MR. RAFTICAN: Second.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: So that's back on the floor then for discussion. Let's just start there. Phil.

MR. DYSKOW: I'd like to recommend that we change the word encourage to request, because what we are up against is staff is doing excellent work within NOAA. I get the sense that they have gone about as far as they can without their supporting representation on the councils. That's the key next step for them, is if we want to take this from an information-gathering process within NOAA to a successful field project, we need champions on the regional councils.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So, Phil has a friendly amendment. Ken, do you expect that as a friendly amendment?

1 MR. FRANKE: I do.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, so the motion then would request instead of encourages. Thank you. Martin and then Terry and then Paul.

MR. FISHER: Thank you Madam
Chair. I would really like to support the
motion. I am a little confused because I
thought that was one of the mandates of the
councils to have a balance, unknown to itself,
we do have a balancing and there's always the
intent to maintain that balance, so could you
please share briefly which councils are
deficient and perhaps even why?

MR. FRANKE: As I understood, specifically the Alaska group. According to them they have one representation, or one person representing their interests, and I think it was the southeast region that was complaining yesterday?

MR. FISHER: I don't see how that

22 --

MR. FISHER: The Gulf of Mexico was a little concerned about their representation.

MR. FRANKE: Okay, I stand corrected. Gulf of Mexico.

MR. FISHER: Can I follow up on that, because you know, we lost Pam, she is now a council member, she is a recreational representative. There are more recreational representatives than there are commercial on that particular council.

So I'm uncomfortable with this only because those councils that are confined with this already, I don't know, it's almost as if -- it's redundant. Could you, would you consider making this specific? I mean, I challenge the notion that there is an imbalance at the Gulf council. But could you make it more specific to the Atlantic, because it seems like that's really what --

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Can everybody hear 22 Martin? Can everybody hear that?

What we might be able MR. DYSKOW: to do to address that Martin is to say that there's a statement that MAFAC requests there be equitable representation where not already in place. Martin, specific to the Gulf, there was a comment, true or not, I don't know, but from out of the webinar there was the comment made that the Gulf Coast Fishery represents many recreational anglers, and that they felt that they were under-represented and that many of the decisions that had dramatic impact to recreational fishing were being made by people that were aligned with commercial activities in the Gulf.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Whether that's true or not, that was the comment that generated that as it applies to the Gulf. It didn't come from us, it came from people that were participating in the webinar.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So is that appropriate language then for you Ken?

MR. FRANKE: I would think that

solves issues, Martin, just sort of revisit it so the restated motion would be that MAFAC requested there be equitable representation where not already in place, to include recreational fishing on the national councils.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's what we've got up there right now, so that's good. And Terry, Paul and Dave, and I'm not counting you but if you want to jump in at any time, do.

MR. SCHWAAB: Sure. Let's hear some --

MR. ALEXANDER: I was basically going to say the same thing as Martin, that it's clearly all balanced I think. I mean we have four rec guys, four fishermen, and a bunch of NGOs and a bunch of state directors and it's a lot.

I think we are fairly down stuff there. I don't think that's a nationwide issue. So --

CHAIR MCCARTY: And Ken, by the way, it's true that there is only one on the

Alaska -- on the North Pacific Fishery
Management Council. So that is true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FRANKE: Well, we heard quite a bit from the Alaskan constituents.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, I imagine.

MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I just want to comment that you know, a lot of us don't feel they are represented up there in Alaska.

I mean it's said that Alaska is the pride of the lower states and the representatives are supposed to represent all the stakeholders.

CHAIR MCCARTY: They're nominated by the states.

And MR. CLAMPITT: so to put something in here specifically that recreational people need to be at more, or more adequate representation, I think it's a perception, that they feel like they are getting beat up on up there right now, but we feel that way often too, so I don't -- I think you know, it's up to each state's governor to make recommendations and it's to the up

Department of Commerce to decide, the Secretary of Commerce to decide which one he's choosing.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Dave.

MR. WALLACE: Well, my comments are going to be similar to Paul's, you know, the governors select from volunteers, and it's really interesting, we see a number of people who are put forward that are probably not qualified to serve on a regional fisheries management council because they don't know anything about the issues.

And so I suggest to the recreational folks that you recruit highly-competent people, and get the governors to submit their names, and then you have a much better chance of having your representatives appointed.

But you know -- and there has been a lot of that. The Gulf of Mexico once was completely dominated by the recreational fishing, and the commercial fishermen had a

1 lot to say about that, and for good reason.

That was a long time ago but that existed.

And so you know, and there are other groups, consumer advocates and what have you, that complain that they also can be appointed but they can't get appointed and that's because their representatives are not the strong candidates.

And so if you put up Alaska there, you know, the rule is very clear, that there must be at least a proportion of recreational and commercial and other interested parties on councils and so you know, actually, I don't like this motion, because the way the law is constructed, that -- and I rest my case.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Dave.

Martin wanted to speak again and Ken.

MR. FRANKE: Yes, I'm responding to his comment. There was a clear recognition by the parties that were on the webinar that there is the responsibility for the four as you just stated, and to lobby the governors to

1 do that.

The purpose of this was to bring in addition to that work that needs to be done, was to bring it over to the federal side and just bring forward the concept of equitability.

And intentionally we use that word so as not to paint anybody in the corner and let there be a fairness factor, and some good judgment involved in making selections.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks Ken.
Martin.

MR. FISHER: I guess I am still having a little bit of heartburn. I just pulled up the council member directory, and out of 11 voting members and I'm not including state directors, or federal and like Dr. Crabtree, out of 11 voting members there are five that are listed as recreational and that we all know are recreational people.

And then you have two other designations of commercial and other and they

make up the other six. So I'm wondering what equitable means in your mind, if there's five out of 11 voting members that are in one sector, and no other sector comes close to having that amount of voting members, where's the inequity? I don't understand.

Okay, so that okay.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Go ahead.

MR. DYSKOW: The Alaska issue has nothing to do with recreational interests, putting up qualified candidates. I know some of the candidates they have put up. They are degreed marine biologists. They have spent a lifetime on fishery issues in Alaska, I mean they were extremely qualified candidates that this nomination was submitted to the governor for consideration.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Vince.

MR. O'SHEA: Thanks, I'll be quick.

You know on the -- I was on the North Pacific

Council, there's three state directors and

nominally they are charged with looking out

for the interests of both their recreational and commercial, as I think all the state directors are throughout the country.

So I know there's a frustration on the recreational side, and regardless of what the outcome is here, and what NOAA does, I would just offer that that is another venue for them to work the council process to include the state directors who have the charge to represent all the interest groups within their states, and they get to vote. Thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thanks Vince. Good point.

MR. FISHER: Well, I didn't have them yet. I would really support this, I mean I would vote with both hands if we took out ones that were in and put them in Alaska, because that's really what the problem is.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And I'd have to turn over the gavel because I couldn't be participating.

MR. FISHER: I support the idea of encouraging the councils to do that, but it is a council -- it's a council -- it's within the council to fix it, and maybe that's -- I'll shut up.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I'd like to make a quick comment on this if I may. I believe that if there is a feeling out there in the public that there is not equitable representation for whichever sector, then NOAA/NMFS has to deal with that.

I think it's an imperative of the organization to deal with that public perception. If it's real, it's real and it needs to be fixed. If it's real we will find out. And so I believe the integrity of the council process has to be protected and in order to protect it, you have to deal with these issues head on and not say it's not true, it's not true in my area.

I will readily say that in Alaska there is one sport fish representative, and

right or wrong, if there's a perception of that not being equitable then that needs to be addressed.

Maybe it is equitable. Maybe by some economic analysis, you can say that that's equitable. Maybe it's not.

I just believe in the integrity of the council process and I want that not to be challenged by perceptions that weaken the council's ability to serve the public.

So that's my soapbox for the day.

MR. FISHER: Madam Chair. Without being able to deal with this, what do you think this accomplishes?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Pardon?

MR. FISHER: Do you think this motion accomplishes what you don't want to accomplish or what you do want to accomplish?

CHAIR MCCARTY: I support that motion.

MR. FISHER: You do. That's what
I wanted to know.

1

CHAIR MCCARTY: Eric.

MR. SCHWAAB: So thank you Madam

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

Chair and thank you all for this discussion. This is an issue that we spend a lot of time on every year when we go through council appointments, and so I was glad to hear Ken sort of -- the definition of your equitable representation consists of or that it's not sort of just simply a numbers game, I mean obviously that's part of the challenge.

And you know, we have worked really hard in the last couple of years at least, and that's all I can really speak to, to ensure sort of good quality candidates in a good -- with good geographic and sort of interest sector based representation.

We don't always achieve that. I think the prime example that has been noted here is Alaska. We have had some -- we have had some -- I mean the north Pacific and we have had some frustrations because you know, because we never get a slate of candidates

from Alaska that includes a recreational candidate to choose from.

And our option then becomes to sort of push back on that. I mean ultimately the Secretary's response can be to reject the list, and request a new list, and we haven't taken that step.

And -- but it continues to -- I think the north Pacific is the place where we probably, I can honestly say continue to struggle the most.

I mean in the Gulf, you know, there's a -- sometimes there's a seat that moves one way or the other, the same is true in a lot of the other councils.

I think we have in this year a Gulf seat that shifted by one from a recreational to another and I'm looking over at Russ because he keeps track of all this stuff very closely.

But, and we issue a report and that report is available I think on the web.

It talks about you know the council makeup and the like.

So this continues to be an important issue for us. You know I don't certainly object at all to -- and it's in fact welcome, you know, MAFAC is sort of reminding us of the importance of this issue.

But you know, rest assured, we are you know, we are focused on it, we certainly focused on it in those two or three months in the spring when the process unfolds.

But you know, I have also thought a little bit about how we could work with some of the governors to ensure that we get good lists -- continue to get good lists or in the case that maybe that we don't get adequate sort of diversity, try to encourage them to beef that up, and I think that opportunity would also be available to constituents in those states.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I'd also like to clarify just a little bit more what I was

perception of any inequitable representation, it doesn't matter if it's recreational fishermen. It could be Alaska natives, in the case of the Alaska region, it could be Washington-based, it could be any sort of sector or subsector that feels as though they are not being represented. That's not good for the council process is my point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And we need to just deal with it somehow, and figure it out, region by region what's there, and encourage the governors to do what's fair and everything else. I mean that was my point. So --

MR. CLAMPITT: Just one last thing, in the Alaska council by mandate, Alaska gets at least six out of the eleven votes and our organization right now, along with fishing groups from Oregon and California, are trying to change that, so that we are all represented on there and equitably.

We feel like we are getting beat up all the time. They are changing laws that I mean the stated goal of Alaska is to Alaskan-ize all of the fisheries.

They want every -- they want us to get lost basically. So I take exception to that motion. I mean if we want to remove recreation, which doesn't make sense because it's a recreational subcommittee, but I think you know, the goal is to have equitable representation everywhere and we are trying to achieve that, like you said.

But I can't support that, because a lot of us get beat up.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MS. DOERR: I just want to ask -I just wanted to suggest some potential
language to address all this and to have it
state MAFAC requests that there be equitable
representation of all recreational, commercial
and other fishing interests in the management
council, or other interests in the management

1 councils.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Can you say that one more time please?

MS. DOERR: MAFAC requests that there be equitable representation of all recreational, commercial and other fishing interests on the management councils.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are you suggesting that as a friendly amendment to Ken?

MR. FRANKE: I would accept that recommendation because our ultimate goal dealing with all the folks, is to do the right thing, be fair, and be reasonable, and I think that friendly motion meets those requirements, but I'd open it up for further discussion. I think that's a good solution. Again, we were dealing with our subcommittee, that's why we had the word recreation. We dealt with this exactly the same way the last time we took out the word recreation and just said fishing, and that was the solution the last time as well.

CHAIR MCCARTY: So that's been

accepted as a friendly amendment. So that becomes the motion language now. Thank you Patty.

MR. FRANKE: Good job Patty.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Martin.

MR. FISHER: Well now I can vote with both hands.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Mark was showing me the Magnuson act and you might just read those two lines, just for information.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Eric and others are submitting a list of names instead of the governor of the state submitting a list of names, shall include at least one nominee each from the commercial, recreational and charter fishing sectors, and at least one other individual who is knowledgeable regarding the conservation and management of fisheries resources in the jurisdiction of the council.

Those are the legal or statutory lists of the range of candidates' labels.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you. Just

1 send that to the governors, right? Julie.

MS. MORRIS: So, isn't this a restatement of what the current law and rules are?

5 CHAIR MCCARTY: Probably.

MR. CLAMPITT: Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: According to what we just heard. Is that a bad thing? Are you saying that's a bad thing? Julie?

MS. MORRIS: Well --

CHAIR MCCARTY: I didn't catch it.

MS. MORRIS: Not necessarily that it's bad but I mean, it's always nice to reinforce what the law is. It seems like this comes to us because there's a sense in specifically Alaska that this has been the case, and we had an explanation that it's because the governor doesn't nominate anybody

And so I support this but it doesn't seem like it addresses the real problem.

with recreational interests.

1 CHAIR MCCARTY: Go ahead.

MR. SCHWAAB: So you know, of course, the underlying -- the underlying counter-argument coming out of in the north Pacific is that commercial fisheries dominate up there.

Therefore, you know, having you know, numbers balance would be inappropriate but there are still remains, I think, a legitimate concern that one is not enough, and partly because of I think reasons that Paul articulated we wouldn't -- it would be hard for the other states to provide us that name without sort of even further, you know, disproportionately affecting the commercial interests from the states outside of Alaska.

So we you know, have hoped to and have tried to you know, encourage Alaska to be more -- to provide a more diverse slate of candidates. Ultimately our choice is going to be to reject the list and it may come to that, but it hasn't yet.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Bill and then Paul.

3 MR. DEWEY: I lost my thought.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Paul.

MR. CLAMPITT: Another comment about Alaska. It's not like they don't have any representation. I mean, they spent 10 years trying to work out an equitable catch share program between the commercial sector and the commercial charter sector. They don't like to call themselves commercial but they are.

And we handled this, it took 10 years, it finally passed, and then it went to the Federal Register, it went up for review, they asked for an extension. They got it.

And then the state of Alaska stepped in and said wait a minute, we don't know enough yet.

And they threw the whole thing out and it's all back on the table. So it's not like the charter boats in Alaska don't have representation and nobody is looking out for

1 them.

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: That is a whole big

3 | issue --

4 MR. CLAMPITT: Yes.

5 CHAIR MCCARTY: And one that I

6 hesitate to get into in this forum.

MR. CLAMPITT: Well we will.

CHAIR MCCARTY: We will eventually

9 I'm sure.

7

8

10 MR. DEWEY: Thank you Madam Chair.

11 I'm not familiar with how the council

12 succeeded, but I just wanted to make it clear

for the motion who MAFAC is making this

14 request of.

15 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. Unless it's

16 stated otherwise, I am assuming that that was

17 the advice, is that right? That was right.

18 Steve.

19 MR. JONER: I just want to add for

20 those who may not be totally familiar with

21 Alaska and what is apparently you know, not a

22 balanced representation, what I think Eric

said, the vast majority of the fisheries are large, commercial fisheries. The other thing Alaska has that no other state has is subsistence fishing. So if you live in a community, I guess smaller than Juneau, Sitka, you have a subsistence fishery.

So I have a daughter in Juneau -in Sitka. They catch all the halibut the way,
all the salmon they want, they go put out a
long line for it, they can go out and reel,
they can set a gill net for sockeye.

So it's not like the average state and the recreational fishing is through these charter boats, or the odd guy who goes up there and has his own boat.

But it's a different situation, and I know in the Pacific council, there's probably four, five recreational, three, three but things are done through the states.

That's kind of the structure. And I know in Washington they are -- the recreational fisheries are very equitably represented

within the policies of the state of Washington. So you can't exclude those.

But you know, I think if I were a support representative sitting through discussions on Steller sea lions or bycatch rates in the whiting trawl fishery, you know, that's -- if you don't have that much direct interest or involvement, it's probably best not to have somebody with just a narrow focus, and as a sportsman, you know, I think they need to certainly be represented but there are other factors that play into it that I think we need to be aware of.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Steve.

I think you have had the discussion on this.

I think we are ready for a vote. All in favor of this motion raise your hand.

(Show of hands)

CHAIR MCCARTY: All opposed raise your hand.

(Show of hands)

MR. ALEXANDER: I'm going to

1 abstain.

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: Any other

3 abstentions?

4 MR. RIZZARDI: I did. I missed

5 too much of it. I abstained.

6 CHAIR MCCARTY: Keith is

7 abstaining. Keith and Paul are abstaining.

8 It passes. Thank you. Go for it Ken.

9 MR. FRANKE: The second item, this

10 regards specifically the support of

recreational staff assigned by NOAA, MAFAC

12 recommends that NOAA incorporates in the

budget process consideration of recreational

14 fishing initiatives. In other words, just be

able to make comment to the regional

16 coordinators and their administrative staff

that they ought to be taking a look at budgets

and what do they need in order to succeed

depending on what their missions are in their

20 various areas.

21 Right now, as I understand it,

22 it's loose in the area of what is done and

they do their best with what they have, but it was just to put it out there that they ought to think long-term now and start solidifying their presence in the world. We really think this idea of regional coordinators. We would like to see it continue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: So it sounds likes there's more than just a budget issue there.

But I could be wrong. I'm hearing you say regional coordinators, regional coordinator.

Is that something that has not been put in place because it isn't funded, or what?

MR. FRANKE: We looked through the regional coordinators, and will say that the budget -- that the fiscal awareness of them has been an indicator that they were going to be there to stay, versus, if their new staff coming in to take over, and there's no line item there for those coordinators to support their mission, that's basically up for grabs whether or not their functionality will continue. So would like to that we see

1 continue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

think MR. SCHWAAB: I the key point is that we went out to each region where we. didn't already have а recreational coordinator designated and essentially tasked the regional administrator with identifying somebody to assume that role.

And it sounds to me like what you are asking for is that we sort of lend that a greater sense of permanence in the planning and budgeting process.

And you know, I think that's a fair -- that's a fair request.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you Eric. I didn't ask you to make that into a motion, but I am assuming it's a motion.

MR. FRANKE: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And then second?

MR. RAFTICAN: Second.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And Tom. It's been seconded. So is there discussion or

questions on this motion? Martin.

MR. FISHER: Thank you Madam
Chair. We need more money for data. We need
more money for data for recreational and
commercial. Every time in my neck of the
woods that the recreational angling community
goes over their tack by a million pounds, we
lose -== we all lose, the commercial fishery,
the tack gets lowered because we no way to
count you guys' fish. You have no way to
count your guys' fish.

Now if this, if funding the -- I am a little bit off on what recreational fishing initiatives, that's a broad term, and if you want to direct money at creating a better data stream for the recreational community, I'm all for that, I'll vote for that with both hands because that's going to help me too. It's going to help all of us.

I don't really understand what recreational fishing industry --

MR. FRANKE: I'd love to answer that if I may.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Please.

MR. FRANKE: Those action plans that you received, most of those are funded items through existing work that NOAA is doing, but there are unfunded things, like for instance having somebody do staff work to research who all the constituency groups are, to pay for web development so that they can have an informational source with all the regulations on them and have a forum to go and answer questions.

Most of it is not high dollar items. It's day to day, conducting business expenses. We just wanted to support all the work that Forbes and Russ have been doing to make sure that everybody recognizes that we really want to acknowledge that they are here to stay, so, and give their folks the tools they need in order to do the job.

MR. FISHER: Well, that doesn't necessarily help me formulate my opinion but I understand.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I understand. 1 Is 2 there other comment or questions? Let's try this. Is there objection to this motion? 3 4 (No response.) 5 CHAIR MCCARTY: Seeing no objection, it passes unanimously. Thank you, 6 7 Ken. 8 MR. FRANKE: Thank you, Madam 9 Chairman. 10 CHAIR MCCARTY: Good job. Excellent. It's actually like five to three. 11 12 I think I just want to have a couple of minutes to talk about Vision 2020. 13 14 We didn't have it on the agenda to report out as a subcommittee. It's an ad hoc 15 16 committee, not a standing committee, and the 17 members of the committee can be anybody. 18 So if anybody wants to jump on and 19 help that would be really great. We had a 20 meeting on the telephone as probably most of 21 you know, because most of you were on it, and

then we had another meeting here which had new

22

1 members involved.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

And so we kind of went back over everything that we had talked about on the teleconference, and what we ended up doing, I don't have a written report for you and I apologize, but when we get the minutes back from this meeting we will put together sort of a summary of this and send it out to you.

Basically what we have ended up doing is deciding on the things that needed to be added to Vision 2020. We decided that it was going to be --

MR. SCHWAAB: This is Tom's last meeting --

15 CHAIR MCCARTY: Pardon?

MR. SCHWAAB: This is Tom's

17 goodbye. He's out the door.

18 CHAIR MCCARTY: Tom is leaving

19 right now?

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes.

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: Sorry.

MR. SCHWAAB: Madam Chair, I would

request for a moment that we break from the agenda.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Absolutely.

4 Absolutely. Go for it.

MR. SCHWAAB: To recognize a very longstanding member who is departing literally as well as figuratively. So Tom, I said earlier --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Pictures.

MR. SCHWAAB: that there are a number of people here that I have spent just a huge amount of time with on the committee and outside of the committee, since I joined the committee, and you are one of those people, and it's just been a great pleasure working with you in all those capacities and I expect to continue to work with you in one of those capacities and several others, but we had this plaque made to recognize your service to the Department, to NOAA, to the committee, and we wanted to present that to you at this meeting, your last meeting.

(Applause.)

MR. RAFTICAN: I'm amazed. The pleasure has been all mine. Working with you folks has really been an experience, a really great experience and, you know, I take away so much more from this than I bring to the table.

I'd like to thank you -- Eric,
thank you again for the good job that job that
you are doing out there, recognizing MAFAC,
raising the level, and truly it's been a
pleasure and I'll miss you guys, I really
will. So I'll catch up with most of you
around the corner anyhow.

(Applause.)

MR. SCHWAAB: That's a little preview for a few of you others.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, a little tear in my eyes there. Anyway, we assigned people to jobs basically and some of you don't even know it yet. Tony, for example, you have a job. So I hope you will accept it. I'll tell you what it is later because I can't

1 remember what number it is.

It's one of the things that you wanted to add. So -- and also I think you volunteered to help with the climate change discussion, as well. So, anyway --

DR. CHATWIN: So it's something

7 else?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

22

CHAIR MCCARTY: Pardon?

DR. CHATWIN: Something else?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Water quality?

MR. FISHER: I took that one.

12 CHAIR MCCARTY: You took water

quality. I can't remember. I am a little

14 verklempt. Anyway, I think that is going to

be a good effort. It's going to be not

16 anywhere near as complicated as the first

17 effort. It's really not that hard. We are

18 going to identify where it needs to be

19 updated. We are going to add some of the

20 current themes and current trends, and make

21 our recommendations.

We are going to go up through

2040, is kind of what we -- 2040, yes. Twenty more years. So we are going to expand a little bit and it will come back to you, of course, probably several times, but the first step is doing this assignment work that we assigned ourselves, and that's all due on th

November 14 .

So a week after that, what we will have is a red-line version with all of the additions, all the recommended additions, and the changes, updates and so on, and we will send that out to the full group at some point th

quite soon after November 14 . That will be the first step. I imagine there will be other teleconferences of the working group and I'm sure it will culminate in a meeting of the entire group, whether it be by teleconference or at next spring's meeting, I'm not entirely sure yet.

But I think we are going to try to get it done relatively quickly because it doesn't need to get dragged out. So I am

going to be heading that up as the chair of that subcommittee until my time with you is over, and then it will be up to the next Chair as to whether that person wishes to chair the standing, I mean the ad hoc committee, or pass it off to somebody else that's already working on things. So that'll be a decision that'll be made by the new Chair.

So that's it -- oh, we appreciate you getting the aquaculture stuff, and so that's sort of ready to go, essentially. The recreational stuff, Ken -- Ken, I think we need your stuff sooner than the next MAFAC meeting, and if you want to talk about that later we can.

But basically the time line that
we have sort of envisioned doesn't really
anticipate waiting that long to get that
material. So we are going to have to ramp
that up a little bit.

MR. FRANKE: We can do that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. I just

wanted to let you know, I noticed it was part of your report but I didn't mention it when you said it so -- anybody else on the working group want to say anything else about where we are at with that?

Okay, so we have pretty much covered it. And Patty volunteered to do all kinds of stuff. So okay, we are going to have the election now, unless we have other things having to do with these reports.

MR. ALEXANDER: What about this? Where did we end up with this? Are we taking this home with us or are we --

CHAIR MCCARTY: What are you pointing at?

MR. ALEXANDER: The paper from -CHAIR MCCARTY: No we are not. We
are going to have a webinar at some point in
the near future, at which we will be working
from material that is going to be developed by
staff and volunteers and we are going to be
preparing that before the webinar so that we

1 are prepared.

So I am going to turn it over to you Mark to do this unless you would like me to run it in some way? Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: So it's very simple. We are going to hold a paper ballot.

We have nominations for Chairperson and ViceChair. The nominees for Chairmen in alphabetical order are Tony Chatwin and Keith Rizzardi.

The nominations for Vice-Chairman in alphabetical order are Martin Fisher and Dave Wallace. We have exclusive paper ballots.

MR. SCHWAAB: You're not going to paint everybody's finger?

(Laughter)

DR. HOLLIDAY: One for each line here with the left hand side, and then report the results.

With this, make your mark, it's anonymous voting. Just fold it in half and

then give it back to me and we'll tally the vote.

We had pre-voting so Tom already voted before he left, so he didn't lose his opportunity, and actually Paul was on his way out the door and so he voted as well. Tom did vote?

CHAIR MCCARTY: And just to be clear, the gavel doesn't get turned over right now.

11 (Laughter)

12 CHAIR MCCARTY: It stays with me

until I leave which is December 8 I believe.

DR. HOLLIDAY: Did you get one?

15 CHAIR MCCARTY: No I didn't.

16 DR. HOLLIDAY: Because we had this

17 | one --

18

19

20

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

And if you have voted and want me to pick it up, raise your hand. I'll mark it off that I have received them.

21 CHAIR MCCARTY: You're going to 22 take these and tabulate them right?

subcommittee chair, you are also a member of

22

the executive committee. We have rarely convened though during the course of putting together Vision 2020, we did quite often, because it was easier to get the executive committee together than the whole group.

But if you are interested in being the chair of any of the subcommittees, Mark asks that you submit your name to him ASAP and either by email -- I recommend email actually, just so there's a record of it. So that's what I would do if I wanted to be considered and then that person for each of the subcommittees is chosen by the leadership, right?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, by Eric.

CHAIR MCCARTY: By Eric. Phil.

MR. DYSKOW: Is it possible that an existing Chairman can have another term?

DR. HOLLIDAY: Possible? Sure.

CHAIR MCCARTY: An existing

21 chairman of a subcommittee?

MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

1 we choose to replace him?

2 CHAIR MCCARTY: You do not. You do not.

4 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are there other questions? No? Okay Mark. Do you want to do the meeting stuff?

DR. HOLLIDAY: So thank you to everybody who took my request this morning about meeting times for the next two meetings.

We are scheduled -- we are going to have to schedule two meetings in 2012. And we identified again open dates.

We have everybody's votes in and the dates for the spring meeting of all the people who are on the committee who were voting with one exception is the week of May nd th

22 to the 24 . Everybody but one of our commission members can attend that at that point in time.

There were five people who could attend on the alternate spring date. So the

general way we try to do this is to find a time when the overwhelming majority of people can come but it's pretty rare that we find a date that everybody can come.

nd

So I'm targeting May 22 to the

as the date for the spring meeting and then we can entertain -- I'll go through the other date first and then we can entertain suggestions by the committee as to where you would like to go.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The second, the fall meeting -- we generally have one in the spring and one in the fall -- the fall meeting we also made a special note that if there is a Managing Our Nation's Fisheries III again our plan is to hold that in October, the dates on

rd

the 23 /4/5 as a placeholder date. That could change but we have included that in the poll to see if MAFAC members would be available and one of the meets -- sorry?

MR. SCHWAAB: Don't they have a

| | Page 322 |
|----|--|
| 1 | hotel contract for that? |
| 2 | DR. HOLLIDAY: No. |
| 3 | MR. SCHWAAB: Okay. Sorry. |
| 4 | DR. HOLLIDAY: They are in the |
| 5 | process of trying to negotiate |
| 6 | MR. SCHWAAB: Okay. Sorry. |
| 7 | DR. HOLLIDAY: And so we gave that |
| 8 | as an option for consideration, and everybody |
| 9 | who participated all the participants in |
| 10 | the poll could make it that week, the week of |
| | th th |
| 11 | November 6 through 8 , and two members who |
| 12 | couldn't make that but everybody else who |
| 13 | submitted on the poll could make it on the |
| | rd th |
| 14 | 23 through the 25 , so that looks to be a |
| 15 | good date for the fall meeting. |
| 16 | The September option had to be |
| 17 | looked at. There were four members who |
| 18 | couldn't make that. So those are what I would |
| 19 | recommend for consideration as the dates based |
| 20 | on the doodle poll. |
| | nd th |
| 21 | CHAIR MCCARTY: May 22 to 24 |
| | rd nd th |
| 22 | and October 23 to May 22 through 24 |

1 and October 23 through 25.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. RIZZARDI: And that is the date that coincides with the rec fisheries three?

CHAIR MCCARTY: We don't know yet.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The tentative date for that, and so we as we discussed earlier, MAFAC would use our funds to bring you to that Managing Our Nation's Fisheries III but we don't have supplemental funds to send you to a third meeting. So we could actually have it the day before or the day after, exclusively for MAFAC business, so that we could continue the momentum that we have generated and keep track of our activities, but also be available to participate fully in the Managing Our Nation's Fisheries III.

The fallback is if that date changes, is pushed off into the future or some other time, we would normally have our fall meeting sometime in October anyway so we will still hold that date, and have a full three-

day MAFAC if there's a Managing Fisheries III,

if that's pushed off until calendar year

2013.

CHAIR MCCARTY: If there's a Managing Fisheries III, is it going to be three full days? Do you know yet?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SCHWAAB: I don't think that we know that yet.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay.

MR. SCHWAAB: I don't think that it would be three full days.

DR. HOLLIDAY: The planning is for two and a half days.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I was just going to say it's obvious that if you want to have other business then attending the Managing Fisheries conference then you would probably have to schedule, just slightly off set the days that the conference was going to be, a day ahead, a day after so that you could do other business in addition to going to the

Managing Fisheries conference. Randy?

You made a comment the other day about the timing for the Managing Fisheries conference and I don't think Eric was here and I know this is slightly out of context, but I do want you to say it again.

MR. FISHER: Well really I was just was wondering about the logic of having the meeting right before the election. Nobody is going to be around. They are all going to be away and I don't want to bring this up, but it's possible that there will be a change in the administration, so the logic of having it right before the election just seems to escape me.

I can see it after the election, in March or something, but since there is no hotel available, you know, maybe it's a good excuse not to do it.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, so I know there was some discussion of that point in the lead up. I don't honestly remember the detail, how

we ended there anyway, so -- but I also was

not aware that there was a booking issue so we

can certainly take that sort of back under

advisement although again, it's -- there was

some awareness of that issue when --

MR. FISHER: Management of what.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes. Yes.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Is there a need for a motion on this Mark?

DR. HOLLIDAY: No, it's not really a motion.

CHAIR MCCARTY: In terms of the timing. I think it sounds like the timing is pretty well self-regulated here, self-choosing. So -- however there is an issue about the place in May.

So Martin?

MR. FISHER: We've been on these discussions for the last two meetings, so people have been talking around, you know, breakfast lunch and dinner, either San Diego or Seattle and Seattle seems to be a good

pick. It's got two regional seats. It's -
this guy over here and all these wonderful

things that he wants to share with us and a

host of other things. So --

CHAIR MCCARTY: Are you throwing out Seattle as a potential place?

MR. FISHER: Or San Diego.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Bill.

MR. DEWEY: So if you do all come to Seattle, it does open up and we'll try -- (Laughter)

MR. DEWEY: If you all want to come on up and see some shellfish farms and dig around we can accommodate that.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Can I come?

MR. DEWEY: So we had last time

MAFAC met out there was actually my first

meeting, so six years ago, but we did it, you

know, we had a wonderful aquaculture tour, got

around some of our shellfish farms. We have

got a restaurant, a clam and oyster house,

catered a dinner at the guys and people pretty

1 much enjoyed it and if there's someone who
2 remembers that --

(Laughter)

Larry Simpson would be with the thumbs up too, Larry continues to talk about dinner since so we would certainly offer to provide that again. I would look forward to that interaction with you all again.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Super. Steve did you want to speak to that?

MR. JONER: Yes, I can't promise fresh sockeye as we had in July of 2006, is that what it was?

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. JONER: But I'm sure the Makah tribe would be glad to, if there was an opportunity, to cook some fish over the fire again.

MR. DEWEY: We would be able to show you all of the exciting new jobs that have been created by the national shellfish initiative.

MR. CATES: How true that is.

(Laughter)

21

22

Page 330 1 Okay. Seattle in CHAIR MCCARTY: 2 May. Raise your hand if you think it's 3 4 a good idea. 5 (Show of hands) MR. JONER: Do I still get to 6 7 vote? 8 CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay, it's 9 unanimous. We did it. And obviously the 10 October one is in D.C. unless the Managing Fisheries doesn't happen and I suppose you can 11 12 cross that bridge when you get to it. Or fall 13 off that bridge when you get to it. 14 MR. DEWEY: I mean, I carry 15 forward from staff but keep in mind that MAFAC has recommended a half day workshop for new 16 17 people coming in. I mean if you are going to 18 do a tour, you are pretty much going to have 19 to dedicate a day, because of the distance to 20 To get out and see things and do our farms. 21 it justice, you need an extra day to do that.

A whole day.

CHAIR MCCARTY:

22

1 Congratulations.

MR. RIZZARDI: Thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That was just too darned easy. Okay. I have -- I have one additional thing and then I will call on Randy. I had one additional thing, and we talked about Managing Fisheries III a number of times. We didn't have it really on the agenda. You had mentioned to me I think a year ago that you thought MAFAC should have a role in that.

We discussed it kind of amongst ourselves, not really formally, but I think we wanted you to know, at least I think that's the will of the group, that we would definitely like to have a role, and I think we just wanted you to know that.

And we have talked about what that role might be. I recommend that an executive committee follows through with this, that maybe the executive committee could be tasked with keeping in touch with everything that is

going on in the development of Managing Fisheries III, and Mark can contact that group with any news and any updates, and then once it gets set, that group can either act as the working group, or appoint a working group to work on how we will participate in that.

Now, if you have specific ideas, I think you should put them out now for us to be chewing on.

MR. SCHWAAB: Thank you. So when we talked a year ago, part of the thought was that we would have a series of smaller workshops that would lead into the bigger event.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, you mentioned that.

MR. SCHWAAB: It is -- and my thinking at that time was that you know there might be a topic or two that would fall into one of those smaller workshop categories that MAFAC would be interested enough to take a view on.

Since that time, there's been I

guess I would say further discussions with the

council coordinating committee, and perhaps

less you know excitement around that model

than we had originally envisioned, which is

6 not to say that model, that concept is dead.

But we just haven't really -- we haven't really circled back to that, and I think all in all the substantive planning has been sort of lagging a bit, and we have a group of three, and I'm looking around the room, because we have a group of three staff, and the council coordinating committee had tasked three people to sort of constitute the organizing committee.

So it seems to me that one of the things we need to do, I mean, we need to sort of go back and get a check in, I do, on where that is and use that as a launch point to come back to this committee and say here's what we -- I think I would think that I certainly can on behalf of NOAA say that we welcome you

know, a strong engagement. I would assume the council coordinating committee members would also welcome that.

hear.

But we will nail it down with them and maybe come back with some recommendations or options.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Thank you.

MR. SCHWAAB: If that's fair.

CHAIR MCCARTY: That's good.

Another loose end, that I wanted to bring up, because you missed it during this meeting too, was MAFAC's role working with the outreach folks, and we were very pleased that we had such a presence from the Department and you and I had also talked about how MAFAC can be a tool for outreach for NOAA/NMFS and we talked a little bit more about that, and I really

two-way street. We can help NMFS look better

and help you teach people what they need to

So I just wanted to bring that up

hope that you use MAFAC to do that.

1 since you missed that discussion.

MR. SCHWAAB: Oh great, thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes. Is there

anything else that people feel that Eric

missed that he needs to hear very briefly?

Okay. I am taking the opportunity. I hope

you don't mind.

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SCHWAAB: No.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Then that I think concludes my points. Randy.

MR. CATES: I would just like to make a couple of comments and maybe some thought from MAFAC. Martin said something yesterday in the subcommittee hearing that really caught my attention, and that was he had put a document structure in front of you folks and then he clarified that for MAFAC to basically take ownership of what MAFAC wants to do with recommendations.

And I thought about that and I think it's very true especially with some of the measures that are going on and I thought

about the time I've had on MAFAC, and how we conduct business, and I think there should be a discussion in the future of when is MAFAC at its best, and to me, MAFAC has been at its best when we have dialogue like we did earlier today, where we take a hard issue and we discuss it, and it seems that as time has gone by we have gotten less of that, and I think we need to structure the meetings a little bit more where we have more dialogue and more back and forth and we draw from each other's expertise.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that, Having said I think valuable tool that I always look at is having Randy Fisher here because he has got so much history on MAFAC, and we can draw from what it used to be like and how it evolved changed, and with the new members and going We need to find a way for the new forward. group, how can we best advise the Secretary of Commerce, and to me it is more -- more of indepth on an issue, and less of presentations

1 and short cue answer time.

I mean let's get into the hard issues. Let's do the hard work. That's what we are here for and let's not be afraid of opposing opinions.

CHAIR MCCARTY: I agree with you completely.

MR. CATES: One other quick thing.

Maybe I mentioned this too, what you just

said, about outreach, but do we need to be

careful of that as far as the documents that

we sign when we first sign up, remember when

we first signed up we got the talk about how

we are an advisory group and we are not in

lobbying and doing the things -- so there's a

fine line there I think.

MR. SCHWAAB: Yes, I don't -- Mark probably understands sort of the details of that better than I.

DR. HOLLIDAY: I don't think there's any risk of -- I think most people who have been on the committee understand

boundaries of the difference between lobbying

-- we have made that clear, as we come to

town, if you came here to town on MAFAC money

and you want to go up and talk to the

representatives on the Hill, you are crossing

the line between using federal funds for

lobbying and that sort of thing.

So those are pretty straightforward. I think the only risk you have is when you are outside of MAFAC and you are at a public hearing or you are at a council meeting or someplace else, you need to make sure you are just -- when you identify yourself, who you represent.

So you are not representing MAFAC at that point in time, even if you are a MAFAC member. You are representing your organization or your firm or your client.

So I think sort of the clarity of transparency when you are making these determinations, are you speaking on behalf of a position that MAFAC has voted on, are you

conveying that? Versus you are representing your day job, your paying job or your constituency.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I think most people seem to get it. I don't, you know, have many questions about circumstances where people uncertain, so I think that's the only time when it would become that -- when I'm out there doing something in a council arena or some other public venue, who Ι representing, and just making sure that's clear.

And if you do that, and you sort of self-identify, I don't think you'll have any potential problems communicating and staying clear or running afoul of any ethical conflicts.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Okay. Any other points to the good of the order?

Okay you want to do that now?

Let's do that.

MR. SCHWAAB: It's time

1 CHAIR MCCARTY: It's time.

MR. SCHWAAB: So to the rest of the outgoing members.

CHAIR MCCARTY: Except for Cathy.

MR. SCHWAAB: So a lot of the same personal sentiments go, but Steve Joner, so I will just say this which is in lots of venues where we ask individuals to represent in some fashion the interests of the tribes and that's particularly challenging and tasking because of the diversity of interests that exist, I will just say, from the get-go and throughout Steve, you have done just a great job of doing that I think with skill, with just the right amount of assertiveness, and just you know perhaps a little more than the right amount of storytelling --

(Laughter)

And I will never forget, I will never forget for the rest of my life Joner and the whale.

MR. JONER: And I appreciate your

1 kids being attentive.

MR. SCHWAAB: We still talk in my house about Joner and the Whale.

(Applause).

MR. JONER: I'm happy with what

Tom said and Randy says it a lot and that is

it feels like he's the one that's being

informed coming to these things.

You know I have really learned a lot about the agency, about fisheries about the country, and of course we've had some really good work here, and I'm going to miss it, but I'm glad you're coming to Seattle because it will be a good phase-out for me and hopefully we can have a repeat with the full program this time, the Makahs really wanted to sing and dance and show up there but more importantly teach games to you.

So anyway, it's been a very very rewarding experience. I've learned many things.

(Laughter)

1 (Simultaneous speaking)

2 (Applause)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So the next one is MR. SCHWAAB: Bill Dewey. So Bill I think you know came in at a time when the committee was very focused on advancing the agency's aquaculture agenda, came right in, I think at the perfect time to complement our former Chair, Tom Billy, because what Bill brought was the real world experience that had -- that we have been able to translate into what I think are now only a very effective hot set of policies but also some very effective sets of actions, and I think that really of sort you know, demonstrates the MAFAC expertise feeding right into agency plans and actions, at its very best, and obviously you have done that with a tremendous amount of skill and grace So Bill, it's been great, and we'll warmth. see you soon.

(Applause).

MR. DEWEY: Thanks for the kind

words and I just want to thank everybody, I
have really enjoyed the relationships I've
made, all of the education and information.

You have broadened my knowledge so much about
the country's fisheries and you have extended
my knowledge on aquaculture.

I'll miss you guys. I'll look forward to seeing you in May. We'll have a good time.

(Applause)

MR. SCHWAAB: And last but certainly not least, Madam Chair. This is your last meeting right?

So you know, for lack of a better characterization I'll refer to you as the jack of all trades, right, I mean you have filled almost every function and every role that we have needed you to fill, up to and including your recent term as the chair, and it has just been a pleasure.

And in every one of those roles you have brought energy. You have brought

expertise. And you have brought a get-it-done kind of approach and we served over the years on subcommittees together and it was always a pleasure either having you on the subcommittee or running the subcommittee, because we knew we would get to the goal line and it would be the right -- we would be in the right place.

And so you know, you have brought that, I think, particularly to a number of the important initiatives that will carry on beyond your tenure here on the committee.

And thank you most for stepping up and serving as chair in this last year, and so Heather it's been a pleasure and --

(Applause)

CHAIR MCCARTY: You guys are fabulous, and you know it's been an honor working with you all, and with the agency. I have a little bit of a soft spot for the agency understandably, and I know way too much about it.

But I still like it and I still

believe that NMFS in particular does incredible work and the fact that I have been able to be part of that for this long is huge to me.

It meant a lot to me personally and professionally and it's already been said a bunch of times, you know, you get more than you give in this group, because of all the incredible back and forth, and Randy, I agree with you, there needs to be always that.

And don't be afraid to do the hard stuff because you can, and that's what you are here for, and if I had any advice to give you, it would be don't be afraid of controversy and do it with a smile on your face, and have respect for other people and you'll be okay.

It's also been a pleasure to work with the staff and I want to thank everyone for the support that you have given me this last year.

202-234-4433

(Applause)

MR. JONER: Heather, I'd just like

to note that our class is very unique and 1 2 privileged because we came in with Eric and he is the boss now, and in that time, we served 3 with three NMFS administrators so you know, we 4 5 had a great opportunity to get to know a lot of people and to be working with three 6 7 different individuals so that was I think a 8 real pleasure for us, for me especially. 9 CHAIR MCCARTY: It was. And I'd 10 like to say a couple of words about Cathy. MR. SCHWAAB: Oh yes, thank you. 11 12 CHAIR MCCARTY: Ι don't know 13 whether you are intending to do that. 14 MR. SCHWAAB: So yes, I guess 15 you're going to have to go to Kodiak and 16 deliver that, huh? 17 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, Cathy was --18 she was an inspiration. She was a workhorse. 19 She was a sweetheart. Talk about doing the 20 hard things with a smile on your face.

she's listening somewhere, but it broke her

Cathy Foy and

hope

That

was

21

22

1 aren't in the room. Even better.

So if anybody wants to say a few words about the outgoing members feel free to do so.

MR. DEWEY: Let the record reflect that there was a standing ovation for Cathy Foy.

(Laughter)

CHAIR MCCARTY: Even though I don't think we stood up.

MR. DEWEY: Yes we did.

12 CHAIR MCCARTY: All right.

13 Congratulations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. RIZZARDI: Thank you.

CHAIR MCCARTY: And

16 congratulations Martin. It's in good hands

with you guys.

MR. RIZZARDI: Well, we still have

19 you for a few more months so --

20 CHAIR MCCARTY: Yes, you do I'm

going to be working hard too, I don't know

22 why. Anyway, unless there's other items of

| | Page 350 |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | business I think we stand adjourned. |
| 2 | (Whereupon the above-entitled |
| 3 | matter adjourned at 3:35 p.m.) |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |

| | achieve 289:17 | 178:11 222:5 | 233:2,15,16 | 271:8 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| A | 293:12 | 223:5 253:3 | 325:13 | afoul 340:16 |
| ability 288:10 | acknowledge 72:8 | 299:19 311:3,19 | administrative | afraid 338:4 |
| able 15:15 38:12 | 306:17 | added 33:15 144:9 | 15:13 234:3 239:7 | 346:11,14 |
| 70:9 99:20 105:9 | act 27:4 100:13 | 308:11 | 240:11 302:16 | afternoon 14:5,17 |
| 112:1 114:14 | | addendum 140:13 | administrator 3:4 | 16:20 17:1 206:2 |
| 173:8 205:2 | 121:3,4 140:15 | | | |
| 247:12 271:21 | 144:12 154:9 | adding 138:13 197:15 223:1 | 3:20 304:6 administrators | agencies 131:1 |
| 279:1 288:13 | 167:5 168:2 179:2 | 228:9 | 347:4 | 195:20,21 216:18 |
| 302:15 328:19 | 180:4 181:12 | = := | | 217:1,8,14 220:11 |
| 343:10 346:3 | 200:11 236:17 | addition 108:15 | adopt 29:12 186:12 | 220:12 |
| above-entitled | 269:22 295:9 | 132:8 172:3 237:3 | 212:8 | agency 21:19 22:3 |
| 206:3 262:20 | 333:4 | 284:3 324:22 | adopted 35:7 210:3 | 23:4 49:1 101:14 |
| 350:2 | acting 168:11 | additional 6:5 | 210:20 211:4 | 101:19,21 102:9 |
| abreast 219:12 | 235:17 | 32:13,16 33:10,15 | adopting 107:4 | 109:4 110:8 174:9 |
| absolute 253:15 | action 176:22 | 34:5 53:14 93:8 | adoption 104:5 | 175:16 195:21 |
| Absolutely 4:16 | 193:5,8,17 194:4 | 121:19 123:2 | advancement | 231:4,5 256:19 |
| 39:19 138:14 | 195:5 221:7 | 139:12 209:16 | 210:7 | 342:10 343:16 |
| 155:1 309:3,4 | 254:22 264:4 | 237:1 257:8 332:5 | advancing 63:3 | 345:18,20 |
| abstain 204:2 | 265:8 269:3 306:2 | 332:6 | 343:6 | agency's 343:6 |
| 302:1 | actionable 269:5 | additions 38:4 | advantage 6:20 | agenda 7:20 10:8 |
| abstained 302:5 | 271:1,6 | 312:10,10 | 89:18 250:3 | 10:13 70:22 |
| abstaining 204:3,8 | actions 55:10 183:9 | address 41:16 47:9 | adverse 194:19 | 204:17 229:17 |
| 242:7 302:7,7 | 212:2 219:19 | 51:5 63:12 65:18 | advice 55:16 57:12 | 236:22 307:14 |
| abstentions 242:6,7 | 270:18 343:13,16 | 83:6 131:2 139:7 | 57:14 68:2 69:3 | 309:2 317:10 |
| 242:8 302:3 | actively 260:2,8 | 139:14,15 148:21 | 69:11,12 70:5 | 332:9 343:6 |
| abundance 270:6 | activities 26:5 44:3 | 157:15 180:14 | 73:3 76:22 77:11 | agendas 267:19 |
| accept 150:5,7 | 45:11,11 46:6 | 193:1 196:3 223:6 | 99:20 171:8 172:3 | agent 15:15 |
| 212:14 294:10 | 48:5,6 52:16 | 279:2 293:18 | 186:13 195:6 | agents 249:1 |
| 310:21 | 53:22 54:15,20 | addressed 45:2 | 196:9 198:22 | aggregate 76:13 |
| acceptable 146:5 | 55:1 76:6 85:4 | 47:1 48:10 61:19 | 257:7 299:17 | aggressive 170:22 |
| acceptance 113:17 | 143:3 183:17,18 | 66:2 118:20 | 346:13 | 190:8 |
| accepted 14:9 | 233:20 279:14 | 142:18 144:11,20 | advise 149:13 | aggressively 63:12 |
| 153:3,4,5,9 295:1 | 323:15 | 174:22 288:3 | 193:22 243:11 | ago 16:10 72:5 74:3 |
| access 94:2 116:16 | activity 53:6 77:6 | addresses 198:9 | 264:15 337:20 | 178:21 283:2 |
| acclamation 329:5 | 118:11 184:3 | 296:21 | advisement 326:4 | 327:18 332:10 |
| 329:10 | 189:13,15 195:17 | addressing 235:21 | advising 194:21 | 333:11 |
| accommodate | acts 100:13 | adds 85:15 | advisory 1:5,10 | agree 73:10 81:1 |
| 327:14 | actual 173:3 | adequate 128:2,6 | 246:4 248:14 | 90:11 98:13,14 |
| accomplish 129:21 | 222:22 273:14 | 129:1,3,4 130:2 | 338:14 | 99:22 110:13 |
| 161:8 266:21 | actuality 247:4 | 281:17 291:16 | advocate 100:21 | 118:14 122:14,17 |
| 288:18,18 | acute 115:13 | adequately 144:20 | advocates 283:4 | 122:19 126:1 |
| accomplishes | ad 307:15 313:5 | adjacent 244:13 | affect 55:9 82:4 | 127:12 137:13 |
| 288:14,17 | adaptive 89:22 | adjourn 3:22 | 87:11 188:5,9,10 | 157:11 174:21 |
| account 22:19 | add 37:19 88:8 | 205:21 | 188:10 | 175:1 196:5 214:4 |
| accumulation 70:7 | 130:3 134:5 | adjourned 350:1,3 | afford 101:16 | 220:3 247:21 |
| accurate 44:7 | 138:15 168:22 | administration 1:3 | 213:7 | 338:6 346:9 |
| accurately 253:5 | 169:9 170:2 178:2 | 98:1 216:19 231:5 | aforementioned | agreed 39:14 |
| accuractly 255.5 | | | | |
| | ı | | ı | 1 |

| | I | | I | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------|
| 130:11 | alphabetical 14:11 | Andy 147:15 | apologize 4:20 | 212:7 220:12 |
| agreeing 112:4 | 14:14 315:9,12 | Angie 165:8 | 38:13 308:6 | 222:5 244:1,3 |
| agreement 16:5 | alternate 320:22 | angler 265:5 | apparent 259:20 | 246:3 247:7 |
| 79:3,6 164:20 | alternative 64:5,10 | anglers 279:9 | 262:11 | 258:14 261:2 |
| agreements 215:19 | 64:20 70:14 163:7 | angles 114:20 | apparently 130:3 | 279:21 |
| ahead 8:7 59:22 | 199:7 | angling 305:5 | 299:21 | appropriated |
| 117:19 138:15 | amazed 77:16 | animal 171:17 | appealing 162:16 | 232:4 |
| 144:3 148:4 149:4 | 310:2 | 177:21 | appeared 259:19 | appropriately |
| 149:5 163:4,15 | amend 37:19 60:5 | animals 170:16 | appendix 214:12 | 253:14 |
| 213:1 285:8 297:1 | 60:11 122:1 124:9 | 174:7,10,14,18 | applause 310:1,14 | appropriation |
| 324:21 | 125:14 150:2,15 | 177:9 186:22 | 331:21 342:4 | 232:12 |
| air 180:20 | 253:1,11 | 187:5 189:3,20,21 | 343:2,21 344:10 | appropriations |
| alarm 95:21 | amended 147:22 | 196:16,22 | 345:15 346:21 | 256:9,10 329:16 |
| alarming 172:18 | 227:18 | announce 13:12 | 348:7,8,15 | appropriators 57:7 |
| 174:4,7 189:19 | amendment 10:19 | announcement | apple 122:15 | approval 225:20 |
| 191:7 | 122:8 124:19,22 | 256:19 | application 188:16 | approve 151:4 |
| Alaska 93:19 94:6 | 125:6,9,9,19,20 | announcements | applies 279:17 | aquaculture 45:16 |
| 102:11 109:16 | 126:2,3,7 127:5 | 14:1 257:1 | apply 115:21 181:9 | 45:16,17 46:17 |
| 217:19 251:5 | 128:15 129:7 | annual 256:6,11 | applying 182:2 | 48:4 54:1 60:14 |
| 269:11,11 272:6 | 146:2 150:1,12 | anonymous 315:22 | appoint 333:5 | 63:3 73:18 79:4 |
| 272:18,22 273:8 | 153:1 154:12 | answer 43:19 45:20 | appointed 282:18 | 82:10 84:13,18 |
| 277:16 281:1,8,9 | 194:18 197:19,21 | 45:21 47:11 65:3 | 283:6,6 | 97:5,13,18 98:3 |
| 283:9 285:9,14 | 202:1 222:15 | 75:9 88:19,20 | appointments | 131:16 142:18 |
| 286:18 287:21 | 238:10 239:3,11 | 91:2 94:19 165:15 | 289:6 | 144:6,11,17,18 |
| 289:19 290:1 | 239:21 254:17 | 180:7 221:4 | appreciate 7:11 9:1 | 145:3,16 150:10 |
| 292:4,5,16,17 | 276:21,22 294:9 | 305:21 306:11 | 38:9 73:4 77:13 | 151:11,15,18,20 |
| 293:3 296:16 | 295:1 | 338:1 | 78:5 195:13 252:9 | 152:18 154:5,8 |
| 297:16,18 298:6 | amendments 127:9 | answered 148:17 | 258:9 313:9 | 155:22 191:17 |
| 298:17,21 299:21 | 129:12 151:8 | answers 75:8 91:5 | 341:22 | 209:15,19 210:7 |
| 300:3 | 227:8 | 93:8 171:10 | appreciated 262:8 | 210:13 211:2,4,15 |
| Alaskan 281:4 | America 82:16 | anticipate 18:9 | appreciation | 211:17,21 215:6 |
| Alaskan-ize 293:4 | amount 19:10 31:4 | 71:22 313:18 | 263:16 | 216:16 217:5,12 |
| ALEXANDER | 120:6 166:20 | anticipated 229:5 | appreciative 254:6 | 220:6,11 227:8,14 |
| 1:15 10:16 12:16 | 197:8 232:10 | anticipating 207:13 | approach 80:20 | 227:15,16,19 |
| 111:18 113:3,7,16 | 238:19 239:14 | 207:19 228:3 | 114:22 115:2 | 230:8,11,22 |
| 204:22 212:17 | 266:18 270:18 | anybody 10:3 12:8 | 132:7,8 145:22 | 231:14 238:21 |
| 240:9 280:12 | 285:5 309:12 | 13:20 42:18 70:3 | 345:2 | 239:15 242:19 |
| 301:22 314:11,16 | 341:15,16 343:18 | 164:21 225:21 | approached 55:2 | 243:14,19,21 |
| align 63:17 | amounts 188:11 | 272:16 284:8 | 132:4 | 244:1,11,12,13 |
| aligned 279:13 | ample 74:11 | 296:18 307:17,18 | approaches 64:20 | 245:19 246:1 |
| allow 85:4 121:14 | analysis 25:2 37:5 | 314:3 329:5 349:2 | 65:19 93:10 | 252:21 253:3,18 |
| 198:19 205:11 | 114:7 116:4 121:1 | anyway 191:7 | appropriate 12:12 | 254:12 255:13,15 |
| allowed 112:16 | 168:3 267:14 | 201:1 229:18 | 24:21 37:12,22 | 255:20 256:3,9,14 |
| allowing 95:20 | 288:5 | 263:6 310:18 | 50:3 71:7 121:18 | 256:15 257:1 |
| allows 179:16,17 | analysts 10:18 | 311:5,14 323:21 | 155:17 172:1 | 313:10 327:19 |
| 181:14 254:1 | ancillary 271:3 | 326:1 342:19 | 193:12 196:18 | 343:6 344:6 |
| all-inclusive 245:3 | 275:3 | 349:22 | 198:12,22 211:11 | aquaculture-focu |
| | | | , | • |
| | ı | ı | 1 | |

| 252:12 | 106:10 118:2 | 235:16,18 | A-F-T-E-R-N-O | 93:6 232:5,15,16 |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| aquaculture-rela | 139:11 149:10 | assured 291:8 | 207:1 | 232:20 233:5 |
| 227:17 | 168:17 207:9 | astounding 203:2 | a.m 1:10 4:2 39:5,5 | 277:10,12 297:8 |
| archipelago 107:22 | 209:3 218:14 | Atlantic 28:6 | 156:12,12 | balanced 280:14 |
| area 31:18 32:10 | 220:15 268:1 | 269:12 270:5 | 130.12,12 | 299:22 |
| 34:13 44:19 46:18 | 298:16 | 278:19 | | balancing 277:11 |
| 48:9 64:17 71:11 | asking 43:1 66:19 | ATMOSPHERIC | B 53:6 | ballot 315:6 |
| 110:6,7 119:2 | 120:13 154:18 | 1:3 | back 4:8 5:11 6:10 | ballots 14:17 |
| 139:6 142:21 | 155:8 181:7 | attach 144:18 | 9:6 15:14 20:16 | 315:14 |
| 169:16 170:9,17 | 193:19 233:5,11 | attempt 66:15 | 21:6 23:16 24:12 | bare 65:15 |
| 170:17 171:16,18 | 235:8 238:11 | 70:11 | 26:19 33:1 39:7 | based 51:16 60:19 |
| 170:17 171:10,18 | 304:9 | attend 320:19,22 | 39:15 43:15 44:17 | 67:6 105:15 |
| 179:8,9,19 180:2 | asks 318:8 | attending 324:17 | 46:14 53:13 56:4 | 113:12 168:2 |
| 186:16,20 187:1,7 | aspect 8:16 61:13 | attention 100:16 | 65:14 66:6 69:6 | 176:4 182:17 |
| 187:8,9 188:13,20 | aspects 68:4 154:20 | 120:1 157:10 | 76:5 78:14,19 | 200:1 243:7 |
| 190:22 193:10 | asserting 113:22 | 336:15 | 89:13 92:18,19 | 246:19 263:21 |
| 204:9 236:20 | assertiveness | attentive 342:1 | 97:14 98:10 | 289:16 322:19 |
| 287:20 302:22 | 341:15 | audio 61:19 139:9 | 103:11 104:10,15 | basic 81:9 85:21 |
| areas 23:9 28:1 | assess 42:5 43:21 | augment 250:4 | 117:13 118:7 | basically 6:18 |
| 44:11,22 45:2 | 73:16 118:10,22 | auspices 260:14,16 | 140:11 146:3 | 20:11 71:19 73:1 |
| 46:16 47:10,13 | assessing 54:5 | authority 168:1 | 147:3 150:16 | 93:22 167:22 |
| 53:3,16 55:6 | assessment 45:11 | 236:17 | 156:9,13 157:5,8 | 246:20 251:13 |
| 57:17 64:14 85:11 | 48:21 64:4 88:22 | availability 230:12 | 158:16 171:10 | 280:12 293:6 |
| 98:13,15,21 | 89:17,17 90:22 | 269:15 | 172:20 177:14 | 303:20 308:9 |
| 124:17 132:5 | 93:14 95:9,19 | available 13:13,20 | 187:22 196:15,19 | 310:19 313:16 |
| 137:7 144:12 | 100:1 115:13 | 56:12 101:9 163:1 | 197:4 202:21 | 336:18 |
| 162:4 167:18 | 121:1 131:10 | 182:1 217:13 | 203:6 205:22 | basis 265:18 275:6 |
| 170:8,12 179:21 | 133:1 135:18 | 220:14,18 290:22 | 207:4 210:4 | beach 167:1 169:14 |
| 180:1 202:8 244:1 | assessments 44:7 | 291:19 321:21 | 215:12 221:1 | 171:17 187:3 |
| 302:20 | 56:16 63:21 64:11 | 323:16 325:18 | 233:6,9 235:9 | 189:17 |
| arena 340:9 | 86:21 90:21 91:4 | Avenue 1:11 | 241:3 247:12 | beat 281:19 293:1 |
| arenas 138:3 | 91:9,12 92:4 | average 300:12 | 254:22 266:5 | 293:14 |
| argue 36:18 130:16 | 113:5 133:5,6,7 | awake 208:20 | 268:2 276:6 290:4 | beef 291:18 |
| arguing 240:19 | 135:22 136:1,2 | 212:12 | 298:20 308:2,6 | began 169:6 |
| arguments 177:13 | assign 168:15 | aware 160:12 225:7 | 312:3 316:1 326:3 | beginning 6:9 7:10 |
| Army 24:21 37:2 | assigned 302:11 | 231:3 259:15 | 334:8,18,20 335:5 | 256:17 |
| 191:17 | 310:18 312:6 | 301:13 326:2 | 337:10 346:9 | behalf 45:15 155:2 |
| arrive 52:10 73:22 | assignment 312:5 | awareness 303:15 | background 166:1 | 168:11 263:15 |
| arriving 50:22 | Assistant 3:3,20 | 326:5 | 168:22 192:17 | 334:22 339:21 |
| 59:10 | associated 222:4,6 | awesome 38:8 | 197:18 | 348:9 |
| articulate 23:12 | 223:2 | awful 20:4 | backup 214:12 | belief 140:13,14 |
| articulated 297:12 | assume 41:22 | aye 29:17 34:5 | bad 4:11 10:21 | 167:12 176:5 |
| ASAP 318:8 | 304:7 335:1 | 129:14 138:20 | 43:5,9 95:15,16 | believe 52:2 94:8 |
| aside 141:1 142:19 | assuming 40:7 64:1 | 156:3 216:6 | 122:17 296:8,9,13 | 112:22 130:5 |
| asked 14:6 15:3 | 110:14 299:16 | ayes 29:18 34:6 | bag 76:11 | 139:11 156:14 |
| 20:17 44:18 62:5 | 304:16 | 129:15 138:21 | balance 54:13 55:6 | 170:9 198:7 216:2 |
| 68:22 88:1,19 | assumption 144:10 | 156:4 216:7 | 55:14,16 57:1 | 236:12 249:22 |
| | | | | |
| | - | - | - | • |

| | I | | I | I |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 288:7 316:13 | 32:12 37:1,14 | 74:20 75:3,4,9 | brief 39:1,2 159:16 | 45:2 46:5 49:16 |
| 346:1 | 66:4 74:7 78:3 | blended 154:5 | briefing 237:1 | 51:2,16 52:4,6 |
| believes 51:1,10 | 79:15 80:17 81:2 | blue 17:10 24:10,12 | 265:8 270:16 | 53:17 57:2 58:17 |
| 159:4 | 113:21 122:9,10 | 24:18,18,19 25:10 | briefings 21:10 | 59:4 62:1,5,6 63:4 |
| beneficial 36:9,15 | 122:11 123:2 | 31:7 32:9 75:21 | briefly 41:9 159:16 | 63:14 64:2 66:20 |
| 36:17 193:11 | 124:20 130:21 | blueprint 8:9 21:9 | 187:17 229:16 | 67:2 71:10 72:14 |
| benefit 22:13 25:1 | 132:12 133:19 | 21:20 24:9,20 | 277:13 336:5 | 73:2 75:17,21 |
| 80:1 122:3 209:13 | 135:14 137:3 | 62:17 | bright 248:4 | 78:6 80:8 81:14 |
| benefits 110:10 | 141:20 143:21 | BMS 103:16 | bring 41:7,20 54:13 | 83:10 84:9 91:22 |
| best 16:22 53:10 | 153:4 159:20 | board 39:11 40:16 | 66:15 157:9 | 93:7 97:2 99:14 |
| 56:12 58:5,5 | 163:12 188:12 | 72:5 89:5 103:16 | 198:17 201:4 | 99:16 101:9,16 |
| 82:22 99:10,15 | 201:18 207:6,14 | 112:12 151:2 | 202:18,19 203:3 | 102:1 114:10,19 |
| 101:15 170:4 | 208:7 213:3,9 | boat 106:6,7,18,22 | 203:11 220:19 | 115:10 116:10 |
| 265:4 275:14 | 216:12 223:5 | 112:9 300:15 | 228:20 236:11 | 118:3 120:1 |
| 301:8 303:1 337:4 | 226:15 230:2 | boats 7:6,7 105:20 | 237:20 241:10 | 124:15,16 126:14 |
| 337:5,20 343:17 | 232:1 238:2,11 | 111:22 112:2,2,5 | 252:18 273:8 | 135:2,4 137:15 |
| bet 19:17 348:5 | 240:6 246:12,18 | 113:12 298:21 | 274:4 284:2,4,5 | 139:6 159:9 |
| better 6:19,22 7:4 | 298:1 327:8 | 300:14 | 310:6 323:8 | 230:18 232:5 |
| 28:2 31:21 33:12 | 330:13 343:4,4,9 | bodies 146:14 | 325:11 335:10,22 | 234:10 274:15 |
| 40:9 63:20 70:8 | 343:19 348:10 | 259:12 | bringing 174:9,12 | 275:1 302:13 |
| 80:12 98:11 124:6 | Billy 343:8 | body 78:17 157:21 | 174:16,17 195:14 | 303:8,15 |
| 152:3,15 171:9 | Bill's 149:16 151:5 | 171:7 193:3 221:9 | 198:5,16 262:7 | budgetary 60:13 |
| 187:12 202:13 | 254:20 | 247:21 248:7 | brings 21:6 63:16 | 72:13 |
| 217:12 220:21 | biodiversity 32:5 | 250:4 254:14 | British 213:22 | budgeting 304:11 |
| 265:17 282:17 | biological 184:1 | book 17:10 75:21 | broad 119:2 121:18 | budgets 41:21 |
| 305:15 335:19 | 244:3 | 107:4 | 247:6 250:8 | 118:20 128:15 |
| 338:19 344:14 | biologists 285:13 | booking 326:2 | 256:19 305:13 | 160:8 274:17 |
| 349:1 | bit 23:1 34:13 | boss 347:3 | broadened 344:4 | 302:17 |
| beyond 28:10 | 41:17 53:13 58:7 | bottom 48:8,11 | broader 64:21 | budget's 26:9 |
| 202:9 220:5 | 70:1 79:19 81:5 | 63:8 158:10 | 247:2 | 126:13 |
| 231:13 232:6 | 89:21 94:6 96:13 | bought 104:13 | broadest 140:18 | bug 15:17 |
| 249:16 345:11 | 103:22 105:4 | boundaries 339:1 | 141:9 | build 21:21 187:19 |
| bias 114:2,4 | 119:22 135:6 | box 110:7 137:11 | broke 347:22 | 236:1 255:14 |
| big 7:6 8:8,21 25:7 | 137:6 158:8,15,17 | boxes 58:2 | brother 107:13 | building 197:6,8 |
| 55:20 76:21 77:17 | 160:8 168:22 | brainstorming | brought 24:4 30:19 | bullet 34:22 135:11 |
| 82:6,11 84:15 | 171:2 174:15 | 70:15 | 54:1 67:12 93:17 | bunch 63:19 |
| 92:16 93:11 94:4 | 184:8 201:22 | break 3:8 15:22 | 129:12 157:10 | 120:14 280:16,16 |
| 107:13 113:20 | 208:3 209:7 236:2 | 156:8 157:14 | 169:8 170:16 | 346:7 |
| 135:8 171:1 | 263:11 265:17 | 204:10 258:6 | 189:22 190:1 | buoys 112:8 |
| 188:18 192:6 | 281:4 284:14 | 262:19 309:1 | 196:21 210:8 | bureau 224:21 |
| 195:16 197:10 | 291:13,22 305:12 | breakfast 326:21 | 245:4 272:5 343:9 | bureaus 224:22 |
| 224:10 235:13 | 312:3 313:20 | breakout 68:21 | 344:22,22 345:1,8 | 225:3 |
| 299:2 | 334:10 335:17 | breaks 9:9 | browse 17:15 | buried 53:19 |
| bigger 86:10 199:9 | 337:9 345:19 | breed 21:20 | budget 3:6 17:5,5 | burning 10:14,15 |
| 333:13 | bite 56:4 92:18,19 | breeding 166:6 | 17:11,13 22:2 | 10:15 |
| biggest 107:20 | 183:11 | 180:22 | 23:16 26:7 41:4 | business 3:19 44:22 |
| Bill 1:16 30:15 | blank 48:8 74:20 | bridge 330:12,13 | 41:11 44:13,17 | 56:21 62:19 64:15 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 65.10.02.16.05.4 | 200.16.10 | 00.16.17.05.19.20 | 127.2 12 194.10 | 120.20 122.1 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 65:19 83:16 85:4 | 309:16,18 | 90:16,17 95:18,20 | 127:2,13 184:19 | 130:20 132:1 |
| 95:15,16 97:1,14 | capacity 26:2 | 105:17 111:3 | 191:15 218:9 | 133:11,17 134:8 |
| 98:9,18 131:3 | 157:21 | 267:11 273:9 | 235:19 291:5,9 | 134:14 135:12 |
| 136:18 137:10 | capitalize 25:7 | 296:11 298:8 | 301:11 326:3 | 136:4,7 137:2,13 |
| 194:6,8 204:9 | Capitol 1:11 | 300:8 310:12 | 328:6 334:21 | 137:18 138:10,14 |
| 306:13 317:15 | capture 37:2 48:20 | catching 6:12 19:9 | 344:12 | 138:18,22 139:2 |
| 323:13 324:17,22 | 61:4 68:1 73:6 | categories 54:16 | chad 74:21 | 141:10,15,18 |
| 331:15 337:2 | 123:16 131:15 | 79:9 160:3 333:20 | chair 1:12,14 3:2 | 143:13,20 144:1,3 |
| 350:1 | 222:7 245:5 250:9 | categorize 97:6 | 3:17 4:3,7,14 10:2 | 144:8,22 145:5,7 |
| buy 105:4 | captured 35:11 | category 74:18 | 10:6,9 13:9,11,17 | 145:12,18,21 |
| buying 213:22 | 37:17 210:21 | 76:16 101:6 185:5 | 14:9,10,14,20 | 146:9,21 147:8,12 |
| bycatch 301:5 | 227:8 | 256:15 | 15:6 18:1,9,13,18 | 147:18 148:3,18 |
| C | capturing 123:3,13 | catered 327:22 | 19:6 29:22 30:1,6 | 148:22 149:4,8,20 |
| | 129:22 132:11 | Cates 2:2 17:21 | 30:13 32:12,20 | 150:11,20 151:1,9 |
| C 1:20 | carbon 24:10,12,15 | 34:10,12 74:15 | 33:3,7,16,22 34:2 | 152:4,19 153:7,22 |
| cabinet-level | 24:18,18,20 25:3 | 77:12 96:19,21 | 34:7,11,15,18 | 154:15 155:8,12 |
| 260:18 | 25:10 31:7 32:4,9 | 147:16 148:1 | 37:14,18,21 38:3 | 155:16,19 156:5,7 |
| cages 216:2 | 35:4,5,20,22 37:4 | 154:2,17 155:5,18 | 38:22 39:6,19,22 | 156:13,18 157:1,6 |
| calculate 61:8 69:5 | care 81:19 | 170:2 172:7 | 40:3,13,22 42:20 | 157:9 158:19 |
| calculation 69:11 | careful 116:3 120:8 | 173:22 174:3 | 43:1,7,11 46:19 | 159:1,14 161:5,14 |
| calendar 16:21 | 338:11 | 186:5,8,14 196:5 | 47:22 48:12,16 | 162:7,19 163:5,11 |
| 324:2 | carefully 167:15 | 212:21 213:2 | 49:8,9 53:9 58:8 | 163:19 164:4,5,7 |
| California 142:13 | 181:5 | 214:16 319:8,11 | 58:12 59:15,18 | 164:11,18 165:1 |
| 292:20 | cares 12:18 | 329:11,17,22 | 60:10,22 62:8 | 168:8 170:1 172:2 |
| call 75:20 76:18 | Caribbean 23:1 | 336:11 338:8 | 65:1 67:11 71:3 | 172:19 173:2,11 |
| 121:10 155:14 | 25:12,16 26:4,6 | Cathy 168:9,12 | 71:18 74:14 78:2 | 173:17 174:2,19 |
| 162:13,14,15 | 27:14 28:3,5,15 | 341:4 347:10,17 | 79:14 83:5 86:13 | 176:8,11,19 |
| 185:4 209:2 225:5 | 28:22 42:9 | 347:21 348:7 | 86:20 87:1,4,7,15 | 178:11,16 180:8 |
| 236:15 239:4 | carried 29:21 | 349:6 | 87:20 91:14,17 | 180:12 182:19 |
| 240:17 265:18 | carries 146:2,11,11 | caught 270:2 | 93:3,16 94:18,21 | 184:22 185:11,14 |
| 271:20 298:11 | 146:21 241:2 | 336:15 | 95:22 96:7,10 | 186:7,11 188:21 |
| 332:5 | 242:15 | cause 155:3 | 99:6 100:20 101:2 | 190:10 191:9 |
| called 32:18 181:12 | carry 330:14 | causing 177:18 | 102:2,6 109:15 | 192:21 195:11 |
| calling 197:21 | 345:10 | cautioning 70:21 | 110:12,17,19 | 197:14 198:18,18 |
| calls 272:20 | carrying 18:20 | cautious 167:22 | 111:3,16 113:14 | 200:20 202:11 |
| camera 106:18 | 235:2 | 181:9 | 113:17 115:17 | 203:10,18,21 |
| cameras 103:16 | carve 142:13 | ceases 44:19 | 116:6,12 117:2,10 | 204:3,7 205:5,16 |
| 107:12,16 | carved 143:6 | center 257:3 | 117:15,18 118:12 | 205:20 207:3,11 |
| Canada 103:8 | carving 140:5 | 267:16 268:12 | 118:14 119:6,14 | 207:16,22 208:5 |
| 104:6 106:19 | case 170:15 176:3 | centers 244:8 | 119:17,20 120:4 | 208:10,21 211:11 |
| 108:9 | 234:4 283:15 | CEQ 260:14,16 | 121:13 122:11 | 211:12 212:7,10 |
| candidate 290:2 | 291:16 292:5 | certain 52:16 82:19 | 123:1,15 124:18 | 212:13,20,22 |
| candidates 283:8 | 296:17 | 97:4 195:20 | 125:1,5,8,16 | 213:8 214:11,15 |
| 285:11,12,15 | cases 56:18 109:18 | 232:10 | 126:8,17,22 127:4 | 216:4,8,10 217:17 |
| 289:14,22 295:21 | 270:10 | certainly 5:6 7:15 | 127:8,15,21 | 217:21 218:4,12 |
| 297:20 | cash 132:22 135:18 | 33:9 48:11 65:10 | 128:11,14 129:2,5 | 218:17,19 219:7 |
| capacities 217:8 | catch 5:17,20 9:10 | 92:9 93:11 95:4 | 129:10,16,18 | 219:16 220:1,3 |
| _ | | | | |
| | 1 | I | <u> </u> | |

| 221.4.14.222.14 | 214.14 17 215.0 | 22.10.220.12 | 172.10.224.10 | - 1:6 124-1 127-0 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 221:4,14 222:14 | 314:14,17 315:8 | 32:18 228:13 | 173:18 334:18 | clarify 124:1 127:9 |
| 222:21 223:3,16 | 316:8,12,15,21 | 282:17 | checking 227:1 | 224:6 231:21 |
| 223:18 224:3,7,18 | 317:7,11,14,22 | change 89:20 90:19 | cherry-picked | 234:17 291:22 |
| 225:13,18 226:2,5 | 318:7,16,20 319:1 | 91:10,11 98:2 | 113:9 | clarifying 127:10 |
| 226:8,13,18 227:1 | 319:5,7,9,15,17 | 126:5 170:9 | chewing 135:7 | 225:19 |
| 227:20 228:1,7,18 | 319:21 320:2,5 | 172:10 177:17 | 333:9 | clarity 36:11 |
| 229:1,14,22 231:8 | 321:11 322:21 | 199:12 201:22 | chief 112:9 165:13 | 192:12 233:12 |
| 231:11,20 234:9 | 323:5 324:4,9,15 | 222:21 241:13 | choice 215:3 | 339:19 |
| 235:11 236:7 | 326:8,12 327:5,8 | 249:11 276:10 | 232:13,13 297:20 | class 347:1 |
| 237:3,10,19,22 | 327:15 328:9,14 | 292:20 311:4 | choices 57:10 67:10 | classify 141:8 |
| 238:9,22 239:9,18 | 329:4 330:1,8,22 | 321:19 325:12 | 81:22,22 | clause 151:13 |
| 239:20 240:2,4,13 | 331:3,12,22 332:3 | changed 337:18 | choose 290:2 320:1 | clean 58:1 |
| 242:2,5,12 244:15 | 333:15 335:7,9 | changes 8:17 | chooses 220:2 | clear 6:16 7:9 |
| 244:17,19 245:7 | 336:3,9 338:6 | 153:15 178:6 | choosing 282:3 | 25:15,21 26:8,9 |
| 245:10,14 246:7 | 340:18 341:1,4 | 312:11 323:19 | 317:15 326:15 | 28:14 55:10 |
| 246:10,15 248:10 | 343:8 344:12,19 | changing 90:22 | Chorus 29:18 34:6 | 126:15,19 162:11 |
| 249:7,19 250:13 | 345:13,16 347:9 | 170:10 293:2 | 129:15 138:21 | 163:3 173:14 |
| 251:19,22 252:8 | 347:12,17 348:5 | characterization | 156:4 216:7 | 197:20 218:13 |
| 253:7 254:16 | 348:16,22 349:9 | 344:15 | chose 171:16 | 221:8 223:13 |
| 255:9,17,22 256:4 | 349:12,15,20 | characterizing | chosen 318:13 | 226:9 254:5 |
| 257:8,14,21 258:1 | chaired 38:11 | 66:14 | chunk 64:3 235:14 | 261:17 267:4 |
| 258:2,5,11,17,20 | chairman 13:6 | charge 11:15 | circled 334:8 | 270:18 283:10,19 |
| 259:3 260:5,20 | 14:10 168:10 | 149:13,13,18 | circles 166:21 | 299:12 316:9 |
| 261:15 262:1,6,15 | 209:1 275:8 307:9 | 152:11 155:4 | circulation 28:3,8 | 339:2 340:12,16 |
| 262:18 263:1,5,13 | 318:18,21 319:2 | 286:10 | circumstances | clearing 18:8 |
| 275:10 276:1,6,20 | Chairmen 315:8 | charged 104:8 | 198:13 340:6 | clearly 12:4,7 23:7 |
| 277:2,7 278:21 | Chairperson 315:7 | 285:22 | citizens 170:22 | 23:12 36:13 57:2 |
| 279:20 280:6,21 | 331:20 | charger 17:18 | city 16:7 | 96:5 140:20 145:2 |
| 281:5,12 282:4 | chairs 317:17,19,20 | chart 114:5 | claims 40:22 | 241:18 259:17 |
| 283:16 284:11 | challenge 11:15 | charter 105:20 | clam 327:21 | 280:14 |
| 285:8,18 286:13 | 36:2,20 58:10 | 295:15 298:10,21 | Clampitt 1:15 | click 16:19 |
| 286:20 287:6 | 278:17 289:10 | 300:14 | 19:21 34:17 102:7 | client 339:18 |
| 288:12,15,19 | challenged 288:9 | charts 143:1 | 108:3 109:5,13 | climate 8:19 170:9 |
| 289:1,3 291:21 | challenges 55:18 | Chatwin 14:11 | 110:15 111:1 | 177:17 199:12 |
| 293:15 294:2,8,22 | 57:22 63:11 83:10 | 61:2 99:8 100:4 | 177:7 178:14 | 311:4 |
| 295:5,22 296:5,7 | 93:5 107:20 | 101:1,7 126:10 | 179:14 231:10,18 | close 64:2 100:21 |
| 296:11 297:1 | challenging 13:2 | 127:17 128:4,10 | 240:3 244:18 | 243:5 264:7 285:4 |
| 298:1,4 299:2,5,8 | 140:15 230:18 | 136:6 141:22 | 281:6,14 292:15 | closely 290:20 |
| 299:10,15 301:14 | 341:10 | 142:6 146:16 | 296:6 298:5 299:4 | closer 95:20,21 |
| 301:19 302:2,6 | champion 140:6,16 | 162:9 163:2,6,18 | 299:7 | 240:19 |
| 303:7 304:14,18 | 141:7 142:9,15 | 174:20 176:10,14 | clarification 142:2 | coast 6:2 16:6,7 |
| 304:20 305:2 | 143:10 144:5 | 213:12 214:4,14 | 178:3 180:5 | 20:8,22 86:4 |
| 306:1 307:1,5,10 | 145:15 150:12 | 224:9 246:17 | 217:18 221:17 | 89:21 279:8 |
| 308:15,18,21,22 | 155:21 | 247:20 248:18 | 233:4,22 | coastal 23:7,13 |
| 309:3,9 310:17 | champions 140:21 | 249:14 311:6,9 | clarified 235:3 | 24:6,7 35:4,5,8 |
| 311:8,10,12 313:1 | 276:19 | 315:9 | 336:17 | 244:4 |
| 313:3,4,8,22 | chance 22:6 31:11 | check 104:15 | clarifies 250:15 | cod 112:3,7 113:8 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | 1 | • | 1 | • |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| coffee 39:2 | 267:15 271:21 | 325:2 | 105:11 320:19 | 213:18 |
| cohort 19:4 | 272:22 273:9 | commentary | committed 11:18 | company 213:20 |
| coincide 22:12 | 275:5 279:17 | 273:22 | committee 1:5,10 | 213:21 |
| 114:10 | 297:21 312:3 | commented 273:11 | 9:15,16 13:6 | compelled 114:8 |
| coincides 323:3 | 321:3,4 327:9,13 | commenting 75:2 | 14:19 17:6 19:18 | competent 282:15 |
| collaborate 23:5 | 327:15 334:19 | 176:2 | 26:16 31:1,12 | competing 57:15 |
| collaboration 29:1 | 335:5 339:2 348:1 | comments 4:15 | 35:12 38:8 39:15 | 59:3,3 182:14 |
| 134:10 215:8 | comes 33:1 55:8 | 21:1 27:6 42:19 | 41:8,20 43:13,18 | compilation 263:8 |
| collaborative | 60:14 94:12 118:6 | 100:8 107:6 | 45:15 50:3 53:2 | compile 79:16 |
| 130:14 | 151:14 243:8,9 | 121:19 139:13,15 | 64:17 66:19 67:17 | compiled 66:6 |
| collaterally-assig | 285:4 296:15 | 140:13 170:6 | 69:6 78:5,10 | complain 283:5 |
| 274:21 | 329:19 | 172:20 186:15 | 119:3,5 130:19 | complaining |
| colleagues 97:17 | comfort 77:10 | 196:17 213:2 | 139:6,16 145:3 | 277:20 |
| 259:2 | comfortable 9:20 | 216:4 223:6 | 161:10 164:2,5,12 | complement 21:21 |
| collect 68:5 162:13 | 75:1 132:14 | 225:19 237:16 | 164:13 179:2 | 343:8 |
| collected 112:16 | 149:17 154:19 | 245:8,10 253:10 | 199:9 204:13 | complete 75:11 |
| collecting 105:12 | coming 4:12 8:18 | 255:18 257:9 | 208:12,18 209:5 | completely 15:7 |
| 106:6,22 | 9:19 15:18 39:6 | 263:16 271:19 | 219:19 221:1 | 32:14 103:14 |
| collection 105:3,18 | 88:15 99:12,13 | 274:3 282:5 | 222:18,19 227:11 | 282:21 338:7 |
| 124:5 131:2 | 110:11 156:9 | 336:12 | 230:13 243:8 | completion 270:11 |
| 260:17 | 188:7 244:21 | commerce 1:1 3:12 | 246:5 266:16 | complex 61:11 74:6 |
| collective 60:8,20 | 267:17 297:4 | 45:15 149:14 | 307:16,16,17 | complexity 61:20 |
| 61:5,9 | 303:18 330:17 | 171:6,20 188:10 | 309:12,13,14,20 | 159:5 |
| colonized 190:7 | 342:8,13 | 196:10 207:12 | 313:5 318:1,5 | complicated |
| Columbia 213:22 | comma 151:17 | 209:3,5 211:3,16 | 320:16 321:9 | 191:20 311:16 |
| column 53:8 75:14 | comment 3:2 13:12 | 217:10,14 218:5,8 | 332:20,21 334:3 | component 250:7 |
| 75:18 | 40:11 41:13 62:9 | 220:9,11,12 221:3 | 334:13,15,20 | 272:1 |
| columns 75:17 76:4 | 65:2 77:13 78:6 | 223:7,9,11,15,21 | 335:2 338:22 | components 22:8 |
| 76:4 78:16 123:10 | 99:5 100:19 102:4 | 224:10,21 226:3,7 | 343:5 345:11 | composition |
| 160:7,18 | 126:9 136:13 | 227:12,14 230:16 | committees 32:22 | 105:17 |
| combination 105:7 | 139:16 148:20 | 232:10 254:10 | 218:10 248:15 | comprehensive |
| 105:19 | 149:2,9,10,21 | 282:1,2 337:21 | 252:4 | 29:9 |
| come 12:13 18:22 | 151:5 153:12 | Commerce's | common 69:19 | compromise |
| 26:19 27:1,1,3 | 154:3,3 159:21 | 209:13 216:14,15 | 265:12 267:8 | 172:14 |
| 41:1 42:9 56:4 | 172:21 177:16 | commercial 85:22 | communicate | computer 16:18 |
| 62:14 67:1 70:2 | 178:19 191:10 | 86:4,18 95:6 | 271:7 | 17:8,14 39:18 |
| 74:18 78:5 79:6 | 193:9,13,17 195:4 | 133:6 136:1 | communicating | 41:2 |
| 90:6,7,15 91:18 | 195:9,13 196:7,7 | 142:16 143:4 | 340:15 | computing 64:11 |
| 92:18,19 100:7 | 196:12 205:2,7 | 171:5 278:10 | communication | concept 35:13 44:2 |
| 101:11 105:5 | 210:19 212:4,5 | 279:13 282:22 | 267:22 | 284:5 334:6 |
| 123:12 130:8 | 218:21 237:14 | 283:12 284:22 | communities 12:14 | concern 35:19 |
| 153:15 156:13 | 240:7 246:16 | 286:2 293:20 | 23:13 24:6,7 | 37:17 44:14 67:9 |
| 160:14,20 163:9 | 250:8 254:20 | 294:6 295:15 | 194:20 | 100:18 123:22 |
| 163:15 180:15 | 271:3 279:6,7,16 | 297:5,15 298:9,10 | community 11:5,22 | 165:19 193:7 |
| 190:13 196:16 | 281:7 283:19 | 298:11 300:2 | 27:22 194:9 300:5 | 194:5 239:4 272:9 |
| 214:20 215:13 | 287:7 298:5 | 305:4,7 | 305:5,16 | 272:16 297:10 |
| 219:19 221:1 | 302:15 307:2 | commission 16:13 | companies 213:5 | concerned 71:1 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 85:20 88:13 | conjunction 211:6 | 123:11 281:4 | continuum 57:19 | 118:9,11,21 119:2 |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| 157:20 160:19 | connected 268:6 | 291:19 | contract 322:1 | 120:19 121:22 |
| 167:4 192:22 | consensus 58:20 | constitute 334:14 | contribute 32:10 | 122:5 123:4,21 |
| 273:13 278:2 | 59:11 123:12 | constructed 283:15 | contribute 32.10 | 124:7,17 126:13 |
| concerns 7:6 193:1 | 131:16 158:3 | constructive | 165:17 167:3 | 128:6 130:5,12 |
| 273:11 | consequence | 247:22 | 168:7 177:8 | 131:9 134:1,9 |
| concerted 175:4 | 120:10 | consult 246:3 | 182:22 183:5 | corner 7:13 8:1,2,6 |
| concise 169:1 | consequences | 253:16 | 236:20 | 284:8 310:13 |
| conclude 274:2 | 189:12 | consultant 191:22 | controversy 187:12 | Corps 24:22 37:3 |
| concludes 336:10 | conservation 21:18 | CONSULTANTS | 346:14 | 183:11 191:17 |
| conclusion 167:10 | 31:21 133:1 | 2:1 | convene 217:10 | correct 52:21 |
| 167:15 176:21 | 135:18 179:11,22 | consultation 36:4 | 223:12 | 157:13 173:3 |
| 181:4 270:16 | 295:18 | 187:16 189:14 | convened 318:2 | 185:13 200:16 |
| concrete 59:20 | consider 21:13 | 193:14 | convergence | corrected 198:20 |
| 65:6 | 22:7 80:4 100:5 | consultations 85:3 | 161:19 | 278:5 |
| concurrent 26:22 | 167:17 175:12 | 167:5 | conversation 85:7 | Corrigan 209:10 |
| condensed 187:1 | 180:19 184:20,22 | consulted 254:3 | 158:15 | cost 25:1 26:3 |
| conditions 243:20 | 209:17 211:9 | consulting 257:5 | conversations | 103:18,19 110:10 |
| conduct 14:16 17:6 | 239:3 274:5 | consumer 283:4 | 83:12 94:4,15 | 138:8 270:14 |
| 83:16 337:2 | 278:16 | contact 190:15 | conveying 340:1 | costing 77:20 |
| conducted 11:8 | consideration 35:8 | 268:7 333:2 | cook 328:17 | costs 134:11 240:11 |
| conducting 69:1 | 122:21 183:14 | contains 17:11 | cooperative 94:13 | cost-benefit 37:5 |
| 269:11 306:13 | 274:15,18 285:17 | 72:14 | 105:22 | council 5:2 11:14 |
| conducts 194:6 | 302:13 322:8,19 | contemplated | coordinate 23:5 | 11:16,18 12:17 |
| conference 61:20 | considerations | 143:3 | coordinated 25:16 | 13:2 16:13 87:4 |
| 139:10 209:2 | 194:13 | CONTENTS 3:1 | coordinating 25:22 | 100:10 109:3,17 |
| 271:20 324:18,20 | considered 35:22 | context 53:14 | 334:3,13 335:2 | 110:4 131:12 |
| 325:1,4 | 45:17 67:22 182:6 | 54:11 58:10 62:15 | coordination 26:18 | 251:3,9,14 260:17 |
| confined 278:13 | 182:13 318:11 | 66:10 70:2 116:22 | coordinator 268:4 | 272:11,15 273:15 |
| confirm 248:9 | considering 134:21 | 121:18 141:9 | 274:21 303:10 | 274:12 278:8,11 |
| 317:5 | consistent 222:19 | 182:2 200:19 | 304:5 | 278:18 281:2 |
| conflict 16:12,16 | 227:18 255:7 | 325:5 | coordinators 264:3 | 282:11 284:15 |
| conflicts 244:2 | 271:1,11 | contingent 25:17 | 266:1 268:17,22 | 285:21 286:8 |
| 340:17 | consists 289:8 | continue 8:11 10:1 | 270:20 302:16 | 287:3,3,4,17 |
| confused 277:8 | consolidate 10:20 | 24:17 55:22 82:8 | 303:5,10,14,19 | 288:8 289:5 291:1 |
| congratulating | 10:20 | 83:16 85:5 99:21 | core 36:5 42:4,10 | 292:9,16 293:22 |
| 31:1 | consolidation 7:8 | 189:15 254:8 | 43:20 44:3,22 | 295:19 299:11 |
| congratulations | 10:21 | 260:8 290:10 | 45:6,12,13,17 | 300:17 334:3,13 |
| 332:1 349:13,16 | constantly 77:19 | 291:15 303:6,22 | 46:6 47:13 51:1,7 | 335:2 339:12 |
| Congress 44:17 | constituencies 59:6 | 304:1 309:17 | 51:8,10 60:2,7 | 340:9 |
| 232:4,22 233:6,9 | 247:12 | 323:14 | 68:8 70:16 73:14 | councils 7:16 54:22 |
| 234:4,16 235:9 | constituency 264:1 | continued 9:1 | 73:15 82:13,14,14 | 110:8 131:7 247:1 |
| 236:17 | 265:10 266:6 | 169:6 | 82:20 83:16 85:2 | 251:11 252:1 |
| Congressional | 267:7 268:2 306:7 | continues 290:8 | 85:10 86:15 87:22 | 259:11 261:3,19 |
| 232:13 | 340:3 | 291:3 328:5 | 88:21,22 91:4 | 273:21 274:9 |
| congressionally | constituent 79:11 | continuing 12:11 | 98:13,15 100:22 | 275:22 276:15,19 |
| 76:9 | constituents 101:19 | 243:18 | 101:1,2 110:13 | 277:10,13 278:13 |
| , 5.5 | 101.17 | 2.0.10 | 101.1,2 110.13 | 277.10,13 270.13 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| 200 5 202 12 | 155.10 | 140.44.5.10 | 110 10 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 | 200.11.221.12 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 280:5 283:13 | 175:10 | 143:4 166:18 | 119:10,14 122:14 | 308:11 331:13 |
| 287:2 290:15 | crafting 21:4 | 167:17 226:10 | 280:8 282:4 | deciding 308:10 |
| 294:1,7 | cranes 184:14,18 | 274:20 | 283:16 315:13 | decision 109:3 |
| council's 288:10 | create 161:17 | currents 28:4 | DAVID 1:22 | 176:17 182:17 |
| counsel 198:21 | 163:22 270:4 | cut 44:18 50:12 | day 4:9 15:22 18:15 | 198:19 232:22 |
| 257:7 | created 328:21 | 65:14 82:19 84:2 | 18:22 55:17 56:1 | 233:1,14 234:2 |
| count 111:21 | creating 26:1,13 | 84:12,13 85:9 | 90:8 103:2 175:8 | 260:13 313:7 |
| 194:15 203:19 | 98:9 305:14 | 86:1,2 88:7 89:6 | 245:2 273:6 | decisions 56:13,17 |
| 241:22 305:9,10 | credibility 94:11 | 97:14,18 98:4 | 288:11 306:13,13 | 57:1,4,9 266:13 |
| counterproductive | 113:15 | 99:17 120:9 132:9 | 323:12,12 324:1 | 279:11 |
| 190:4 | credit 262:13 | cuts 44:18 81:18 | 324:21,21 325:2 | decision-making |
| counter-argument | cries 272:13 | 97:2 100:16 | 330:16,19,21,22 | 260:12 |
| 297:4 | criteria 167:19 | 101:17 | 331:6,9 340:2 | declare 177:20 |
| counting 112:19 | 175:18,19,21 | cutting 45:10 51:3 | days 4:21 5:1 7:2 | declared 177:11 |
| 280:8 | 176:3,6 180:17 | 59:4 85:2,12 | 16:6,10 103:10 | 189:5 |
| countries 28:15,17 | critical 5:11 45:5 | 89:13 90:21 98:21 | 193:15 209:18 | declaring 172:17 |
| 215:20 | 70:16 166:16,19 | 128:9 136:15 | 268:10 324:6,11 | declining 57:2 63:3 |
| country 5:8 7:17 | 166:20 167:18,20 | cycle 22:21 | 324:13,20 | 63:14 93:7 |
| 210:8,13 248:5 | 175:19 177:12,20 | | DC 1:11 | decrease 56:14 |
| 286:3 342:11 | 178:22 179:3,5 | <u>D</u> | dead 334:6 | dedicate 64:3 95:17 |
| country's 344:5 | 180:11,17 181:18 | D 1:14 3:2,7 | deadline 242:22 | 115:7 330:19 |
| couple 4:21 7:2 9:9 | 182:21 183:7,19 | dam 269:17 | 243:6 | dedicated 238:20 |
| 10:10 15:12 27:16 | 183:20 184:9 | dance 342:17 | deadlines 21:1 | 239:15 275:1 |
| 31:8 39:8 81:7,8 | 185:7 187:15 | dangerous 170:22 | deal 8:21 67:20 | deductions 89:6 |
| 84:19 89:7 105:22 | 191:12 192:3 | Darby 2:7 263:18 | 86:12 120:19,20 | deep 23:2 |
| 107:6 170:3 176:5 | 197:5 199:22 | 264:9 | 127:16 188:14 | deeply 54:9 58:16 |
| 186:15 192:22 | 202:8 205:4 | darned 332:4 | 192:4,6 197:11 | 80:5 140:3 |
| 225:9 244:20 | 265:18 | data 68:5 86:4 | 219:17 235:9 | defer 41:9 |
| 252:4 253:17 | critically 115:5 | 94:11 95:9 102:15 | 259:19 287:11,13 | deference 182:17 |
| 258:6 268:10 | 182:6 184:17,19 | 104:8 105:2,12 | 287:18 288:13 | deferential 164:9 |
| 289:12 307:12 | critique 139:9 | 106:6,21 107:1,18 | 292:10 | deficient 277:14 |
| 336:12 347:10 | cross 271:14 | 112:15,15 113:8 | dealing 5:7 85:3 | define 23:8 |
| course 9:14 12:6 | 330:12 | 124:4 131:2 138:1 | 199:12 294:12,17 | defined 60:7 |
| 22:20 114:3 | crossing 107:21 | 138:5,6,17 265:2 | dealt 294:18 | 144:13,16 154:8 |
| 258:17 272:3 | 339:5 | 265:5 267:11,13 | dear 44:12 | 179:7,8 |
| 297:3 312:4 318:2 | Cuba 29:2 | 305:2,3,15 | debatable 107:8 | defining 21:14 |
| 342:11 | cue 338:1 | date 317:9 320:22 | debate 24:12 | definitely 37:8 |
| cover 30:17 180:21 | culminate 312:16 | 321:4,6,8,18 | 114:19 193:6 | 192:8 200:16 |
| coverage 103:10,17 | cumulative 6:12 | 322:15 323:3,6,18 | debated 210:9 | 251:5 332:16 |
| 109:2,16 | cup 39:2 | 323:22 | December 117:7 | definition 179:3 |
| covered 30:10 | curious 81:17 | dates 16:5,11 17:1 | 164:3 168:16 | 180:10,11 289:7 |
| 103:12 314:7 | 142:7 | 270:11,13 320:13 | 316:13 | degradation |
| covering 134:10 | current 26:4 | 320:15 321:17 | decide 62:4 80:6 | 177:18 |
| Crabtree 284:18 | 124:16 126:4 | 322:19 331:14 | 115:22 181:7 | degree 11:3 114:6 |
| crack 65:10 | 166:21 296:3 | daughter 300:7 | 204:19 282:1,2 | degreed 285:13 |
| craft 22:4 32:17 | 311:20,20 | Dave 14:15 19:20 | decided 130:2 | delay 213:6 |
| crafted 20:10 | currently 16:12 | 20:1 113:1 117:19 | 188:4 209:12 | delayed 188:3 |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | I | | I | I |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| delegate 225:12 | 169:15 183:9 | 314:20 | 327:16 328:19 | directly 22:14 |
| delegated 42:12 | 185:7 197:2 | developing 11:15 | 330:14 331:1,8 | 23:18 54:21 198:4 |
| deliberation 261:7 | 199:20 264:2 | 257:4 264:4 | 343:4,22 349:5,11 | 268:18 275:2 |
| deliberations 245:6 | 304:5 | development 31:17 | dialogue 266:9 | Director 3:17,21 |
| deliberative 69:12 | designating 175:13 | 33:20 35:9 140:7 | 268:8 275:4 337:5 | directors 280:16 |
| delineate 123:20 | 202:8 | 205:12 212:6 | 337:10 | 284:17 285:21 |
| deliver 209:3 | designation 167:2 | 216:18 217:15 | diary 265:5 | 286:3,9 |
| 347:16 | 167:20 169:10,18 | 230:10 231:1 | dictated 109:2,4 | directory 284:15 |
| delivering 28:4 | 175:19 179:1,5 | 238:21 266:1 | dictating 12:15 | disagree 134:6 |
| delve 80:6 | 181:13,15,17 | 270:20 306:8 | Diego 326:21 327:7 | 135:13 |
| demanded 109:17 | 182:22 183:8,20 | 333:1 | difference 86:9,10 | disagreement |
| demands 55:17 | 184:10,13 191:12 | develops 219:18 | 195:6 339:1 | 158:4 |
| 56:1 57:15 | designations 172:6 | deviants 190:8 | differences 69:8,20 | discrepancy 106:16 |
| demonstrates | 175:5 284:22 | devil's 81:11 | different 24:15 | discuss 58:21 68:11 |
| 343:15 | designed 181:4 | Dewey 1:16 30:8,16 | 55:6 67:14 69:15 | 74:12 118:19 |
| demonstrating | 189:6 | 30:22 32:15 33:13 | 70:11 83:14 91:3 | 119:8 159:15 |
| 21:17 | designs 243:20 | 33:18 34:20 35:15 | 95:5 115:7,10 | 162:15 163:16 |
| demonstration/tr | desk 80:18 97:9 | 37:8,16,20 38:1 | 125:14 137:10 | 178:22 209:16 |
| 244:6 | despite 6:8 | 78:4 122:13 123:6 | 144:12 146:13,14 | 217:1 247:15 |
| departing 309:6 | detail 4:19 51:15 | 132:13 133:15,21 | 151:22 159:7 | 337:7 |
| department 1:1 | 52:3 71:10 76:19 | 134:2,12 135:15 | 160:17 171:9 | discussed 35:12,14 |
| 68:3 149:14 | 81:12 117:4 120:7 | 137:4 138:12 | 181:16,19 194:22 | 66:13 110:4 172:8 |
| 211:16 223:9,11 | 157:22 161:1 | 144:1,4,14 145:2 | 196:2 200:14 | 218:9 230:14 |
| 223:21 224:9,20 | 203:9 263:12 | 145:14 159:22 | 238:14 241:9 | 253:6 273:17 |
| 282:1 309:20 | 325:22 | 161:6 191:11 | 245:18 300:16 | 323:7 332:12 |
| 335:14 | detailed 101:8 | 201:20 207:9,15 | 329:6 347:7 | discussing 60:4 |
| departure 69:10 | 106:6 116:10 | 208:9,11 209:1 | differently 45:20 | 125:18 |
| dependent 270:5 | 137:15 214:11 | 211:13 212:11 | 95:8 137:6 146:13 | discussion 3:5,7,10 |
| depending 81:19 | details 17:7 72:6 | 213:11,16 216:13 | 171:13 | 3:12,14 16:20 |
| 207:22 274:11 | 169:3 184:6 | 218:2,7,16 219:16 | difficult 28:22 | 29:16 30:9,12 |
| 302:19 | 202:14 247:15 | 220:8 222:1,16 | 47:17 51:11 176:7 | 31:8,12 33:4 34:3 |
| depends 88:11 | 338:18 | 223:8,12,20 | 178:7 195:10,11 | 34:21 38:2 42:15 |
| 120:22 199:4 | determination | 224:13 225:4 | 195:12 256:12 | 42:18 59:8 62:16 |
| 256:8,10 | 179:20 | 226:4,6,16,20 | dig 327:14 | 65:12 66:9 68:8 |
| depredation 270:9 | determinations | 227:3,22 228:6,12 | digging 54:8 | 68:14 69:10 70:17 |
| depth 169:20 | 339:21 | 228:19 230:3 | digress 265:13 | 71:15 73:14 78:16 |
| 337:22 | determine 28:17 | 232:19 233:8,21 | dimensions 27:22 | 79:1 80:1 81:4 |
| describe 130:4 | 46:12 50:9 249:9 | 234:8,13 235:4,22 | dinner 326:21 | 82:6 96:5,22 99:9 |
| described 74:9,13 | 250:22 | 236:8,19 237:6 | 327:22 328:6 | 114:10 116:21 |
| 75:20 162:10 | determined 18:14 | 238:13,16 239:2 | direct 45:21 194:8 | 118:6 122:4 |
| 179:4 | 179:10 | 242:16 243:7 | 230:21 234:18 | 123:14,16,20 |
| describes 75:16 | determining 261:2 | 244:16 245:1,16 | 301:7 305:14 | 125:13 129:7,11 |
| descriptions 17:11 | 265:4 | 246:8,13 247:3 | directed 234:16 | 129:22 132:15 |
| 67:2 | develop 164:2 | 252:9 254:5 255:6 | direction 60:13 | 135:2,4,8 136:9 |
| designate 166:16 | 249:6 265:10 | 255:10 256:8 | 98:5,6 137:16 | 136:10 137:6,14 |
| 180:1 | 267:7 | 258:1 298:3 | 230:5 265:13 | 137:15,19 141:13 |
| designated 2:4 | developed 46:3 | 299:10 327:9,12 | directive 253:22 | 141:19 142:8,21 |
| | | | | |
| | • | • | • | - |

| 146.0 147.14 16 | ١٤١.٥٥ دندند | domino4od 202.21 | d 197.20 | 150.17 161.0 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 146:8 147:14,16 | divided 161:20 197:12 | dominated 282:21 | draw 187:20 | 152:17 161:2 |
| 147:19 148:2,3 | | doodle 16:9,19 | 337:11,16 | 241:8 309:8 323:8 |
| 159:17 160:7,14 | division 174:8 | 322:20 | dredge 183:12 | 337:5 |
| 160:22 161:2,11 | doable 67:16 | door 308:17 316:6 | drill 115:9 160:8 | early 18:22 27:12 |
| 161:13 162:1,2,6 | DOC 225:1 | doubt 110:18 | 187:20 235:5 | 96:4 |
| 162:17,17 163:17 | docks 275:4 | downstream 41:12 | drilling 29:6 44:9 | ease 114:14 132:4 |
| 165:16,17 168:5,7 | dockside 107:11 | Dr 3:17,21 14:4 | 135:6 | easier 22:16 152:22 |
| 168:19 170:3,5 | document 17:5 | 15:4,12,21 17:22 | drive 38:11,16 | 219:22 228:9 |
| 172:1,5 174:15 | 27:10,12,18 28:16 | 46:3,14 47:14 | drives 89:1 | 318:4 |
| 175:20 176:15 | 158:7,16 222:12 | 61:2 66:8 67:12 | drop 91:8 | easing 115:11 |
| 177:9 180:6,16 | 227:13 263:7 | 71:4 75:6 99:8 | due 192:3 270:13 | east 16:6 |
| 185:20 186:15 | 267:17 271:5,9 | 100:4 101:1,7 | 312:6 | easy 28:20 61:12 |
| 196:21 201:4,21 | 272:2 336:16 | 126:10 127:17 | Duly 237:10 | 93:8 98:22 121:21 |
| 203:1,7 204:11 | documentation | 128:4,10 136:6 | dumped 19:9 | 197:3 332:4 |
| 209:11,18 210:2 | 166:9 173:9,16 | 141:22 142:6 | Dunn 2:8 263:17 | eat 82:17 205:22 |
| 212:16 220:13 | 213:15 | 146:16 162:9 | 264:9 | EBISUI 1:17 |
| 222:20 234:13 | documented 214:6 | 163:2,6,18 165:10 | duties 232:9 | 168:21 173:1,4,20 |
| 235:6,8,10 241:5 | documenting 27:21 | 165:12 174:20 | duty 153:18 166:15 | 186:10 189:1 |
| 241:15,16 246:11 | documents 61:22 | 176:10,14 178:20 | DYSKOW 1:17 | 190:11 198:2 |
| 247:4 257:17 | 264:5 338:11 | 179:18 180:10 | 39:17,21 40:1,6 | 348:9 |
| 258:13 260:22 | Doerr 1:16 15:19 | 188:7 193:2 204:6 | 40:10,15,20 41:3 | echoing 113:20 |
| 270:17 272:4 | 20:2 147:7,9 | 213:12 214:4,14 | 42:22 43:3,9 44:2 | ecological 181:2 |
| 275:9 276:7 289:3 | 208:20 221:16 | 224:9,19 225:15 | 45:19 47:9 48:2,7 | economic 24:2 |
| 294:15 301:15 | 222:8 223:1 | 225:22 232:1 | 49:5 52:15 59:12 | 167:16 172:11 |
| 304:21 311:5 | 293:16 294:4 | 233:3,16 234:6,12 | 59:17 60:1,11 | 175:12 216:18 |
| 325:21 336:1 | doing 25:5 26:21 | 234:15 236:10 | 61:16 87:18 | 244:8 267:14 |
| 337:3 | 35:3 37:11 45:9 | 242:1,11 243:4 | 117:12,17,20 | 269:12 288:5 |
| discussions 21:10 | 49:2 63:13 64:7 | 246:17 247:20 | 118:18 119:12 | economical 22:11 |
| 69:4 163:8 301:5 | 72:20 94:6 96:16 | 248:18 249:14 | 124:9,13 125:7,10 | economically |
| 326:19 334:2 | 108:9 124:14 | 254:19 255:12 | 126:5 127:1,7,12 | 230:11 |
| dispatched 79:20 | 138:2 139:13 | 256:12 257:10 | 128:13,18,21 | economics 168:3 |
| disproportionately | 151:4 165:5 | 259:14 284:17 | 129:4 130:18 | 175:6 182:18 |
| 297:15 | 167:14 171:8 | 295:8,11 311:6,9 | 139:5 141:12 | economy 192:8 |
| dissimilar 84:8 | 187:13 200:1 | 315:5,18 316:14 | 142:4,11 144:10 | ecosystem 3:5 19:8 |
| distance 330:19 | 237:17 249:22 | 316:16 317:1,4,8 | 144:15 145:10 | 20:8 24:22 25:11 |
| distinguished | 267:2 276:12 | 318:15,19 320:8 | 149:6 150:21 | 31:16 33:19 37:3 |
| 241:19 | 306:5,15 308:4,10 | 321:12 322:2,4,7 | 151:3,19 152:2,6 | 133:4 135:21 |
| distrust 197:7,8 | 310:9 312:5 | 323:6 324:12 | 273:4 276:9 279:1 | 165:3 |
| disturbance 181:1 | 338:15 340:9 | 326:10 329:15,19 | 285:9 318:17,22 | Ed 168:4,20 171:2 |
| dive 99:16 | 341:13 347:19 | 331:17 338:20 | 319:4,20 320:4 | 185:17 186:5 |
| diverse 78:9 297:19 | dollar 306:12 | draft 139:9 263:7 | D.C 330:10 | 188:22 198:1 |
| diversity 7:7 11:21 | dollars 111:5 | 264:5 265:10 | | 205:8 |
| 11:22 291:17 | dolphins 188:5,9 | 267:7 | <u>E</u> | edges 85:9,12 |
| 341:11 | domestic 211:1 | dragged 312:22 | earlier 61:17 73:13 | edit 222:17 |
| divert 234:2 | 244:11 | dramatic 84:22 | 101:3 113:21 | educate 116:17 |
| diverted 235:14 | dominate 162:2 | 92:2 93:1 279:11 | 119:10 123:7 | 214:14 |
| 239:6 | 297:5 | dramatically 93:6 | 130:7 132:16 | educated 219:12 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | I | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| education 344:3 | 140:3 142:13 | 106:13 107:14 | equitability 284:6 | 111:9 185:10 |
| educational 57:7 | 152:9 | engage 116:14 | equitable 273:19 | establishment |
| EDWIN 1:17 | eleven 292:17 | 275:4 | 274:8 275:20 | 113:18 |
| Ed's 172:21 199:7 | eliminate 46:9 53:6 | engaged 66:20 | 279:4 280:3 285:2 | estimated 269:13 |
| EEA 225:3 | 158:8 | 260:14 263:22 | 287:9 288:2,4,6 | estuary 133:8 |
| effect 92:22 120:12 | email 15:17 16:8,19 | 264:15 268:13,21 | 289:8 293:10,19 | 136:3 |
| 122:8 167:6 | 17:4,13 133:16 | engagement 261:9 | 294:5 298:8 | ethical 340:16 |
| effective 63:7 221:6 | 139:14 168:12 | 335:1 | equitably 292:22 | evaluate 76:20 |
| 228:10 343:12,13 | 318:9,9 | engaging 265:21 | 300:22 | 118:3 167:16 |
| effectively 62:19 | emailed 133:15 | Engineers 24:22 | equivalent 75:19 | 181:5 |
| 196:4 | 208:12,16 | 37:3 183:12 | Eric 2:9 3:3,20 4:9 | evaluated 36:6 |
| effects 36:9 243:19 | emails 208:14,15 | England 5:1 11:18 | 10:15 13:14 18:3 | evaluating 35:3 |
| 244:11 | 253:17 | 12:17 108:17 | 18:14 19:9 23:19 | 157:19 166:18 |
| efficiencies 130:13 | embraced 149:18 | 194:19 | 41:10 44:16 48:9 | evaluation 86:7 |
| 131:3 | emerge 93:12 | enhance 133:5 | 48:15 53:10 60:14 | event 333:14 |
| efficiency 124:4 | emerging 96:6 | 135:22 248:8 | 62:8 78:14 79:22 | eventual 205:12 |
| efficient 77:22 | emphases 50:9 | enjoyed 328:1 | 81:13 83:6 88:13 | eventually 299:8 |
| 98:17 111:21 | emphasis 27:21 | 344:2 | 89:4 93:17 102:3 | everybody 23:20 |
| 124:6 | 152:17 269:3 | ensure 82:7 289:14 | 120:8 129:21 | 51:6 59:9 60:9 |
| efficiently 42:5 | emphasize 153:17 | 291:14 | 136:13 137:9 | 61:6 83:13 113:22 |
| 62:20 64:7 73:16 | empower 164:1 | enters 142:20 | 140:8 141:6 142:3 | 133:11 168:17 |
| 79:20 88:12 98:20 | encompasses 8:14 | entertain 118:16 | 143:14 154:18 | 186:16 208:20 |
| 110:16 118:9,22 | 169:11 | 122:8 321:7,8 | 159:20 161:2 | 223:14 260:6 |
| 225:4 | encourage 24:21 | enthusiasm 104:3 | 251:18 258:11 | 268:5,13 278:21 |
| effort 115:7 168:6 | 37:2 132:21 | enthusiastic 103:5 | 289:1 295:11 | 278:22 306:16 |
| 175:4 220:20 | 135:16 203:13 | entire 28:10 103:12 | 299:22 304:14 | 320:9,18 321:4 |
| 263:17 267:11 | 204:14 205:9 | 149:18 188:19 | 310:7 318:15,16 | 322:8,12 344:1 |
| 270:19 311:15,17 | 230:9 254:8 | 312:17 | 325:4 336:4 347:2 | everybody's 24:13 |
| efforts 267:19 | 274:18 276:10 | entirely 38:17 | Eric's 40:4 100:8 | 79:16 257:15 |
| eight 258:18 | 291:17 292:12 | 218:13 312:18 | 123:8 156:9 | 315:16 320:14 |
| either 54:21 77:8 | 297:18 | entities 246:3 | ESA 193:8,17,19 | evident 154:10 |
| 93:15 97:12 | encouraged 139:12 | entitled 39:4 | 195:18,19 201:9 | evolve 25:4 135:4 |
| 118:12 148:21 | encourages 274:7 | 156:11 | escape 325:14 | evolved 99:9 |
| 149:3,9 167:18 | 275:20 277:4 | entity 77:17 257:6 | especially 24:7 | 337:17 |
| 186:5 214:20 | encouraging 5:14 | entrenched 140:3 | 106:18 150:9,14 | exact 37:10 |
| 228:16 272:14 | 167:15 261:18 | environment 45:4 | 151:20 182:10 | exactly 27:19 49:2 |
| 274:11 318:9 | 287:2 | 57:3 63:4,14 93:7 | 267:22 272:5,6 | 51:15 125:2 127:6 |
| 326:21 331:10 | endangered 115:5 | 189:8 190:21 | 336:21 347:8 | 178:21 185:1 |
| 333:4 345:4 | 121:3 166:2,3,15 | environmental | essential 86:15 | 294:19 |
| elect 14:18 | 167:5 168:2 179:1 | 98:8 243:19 | 170:13,18 171:3 | example 11:6 42:7 |
| election 3:17 14:6 | 181:12 184:17,19 | environmentally | 172:17 179:11,21 | 44:14 45:9 52:6 |
| 14:16 15:1 207:22 | 200:10 | 230:10 | essentially 87:16 | 53:22 56:10 62:21 |
| 314:9 325:9,14,16 | ended 265:21 308:4 | envisioned 313:17 | 107:13 210:1,8 | 63:22 84:1 89:4 |
| 331:16 | 308:9 326:1 | 334:5 | 304:5 313:11 | 91:19 92:5,20 |
| electronic 102:22 | endpoint 11:4 | envisioning 271:10 | establish 47:20 | 96:4,12 121:20 |
| 107:9 131:12 | energy 344:22 | equation 36:21 | 261:12 | 154:7 170:10 |
| elements 21:7 41:7 | enforcement 44:6 | equipment 102:22 | established 23:9 | 176:12 255:15 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 273:10 289:18 | expected 104:18 | extent 144:17 | fallback 323:18 | feeding 343:15 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 310:20 | expending 138:8 | externally 118:5 | fallen 182:10 | feel 49:8 116:7 |
| examples 64:8,10 | expenditures | extra 116:4 229:9 | falling 54:15 | 122:7 123:2 |
| 133:9 195:22 | 160:17 | 330:21 | familiar 56:11 | 149:22 172:14,15 |
| 269:7 | expense 45:7 | extraneous 83:21 | 147:5 184:4 | 177:17 281:8,18 |
| exceed 157:21 | expenses 306:14 | extraneous 83.21 extraordinary | 299:11,20 | 281:20 293:1 |
| excellent 276:12 | expenses 500.14 expensive 63:7 | 41:10 | far 16:11 20:5 | 336:4 349:3 |
| 307:11 331:22 | experience 40:2 | extravagance | 41:12 45:2 66:12 | feeling 287:8 |
| exception 166:22 | 81:3 184:11 310:4 | 45:14 | 91:5 98:14 111:22 | feelings 123:4 |
| 236:15 293:6 | 310:5 342:20 | extreme 22:2 | 129:5,20 155:11 | feels 79:22 292:7 |
| 320:17 | 343:10 | extremely 23:15 | 172:12,13 276:13 | 342:7 |
| exchanged 266:10 | experienced 197:13 | 24:6 28:6 132:6 | 338:11 | fees 191:22 192:1 |
| excited 19:7 | experiences 160:11 | 285:15 | farm 141:2 142:21 | fell 20:17 |
| excitement 334:4 | experiencing | eyes 310:18 | farming 216:1 | felt 16:15 50:2,11 |
| exciting 328:20 | 210:12 | eyes 510.16 | farms 36:3,7,18 | 50:18 245:4 279:9 |
| exclude 301:2 | experimental | | 142:22 191:18 | female 172:22 |
| exclude 301:2 excluded 167:19 | 181:13 184:12 | fabulous 32:21 | 192:1 213:22 | females 169:8 |
| exclusive 142:22 | 185:6,9 200:9 | 261:15 345:17 | 214:1 327:13,20 | 173:10 174:13,14 |
| 315:13 | expertise 63:15 | face 57:22 146:17 | 330:20 | 190:3 |
| exclusively 256:14 | 337:12 343:15 | 183:1 230:18 | fashion 8:5 103:1 | field 276:18 331:6 |
| 323:13 | 345:1 | 346:15 347:20 | 341:9 | fields 246:22 247:2 |
| excuse 25:10 75:18 | experts 72:9 254:2 | faced 49:15 | fast 66:12 107:7 | 248:7 |
| 249:7 325:19 | 264:18 265:15 | facetiously 84:6 | 108:12 | fight 109:7 |
| executive 164:1,4 | expired 319:22 | facilitate 31:16 | fastened 59:19 | figuratively 309:7 |
| 164:13 318:1,4 | explain 47:7 49:10 | 32:1 33:20 217:5 | fathoms 169:16,17 | figure 83:15 101:21 |
| 332:19,21 | 188:8 263:11 | 217:14 221:18 | favor 29:17 34:5 | 112:1 158:9,11 |
| exemplary 348:11 | explained 73:5 | 243:17 | 129:14 138:19 | 162:3,5 184:3 |
| exemplary 348.11 exercise 11:19 | explaining 73:4 | fact 24:4 82:14 | 155:19 156:3 | 190:19 257:11 |
| 48:22 49:7 53:15 | 272:21 | 153:15 174:11 | 203:15 216:5 | 292:11 |
| 54:3 70:3 78:11 | explanation 46:20 | 252:3 262:8 | 241:19 242:2 | fill 47:16 48:5 |
| 80:18 116:17 | 71:19 296:17 | 271:11 291:5 | 260:1 301:16 | 50:19 53:2,8 |
| 135:5 168:1 | explanatory 47:4 | 346:2 | favoring 259:17 | 58:19 60:9 61:7 |
| exhaustive 136:20 | explicit 74:5 | factor 95:8 183:13 | favors 259:11 | 70:4 74:21 76:1 |
| exist 182:3 341:11 | exploration 140:1 | 284:9 | fearless 4:10 | 106:8 183:12 |
| existed 283:2 | explore 69:20 | factored 56:16 | fears 136:8 | 188:16 344:18 |
| existing 21:22 | 132:20 135:16 | factors 180:19 | feasible 69:2 | filled 15:20 50:17 |
| 23:10 25:22 26:19 | 136:12 202:4 | 181:4 272:4 | feature 179:1 | 344:16 |
| 236:16 267:3 | express 8:12 67:4 | 301:12 | federal 2:4 36:4,5 | filling 58:1 61:21 |
| 306:4 318:18,20 | 67:18 162:9 | facts 174:16 181:6 | 82:2 180:18 183:9 | 74:17 |
| 319:1 | expressed 175:2 | fair 292:13 294:13 | 187:16 188:2 | final 4:8 245:16 |
| exists 200:2 | 259:10 | 304:13,13 335:8 | 189:5,12,18 | 267:21 268:19 |
| expand 312:2 | extended 344:5 | fairly 5:17 61:11 | 191:14 284:4,17 | finally 298:14 |
| expanded 64:4 | extends 210:3 | 280:18 | 298:15 339:6 | financial 128:19 |
| expands 169:15 | extension 243:3,4 | fairness 284:9 | fee 133:7 136:2 | find 64:6 69:19 |
| expect 276:21 | 298:16 | fall 321:13,14,14 | feed 69:6 | 91:7 143:18 173:8 |
| 309:16 | extensive 243:21 | 322:15 323:20 | feedback 49:4 62:1 | 215:13 221:5 |
| expectation 269:6 | 250:22 | 330:12 333:19 | 265:19 | 251:4 261:13 |
| 200.0 | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 1 | ı |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 287:15 321:1,3 | fish 44:7 45:11 | 321:16 323:3,9,17 | 300:4,13 302:14 | focused 5:3 160:13 |
| 331:15 337:19 | 82:17 90:13,17 | 324:1,5,18 325:1 | 305:13,20 | 291:9,10 343:5 |
| finding 209:22 | 105:16 107:17 | 325:3 330:11 | fit 90:18 201:5 | focuses 149:16 |
| 210:5,21 216:13 | 109:20 110:2 | 332:7 333:2 | 202:2 | focusing 193:10 |
| 222:6 227:4 230:6 | 111:2,21 112:20 | 342:10 344:5 | fits 25:8 68:12 | fold 315:22 |
| 242:16 245:16,20 | 115:19 187:19 | Fisherman 151:17 | 114:19 | folded 62:2 |
| 250:17 251:4 | 216:1 266:6 268:1 | fishermen 5:15 6:4 | five 79:17 214:19 | folks 15:9 19:18 |
| 252:7 253:2 | 269:17 273:1,7,9 | 6:9,18 7:10,17 | 214:19,22 215:11 | 45:15,16 66:4 |
| findings 209:21 | 287:22 305:9,10 | 90:1,10,15 105:2 | 226:17 267:9 | 89:18 94:8 99:16 |
| 221:18 222:18 | 328:17 | 110:8 140:9,17,18 | 284:19 285:2 | 261:1 263:1 |
| 230:4 236:1 255:1 | fisher 1:18 14:15 | 143:5,5,10 144:6 | 300:18 307:11 | 282:14 294:12 |
| fine 15:7,7 32:14 | 81:1 82:5 85:14 | 145:15 149:17 | 320:21 | 306:18 310:4 |
| 33:6 37:17,20 | 85:19 86:17,22 | 150:9,14 151:11 | fix 287:4 | 317:16 335:13 |
| 38:1 124:21 130:6 | 87:3,6,8 141:17 | 151:15,20 152:9 | fixed 111:22 112:2 | 336:17 |
| 152:1 154:12,13 | 150:18,19 155:14 | 152:13,18 153:15 | 287:15 | follow 28:22 77:12 |
| 154:13 173:5,19 | 164:14,17 218:18 | 153:18,18 154:5 | fixes 224:3 | 125:17 146:14 |
| 178:18 223:1 | 251:11,21 277:6 | 155:22 262:12 | fixing 187:8 193:21 | 199:6 219:20 |
| 239:9 254:17 | 277:21 278:1,6 | 280:15 282:22 | flat 63:3 | 225:3 278:6 |
| 275:18 329:14 | 284:13 286:15 | 292:4 | flavor 269:10 | followed 270:15 |
| 338:16 | 287:1 288:12,16 | fishermen's 144:19 | fleet 7:7 11:21 | following 21:14 |
| finesse 168:6 | 288:21 295:6 | 144:21 | 103:13 106:22 | 108:2 209:20 |
| finger 315:16 | 305:1 306:20 | fishery 5:22 6:1,11 | 109:8,8 110:16 | 224:1 230:17 |
| finish 59:16 228:16 | 311:11 315:12 | 44:4,6 56:13 | flesh 133:20 134:1 | 243:8,10 254:19 |
| 317:6 | 319:14,19 325:7 | 60:16,16 85:22 | 220:20 | 267:9 |
| fire 328:17 | 326:6,18 327:7 | 86:19 102:10 | fleshing 161:1 | follows 269:8 |
| firm 339:18 | 331:19 337:15 | 105:21 111:9 | flexibility 163:22 | 332:20 |
| first 4:20 6:15 19:7 | 348:13,20 | 193:4 269:15 | 182:1,16 254:1 | follow-up 20:7,11 |
| 19:19 26:12,12 | fisheries 1:5,10 3:4 | 270:4 279:8 281:1 | flexible 89:22 | food 174:13 180:20 |
| 27:9,16 30:16 | 3:14,21 5:7 8:4 | 285:14 300:6 | flip-side 136:15 | 209:10 230:12 |
| 41:21 42:13 47:10 | 11:9 12:9 23:17 | 301:6 305:7 | floating 244:13 | Forbes 2:7 263:17 |
| 53:8,14 74:10,12 | 42:6 43:22 50:15 | fishery-dependent | floor 122:21 125:12 | 264:9 265:20 |
| 79:20 80:3 83:9 | 50:16 54:6 55:3 | 95:9 | 125:18 147:19 | 268:17 274:19 |
| 87:9,14 95:1,1 | 66:22 73:17 82:7 | fishes 270:7 | 176:20 178:19 | 306:15 |
| 97:17 113:20 | 91:21 92:19,22 | fishing 24:7 82:15 | 197:15 203:11 | force 20:9,16 |
| 114:5 122:9,10 | 99:22 100:7 102:8 | 89:18 106:21 | 221:15 239:10 | forced 210:10 |
| 130:22 147:17 | 104:9 109:16 | 140:6,22 141:7,8 | 276:7 | foreign 15:15 |
| 153:16,19,21 | 111:10 115:21,22 | 142:15 143:1 | Florida 29:7 | 103:13 215:19 |
| 180:16 197:1 | 118:10 119:1 | 144:13 154:9 | 184:12,14 | forget 165:8 341:19 |
| 200:7 209:22 | 120:21 121:5 | 171:5 189:16 | fly 120:14 178:10 | 341:20 |
| 210:22 211:7 | 131:11 175:6 | 230:12 263:19 | focus 7:1 59:21 | forgotten 65:4 |
| 223:8 245:2 259:9 | 184:1 207:17 | 264:3,14,16 | 78:22 79:7 99:11 | form 46:12 61:17 |
| 263:6 275:19 | 230:22 231:19 | 267:10 269:1,12 | 99:11 119:2 | 82:5 118:3 134:15 |
| 276:2 311:16 | 233:20 238:20 | 272:21 274:9,16 | 124:10,13,17 | 274:20 275:12 |
| 312:4,14 321:8 | 239:15 245:22 | 275:22 279:12,13 | 125:3 126:6,13 | formal 33:11,14 |
| 327:17 338:12,13 | 265:6 282:10 | 280:5 282:22 | 132:9 162:6 | 219:15 |
| fiscal 256:18 | 293:4 295:18 | 292:19 293:21 | 221:22 255:13 | formally 181:7 |
| 272:10 303:15 | 297:5 300:1,2,22 | 294:6,20 295:16 | 301:9 | 252:19 332:13 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 6 472 10 00 7 | 270 22 201 2 | | . 100 10 017 10 | 22.16.24.12.26.0 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| format 72:18 80:7 | 279:22 281:3 | functionality | gain 103:18 217:12 | 23:16 34:13 36:8 |
| 159:8 162:12 | 283:18 294:10 | 303:21 | gains 37:11 | 36:20 39:12 41:12 |
| former 343:8 | 295:4 302:9 | functions 51:1,20 | galore 191:19 | 65:6 70:18 72:22 |
| forms 142:17 | 303:13 304:17 | 86:15 87:2 121:22 | game 82:21 140:9 | 77:5 95:18 104:10 |
| formulate 65:9 | 305:21 306:2 | 122:5 123:5 | 141:4,5 143:7,8 | 117:4,12 188:2 |
| 186:2 306:21 | 307:8 313:21 | 134:11 | 178:6 289:9 | 197:11,11 207:4 |
| fort 105:16 | frankly 32:4 92:6 | fund 54:21 111:6 | games 342:18 | 250:1 258:8 264:7 |
| forth 24:13 42:9 | 144:17 159:17 | 230:9,20 232:16 | gamut 107:10 | 267:4 274:10 |
| 130:15 177:14 | free 163:16 349:3 | funded 42:11 | GAN 2:8 | 281:19 293:1 |
| 195:18 257:4 | freedom 6:5 | 269:21 303:12 | garner 21:19 | 313:10 |
| 270:19 272:5 | frequency 56:14 | 306:3 | Gary 51:17 67:1 | get-go 341:12 |
| 337:11 346:9 | 256:2 | funding 26:2 128:2 | 68:22 | get-it-done 345:1 |
| forum 162:22 | fresh 328:12 | 128:6,17 129:1 | Gary's 67:6 | gill 300:11 |
| 299:6 306:10 | friendly 124:22 | 215:15,19 238:5 | gas 140:2 141:2 | give 6:4 24:11 30:4 |
| forward 7:9 18:20 | 125:6,8,9,20 | 254:12 266:20 | gather 58:6 | 44:14 45:21 58:14 |
| 21:11 22:12 30:19 | 126:2,3,6 127:5,9 | 305:11 | gathering 85:21 | 67:2 73:2 76:22 |
| 58:20 73:3 121:11 | 128:12,14 129:6 | funds 114:17 | gauge 158:2 | 79:11,22 99:10 |
| 129:12 130:8 | 150:6,8,11 151:5 | 230:13,14 231:4 | gavel 30:5 33:1 | 120:14 158:18 |
| 142:12 157:12 | 153:6,9 222:15 | 231:15 232:3,5,9 | 286:21 316:9 | 171:8 182:16 |
| 176:15 195:8 | 239:3 276:21,22 | 232:14 234:18 | gear 111:22 112:2 | 187:17 207:7 |
| 198:19 199:1 | 294:9,14 295:1 | 235:14 236:14 | general 16:6 | 269:9 306:18 |
| 225:16 235:2 | front 50:6 51:12 | 238:8,20 239:6,15 | 111:18 164:20 | 316:1 346:8,13 |
| 243:8,9 245:4 | 65:22 68:18 | 323:8,10 339:6 | 172:4 193:18 | given 4:17 41:10 |
| 264:4 265:17 | 167:12 193:5,9 | further 34:20 | 198:21 231:15 | 61:10 114:19 |
| 266:11 269:16 | 253:3 257:2 | 69:10 71:8,15 | 235:12 236:12 | 170:10 181:15 |
| 271:21 274:4 | 336:16 | 75:7 78:16 80:4 | 256:15,16 321:1 | 215:17 274:18 |
| 282:9 284:5 328:7 | frowning 146:15 | 129:7,10,11 | generally 321:13 | 346:19 |
| 330:15 337:19 | fruit 103:21 | 137:19 138:19 | generate 139:12 | gives 51:18 |
| 344:8 | frustrated 89:16 | 172:4 203:9 | 244:22 | giving 55:15 |
| forwarding 132:15 | frustrating 81:5 | 235:19 241:4 | generated 245:1 | 265:19 |
| found 17:17 | frustration 36:22 | 260:1 267:19 | 279:16 323:15 | glad 4:12 89:14 |
| four 27:15 66:18 | 252:13 286:4 | 294:15 297:14 | generating 138:4 | 137:2 229:4 |
| 79:17 112:8,15 | frustrations 289:21 | 334:2 | generic 202:1 | 250:14 255:6 |
| 192:2 215:11 | full 41:7,20 50:3 | furthering 269:1 | genetic 27:17 | 289:6 328:16 |
| 226:16 242:7 | 119:4 203:7 | future 22:10 55:18 | gentleman 103:2 | 342:13 |
| 259:4 280:15,15 | 207:13 221:1 | 97:5,7,10,12 | 272:18 | go 4:18 6:10,17 9:5 |
| 283:21 300:18 | 312:12 323:22 | 172:10 177:17 | gentlemen 272:19 | 9:19 12:7,8 14:5 |
| 322:17 | 324:6,11 342:15 | 194:5 196:10,15 | geographic 21:14 | 19:9 20:5,7 36:4 |
| Foy 168:9,12 | fuller 6:20 | 200:8 201:6,12 | 23:8 179:6 289:15 | 46:14 49:18,19,19 |
| 347:21 349:7 | fully 23:9 43:5 | 236:22 237:9 | geographical 179:9 | 56:18 59:21 62:9 |
| frame 205:1,11 | 48:18 49:10 72:12 | 247:18 254:9 | 179:19 180:2 | 65:2 66:3 69:19 |
| framework 266:4 | 72:14 80:13 | 270:17 271:9,11 | geometric 69:5 | 72:3 74:6 75:7 |
| Franke 1:18 3:15 | 132:20 135:16 | 314:19 323:19 | George 1:20 | 76:5 86:2 90:16 |
| 207:18 229:12 | 202:4 217:7 | 337:3 | 213:16,17 249:20 | 98:18 99:16 101:9 |
| 258:4 263:3,6,14 | 220:13 323:16 | FY 242:20 243:15 | 250:14 | 104:16 106:1 |
| 273:5 275:18 | full-time 274:22 | | germane 149:3,9 | 115:17 117:19 |
| 277:1,15 278:4 | function 344:17 | G | getting 6:18 21:3 | 119:9 121:14 |
| | | | | |
| L | | - | • | • |

| 123:9,20 125:21 | 26:10 28:9 30:9 | 266:20 267:14 | 326:22 330:4 | 341:13 343:19 |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 128:20 130:22 | 33:5 39:10 40:18 | 268:8 269:14 | 335:9 340:19 | 347:5 |
| 137:16,21 138:14 | 41:1,8 42:20 45:5 | 270:14,15 271:14 | 342:12,14 344:9 | greater 124:4 |
| 139:3 142:12 | 45:8,21 56:4 59:1 | 271:19 275:11 | 349:16 | 304:10 |
| 144:3 146:3 147:3 | 59:10 61:7,12,15 | 280:13 282:6 | goodbye 308:17 | grid 157:17,19 |
| 148:3 149:4,4 | 64:1,13,22 65:17 | 297:20 301:22 | Googling 236:2 | 161:17 |
| 150:14,16 157:4,7 | 68:9 70:5 71:13 | 303:16 305:17,18 | gorgeous 329:7 | grids 106:4 |
| 159:17 165:3 | 72:1 73:3 76:19 | 308:12 311:14,15 | gotten 15:13 200:4 | gritty 80:8 |
| 171:20 172:4,12 | 77:1,19 78:7,11 | 311:18,19,22 | 200:6 337:8 | ground 30:10,17 |
| 172:20 183:18 | 81:21 82:4,6,9,10 | 312:2,20 313:1,19 | government 82:2 | 69:19 139:21 |
| 188:16 189:13 | 82:21 83:15,20 | 314:8,18,20,21 | 215:5,9,14 | 196:1 213:5 |
| 196:9 198:19 | 84:20 85:11 86:2 | 315:2,6,15 316:21 | governor 170:20 | groundfish 5:22 |
| 199:1,3 202:20 | 87:10 91:6 93:22 | 317:1,12 320:11 | 281:21 285:16 | 13:5,6 194:19 |
| 204:13 208:10 | 94:1 96:17 98:2,3 | 324:5,15,20,22 | 295:13 296:18 | group 50:14 69:14 |
| 211:8 212:22 | 98:6 99:1 100:5 | 325:10,10 329:3 | governors 282:7,15 | 78:18 122:5 135:6 |
| 220:5 231:22 | 101:5 102:16 | 330:17,18 333:1 | 283:22 291:14 | 177:4 209:7 227:7 |
| 233:5,9 235:9 | 103:4 104:1,19,20 | 336:22 337:18 | 292:12 296:1 | 248:20 253:5 |
| 241:3,6 247:12 | 107:22 108:6,14 | 342:12 347:15 | grabs 303:20 | 261:21 264:15,20 |
| 250:21 252:17,19 | 108:16 110:1,2,6 | 349:21 | grace 343:18 | 266:7 268:1 271:6 |
| 254:22 259:22 | 110:9,20 111:14 | gold 142:13 | graciously 19:11 | 271:7 273:12 |
| 268:2,14,18 | 116:8,10,14 117:6 | good 13:18 19:3 | grammatical | 277:16 312:12,15 |
| 272:15 273:2,6 | 119:21 120:14,20 | 23:17,18 24:11 | 151:22 | 312:17 314:4 |
| 275:4 285:8 289:5 | 120:21 121:8,14 | 27:3 31:2 53:22 | grant 230:7 232:6 | 318:5 332:15 |
| 297:1 300:9,10 | 129:22 130:3 | 71:19 74:10 80:3 | 232:17,21 235:15 | 333:2,4,5,5 |
| 302:8 306:10 | 132:18,19 134:20 | 80:9,15,20 96:18 | 238:5 239:16,17 | 334:11,12 337:20 |
| 309:4 311:22 | 135:1,10 136:9 | 96:21 100:18 | 242:19,20 243:11 | 338:14 346:8 |
| 313:11 321:7,10 | 142:11,21 143:6 | 106:22 112:15 | 243:15 245:19 | groups 98:8 139:20 |
| 334:18 339:4 | 152:20,20 157:1 | 116:21 120:22 | 248:22,22 254:6,9 | 248:15 249:3 |
| 341:6 347:15 | 157:11 158:11,13 | 136:11 151:8 | 254:10,11,20 | 264:1 265:10 |
| goal 26:3 27:7,20 | 160:20,21 162:11 | 169:2 184:14 | 256:13,17,19 | 266:6 267:7 268:3 |
| 133:22 182:16 | 166:16 170:10,17 | 186:1 201:15 | 257:2 | 268:11 283:4 |
| 293:3,10 294:11 | 171:19 175:7 | 203:1 204:11 | granted 36:15 | 286:10 292:19 |
| 345:6 | 176:22 177:14 | 205:14 209:18 | granting 246:3 | 306:7 |
| goals 27:7 266:21 | 178:4,8,9 185:20 | 214:9,12 219:9 | 249:1 | group's 123:4 |
| God 77:19 | 187:6 190:17 | 223:2 228:7 | grants 233:18 | grow 76:22 |
| goes 20:13 23:2,18 | 192:18 193:14 | 237:11 238:9 | 238:20 255:3 | growing 166:12 |
| 25:15 51:14 56:16 | 194:2 196:11,11 | 253:8,21 259:6 | granularity 68:16 | growth 77:16 |
| 72:15 83:3 86:3 | 197:9 199:2,2,22 | 262:15 263:10 | 76:18 | 180:20 |
| 113:14 147:2 | 201:1 202:18 | 266:8,11 267:2 | grasped 65:5 | guess 35:15 41:18 |
| 199:5 201:2,16 | 203:11 205:11 | 268:13 280:7 | great 4:19 8:12,12 | 45:13,14 47:6 |
| 231:13 233:17 | 207:6,7,12,17 | 283:1 284:9 | 9:18 18:13,17 | 48:4 58:6 59:7 |
| 249:16 251:14 | 212:18 215:12 | 286:14 289:14,15 | 30:18 38:7 134:5 | 65:9 82:20 107:2 |
| 300:14 305:6 | 229:3,7,17 233:18 | 289:15 291:14,15 | 155:13 157:15 | 107:8 113:19 |
| going 5:11 6:17 | 234:9 237:18 | 292:8 294:16 | 202:12 250:21 | 119:15 135:12 |
| 14:5 15:9 16:3 | 238:1,2 241:14 | 295:4 307:10 | 255:8 268:8 | 148:10 152:18 |
| 17:6 18:14 19:7 | 250:6 256:1 259:4 | 310:8 311:15 | 307:19 309:15 | 248:18 284:13 |
| 22:5 23:15 25:3 | 260:13 262:19 | 322:15 325:18 | 310:5 336:2 | 300:5 334:2 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | I | I | I | I |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 347:14 | halibut 90:3 102:10 | 338:2,3 346:11 | 164:19 187:14,15 | 90:15 104:16 |
| guidance 212:5 | 105:11 111:4,9 | 347:20 349:21 | 212:22 255:3,7 | 114:9 181:8 |
| guide 252:5 | 272:22 273:2 | harder 65:8 | 259:10 281:3 | 253:18 254:13 |
| Gulf 20:8,15,22 | 300:8 | harking 78:14 | 296:8 | Hi 208:21 |
| 28:5 278:1,5,18 | hall 101:4 | harm 175:14 | hearing 71:20 | high 21:17 49:19 |
| 279:5,8,14,17 | halt 210:8 | harms 167:16 | 78:19 80:10 108:8 | 50:13 76:12 264:9 |
| 282:20 290:12,17 | hand 39:15 119:10 | 175:12 | 165:1 176:15 | 306:12 |
| guy 90:16 234:10 | 148:1 203:16,22 | hatchery 187:19 | 216:10 226:13 | higher 182:7 |
| 300:14 327:2 | 205:14 212:19 | 269:21 | 229:5,6,22 258:16 | highest 78:21 |
| guys 9:20 10:22 | 241:20 242:3 | hate 124:8 | 259:15,16 303:9 | highly 282:14 |
| 18:21 30:10,17,18 | 301:17,20 315:19 | Hawaii 77:16 | 336:14 339:11 | Hill 1:11 339:5 |
| 31:5 49:4 84:3 | 316:19 330:3 | 154:10 170:15 | heart 44:12 348:1 | hindsight 196:19 |
| 104:12 113:12 | handed 15:21 16:1 | 171:21 183:6 | heartburn 284:14 | hindsight's 197:3 |
| 200:3 205:1 | 46:21 268:12 | 187:2 188:8 197:6 | heartening 262:7 | hired 268:9 |
| 217:18 228:13 | handled 298:13 | 214:18 215:11 | Heather 1:11,14 | historic 165:19 |
| 253:10 280:15 | handling 10:22 | Hawaiian 165:16 | 2:5 3:2,7 4:17 | 202:9 |
| 305:9,10 310:11 | hands 203:17,19 | 165:20,20 166:1,6 | 14:4,6 21:3 59:12 | historically 177:10 |
| 327:22 344:7 | 204:1 241:21 | 166:10,10,12,22 | 61:16 88:18 | 191:1 |
| 345:16 349:17 | 242:4 286:17 | 167:8 169:11 | 132:17 250:1 | history 337:16 |
| | 295:7 301:18,21 | 181:22 182:5,11 | 345:14 346:22 | hit 106:3 139:20 |
| H | 305:17 330:5 | 182:12 184:7 | heavily-populated | 275:3 |
| H 1:22 | 349:16 | 189:22 190:1,7 | 189:10 | HMS 269:13 |
| habitat 8:9,16 21:9 | handy 17:8 | 196:22 198:6 | heavily-used | hoc 307:15 313:5 |
| 21:18 22:14,20 | hanging 74:21 | 199:15 | 189:10 | Hogarth 188:7 |
| 23:12 24:14,19,20 | happen 15:10 | Hawaiians 191:3 | hell 30:10 | hold 315:6 321:17 |
| 25:10 28:9 29:4 | 81:18 96:2 108:18 | haziness 221:9 | hello 168:17 217:20 | 323:22 |
| 43:22 62:15,17 | 121:8 163:10 | head 174:5,7 | help 32:3 41:11 | Holliday 2:4 3:17 |
| 63:11 73:17 88:2 | 196:11,11 201:12 | 287:19 | 47:20 64:22 67:18 | 3:21 14:4 15:4,12 |
| 91:6 96:12 166:16 | 204:14 234:21 | heading 313:1 | 68:13 72:10 74:2 | 15:21 17:22 46:3 |
| 166:19,20 167:19 | 247:10 254:8 | heads 164:12 | 79:10 89:19 93:9 | 46:14 47:14 66:8 |
| 167:20 170:13,19 | 330:11 | healthier 6:20 | 93:10 129:21 | 67:12 71:4 75:6 |
| 171:3 172:17 | happened 100:17 | hear 19:8 40:12 | 150:17 159:15 | 165:10,12 178:20 |
| 175:13,19 177:12 | 199:17 234:21 | 61:14 80:5 84:3 | 250:4 252:5 | 179:18 180:10 |
| 177:18,20 178:22 | happening 67:7 | 101:19 129:9 | 264:15 305:18,18 | 193:2 204:6 |
| 179:3,5 180:11,18 | 197:18 235:20 | 133:11,12 148:22 | 306:21 307:19 | 224:19 225:15,22 |
| 181:18 182:21 | 240:16 | 149:7 163:11 | 311:4 335:19,20 | 232:1 233:3,16 |
| 183:8,9,19,21 | happens 164:10 | 172:15 186:7 | helpful 58:13 117:1 | 234:6,12,15 |
| 184:9 185:4,7 | 208:1 236:9 251:7 | 190:10 196:4 | 122:16 134:16 | 236:10 242:1,11 |
| 187:15 191:12 | happily 155:3 | 228:15 229:12 | 180:6 214:5 | 243:4 254:19 |
| 192:3 199:22 | happy 4:9 10:5 | 261:18 278:21,22 | 219:18 252:10 | 255:12 256:12 |
| 202:6,8 205:4 | 37:14 97:19 | 280:10 289:6 | helping 5:16 88:14 | 257:10 295:8,11 |
| habitats 23:7 27:14 | 104:21 342:5 | 319:17 335:21 | helps 37:7 74:4 | 315:5,18 316:14 |
| 181:1 | hard 31:2 73:6 | 336:5 348:13,13 | 85:13,14 153:16 | 316:16 317:1,4,8 |
| half 18:15,22 | 104:4 107:8 | 348:14,14 | 162:3 224:5 | 318:15,19 320:8 |
| 104:11 207:19,21 | 116:18 262:12 | heard 21:8 61:5 | HENRY 1:21 | 321:12 322:2,4,7 |
| 315:22 324:13 | 289:12 297:12 | 71:20 81:15 98:14 | hesitate 299:6 | 323:6 324:12 |
| 330:16 | 311:17 337:6 | 121:16 131:17 | hey 26:16 69:14 | 326:10 329:15,19 |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | I | I | 1 |

| 331:17 338:20 | 101:5 132:2 | imporative 207.12 | 342:18 | 235:18 |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| home 9:21 267:15 | 134:14,20 185:2 | imperative 287:12 imperiled 182:6 | imposing 12:15 | increased 93:2 |
| 314:13 | 201:15 202:10 | imperned 182.0 impetus 261:13 | imposition 5:20 | 133:6 136:1 |
| honest 235:4 | 201.13 202.10 205:14 214:13 | implement 25:18 | impressed 31:4 | 137:22 138:16 |
| 272:19 | 219:9 226:19 | 52:18 211:3 | impression 229:4 | |
| | | 243:13 269:20 | 234:1 236:4 | increasing 22:9 |
| honestly 290:10 325:22 | 237:11 253:8,21 | | | incredible 346:2,9 |
| honor 345:17 | 287:1 303:5 330:4 | implementation | improve 23:6 | incredibly 13:2 29:3 |
| | ideally 185:17 ideas 79:16 93:10 | 139:19 140:4,8,16 144:7 145:17 | 267:10,12,21 | |
| hope 9:11 18:11 | | | improved 269:13 | incrementally 55:22 |
| 74:4 90:10,11 | 134:5,6 203:3 | 156:1 201:9 | improvements 22:14 | |
| 155:10 208:1 310:21 335:18 | 204:20 245:4 | 209:14,19 211:17 | | independent 95:3 112:12 |
| 336:6 347:21 | 333:7 identified 16:12 | 216:16 217:1,6 | improving 267:9 | index 270:6 |
| | | 221:19 225:1 227:13 243:12 | improvising 91:1 | indicate 47:14 |
| hoped 297:17 | 27:10,18 52:19 270:11 320:13 | | inappropriate 40:11 297:8 | |
| hopefully 160:15 247:9 342:15 | identify 14:7 47:12 | implemented 5:12 42:8 103:8 200:11 | inches 273:3,5 | indicated 50:7 216:21 242:21 |
| | 64:14 86:14 98:12 | | include 24:22 29:1 | |
| hoping 257:6 266:16 | | implementing 211:22 216:20 | 37:3 43:22 73:17 | indicator 303:16 individual 139:15 |
| horizon 55:21 | 131:9 140:17 | | 73:18,19 88:2,3 | |
| | 161:18 166:5 | 230:15 243:17 272:8 | 88:10 122:2 133:3 | 160:11 161:16 |
| host 327:4 | 244:1 252:20 | | 134:3 135:20 | 205:6 248:2 |
| hosted 164:2 | 311:18 339:13 | implication 172:11 172:11 | | 295:17 |
| hot 343:12 | identifying 134:9 | | 147:10 150:8 | individually 15:8 |
| hotel 322:1 325:18 | 304:6 | implications 57:8 | 203:8 216:17 | 141:5 143:8 |
| hour 70:4,22 71:13 | IFQ 104:9 | 171:4,5 | 217:21 221:19,20 | 205:10 |
| 73:22 207:13,19 | ignore 55:21 | implicit 198:3 | 222:2 227:13 | individuals 14:21 |
| 207:21 226:20 | III 321:16 323:10 | implies 240:14 | 243:18 253:17 | 101:10 162:13 |
| 258:20 | 323:17 324:1,5 | importance 54:5 | 274:8 275:21 | 341:8 347:7 |
| hours 331:10 | 332:7 333:2 | 67:8 248:9 291:7 | 280:4 286:9 | industries 96:14 |
| house 327:21 342:3 | illustrative 136:21 | important 7:21 | 295:14 | industry 93:19 |
| household 97:1 | imagine 61:11 62:2 | 19:5 23:3,15 24:3 | included 28:2,12 | 94:8,12 95:13 |
| hug 261:22 262:3 | 65:13 281:5 | 24:6 25:8 26:17 | 28:15,18 76:6 | 98:9 105:20 |
| huge 19:10 72:11 | 312:14 imbalance 278:18 | 28:4,7 29:3 44:12 52:11 53:21 55:14 | 230:8 321:19 | 113:11 130:14 |
| 77:21 120:5 | | | | 131:1 188:11 |
| 188:11 309:12 | immediately 63:1 | 59:5,9 69:14 | 290:1 | 216:1 265:14 |
| 346:3 | 250:16 | 74:11 75:9 76:7 | including 37:4 95:6 | 305:20 |
| huh 4:6 347:16 | impact 36:17 178:1 | 76:15 86:19 98:18 | 201:9 213:4 | industry's 89:19 |
| human 167:7 | 191:13 192:8 | 100:1,9 101:18 | 217:11 244:9 | industry-based |
| 190:12,15 | 197:10 266:12 | 106:4 108:20 | 284:16 344:18 | 112:3,7 113:4 |
| humankind 187:5 | 279:11 | 118:2 122:7 132:6 | incorporate 24:19 | industry-funded |
| hurting 82:2,3 | impacts 28:9,9 35:4 | 134:11 136:17 | 37:12 89:22 212:1 | 94:12 |
| Hyatt 1:10 | 35:19 36:7,14,15 | 182:13 194:11 | 271:8 | inefficient 77:18 |
| hydrodynamic | 178:1 194:8,20 | 201:3 210:15 | incorporated | inequitable 292:2 |
| 27:17 | 244:12 | 213:3 233:22 | 154:10 | inequity 285:6 |
| I | imparting 266:12 | 239:4 245:5 | incorporates | infections 190:14 |
| idea 19:3 72:17,17 | impassioned | 269:19 272:4 | 274:14 302:12 | inflexibility 89:16 |
| 72:22 80:9 93:18 | 272:12 | 291:4 345:10 | incorporating 91:1 | influence 121:5 |
| 12.22 00.7 73.10 | impediment 193:20 | importantly 27:2 | incorrect 235:16 | inform 57:6,6 |
| | <u>l</u> | <u>l</u> | <u>l</u> | <u>l</u> |
| | | | | |

| 243:19 | installations | 318:6 333:21 | 215:13 | 92:21 120:19 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| information 75:10 | 169:14 | interesting 5:13 | investment 31:20 | 127:3 194:12 |
| 75:16 85:21 100:2 | instance 85:22 | 24:11 177:15 | 97:6 103:22 | 197:7 199:12 |
| 106:9 118:5 | 181:21 306:6 | 185:16 282:8 | 132:21 135:17 | 200:22 201:10 |
| 120:15 123:2 | instances 114:12 | interests 59:3 | 211:1 213:14 | 212:16 280:1 |
| 162:14 176:4,16 | 240:15,15 | 69:16 70:7 140:7 | 214:6,17 | 282:12 285:14 |
| 195:9 203:2 205:8 | instinct 26:12 | 140:17,22 141:1,2 | investors 214:19 | 287:19 338:3 |
| 214:10 261:10 | institution 268:19 | 141:2,8 143:10 | involved 44:4 | item 17:17 41:19 |
| 266:10 269:15 | instructive 5:9 | 144:6 145:15 | 66:20 94:9 102:8 | 52:22 53:3,5 |
| 271:18 295:10 | instrumental | 150:8,13 151:10 | 102:10,11 139:22 | 68:18 75:19 101:6 |
| 344:3 | 216:20 230:14 | 152:8,13,15 | 194:7 251:12 | 157:8 168:5 |
| informational | insufficient 28:16 | 154:19 155:22 | 253:18 255:2 | 204:17 267:22 |
| 265:7 306:9 | integrated 103:1 | 272:17 277:18 | 261:1,20 268:21 | 268:19 274:13 |
| information-gath | integrity 287:16 | 285:10 286:1 | 284:10 308:1 | 302:9 303:19 |
| 276:17 | 288:7 | 293:21,22 294:7 | involvement 301:8 | items 17:3,3,12 |
| informed 342:8 | intend 186:2 | 296:19 297:16 | IPHC 110:20,21 | 49:15,20 51:15 |
| informs 161:22 | 221:19 224:17 | 341:9,11 | iPhone 17:18 | 58:17 68:21 75:20 |
| infrastructure | 275:13,16 | interfered 183:19 | IQ 109:2 | 135:11 267:9,21 |
| 265:19 | intended 220:4,8 | interim 204:18 | islands 28:17 | 269:1,10 271:1,6 |
| inherent 62:16 | 223:9 230:22 | intern 268:10,11 | 165:21 166:7,11 | 306:4,13 349:22 |
| inherently 55:7 | 231:7 245:3 | internal 52:8 118:4 | 166:13,22 169:11 | it'll 19:4 |
| initial 21:16 266:4 | 271:17 | 230:20 233:14 | 169:12,13 182:11 | |
| initiated 16:9 227:5 | intending 142:2 | internally 8:1 50:8 | 182:12 183:5 | J |
| initiative 221:21 | 347:13 | 53:15 57:9 219:5 | 189:22 190:1,7 | j 1:17 201:10 |
| 222:3,9,11,12 | intense 5:6 | international 16:14 | 191:6 196:22 | jack 344:15 |
| 256:10 328:22 | intent 61:18 70:2 | 222:10 | 198:6 270:1 | Jersey 1:11 |
| initiatives 211:5 | 124:15 127:14 | internet 236:4 | issue 70:18 82:12 | Jessica 259:7,8 |
| 222:4,6 223:2 | 152:6 218:3,6,7 | interpret 75:13 | 110:13 113:15 | Jim 178:22 |
| 243:13,18 264:10 | 221:20 224:1 | interpreted 124:8 | 115:3 116:7 | job 6:22 23:17,18 |
| 269:4 272:9 | 225:2 228:21 | 171:13 195:20 | 127:16,18 170:4 | 64:6 82:8 97:22 |
| 274:16 302:14 | 233:9 239:8 | interrelated 54:17 | 175:1 196:8,13 | 155:13 167:13 |
| 305:13 345:10 | 249:21 257:13 | interrupt 119:13 | 199:9,14,15 | 225:8 267:2 |
| injure 190:3 | 277:12 | interrupting | 200:14 203:8 | 270:15 274:22 |
| input 8:13 9:1 58:6 | intention 140:12,14 | 117:17 | 205:1 214:5,17 | 275:3 295:4 |
| 62:5,7 64:17 68:1 | intentionally 284:7 | interval 71:2 | 231:16 235:11 | 306:19 307:10 |
| 70:9 78:8 100:11 | inter 54:22 | inter-generational | 237:9 238:6 | 310:8,8,21 329:18 |
| 160:16 217:4 | interacting 187:5 | 57:21 | 247:22 259:22 | 340:2,2 341:13 |
| 242:19,22 243:3 | interaction 183:22 | intimately 139:22 | 261:1,8 280:20 | jobs 98:4 310:19 |
| 245:17 247:7,14 | 190:12 328:8 | introducing 185:3 | 285:9 289:4 | 328:20 |
| 247:22 250:5,6,11 | interactions 167:7 | invent 251:13 | 290:21 291:4,7 | JOHN 2:2 |
| 252:6,10 254:7,15 | interest 8:12 32:7 | invest 97:5 98:2 | 299:3 303:8 326:2 | joined 209:9 |
| insane 26:14 | 61:3 67:17 72:20 | invested 98:9 | 326:5,15 329:12 | 309:13 |
| insert 192:19 226:7 | 248:7 286:10 | 213:21 215:6 | 337:6,22 | joint 215:8 |
| 257:6 | 289:16 301:8 | investigation | issues 6:6 7:21 8:13 | Joner 1:19 3:13 |
| inside 53:19 | interested 96:15 | 138:11 | 8:19 10:14 15:13 | 45:13 48:3 88:16 |
| insight 93:9 | 214:21 218:10 | investing 98:7 | 29:4,4 41:6,15 | 88:18 89:11,14 |
| inspiration 347:18 | 220:10 283:12 | 210:12 213:18 | 55:20 56:22 79:18 | 91:15 133:13 |
| | | | | |
| | • | • | - | |

| | I | | | I |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 209:2 258:11,18 | justice 330:21 | 29:7 38:16 55:2 | 57:16,17,20 58:15 | 187:2 190:6,16 |
| 258:21 259:5 | | 57:13 59:20 65:12 | 59:5 61:14 62:13 | 192:6,7 194:3 |
| 260:7 261:16 | K | 65:16 74:1 80:7 | 62:15,18 63:2,10 | 196:4 197:3,16 |
| 262:2,17 299:19 | keep 40:20 43:1 | 80:19 82:12 96:5 | 63:13,21 64:6,8 | 198:10,14,18 |
| 328:11,15 330:6 | 82:15 102:18 | 103:21 104:13 | 64:19,20 65:1,5 | 201:5,12 204:15 |
| 341:6,20,22 342:3 | 108:8 155:11 | 106:15 109:22 | 66:1 67:9,21 68:4 | 204:20 207:5 |
| 342:5 346:22 | 159:16 160:2 | 110:13 112:4 | 70:15,16 71:5,10 | 210:1,6,11 212:18 |
| 348:14 | 252:10 272:19 | 113:8 124:2 | 71:16 73:8 75:2 | 215:5 220:16 |
| Joner's 207:8 | 317:21 323:15 | 126:14 131:16 | 76:3,4,12,13,19 | 227:4 228:8 |
| Jones 217:18,20 | 330:15 331:1 | 132:11,22 135:3 | 76:22 77:4 78:18 | 231:16 233:19 |
| 234:10 | keeping 130:10 | 135:17 137:10 | 78:22 79:2,4,5 | 235:2 239:5 247:5 |
| Josh 16:8 39:12 | 332:22 | 154:6 162:21 | 80:18 81:2,17 | 247:9 249:4,17 |
| 133:15 138:19 | keeps 100:6 290:19 | 168:15 190:3,6 | 82:14 83:9 84:1,2 | 250:5,19,21 251:7 |
| 151:13 156:21,21 | Keith 1:21 14:12 | 191:7 195:15,19 | 84:9,10,12,19,22 | 251:9,10,18 252:1 |
| 208:16 317:4 | 19:20 20:13 47:19 | 198:10 215:16 | 85:1,2,3,4,8,8,13 | 252:5,16 253:16 |
| JOSHUA 2:5 | 47:22 48:12 | 228:10 238:6 | 85:15,16,19,20 | 254:18 257:10 |
| judgement 199:5 | 111:17 113:18 | 240:9 248:16 | 86:6 87:11,12 | 259:16,21 260:11 |
| judgment 76:14 | 131:20 134:17 | 255:4 265:13 | 88:3,7,8,10,14 | 260:12 261:8,11 |
| 200:12 284:10 | 136:8 137:19 | 300:20 308:2 | 89:2,6,7,15,19 | 264:18 266:19 |
| judicious 181:9 | 143:22 148:11,16 | 312:1 332:12 | 90:5,8 91:4 92:5 | 267:15 268:9 |
| Judy 2:8 208:21 | 151:22 152:4 | 343:22 345:2 | 92:20 93:4,22 | 270:12,14 278:7 |
| Julie 1:19 19:20 | 153:12 156:14 | kinds 73:19 136:21 | 94:3,13,14 95:1,4 | 278:14 279:6 |
| 20:1 47:18 62:10 | 157:10,14 159:1 | 172:5 181:16 | 95:5,8,13,15,17 | 281:7,21 282:6,11 |
| 66:4 74:7 88:1 | 163:20 165:2 | 183:17,18 189:17 | 95:18,19,21 96:1 | 282:19 283:3,10 |
| 120:6 122:9,12 | 168:8,10,19 | 190:16 193:21 | 96:2,3,12 101:8 | 283:13 284:20 |
| 123:16 124:18 | 180:12 182:19 | 198:11 314:8 | 103:7,15,17,22 | 285:11,20 286:4 |
| 141:20 143:21 | 185:5 200:20 | knew 53:17 345:5 | 104:12,14,16,21 | 288:22 289:11,21 |
| 148:11,18 151:19 | 218:22 253:11 | knock 158:17 | 105:6,8,14,15,18 | 290:12 291:1,4,6 |
| 153:3 161:14 | 302:6,7 315:9 | know 5:5,18,21 6:9 | 105:21 106:5,10 | 291:8,9,12 293:10 |
| 162:10 180:13 | 331:20 | 6:10 7:2,6,12,13 | 106:15,17,19 | 297:2,7,8,14,17 |
| 182:20 185:1,15 | Keith's 137:5 | 7:16,19,19,20,22 | 107:6,8,13,14,15 | 297:18 298:18 |
| 205:14 221:15 | Ken 1:18 3:15 | 8:2,3,8,11,11,15 | 107:17 108:7,8,9 | 299:21 300:17,20 |
| 223:4 237:16 | 258:3 263:13 | 8:21 9:8,11,13,14 | 108:12,21 109:11 | 301:3,6,10 304:12 |
| 239:12 255:18 | 275:11 276:21 | 9:18,21 10:12,18 | 109:12,21 110:20 | 307:21 310:5,20 |
| 296:1,9 | 279:21 280:21 | 11:4,11,11,12,13 | 110:21 112:18 | 314:1 323:5 324:6 |
| Julie's 151:6 | 283:17 284:11 | 11:17,20,20 12:4 | 113:1 114:3 115:3 | 324:8 325:5,18,20 |
| 240:16 | 289:6 294:9 302:8 | 12:5,10,20 13:1,3 | 115:22 116:2 | 326:20 327:19 |
| July 328:12 | 307:7 313:12,12 | 13:8 17:19 18:3 | 119:22 120:18,20 | 329:4 332:14,17 |
| jump 20:6 38:11,15 | kept 51:6 | 19:3 20:3,21 22:4 | 121:2,6,10 122:2 | 333:18 334:4 |
| 49:14 102:3 | key 15:3 46:16,18 | 22:15 23:2 24:13 | 122:16 123:9,12 | 335:1 340:5 |
| 171:18 280:9 | 190:21 210:4 | 24:14 26:11 27:19 | 124:15 143:14 | 341:15 342:9 |
| 307:18 | 266:3 276:15 | 28:8,10,20,20 | 146:13 150:18,18 | 343:4,14 344:14 |
| June 210:4 211:4 | 304:2 | 35:10 38:18 40:7 | 154:4 160:5,7,10 | 345:8,17,20 346:7 |
| 256:18 | kidding 225:14 | 50:14 51:4 53:14 | 160:16 161:7,9 | 347:4,5,12 349:21 |
| Juneau 300:5,7 | kids 342:1 | 53:20,21,22 54:14 | 168:4 172:14 | knowing 75:14 |
| jurisdiction 295:19 | kind 8:16 11:19 | 55:19 56:5,9,10 | 177:3 184:5,6,15 | 98:20 |
| jurisdictional 55:1 | 25:13 26:15 28:21 | 56:21 57:6,14,14 | 184:18 185:17 | knowledge 67:18 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 70.0 116.10 | 262.5.215.17 | 1 | 1::4 272.2 | 201.20.247.22 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 79:9 116:19 | 262:5 315:17 | legislative 114:11 | limit 273:3 | 201:20 347:22 |
| 174:12 344:4,6 | 316:11 319:10,13 | 114:20 132:3 | limitations 114:14 | lists 291:15,15 |
| knowledgeable | 327:11 328:3 | 193:20 195:17 | limited 31:19 133:4 | 295:21 |
| 295:17 | 329:1,21 341:18 | legislators 170:21 | 134:4 135:21 | literally 89:8,10 |
| Kodiak 347:15 | 342:22 348:19 | legitimate 7:5 30:9 | 169:7 244:10 | 309:6 |
| Korea 215:13,22 | 349:8 | 30:12 56:19 | 273:1 | little 8:10 9:4,6 |
| Korean 215:9 | launch 334:19 | 149:21 297:10 | limiting 6:6,19 | 22:22 41:17 51:22 |
| Kris 216:14 217:3 | launched 211:5 | legitimately 266:18 | limits 5:17,21 | 52:5 53:13 54:8 |
| 220:15 223:20 | laundry 265:15 | 266:19 | 95:20 | 66:12 69:22 70:1 |
| 224:13,19 225:7 | law 46:7 52:17 53:4 | lend 304:9 | line 17:12 20:17 | 71:1 73:6 81:5 |
| kudos 30:16 | 53:7 120:18 | lengthy 139:9 | 49:20 51:15 58:17 | 89:21 90:16 96:13 |
| | 171:11,12 283:14 | letter 20:10 212:4,5 | 68:17,20 72:10 | 103:4,22 105:4 |
| L | 296:3,14 | letting 112:5 | 75:19,20 101:5 | 108:18 119:22 |
| labels 295:21 | laws 293:2 | let's 23:22 25:4 | 109:8 114:5 | 135:6 137:6 |
| lack 245:20 344:14 | lawsuits 178:9 | 27:19 41:18 44:16 | 158:10 249:12 | 153:20 157:20 |
| lagging 334:10 | lawyer 191:22 | 84:2 90:21,22 | 267:1,1 300:10 | 158:8,14,17 160:8 |
| laid 165:22 | layer 116:4 195:19 | 98:10 99:2 121:10 | 303:18 313:16 | 168:22 197:9 |
| land 142:12 183:2 | 196:3 | 139:3 151:1 | 315:18 338:16 | 208:3,19 209:7 |
| 185:8 187:19 | layers 196:3 | 156:13 159:15,16 | 339:6 345:6 | 228:8 236:2 252:7 |
| 265:6 | lays 180:18 | 165:3 223:18 | lines 37:19 53:17 | 263:11 265:17 |
| landed 171:17 | lead 58:1 270:7 | 268:4 276:2,7 | 54:4 92:10 109:7 | 277:8 278:2 |
| landings 269:13 | 325:21 333:13 | 280:10 307:2 | 202:3 295:10 | 284:14 291:13,22 |
| land-based 243:22 | leader 4:10 | 338:2,3,4 340:21 | link 16:19,19 17:5 | 305:12 310:15,17 |
| language 126:4,18 | leaders 265:14 | level 49:19 50:14 | 75:22 | 311:13 312:3 |
| 127:6,9,11 128:8 | 267:18 | 54:2 59:21 67:17 | lion 270:9 | 313:20 335:17 |
| 130:4 135:4 142:9 | leadership 77:11 | 68:16,17,18 71:21 | lions 301:5 | 337:9 341:16 |
| 150:1 153:3,21 | 318:13 | 75:18 76:13 77:10 | lion's 20:14 | 345:19 |
| 178:2,12 181:5 | leads 114:9 | 94:5 115:10,15,16 | list 27:13 28:14 | live 191:8 300:4 |
| 192:19 213:4 | learn 142:7 213:13 | 116:19 143:18 | 63:6,8 100:22 | lived 191:1 |
| 236:1 239:17 | learned 22:9 342:9 | 157:22 195:16 | 101:1,2 121:21,22 | living 149:14,19 |
| 253:14 279:21 | 342:20 348:12 | 235:5 264:1,10 | 130:9,16 131:4,14 | 150:9,13 151:11 |
| 293:18 295:2 | leased 102:13 | 273:16 310:10 | 131:17 132:10 | 151:14,16 155:22 |
| lap 40:1,4 | leave 9:7 58:6 | levels 77:22 195:16 | 134:1,5 136:20 | 191:16 |
| large 166:20 | 74:19 75:3 101:21 | leverage 26:22 | 138:13 152:5 | loan 188:3 |
| 186:20 215:22 | 316:13 319:3 | 63:17 130:22 | 153:16 160:4 | lobby 283:22 |
| 269:14 300:2 | leaves 225:11 | 136:19 | 182:8 219:18 | lobbying 338:15 |
| larger 169:19 | leaving 156:9 | leveraging 25:22 | 244:21 251:13 | 339:1,7 |
| 199:14 200:18,22 | 308:18 317:19 | lieu 133:7 136:2 | 265:15 266:22 | local 77:15,22 |
| 209:7 | 319:6 | life 22:20 191:20 | 268:4 269:2 290:6 | location 16:6 |
| largest 186:21 | Lecky 178:22 | 319:9 341:20 | 290:6 295:12,13 | locations 17:2 |
| 216:1 | led 5:20 | lifetime 285:14 | 297:21 | logbook 106:14,20 |
| Larry 328:4,5 | left 258:19 315:19 | light 48:17 164:8 | listed 166:2,4,14 | 265:5 |
| late 184:21 208:16 | 316:4 | 180:20 181:6 | 179:20 180:3 | logbooks 106:8 |
| Laughter 30:3 40:5 | legal 114:4 260:22 | | 191:19 284:19 | logic 325:8,13 |
| 90:9 145:6 205:19 | 261:1,3 295:20 | 188:13,14 | listen 188:8 | 0 |
| 224:15 226:22 | , | liked 152:2 | listened 81:4 | long 38:12 61:15,17 |
| 255:11 259:1 | legislation 115:12 | likelihood 21:17 | | 80:10 109:7,8 |
| 200.11 207.1 | 195:3 | likes 303:7 | listening 66:8 | 131:4 136:9,10 |
| | | | <u> </u> | |

| 159:18 198:14,15 | 272:16 285:22 | lower 281:10 | 205:6,12 208:13 | maintained 92:14 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| 207:5 213:6 215:2 | 290:18 298:22 | lowered 305:8 | 211:2,17,20 | maintains 128:2,5 |
| 227:2 237:15 | 331:10 334:11 | | 211.2,17,20 212:16 217:4,15 | , |
| 283:2 300:10 | looks 17:17 71:6 | low-hanging 103:21 | 217:22 218:5 | major 50:9 53:16 54:15 197:8 |
| 313:18 346:3 | 187:3 322:14 | low-tide 331:11 | 220:5,5,5,9,9 | majority 14:18 |
| | loom 55:20 | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 234:15 300:1 |
| longer 51:3 135:10 213:7 | | loyalties 161:21 | 226:3,7 227:11 | |
| | loose 302:22 335:10 | Lubchenco 259:14 | 230:19 231:6 236:22 237:8 | 321:2 331:17,19 Makah 328:15 |
| longstanding 9:12 309:6 | | lump 76:21 lunch 3:11 202:21 | | |
| long-term 11:9 | lopping 83:20 | 204:10 205:21 | 238:18 243:10 | Makahs 342:16 |
| 21:19 27:5 199:13 | lose 54:2 305:7,7 | | 246:2,3 247:17 | makeup 60:19 159:5 291:1 |
| | 316:4 loss 214:5 273:14 | 326:21 | 250:2,6 254:7 | |
| 212:2 303:3 | | | 255:10 257:5 | making 98:16 121:21 141:16 |
| long-time 117:8 | lost 156:15 211:1 | Mac 38:16,18 | 263:22 264:16 | |
| look 8:7,7,15 16:17 | 213:4,14 222:13 | macro 44:8 49:18 | 266:15 271:16,21 | 156:15,18,20 |
| 16:18 20:15 24:17 | 274:10 278:7 | 54:12 57:13 58:18 | 273:18 274:5,7,13 | 197:20 200:17 |
| 25:4 26:16 36:13 | 293:6 298:3 | 59:21 | 275:20 279:3 | 205:4 218:14 |
| 36:16,21 39:13 | lot 7:10,12 13:14 | Madam 10:2 29:22 | 280:2 291:6 | 227:20 268:20 |
| 44:8 54:14 55:13 | 20:3,4 22:1 30:10 | 49:7 118:12 144:1 | 293:19 294:4 | 278:16 284:10 |
| 62:21 67:16 77:19 | 30:19 36:16 52:20 | 211:11 212:7 | 299:13 302:11 | 299:13 339:20 |
| 95:1,2 101:10,11 | 53:18 54:20 56:8 | 258:1,11 275:7 | 310:9 313:13 | 340:11 |
| 101:15 106:14 | 56:18 71:9 76:7,8 | 277:6 288:12 | 319:6 321:20 | male 166:9 172:22 |
| 108:7 114:5 | 78:8,9 80:10 83:2 | 289:2 299:10 | 323:8,13 324:1 | 172:22 |
| 133:18 136:18 | 87:11 88:15 104:2 | 305:1 307:8 | 327:17 330:15 | males 169:8 173:15 |
| 138:8 143:1 146:3 | 105:14 108:16 | 308:22 344:12 | 332:10 333:21 | 190:2,5 |
| 184:2 197:4 | 110:9,22 114:22 | | 335:15,18 336:13 | mammal 121:3 |
| 199:18 201:8 | 116:1 121:11 | MAFAC 2:1 3:19 16:15 25:15 42:3 | 336:17,18 337:1,3 | mammals 115:18 |
| 235:19 247:16 | 131:8 135:10 | | 337:4,16 339:3,10 | manage 23:6 42:5 |
| 302:17 328:7 | 143:2 152:22 | 48:19 50:3,19,22 51:9 52:10 60:6 | 339:15,16,22 | 43:21 73:16 |
| 335:19 337:14 | 161:19 162:16 | | 343:15 | 118:10 119:1 |
| 344:7 | 170:21 171:4 | 60:13,19,21 72:22 79:22 80:10 | MAFAC's 46:15 | 222:8 |
| looked 21:7 68:20 | 178:1,1 192:3 | 100:19 101:5 | 210:18 335:12 | managed 111:6 |
| 77:15 109:21 | 194:5 204:12 | 116:18 118:20 | MAFAC-inclusive | management 3:7 |
| 139:18 197:1 | 207:5 247:3 248:4 | 110.18 118.20 | 218:21 | 5:7 6:3,22 7:3 |
| 303:13 322:17 | 248:5 280:17 | 128:15 132:20 | Magnuson 56:20 | 11:7 12:3 23:11 |
| looking 29:5 49:3 | 281:7 282:20 | | 100:13 295:9 | 41:4 44:6 54:20 |
| 62:12 64:4 67:14 | 283:1 289:4 | 135:15 139:8 140:14 144:4 | Magnuson-Stevens | 55:10 56:13,17 |
| 69:13 70:12 87:14 | 290:15 293:14 | 140:14 144:4 | 154:9 | 60:16 66:21 87:1 |
| 97:12 98:16 | 341:5 342:6,10 | 154:4 155:20 | main 150:4 165:20 | 87:2 89:5 100:12 |
| 102:14 120:6 | 346:5 347:5 | | 166:6,10,12,21 | 104:9 120:21 |
| 152:8,12,14 | 348:12 | 159:9 161:18 | 169:10 182:12 | 131:11 133:2 |
| 157:16 175:17 | lots 95:5 138:2 | 164:1 170:4 172:8 | 183:5 190:1,7 | 135:19 171:13 |
| 176:14 193:8 | 191:22 224:10 | 175:1 176:1,22 | 196:22 198:6 | 193:4 202:5 |
| 195:8 196:19 | 341:7 | 178:12 181:7 | 238:4 | 269:16 272:11 |
| 200:9 204:21 | louder 263:13,14 | 185:22 186:12 | maintain 55:5 | 273:15,21 274:9 |
| 205:4 215:12 | loudly 145:8 | 193:16,22 194:6 | 68:22 128:16,22 | 275:22 281:2 |
| 235:22 257:3 | love 15:16 84:3 | 196:3,7 200:13,16 | 129:3 152:16 | 282:11 293:21,22 |
| 265:6 266:22 | 305:21 | 201:5 202:3 205:6 | 237:6,7 277:12 | 294:7 295:18 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 1 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 326:6 | markets 24:18 25:3 | 40:13,22 42:20 | 162:7,19 163:5,11 | 260:5,20 261:15 |
| manager 193:5 | 31:17 33:21 | 43:1,7,11 46:19 | 163:19 164:4,11 | 262:1,6,15,18 |
| managing 11:12 | Mark's 74:2 | 47:22 48:12,16 | 164:18 165:1 | 263:1,5,13 275:10 |
| 103:20 321:16 | 200:15 201:21 | 49:9 53:9 58:8,12 | 168:8 170:1 172:2 | 276:1,6,20 277:2 |
| 323:9,17 324:1,5 | Martin 1:18 14:14 | 59:15,18 60:10,22 | 172:19 173:2,11 | 278:21 279:20 |
| 324:17 325:1,3 | 154:1 155:13 | 62:8 65:1 67:11 | 173:17 174:2,19 | 280:6,21 281:5,12 |
| 330:10 332:7 | 277:4 278:22 | 71:3,18 74:14 | 176:9,11,19 | 282:4 283:16 |
| 333:1 | 279:2,5 280:1,13 | 78:2 79:14 83:5 | 178:11,16 180:8 | 284:11 285:8,18 |
| mandate 114:12,13 | 283:17 284:12 | 86:13,20 87:1,4,7 | 180:12 182:19 | 286:13,20 287:6 |
| 175:11,16 253:15 | 295:5 304:22 | 87:15,20 91:14,17 | 184:22 185:11,14 | 288:15,19 289:1 |
| 253:22 292:16 | 315:12 326:17 | 93:3,16 94:18,21 | 186:7,11 188:21 | 291:21 293:15 |
| mandated 71:11 | 331:18 336:13 | 95:22 96:7,10 | 190:10 191:9 | 294:2,8,22 295:5 |
| 132:3 171:11 | 349:16 | 99:6 100:20 101:2 | 192:21 195:11 | 295:22 296:5,7,11 |
| mandates 56:7,8 | Massachusetts | 102:2,6 109:15 | 197:14 198:18 | 297:1 298:1,4 |
| 121:2 132:5 277:9 | 112:11 | 110:12,17,19 | 200:20 202:11 | 299:2,5,8,15 |
| mandatory 331:5,7 | Massage 205:20 | 111:3,16 113:14 | 203:10,18,21 | 301:14,19 302:2,6 |
| mangroves 23:2 | massive 139:21 | 113:17 115:17 | 204:3,7 205:5,16 | 303:7 304:14,18 |
| man's 45:13,14 | match 84:11 | 116:6,12 117:2,10 | 205:20 207:3,11 | 304:20 306:1 |
| map 28:12,14,16 | 108:10 249:2 | 117:15,18 118:14 | 207:16 208:10,21 | 307:1,5,10 308:15 |
| mapping 50:16 | material 204:12 | 119:6,14,17,20 | 211:12 212:10,13 | 308:18,21 309:3,9 |
| March 325:17 | 313:19 314:20 | 120:4 121:13 | 212:20,22 213:8 | 310:17 311:8,10 |
| marine 1:5,10 23:7 | matrices 39:8 | 122:11 123:1,15 | 214:11,15 216:4,8 | 311:12 313:22 |
| 23:10 115:18 | 46:22 47:7 50:6 | 124:18 125:1,5,8 | 216:10 217:17,21 | 314:14,17 316:8 |
| 121:3 149:14,19 | matrix 46:2,12 | 125:16 126:8,17 | 218:4,12,17,19 | 316:12,15,21 |
| 150:9,13 151:11 | 51:14 52:2 60:8 | 126:22 127:4,8,15 | 219:7 220:3 221:4 | 317:7,11,14 |
| 151:14,16,18 | 61:10 72:4 | 127:21 128:11,14 | 221:14 222:14,21 | 318:16,20 319:1,5 |
| 156:1 210:7 211:2 | matter 18:7,12 | 129:2,5,10,16,18 | 223:3,16,18 224:3 | 319:17 320:2,5 |
| 211:21 227:15 | 39:4 121:8 156:11 | 130:20 132:1 | 224:7,18 225:13 | 321:11 322:21 |
| 244:4 285:13 | 206:4 215:10 | 133:11,17 134:8 | 225:18 226:2,5,8 | 323:5 324:4,9,15 |
| mark 2:4 3:17,21 | 236:21 262:21 | 134:14 135:12 | 226:13,18 227:1 | 326:8,12 327:5,8 |
| 13:22 18:2 21:4 | 292:3 350:3 | 136:4,7 137:2,13 | 227:20 228:1,7,18 | 327:15 328:9,14 |
| 39:7 49:14 50:5 | matters 149:15,19 | 137:18 138:10,14 | 229:1,14,22 231:8 | 329:4 330:1,8,22 |
| 51:13 52:7,21 | maximize 238:5,19 | 138:18,22 139:2 | 231:11,20 234:9 | 331:3,12,22 332:3 |
| 58:7 59:18 66:3 | 239:14 | 141:10,15,18 | 235:11 236:7 | 333:15 335:7,9 |
| 73:4 74:9,13,15 | maximizes 239:13 | 143:13,20 144:3,8 | 237:3,10,19,22 | 336:3,9 338:6 |
| 165:11 178:19 | 244:3 | 144:22 145:5,7,12 | 238:9,22 239:9,18 | 340:18 341:1,4 |
| 192:21 196:5 | McCarty 1:12,14 | 145:18,21 146:9 | 239:20 240:2,4,13 | 345:16 347:9,12 |
| 204:5 231:21 | 3:2,7 4:3,7,14 | 146:21 147:8,12 | 242:2,5,12 244:15 | 347:17 348:5,16 |
| 235:12 242:17,21 | 10:6,9 13:9,11,17 | 147:18 148:3,18 | 244:17,19 245:7 | 348:22 349:9,12 |
| 254:18 260:21 | 14:20 15:6 18:1,9 | 148:22 149:4,8,20 | 245:10,14 246:7 | 349:15,20 |
| 295:8 315:3,21 | 18:13,18 19:6 | 150:11,20 151:1,9 | 246:10,15 248:10 | meager 274:19 |
| 316:19 318:7 | 30:1,6,13 32:12 | 152:4,19 153:7,22 | 249:7,19 250:13 | mean 7:5,16 12:20 |
| 319:18 320:6 | 32:20 33:3,7,16 | 154:15 155:8,12 | 251:19,22 252:8 | 31:18 37:9 45:9 |
| 326:9 333:2 | 33:22 34:2,7,11 | 155:16,19 156:5,7 | 253:7 254:16 | 64:13 65:11 68:9 |
| 338:17 | 34:15,18 37:14,18 | 156:13,18 157:1,6 | 255:9,17,22 256:4 | 69:5 71:12 74:20 |
| market 12:6 | 37:21 38:3,22 | 157:9 158:19 | 257:8,14,21 258:2 | 75:6 77:14 78:1,8 |
| 230:12 244:12 | 39:6,19,22 40:3 | 159:1,14 161:5,14 | 258:5,17,20 259:3 | 81:20 82:18 84:5 |
| | | | | |
| | • | | | |

| 84:6,6,7 85:6,22 | 268:18 | 339:17 | 305:6 | model 43:5,10 |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 89:8,9,12 92:8 | meet 18:21,21 | members 1:13 3:20 | millions 111:5,5 | 64:15 65:19 |
| 94:22 96:3 102:17 | 55:22 167:18 | 9:12 16:15 18:2 | mind 49:13 93:18 | 110:20,21 111:8 |
| 103:1,11,12,18 | 175:18 176:6 | 18:16,21 80:10 | 121:15 132:18 | 111:11 112:22 |
| 103.1,11,12,18 | 204:19 209:12,15 | 117:9 165:7,18 | 133:9 186:9 | 113:5 131:3 |
| 104.18 103.1,4 | meeting 3:19 4:17 | 167:3 170:7 176:5 | 252:11 285:2 | 137:10 334:4,6 |
| 107:10 108:22 | 9:13 13:15 15:16 | 205:6 220:7,10 | 317:21 330:15 | modeling 27:18 |
| 113:8 115:20 | 16:13,13,14 24:4 | 228:4 264:14 | 331:2 336:7 | models 112:17 |
| 119:12 122:14 | 41:1 50:18,20,21 | 284:16,18 285:3,5 | minds 248:5 | 136:18 348:11 |
| 123:6 126:11,15 | 55:17 58:22 66:11 | 307:17 308:1 | mine 17:21 310:3 | moderate 115:14 |
| 134:4 142:4,8 | 66:17 72:2 73:22 | 320:19 321:20 | minerals 180:21 | modification 151:5 |
| 143:15 154:6,21 | 80:3,16 145:3 | 320:17 321:20 | minimal 188:15 | modified 114:13 |
| 157:18 158:19 | 147:15 161:8 | 337:18 341:3 | 273:14 | modify 200:10 |
| 165:3 172:12 | 165:7 168:14 | 348:18 349:3 | minimize 230:19 | moment 199:5 |
| 177:22,22 178:3,5 | 174:4 175:8,22 | membership 72:22 | 240:11 | 309:1 |
| 178:9,16 182:7 | 177:8 179:4 191:3 | 348:10 | minimizes 244:2 | momentum 323:14 |
| 185:15 205:1 | 203:9 204:17 | mention 52:16 | minority 5:10 | money 42:2,11 45:5 |
| 219:2 240:12 | 216:22 217:10,22 | 169:4,22 314:2 | minute 72:5 74:3 | 50:12 52:12 64:4 |
| 248:17 249:14 | 218:21 219:21 | mentioned 61:17 | 95:14 108:6 | 72:15 78:1,1 |
| 257:11 278:16 | 224:20 227:6,7 | 74:15 111:13,19 | 172:21 263:9 | 82:16 83:17,19 |
| 280:14 281:9 | 228:13,14 242:18 | 132:16 143:14 | 298:18 | 88:11 97:20 |
| 285:14 286:16 | 243:1,2,5 245:2 | 144:15 260:21 | minutes 10:4,11 | 102:10 104:17,22 |
| 289:10,20 290:4 | 264:8 266:16 | 332:9 333:15 | 79:5 130:10 258:8 | 110:22 113:11 |
| 290:12 292:13 | 271:5,17 273:18 | 338:9 | 258:19 307:13 | 131:8 138:7 233:1 |
| 293:3,7 296:13 | 274:3 307:20,22 | met 1:10 19:19,22 | 308:6 | 233:17 305:2,3,14 |
| 298:7 313:5 | 308:7,14 309:21 | 209:5 266:9 | minutia 120:13 | 339:3 |
| 330:14,17 331:5 | 309:22 312:16,18 | 327:17 | misdirecting 238:7 | monies 234:2 237:1 |
| 334:17 338:2 | 313:14 317:9 | method 90:18,19 | misread 128:8 | monitoring 107:9 |
| 344:16 348:20 | 320:7,10,15 321:6 | 91:3 143:11 | missed 4:11 40:8 | 107:12 131:12 |
| meaning 99:13 | 321:13,14 322:15 | 263:20 | 101:3 131:19 | 138:1,17 |
| 123:19 | 323:11,21 325:9 | methodologies | 302:4 335:11 | monk 165:16,20 |
| meaningful 77:11 | 327:18 335:11 | 63:22 64:11 | 336:1,5 | 166:1,10 167:8 |
| 78:12 160:16,20 | 339:12 344:13 | methods 90:4,5,6 | missing 17:20 | 181:22 182:5 |
| 247:13 | 348:1 | 90:22 270:9 | 225:22 | 184:7,17 185:3 |
| meaningless 77:2 | meetings 16:4 | Mexico 28:6 278:1 | mission 58:21 | 186:17 189:7 |
| means 68:7 75:4 | 19:13 66:17,18 | 278:5 282:20 | 68:17 303:20 | 191:4 192:13,13 |
| 82:16 84:22 | 70:10 71:16 | microphone 4:4 | missions 51:1 | 192:20 199:15 |
| 187:18 188:13 | 201:12,13 215:11 | middle 20:6 256:18 | 70:16 302:19 | monthly 256:7 |
| 285:2 | 219:11 252:19 | 331:9 | misunderstanding | months 267:17 |
| meant 87:22 346:5 | 320:10,12 326:19 | midnight 208:19 | 236:12 237:12 | 291:10 349:19 |
| measurable 212:3 | 331:14 337:9 | mid-Atlantic 11:16 | Mitchell 269:22 | monument 186:18 |
| 266:17 269:5 | meets 294:14 | Mike 252:15 | mitigation 36:10 | 186:21 189:4,6,6 |
| measure 105:16 | 321:21 | military 167:1 | mix 103:9,15 | moot 41:13 |
| 107:16 | member 47:18,18 | 169:13 | mixed 76:11 | morning 17:4 66:9 |
| measured 46:17 | 47:18,19 209:9 | million 84:14,18,21 | mob 190:3 | 76:1 139:11 320:9 |
| measures 336:22 | 278:8 284:15 | 84:21 85:15 86:8 | mobilize 268:3 | Morris 1:19 20:1 |
| mechanism 71:5 | 309:6 317:22 | 213:22 232:3,8 | mode 265:4 | 29:14 40:18 43:20 |
| | | | | |

| 74 0 122 10 | 170 12 105 10 21 | 10.524.10 | 1220 17 221 4 | 1 12 11 25 20 |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 74:8 122:10 | 178:13 185:18,21 | moving 18:5 24:10 | nd 320:17 321:4 | needs 12:11 25:20 |
| 123:17 124:11,20 | 186:6,9 192:11,18 | 25:11 170:12 | 322:20,21 | 35:2,7 98:15 |
| 125:3 126:20 | 194:13,16 197:14 | 172:16 196:16 | near 44:11 212:2 | 114:18 115:16 |
| 146:7 148:20 | 203:10 204:15 | 225:8 263:18 | 311:16 314:19 | 174:22 177:1 |
| 149:2,11 150:2,7 | 211:10 212:8 | MRIP 264:22 | necessarily 58:1 | 190:18 193:19,21 |
| 151:21 153:5 | 213:9,13 214:9 | 265:2 | 62:22 77:7 84:11 | 197:22 204:13 |
| 161:15 182:21 | 216:6 218:15 | MRIPs 267:12 | 92:13 93:13 109:3 | 214:2 229:9 |
| 185:2 205:15,18 | 219:2 221:6,12,14 | multiple 22:19 | 134:2 205:13 | 246:21 248:3,6,21 |
| 223:5,10,13,17 | 222:17,22 225:6 | 169:18 236:5 | 275:1 296:12 | 284:3 287:15 |
| 224:5,16 237:17 | 225:21 226:10 | 240:15 | 306:21 | 288:2 311:18 |
| 237:20 238:1,11 | 227:10,21 229:20 | multiply-amended | necessary 117:21 | 336:5 346:10 |
| 238:15,18 239:1 | 231:9,12 236:2 | 129:6 | 173:21 265:19 | negative 35:19 36:7 |
| 239:13,19,22 | 237:4,5,7 240:1,5 | multi-species 5:21 | necessities 65:15 | 36:14 |
| 255:19 256:1,6 | 240:6,7,18,20,22 | N | neck 250:18 305:4 | neglected 173:18 |
| 296:2,10,12 | 241:1,2,4,6,15,17 | | need 11:8 12:2 13:7 | negotiate 322:5 |
| mortality 270:2 | 241:20 242:3,13 | nail 17:1 335:4 | 13:19 23:5 24:8 | neighbors 29:8 |
| motherhood 121:7 | 242:14,15 244:15 | name 45:8 103:3 | 27:13,20 36:5,13 | neophyte 38:16 |
| 122:15 | 245:8,12 246:7 | 130:5 165:8 | 46:20 48:19 49:10 | NEPA 35:3,4 36:1 |
| motion 29:12 32:13 | 248:12 257:19 | 172:13 208:4 | 51:2 57:12 76:1 | nervous 113:11 |
| 33:12,14 34:5,15 | 275:15,19 277:3,8 | 297:13 318:8 | 86:11 91:7,10,10 | net 37:11 300:11 |
| 42:13 49:7 51:5 | 280:2 283:14 | named 181:22 | 99:5 100:15 114:9 | network 268:16 |
| 60:3 73:10 118:7 | 288:17,20 293:7 | names 282:16 | 115:2,6,12,14,14 | never 41:1 67:3 |
| 118:13,13,15 | 294:14 295:2 | 295:12,14 | 118:12 123:19 | 83:4 98:22 155:6 |
| 119:16 120:17 | 299:13 301:17 | Nardi 1:20 145:20 | 132:9 153:8 | 177:10,21 187:22 |
| 121:9,17 122:2,6 | 304:15,16,22 | 213:17 249:21 | 158:10 159:14 | 191:1 196:21 |
| 122:14,20 123:3 | 307:3 326:9,11 | narrative 160:14 | 167:4 170:11 | 234:21,21 289:22 |
| 123:22 125:11,17 | motions 41:19 | 160:22 | 175:8 178:12 | 341:19,20 |
| 126:1 127:14 | 43:15 146:1 241:8 | narrow 106:3 | 183:11 191:10 | new 1:11 4:22 |
| 129:6,8,11,14,18 | 275:12,17 | 199:15 301:9 | 195:4 202:20 | 11:18 12:17 18:2 |
| 130:19,21 132:19 | motion's 136:7 | national 1:3 84:9 | 203:14 204:15,16 | 18:16,21 25:17 |
| 134:15 136:5 | mount 190:5 | 139:7,19 140:4,21 | 207:20,21 208:2 | 26:1,2,13 36:3 |
| 138:20 141:11,13 | move 5:16 10:7 | 142:14 144:11 | 219:1,15,20 | 93:10,14 97:12,13 |
| 141:14,16,18 | 14:2 29:14 63:8 | 252:14,17 253:3 | 235:19 249:6 | 97:14 108:17 |
| 142:1 144:2 | 118:19 121:11 | 258:12 260:17 | 258:5 260:8 | 109:14 149:12 |
| 145:13,19 146:3 | 122:19 129:4 | 264:1 280:5 | 265:16 268:5 | 178:5 185:3 192:1 |
| 146:11,12,18,18 | 151:13 164:1 | 328:21 | 276:18 281:16 | 194:19 202:8 |
| 147:1,2,3,4,10,17 | 191:10 212:10,11 | nationally 252:21 | 292:10 301:11,13 | 203:2 225:8 290:6 |
| 147:17,20,21,22 | 212:12 262:2 | 270:22 | 302:18 305:2,2 | 303:17 307:22 |
| 148:5,7,9,12,15 | 265:16 269:16 | nationwide 280:19 | 306:19 312:22 | 313:8 317:20 |
| 148:19,21 149:3 | moved 34:3 119:7 | Nation's 231:18 | 313:13 317:20 | 328:20 330:16 |
| 149:15 150:3,3,4 | 164:18 174:6 | 321:16 323:9,17 | 326:8 330:21 | 337:18,19 |
| 150:15 152:7,16 | 177:1,11 186:12 | native 191:3 202:6 | 334:17,17 335:20 | news 259:6 333:3 |
| 153:2,10,10,14,14 | 244:19 246:10 | natives 292:4 | 337:9,19 338:10 | nexus 36:5 189:13 |
| 153:19,21 155:20 | 264:3 | natural 140:2 | 339:12 | 189:18 191:14 |
| 163:20 164:14,15 | moves 203:12 | 141:2 | needed 10:19 55:5 | NGOs 280:16 |
| 164:20 167:21 | 225:12 290:14 | nature 8:17 114:4 | 88:9 227:9 272:10 | nice 10:10 104:14 |
| 176:12,20 177:1 | move's 212:13 | 184:17 186:20 | 308:10 344:18 | 117:6 245:7 254:3 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 296:13 | 217:11 219:4 | 177:21 186:17 | objection 34:16 | oceans 189:17 |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| night 208:17,19 | 227:14 230:16,19 | 193:4,22 194:18 | 143:18 152:14 | October 1:8 321:17 |
| nine 267:16 | 232:5,20,22 | 323:20 | 307:3,6 | 322:22 323:1,21 |
| nitrogen 32:5,8 | 232:3,20,22 | north 103:5 104:9 | objections 33:8 | 330:10 |
| 36:10 | 235:8 238:7,19 | 250:20 281:1 | 34:18,19 | odd 300:14 |
| nitty 80:8 | 239:13,14 243:11 | 285:20 289:20 | objective 27:8,11 | offer 89:19 99:20 |
| NMFS 3:4,18,21,21 | 245:18,18,19 | 290:9 297:4 | 27:15,20 60:2 | 144:2 198:21 |
| 10:20 41:11 42:3 | 245.18,18,19 | northeast 269:16 | 66:11 67:15 | 203:3 230:17 |
| 44:3,20 52:17 | 250:20 251:6,14 | northern 182:11 | objectives 27:7 | 247:7 254:11 |
| 53:2,8 60:3,7 | 250:20 251:0,14 | northwest 89:20 | obligation 199:21 | 286:7 328:6 |
| 61:22 62:4 63:18 | 256:2,17 259:11 | 269:20 | obligations 81:9 | offered 209:20 |
| 81:9 112:10 118:8 | 262:9 265:1 268:4 | northwestern | observation 78:13 | offering 168:14 |
| 118:20,21 120:12 | 272:7 274:14 | 189:22 | 99:22 193:3 | 194:15 |
| 128:16 141:6 | 276:12,17 286:6 | note 117:5 127:10 | 253:13 | offers 100:12 |
| 142:3,5 143:9,15 | 302:11,12 306:4 | 321:15 347:1 | observations | office 3:18,21 45:17 |
| 142.3,3 143.9,13 | 309:20 329:11 | noted 46:18 75:12 | 113:20 131:6 | 77:15 97:8 211:14 |
| 155:2 198:7 | 334:22 | 216:17 237:10 | observe 102:22 | 217:11 220:6,10 |
| 230:20 335:19 | NOAA's 26:4 | 270:17 237:10 270:10 289:18 | 110:16 | officers 14:18 |
| 346:1 347:4 | 119:22 157:17 | notes 132:15 179:5 | observer 103:10,11 | Official 2:4 |
| NMFS's 118:3 | 199:17 232:12 | noteworthy 7:14 | 103:17 109:2 | officially 95:3 |
| 140:19 | 234:1 242:18 | 264:21 | observers 103:19 | officials 260:18 |
| NOAA 17:10,10 | 250:5 271:11 | noticed 314:1 | 106:7 110:13 | offline 266:15 |
| 23:16,17 25:5,20 | NOAA-wide 55:4 | notion 278:17 | 131:11 | offset 35:21 232:4,6 |
| 25:21 31:15 32:1 | NOAA/NMFS | November 108:1 | observing 105:15 | 232:14 233:6,10 |
| 32:10 33:18 46:5 | 144:5 145:15 | 312:7,13 322:11 | 194:17 | 234:3,16 236:14 |
| 54:4 57:10 66:21 | 155:21 201:8 | no-brainer 122:16 | obtained 271:18 | offsetting 232:11 |
| 68:2 70:5 75:17 | 287:11 335:16 | number 22:4 24:15 | obvious 324:16 | offshore 154:11 |
| 75:21,21 78:12 | noise 101:4 | 27:4 41:6,19 | obviously 30:19 | 216:1 |
| 79:11 91:21 99:16 | nominal 161:16 | 42:17 47:1,3,3,6,7 | 53:19 78:9 152:15 | offspring 180:22 |
| 101:8 116:16 | nominally 285:22 | 60:2,14 61:10 | 222:2 225:7 227:5 | oh 18:17 42:22 47:6 |
| 122:17,18 123:14 | nominate 296:18 | 70:10 72:3 73:11 | 236:3 289:10 | 89:9 93:3 149:11 |
| 132:20 135:16 | nominated 281:12 | 116:8 124:15 | 330:9 331:5 | 156:14 226:18 |
| 138:4,7 140:14 | nomination 285:16 | 147:11 152:21 | 343:17 | 313:9 336:2 |
| 142:2 143:14,15 | nominations 14:9 | 160:2 186:15 | Occasionally | 347:11 |
| 143:18 152:11 | 315:7,11 | 210:18 215:1 | 234:18 | oil 140:1 141:1 |
| 155:2 165:7 166:8 | nominee 295:14 | 231:17 249:1 | occupied 179:10,14 | okay 10:6,9 13:16 |
| 166:9,15 167:13 | nominees 14:7,10 | 267:13 269:18 | 179:19 180:2 | 15:6 18:13 30:14 |
| 167:15,22 168:1 | 14:13 315:8 | 272:13 274:6,9 | occupy 22:19 | 33:2,10,13 34:2 |
| 170:11 171:14 | non-core 42:12 | 282:8 309:11 | occur 102:15 247:4 | 34:11,15 37:18 |
| 174:8 181:8 182:1 | 45:1,7 | 311:1 332:7 345:9 | occurred 266:9 | 38:7,20 39:6,12 |
| 182:17 184:2,20 | non-disclosure | numbers 182:10 | ocean 8:13 23:3 | 39:22 40:18 42:22 |
| 186:13 194:21 | 15:14 | 289:9 297:8 | 54:7 139:7,19 | 48:12 59:15 65:1 |
| 196:14 197:4 | non-SK 234:19 | numeric 160:20 | 140:4,21 142:14 | 89:11,14,14 94:21 |
| 198:4,6,21 199:9 | NOP 42:7 140:7 | NW 1:11 | 144:12 188:1,6 | 99:6 109:10 |
| 200:8 202:4 | 142:19 144:7 | | 189:11 258:12 | 111:12,16 117:14 |
| 209:13 210:2 | 145:16 156:2 | 0 | 260:17 | 117:18 119:14 |
| 211:2,14,20 215:8 | normally 97:10 | object 34:17 291:5 | OCEANIC 1:3 | 120:4 123:1 125:1 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 105 5 106 16 17 | 107 5 150 14 | 120 10 | .45 . 4. 227 11 | 207.5.200.17 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 125:5 126:16,17 | 127:5 158:14 | opposition 129:19 | other's 337:11 | 297:5 300:17 |
| 127:8,15,21 | 171:22 188:6 | 165:2 216:11 | ought 225:10 257:2 | package 18:6 |
| 128:14 129:18 | 193:15 220:6 | 226:10 229:19 | 302:17 303:2 | page 69:15 163:14 |
| 132:11 133:12 | 238:16 270:17 | 245:11,11 257:18 | outcome 63:20 | pages 163:14 |
| 137:17 142:6 | 272:3 294:15 | option 171:15 | 68:7 130:2 286:6 | pains 250:21 |
| 143:20 147:8 | 320:13 327:10 | 290:3 322:8,16 | outcomes 99:11 | paint 284:8 315:16 |
| 148:18 149:11 | opened 208:15 | options 67:22 | 212:3 | palatable 253:4 |
| 150:20 152:4,19 | openly 48:15 | 107:9 132:21 | outgoing 3:20 | Pam 278:7 |
| 163:5 173:11,17 | open-ended 240:10 | 133:3 134:3 | 341:3 348:17 | paper 14:17 51:12 |
| 176:11 178:16 | operate 105:14 | 135:16,20 171:14 | 349:3 | 214:6,7 314:16 |
| 186:11 192:21 | 106:19 | 202:5 335:6 | outline 51:16 | 315:6,13 |
| 198:1 205:20 | operating 100:7 | opts 219:17 247:18 | outlooks 24:15 | paragraph 231:13 |
| 207:11 208:7,10 | operationalize 71:8 | order 14:11,14 | output 164:9 | paragraphs 73:7 |
| 211:12 218:4,12 | opinion 87:13,16 | 19:13 23:6 39:7 | outreach 252:17 | parameters 244:4 |
| 221:13 222:14,21 | 96:18 120:15 | 50:11 67:18 72:8 | 335:12,16 338:10 | Pardon 157:6 |
| 222:22 223:3 | 134:16 136:12 | 94:2 102:18 | outside 137:11 | 288:15 308:15 |
| 225:19 226:18 | 161:3 170:19,20 | 125:11,17 132:14 | 179:6,9,18 180:1 | 311:8 |
| 228:7 229:1,22 | 175:2,3 184:2 | 150:22 152:21 | 202:7 210:13 | parentheses 132:22 |
| 238:2 239:19 | 194:3,14,14 | 156:14 162:5 | 273:8 297:16 | 135:17 |
| 240:4 241:11 | 306:21 | 178:11 189:14 | 309:13 339:10 | part 15:2,4 24:8 |
| 242:9,10 246:15 | opinions 78:9 | 205:2 266:20 | outweighs 60:16 | 40:13 42:21 56:5 |
| 249:19 252:8 | 160:11,12 338:5 | 267:4 268:7 272:9 | ovation 349:6 | 68:21 83:22 91:20 |
| 253:10,11 257:16 | opportunities | 287:18 302:18 | overall 25:9,14 | 93:11,21 95:12 |
| 258:5 259:5 | 134:10 200:9 | 306:19 315:9,12 | 26:21 27:3 | 123:2,21 138:11 |
| 262:18 266:7 | 267:10 | 317:15 331:15 | overlays 23:11 | 139:3 185:4 |
| 276:1 277:2 278:4 | opportunity 3:2 | 340:19 | overnight 75:15 | 189:10 191:5 |
| 285:7,7 298:1,4 | 13:12 15:8 41:11 | Oregon 292:19 | 93:12,15 | 212:4,5 214:17 |
| 310:17 313:22 | 46:11 47:20 50:4 | organization 16:14 | overruled 26:15 | 215:4,14 222:16 |
| 314:6,8 315:4 | 51:18 58:3 67:3 | 287:13 292:18 | overseas 213:18 | 225:6 232:3,11 |
| 317:7 319:4 320:6 | 72:11 74:11 77:14 | 339:18 | 215:7,18 | 235:10 236:10 |
| 321:11 322:3,6 | 78:6 100:11 158:6 | organizations | overwhelming | 245:6 261:7 |
| 324:9 330:1,8 | 168:18 200:13 | 105:12 138:2 | 321:2 | 272:16 289:10 |
| 331:3,12 332:4 | 228:20 291:18 | 140:2 | over-fishing 5:19 | 314:1 333:11 |
| 336:6,9 340:18,20 | 316:5 328:17 | organized 224:22 | 8:3 | 346:3 |
| 346:16 | 336:6 347:5 | 265:17 | over-reaction | PARTICIPANT |
| Oklahoma 142:12 | oppose 249:10,15 | organizing 334:15 | 184:9 | 129:9 151:17 |
| old 103:10 | opposed 29:19 34:7 | orientation 268:20 | ownership 336:18 | participants 322:9 |
| OMAO 91:22 | 45:10 125:15 | oriented 236:21 | oyster 327:21 | participate 31:3,11 |
| once 61:6 146:17 | 129:16 138:22 | original 40:17 | O'SHEA 2:2 252:3 | 72:12,19 80:13 |
| 150:16 209:6 | 156:5 164:21 | 125:22 146:3,11 | 285:19 | 96:16 323:16 |
| 266:4 282:20 | 176:3 195:5 | 146:22 147:1,2,4 | | 333:6 |
| 333:3 | 199:14 200:18 | 147:9 152:2,7 | <u>P</u> | participated 19:22 |
| ones 63:6 109:11 | 203:21 216:8 | 154:12 236:16 | pace 11:3 | 322:9 |
| 286:18 348:20,22 | 301:19 | 240:6,20 241:2,4 | Pacific 250:20 | participating 93:19 |
| online 38:12 173:9 | opposes 225:21 | 241:6 242:15 | 264:19 270:1 | 93:20,20 279:18 |
| 174:17 | opposing 338:5 | originally 166:4 | 281:1 285:20 | 286:22 |
| open 10:10 42:15 | opposite 127:20 | 334:5 | 289:20 290:9 | particular 16:7 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | I | I |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 23:1 29:5 71:11 | 231:20 237:14 | 338:21 340:4,6 | perspectives 58:3 | 52:11 54:22 55:11 |
| 159:5 181:6,21 | 277:5 280:8 | 346:16 347:6 | 93:9 182:15 | 63:18 96:2 97:18 |
| 193:4,10 196:8 | 297:11 298:2,4 | people's 50:9 | Pete 217:18 234:10 | 136:19 231:17 |
| 200:17,18 211:5 | 302:7 316:5 | percent 44:18,19 | phase-out 342:14 | plan 29:9 117:2,10 |
| 243:16 278:11 | Paul's 178:20 | 97:9,11 102:18 | Phil 39:13,14 40:22 | 117:16 194:19 |
| 346:1 | 282:6 | 103:12,13 104:8 | 42:20 43:17,20 | 211:21 212:1 |
| particularly 9:16 | Pause 34:8 203:20 | 104:11,19 108:22 | 46:21 47:7 60:22 | 227:15 321:17 |
| 10:3 21:8 56:2 | pavement 275:3 | 109:1,6,6,9,15,19 | 70:13 72:11 73:13 | planning 3:6 41:4 |
| 64:18 152:10 | pay 96:16 100:15 | percentage 103:16 | 125:6 128:12 | 244:4 259:12 |
| 201:21 247:18 | 104:1 109:19 | perception 239:5 | 153:11 242:9 | 261:5 263:19 |
| 341:10 345:9 | 306:8 | 244:10 281:18 | 276:8,20 318:16 | 304:10 324:12 |
| parties 194:7 | paying 6:7 93:21 | 287:14 288:1 | PHILLIP 1:17 | 334:9 |
| 273:20 283:12,20 | 120:1 138:6 340:2 | 292:2 | philosophical 65:8 | plans 264:4 265:8 |
| partly 297:11 | payments 133:4 | perceptions 288:9 | 65:12,18 | 265:11,12 266:2,3 |
| partner 214:20 | 135:21 | perfect 343:7 | philosophies 78:20 | 267:8,8 269:4,7 |
| partners 63:20 | pays 95:12 | perfectly 56:19 | Phil's 72:17 149:16 | 270:21 306:2 |
| parts 94:17 | pelagic 269:14 | 112:19 | 153:17 | 343:16 |
| part-time 275:2 | people 5:3 12:19 | peril 44:5 | phrase 151:8 | plant 263:8 |
| pass 121:9 146:18 | 15:3 16:9,10 20:3 | period 83:12 | physical 244:3 | plaque 309:19 |
| 147:3 241:3 313:5 | 26:16 33:8 38:4 | 125:13 196:8,12 | pick 316:19 327:1 | plate 19:15 |
| passage 269:17 | 43:12,18 47:2 | 259:18 | picked 132:17 | platform 95:2 |
| passed 33:9 216:11 | 49:11,20 51:18 | permanence | 269:9 | platforms 95:6 |
| 263:7 264:6 | 59:5 65:3 69:18 | 304:10 | Pictures 309:9 | play 24:19 32:1 |
| 298:14 | 75:10 82:12,15 | permission 348:17 | pie 86:1,3 122:15 | 82:21 259:22 |
| passes 34:16 | 87:12 93:18 | permit 154:11 | piece 52:5 95:7,11 | 301:12 |
| 129:19 139:2 | 109:19 112:19 | 183:11,14 215:3 | 95:12 142:14 | playing 195:3 |
| 146:1,19 150:16 | 119:20 121:16,20 | 243:20 | 192:12 | |
| 156:7 165:2 204:8 | 122:2 130:16 | | | plays 25:6 |
| | | permits 36:5 | pieces 33:10 | pleasant 40:2 |
| 226:14 230:1 | 131:17,18 132:14 | 191:18 215:2 | pile 85:15 167:11 | please 30:15 33:17 |
| 241:2 242:14,14 | 133:18 134:4 | permitted 36:3 | pilot 103:4 108:17 | 41:17 42:16 48:16 |
| 245:15 257:22 | 135:10 146:6 | 192:1 214:1 | 108:18,19 265:3 | 129:14 138:20 |
| 302:8 307:6 | 148:6,8 152:21 | person 46:10 | pin 22:16 | 145:8 203:15,19 |
| passing 39:7 237:4 | 178:8 183:2 191:3 | 272:14 274:22,22 | place 10:17 12:2,12 | 203:22 216:6 |
| 237:4 | 197:11,16 205:10 | 277:18 313:4 | 12:13 16:4 36:13 | 268:2 277:13 |
| path 7:9 135:9 | 205:22 210:11 | 318:12 319:16 | 49:12 77:9 83:14 | 294:3 306:1 |
| 137:21 200:1 | 215:5 224:11 | personal 46:4 | 84:17 95:1,2 | pleased 210:18 |
| 270:14 | 235:16 236:3,15 | 87:13 131:5 | 107:19 111:13 | 335:13 |
| paths 271:14 | 252:11 253:18 | 174:12 341:6 | 116:5 123:8 | pleasure 309:15 |
| PATRICIA 1:16 | 258:7 260:20 | personally 78:7,13 | 177:10 197:1 | 310:3,11 319:12 |
| Patty 20:2 47:18 | 268:20 272:14 | 80:15,19 102:9 | 200:7 207:8 | 344:20 345:4,14 |
| 141:21 143:21 | 279:12,18 281:16 | 108:7 160:6 | 210:16 279:5 | 346:17 347:8 |
| 147:5 148:11 | 282:8,15 284:20 | 190:18 237:7 | 280:4 290:9 | plenty 15:8 |
| 221:15 295:3,4 | 309:11,14 310:19 | 346:5 | 303:12 326:16 | plus 271:19 |
| 314:7 | 320:16,21 321:2 | perspective 5:8 9:4 | 327:6 345:7 | poaching 106:14 |
| Paul 1:15 19:20,22 | 326:20 327:22 | 27:3 54:12 57:8 | placed 269:4 | point 4:17 17:15 |
| 96:19 99:7 102:6 | 330:17 334:14 | 63:19 79:12 99:19 | placeholder 321:18 | 25:15 60:12 67:15 |
| 111:19 177:6 | 335:20 336:4 | 100:6 118:4 173:7 | places 6:2 9:19 | 68:10,13 69:10 |
| | | | | |
| | - | | • | • |

| 70 7 71 14 72 12 | 227 10 226 15 20 | D. D. 425 1 | 157.00.150.10 | 22 0 11 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 70:7 71:14 73:12 | 227:19 236:15,20 | PowerPoint 35:1 | 157:22 159:18 | priority 23:9,11 |
| 75:13 83:11 84:17 | 243:20 258:13 | practices 171:14 | 165:16,17 203:1 | 27:9 53:2 114:17 |
| 95:14,16 113:21 | policy-related 8:13 | precedent 193:7 | 215:22 246:13 | 230:9 231:6 |
| 114:4 115:1,15 | policy-type 137:14 | precise 76:14 95:19 | 253:20 267:2 | 249:17,18 251:13 |
| 118:12 125:11 | political 267:18 | 171:16 | 314:6 321:3 | 269:9 |
| 128:7 150:21 | poll 16:9,19 321:20 | precisely 163:18 | 326:14 327:22 | pristine 187:7 |
| 153:17 167:10 | 322:10,13,20 | predicted 92:21 | 330:18 339:8 | 189:7,8 190:20 |
| 168:9 169:9 | poor 97:21 | preface 263:16 | preview 310:16 | private 31:20 32:2 |
| 173:13,16 174:1 | popping 208:14 | prefer 153:19 | previous 175:4 | 96:14 132:21 |
| 180:5,16 181:11 | populated 169:12 | preferences 67:19 | 263:21 273:17,18 | 135:17 138:1,5,6 |
| 182:4 199:7,7 | 191:5 | 118:1 | pre-designate | 138:17 183:3 |
| 200:16 201:21 | population 115:4 | preferred 17:2 | 170:11 | 265:6 |
| 214:16 222:1 | 166:11 180:20 | 67:21 | pre-voting 316:3 | privileged 347:2 |
| 238:9 240:16 | 182:13 184:12 | prep 163:10 | price 109:19 | pro 194:15 |
| 241:13 250:12,13 | 185:6,10 199:19 | preparatory 18:22 | 244:12 | probably 10:10 |
| 254:2 256:21,22 | 201:10 | 163:4 | pride 281:9 | 23:14 36:16,20 |
| 261:8,9 275:7 | populations 116:1 | prepared 4:19 62:7 | primarily 183:8 | 40:9 55:14 56:2 |
| 286:14 292:9,14 | 181:13,15,20 | 163:14 315:1 | prime 289:18 | 73:20 82:17 88:22 |
| 304:3 312:12 | 199:10,11 200:10 | preparing 55:17 | principle 195:2 | 96:6 97:16 130:8 |
| 314:18 320:20 | port 102:13 | 263:11 314:22 | prior 41:12 162:13 | 142:3 159:8 |
| 325:21 329:6 | portion 46:1 95:17 | presence 303:4 | 162:14 242:18 | 163:13 187:12 |
| 334:19 339:16 | 147:13 171:1 | 335:14 | 246:5 271:5 | 188:12 201:15 |
| pointed 120:8 | 222:10 228:20 | present 1:13 2:3,6 | priorities 13:4,8 | 202:13 205:7 |
| 191:2 | 233:12,13,14 | 43:7,11 204:20 | 21:15 22:2 23:16 | 215:11 251:15 |
| pointing 314:15 | position 139:8 | 264:13 309:21 | 46:4,13 47:20 | 259:6 262:10 |
| points 132:16 | 140:20 141:7 | presentation 31:9 | 50:12 54:9 61:5,9 | 282:9 290:10 |
| 147:14 158:5 | 176:8 205:13 | 31:14 67:6 139:17 | 67:5,8 68:14 | 296:5 300:18 |
| 170:3 180:15 | 236:5 331:18 | 207:6 262:16 | 78:21 79:12 137:7 | 301:8 307:20 |
| 210:5 261:5 | 339:22 | 264:21 | 162:3 242:20 | 312:4 324:18 |
| 336:10 340:19 | positioned 101:15 | presentations | 243:14,16 245:18 | 338:18 |
| poker 146:16 | possible 50:19 69:2 | 337:22 | 245:22 246:5 | problem 25:19 |
| policies 35:7 36:12 | 178:1 201:8 | presented 35:1 | 247:1,8,13 248:1 | 83:19 84:21,21 |
| 209:15,20 210:4,9 | 225:11 318:17,19 | 249:4 250:15 | 249:2 251:1,12 | 90:2 94:7 286:19 |
| 210:16,20 211:4 | 325:12 | preserve 11:22 | 252:5,20 | 296:22 |
| 211:18 227:14 | possibly 175:18 | preserves 127:13 | prioritization | problematic 5:22 |
| 230:16 243:14 | post 270:1 | presiding 1:12 | 67:15 92:15,17 | problems 120:16 |
| 301:1 343:12 | potential 16:16 | pressure 110:11 | 248:2 | 340:15 |
| policy 3:18,21 | 29:6 36:14 92:17 | 230:12 | prioritizations | proceed 21:11 |
| 31:22 35:2 139:7 | 92:18 175:12 | presumably 220:22 | 69:18 | 59:13 271:15 |
| 139:19 140:4,21 | 195:17 244:5 | 228:14,15 | prioritize 13:7 | proceeding 267:5 |
| 142:14 144:12 | 293:17 327:6 | presume 192:13 | 41:11 51:21 88:5 | process 14:6 15:2 |
| 178:3,4 179:7 | 340:15 | presuming 243:2 | 92:3 124:11 | 18:4 32:21 40:14 |
| 198:3 199:14 | potentially 83:18 | pretty 5:8,20 6:16 | 126:21 127:13 | 47:16 49:10 51:3 |
| 200:12 211:22 | 253:1 | 16:21 19:4 56:4 | 128:16 | 51:3 66:21 69:12 |
| 212:6 216:16,20 | pounds 305:6 | 86:19 92:1 102:14 | prioritizes 128:2,4 | 72:1,3,13 73:9 |
| 217:2,6 221:18 | power 64:21 | 104:13,21 120:17 | prioritizing 49:15 | 74:2,8,10 87:5 |
| 222:4 225:2 | powerful 141:1,6 | 122:15 136:11 | 128:8 | 93:21 95:10 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | |

| 100 10 116 0 14 | 100 00 100 0 | | 107.0 | 40 6 50 0 10 |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 109:18 116:9,14 | 123:22 138:9 | promote 98:3 | 187:9 | 48:6 52:2,12 |
| 119:13 125:22 | 230:7 231:16 | proof 191:16 | provide 8:12 31:15 | 58:10 62:12 66:6 |
| 131:12 140:1,8,16 | 233:17 235:15 | proper 239:16 | 33:18 36:10 46:7 | 74:5,9 89:15 |
| 144:7 145:17 | 238:6 239:16,17 | properly 42:10 | 52:17 53:4,7,13 | 97:10,10 98:22 |
| 147:4,6,15 152:10 | 242:19 264:22 | property 244:14 | 62:1 70:8,11 78:8 | 112:8 122:20 |
| 156:2 157:11 | 265:2 269:21 | proportion 283:11 | 101:22 211:16 | 171:6 178:18 |
| 161:10 166:17 | 298:9 342:16 | proposal 44:17 | 247:13 252:5 | 186:6 187:21 |
| 171:20 172:6 | programmatic | 159:10 166:21 | 254:14 297:13,19 | 226:2 236:22 |
| 181:12 188:15 | 53:21 132:8 | 193:6 246:6 | 328:7 | 239:10 241:14 |
| 189:14 193:13,14 | programs 21:22 | 253:19 255:21 | provided 39:8 50:5 | 242:17 248:5,16 |
| 195:10 208:4 | 26:22 42:4,8,10 | 256:3 257:4 | 50:10 51:13,14 | 265:15 266:4 |
| 210:3,6,20 219:6 | 43:21 45:6,7 | propose 124:19 | 59:19 176:4 | 270:19 281:14 |
| 227:5 236:13 | 47:16 51:7,8,10 | 132:19 159:7 | 216:15 264:9 | 282:9 283:9 |
| 241:9,10,12 | 51:19 58:22 60:3 | proposed 27:7 | providing 32:2 | 285:12 286:18 |
| 245:21 246:19 | 60:7 64:14 68:8 | 35:21 140:12 | 56:12 174:13 | 300:9 303:2,11 |
| 247:10,16 249:5 | 73:14,15 76:9 | 145:13 159:3 | public 3:2 13:12,13 | 308:7 333:8 |
| 250:22 251:3,9,14 | 78:17,21 79:13 | 166:19 167:2,18 | 13:15 31:20,22 | 336:16 |
| 251:20,21 252:2 | 83:21 88:1 96:3 | 169:10 | 193:6,9,13 195:9 | putting 81:16 |
| 252:14,16,20 | 111:7 114:22 | proposing 25:20 | 196:17 209:10 | 134:15 186:9 |
| 253:1 260:15 | 115:1 118:9,21 | 32:13,15 125:19 | 210:3,19 220:7 | 187:1,7 208:4 |
| 272:8 274:15 | 123:5 124:7 | 170:18 194:3 | 235:13 236:14 | 266:11 285:11 |
| 276:17 286:8 | 126:13 128:6 | 196:6 | 244:10 265:6 | 318:2 |
| 287:17 288:8 | 130:5,12 131:9 | protect 42:4 45:6 | 287:9,13 288:10 | puzzled 215:20 |
| 291:11 292:9 | 133:8 134:9 160:9 | 51:6,7 60:2,6 82:7 | 339:11 340:10 | P-R-O-C-E-E-D |
| 302:13 304:11 | 230:21 232:7,17 | 118:8,21 124:1,10 | publicly 14:22 | 4:1 |
| 322:5 | 232:21 233:20 | 124:16 125:4,15 | Pugent 192:2 | p.m 206:4,5 207:2 |
| processes 124:7 | 242:21 243:15 | 126:6 187:6 | Puget 191:19 | 262:21,22 350:3 |
| 146:14 251:3 | 245:19 254:10,11 | 287:18 | pull 98:10 156:21 | |
| 255:3 | 256:13,17,20 | protected 3:9 44:1 | pulled 284:15 | Q |
| proctor 47:15 | 257:2 265:3 | 45:1 50:14,14 | pulls 42:1 | qualifications |
| procure 107:17 | progress 7:14,18 | 51:2 88:4 91:6 | pups 190:6 | 117:22 |
| produce 78:11 | 27:8,11 264:7,12 | 92:7,20 98:15 | purpose 60:1 | qualified 112:19 |
| 99:14 161:3 | prohibit 183:16 | 100:8,16,21 115:3 | 108:15 117:20 | 282:10 285:11,15 |
| production 227:16 | prohibited 198:15 | 115:18 121:4 | 234:19 284:2 | quality 32:5 106:22 |
| professional | prohibitive 142:22 | 123:21 131:13 | purposely 215:7 | 265:5 289:14 |
| 246:20 | project 35:20 | 157:2 165:4,6,14 | purposes 107:14 | 311:10,13 |
| professionally | 108:17,19,19 | 171:18 174:8 | 235:1 239:7 275:2 | quantify 31:15 |
| 346:6 | 123:18 215:15 | 177:19 181:1 | push 260:8,9 290:4 | 32:3 33:19 |
| profit 244:6 | 276:18 | 198:7 199:8 | pushed 109:4 | quarter 6:12 |
| program 3:6 5:4,12 | projects 21:16,21 | 200:21 202:4 | 142:19 323:19 | query 123:8 |
| 5:15 7:3 26:1,13 | 22:4,7,10,12,18 | 287:17 | 324:2 | question 11:3 13:4 |
| 41:4 44:20 45:18 | 35:9,21 36:16 | protecting 24:19 | pushing 66:12 | 14:20 18:1 30:7 |
| 53:16 57:17 77:5 | 42:12 44:10 | 87:9 | 107:8 108:12 | 45:20 47:12 48:1 |
| 79:6 84:13,18 | 187:16 230:9 | protection 73:18 | 124:6 206:2 | 48:13,14 56:6 |
| 88:21 99:17,18 | 244:6 267:3,3 | 88:3 121:4 171:16 | put 12:2 25:13 | 61:3 65:3 66:2 |
| 103:4,20 105:3 | 269:17,18 329:2 | 172:13 174:5 | 26:19,20 29:9 | 74:16,16 81:12 |
| 114:6 115:15 | promise 328:11 | 181:2 182:12 | 35:15 39:11 44:4 | 82:20 88:1,19 |
| | • | | | |
| | ı | ı | ı | ı |

| 00 17 11 67 110 4 | 140 1 242 1 | 1. 50.00 | 100 0 105 0 154 5 | 02 11 12 200 7 10 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 93:17 116:7 119:4 | 148:1 243:1 | reaching 58:20 | 132:2 135:9 154:5 | 83:11,13 309:5,19 |
| 121:10 147:5,15 | 252:15 | 250:11 255:4 | 162:4 171:7 184:6 | recognized 139:18 |
| 148:17 154:3,17 | raises 194:5 | reaction 92:9 184:8 | 187:18 188:13 | 257:1 |
| 155:9,15 178:21 | raising 194:11 | read 47:3 126:12 | 189:11 195:16 | recognizes 306:16 |
| 180:7 198:3 221:5 | 310:10 | 127:6 132:19 | 196:16 197:6,7,19 | recognizing 272:6 |
| 221:17 228:2 | ramp 313:19 | 135:14 136:16 | 198:12 201:18 | 310:9 |
| 233:3,7,10,11 | Randy 2:2 34:9 | 144:4 295:9 | 204:11 206:2 | recollection 109:1 |
| 241:8 246:17 | 62:10 66:4 74:7 | readily 287:21 | 217:7 224:10 | recommend 42:3 |
| 258:14,16 | 78:2,4 80:21 81:2 | reading 223:14 | 228:10 259:6 | 52:11 118:8 211:9 |
| questioning 219:14 | 84:1 86:13 88:17 | 226:11 | 262:12 268:21,22 | 217:10 221:2 |
| 249:8 | 88:19 96:19 | reads 155:20 | 270:12 277:7 | 243:11 276:9 |
| questions 10:15 | 150:17,17 154:1 | 248:12 249:10,22 | 278:20 282:8 | 318:9 322:19 |
| 29:10 43:2,12,16 | 154:16 168:4 | ready 39:13 216:5 | 286:16,19 289:12 | 332:19 |
| 43:16,17 158:9,18 | 170:1 174:21 | 258:9 263:2 | 289:13 303:4 | recommendation |
| 165:15 198:10 | 182:20 185:16 | 301:16 313:11 | 305:19 306:17 | 28:19 32:16 33:15 |
| 244:20 304:22 | 186:4 188:21 | reaffirm 248:9 | 307:19 310:4,4,11 | 39:13 52:1 59:11 |
| 306:11 307:2 | 189:2 191:2 196:4 | real 19:15 24:11 | 311:17 313:17 | 59:13 60:6 72:2 |
| 320:6 340:5 | 205:8 212:19,20 | 58:1,3 72:6 74:11 | 325:7 326:10 | 80:15 137:5,9 |
| quick 17:3 174:3 | 214:15 228:2 | 78:1 82:22 84:7 | 332:8,13 334:7,8 | 202:2,16 210:22 |
| 285:19 287:7 | 251:10 325:1 | 103:18,21 106:5 | 335:17 336:15 | 211:14,19 217:9 |
| 338:8 | 332:6 336:10 | 269:19 287:14,14 | 342:9,12,16 | 221:12 224:2 |
| quickly 20:6 56:4 | 337:15 342:6 | 287:15 296:21 | 343:14 344:2 | 225:5,16 230:17 |
| 92:20 312:21 | 346:9 | 343:9 347:8 | rearing 180:22 | 231:12 232:2 |
| quite 13:14 26:8,9 | Randy's 99:22 | realistic 73:3 | reason 35:16,16 | 235:1 243:9,10 |
| 37:7 79:19 94:6 | 199:7 | reality 57:5 81:15 | 190:9 215:1 | 246:1 247:19 |
| 96:22 97:3 113:9 | range 8:14 56:9,22 | 108:11 109:14 | 236:11 251:16 | 253:2,13 255:20 |
| 235:13 281:3 | 107:14 169:20 | 253:11 | 254:20 283:1 | 273:19 294:11 |
| 312:13 318:3 | 179:6 202:6,9 | realize 26:3 120:11 | reasonable 253:20 | recommendations |
| quotas 56:18 | 295:21 | 174:6,9 | 266:18 269:6 | 18:7,19 20:5,9,16 |
| quote 37:10 | ranging 163:17 | really 4:11 5:9 6:3 | 294:13 | 20:19 21:12 24:17 |
| quoting 202:10 | ranking 52:20 | 6:7 7:21 8:8,21 | reasons 130:6 | 25:9,12 28:21 |
| R | 79:17 160:21 | 10:21 12:13,18 | 215:3 297:11 | 29:13 30:18 31:3 |
| radical 105:7 | 161:16,18 | 19:3,18 24:13 | rebuild 5:19 | 31:6,10 46:15 |
| Raftican 1:20 3:5 | rap 10:12 | 26:17 28:13 48:14 | rebuilding 8:3 | 101:12 209:17,21 |
| 19:17 29:16,19,21 | rapid 104:5 | 49:18,19 50:13 | rec 266:6 268:1 280:15 323:3 | 210:17,19 211:7 |
| 30:4,11,15 33:2,6 | rare 321:3 | 54:11 58:18 61:13 | received 14:8 232:9 | 212:9,14,15 217:4 |
| 34:1 35:13 37:1,9 | rarely 318:1 rate 52:6 | 62:16 64:21 65:6 72:14 73:1 80:2,7 | | 217:15 219:22 |
| 148:16 204:2 | rate 52:0 rates 301:6 | 80:14 81:13,18,19 | 273:21 306:3 316:20 | 220:16,17 221:2 |
| 276:5 304:19 | rates 301:0 | 80:14 81:13,18,19 | receiving 21:9 | 227:17 229:10 |
| 310:2 | 102:12 | , , | O | 230:4,15 254:22 257:13 260:9 |
| rag-tag 90:16 | rationalized 109:17 | 84:22 85:7,17 | recirculating 243:22 | 263:21 271:16,22 |
| raise 203:15,22 | rd 108:3 321:17 | 86:6 88:9 89:1 90:13 91:7 98:14 | | , |
| 212:19 241:20 | 322:13,21 | 102:21 104:13 | recognition 22:2 199:16 247:5 | 274:4 275:7,12 281:22 311:21 |
| 242:3 301:17,19 | reach 188:1 254:13 | | 283:19 | 335:5 336:19 |
| 316:19 330:3 | reached 131:15 | 105:1 106:2,12,17 111:20 112:15 | | recommended 52:9 |
| raised 119:10 | | 111:20 112:15 | recognize 5:15 9:11 23:4 25:4 36:8 | |
| 141004 117.10 | 254:6,21 | 113.0 110.14,19 | 23.4 23.4 30.8 | 140:10 312:10 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

| | | | 1 | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 330:16 | 128:15 | 251:8 267:13 | 297:9 | 293:11,20 294:5 |
| recommending | reducing 138:3 | 269:18 | remarks 3:3 4:19 | 298:7,22 299:22 |
| 44:21 127:18 | reduction 92:2 | region-specific | remember 15:1 | representative |
| recommends | reductions 45:3 | 269:4 | 91:21 103:3 | 78:18 211:15 |
| 118:21 128:16 | 85:1 230:19 | Register 298:15 | 149:12 311:1,13 | 246:4 248:13,14 |
| 132:20 135:15 | redundant 278:15 | regular 211:16 | 325:22 338:12 | 248:20 250:2,3 |
| 144:5 145:14 | red-line 312:9 | 239:10 | remembers 328:2 | 278:9 287:22 |
| 155:21 202:3 | reel 300:10 | regulation 116:2 | reminder 16:8 | 301:4 |
| 211:2 223:10 | refer 203:6 344:15 | regulations 180:18 | reminding 291:6 | representatives |
| 230:19 238:19 | reference 17:9,16 | 272:22 306:10 | removal 269:17 | 273:13,22 278:10 |
| 239:14 246:2 | 224:21 | regulatory 45:10 | remove 293:7 | 281:10 282:17 |
| 274:14 302:12 | references 76:2 | 181:3 194:4 195:5 | removed 189:21 | 283:7 339:5 |
| reconvene 161:10 | referring 47:8 | 195:19 | repeat 145:1,7,11 | represented 259:12 |
| record 39:4 156:11 | 233:4 | reinforce 296:14 | 145:13 342:15 | 281:8 292:8,21 |
| 206:4 234:8 | reflect 130:11 | reintroduced | repeatedly 273:12 | 300:22 301:11 |
| 262:21 318:10 | 210:17 253:5,11 | 181:14 184:13 | replace 70:20 | representing |
| 349:5 | 349:5 | reinvested 26:5 | 320:1 | 277:18 339:15,17 |
| records 265:4 | reflects 254:17 | Reisner 51:17 | replaced 319:2 | 340:1,11 |
| recovery 27:13 | reform 193:20 | reiterate 159:22 | report 3:5,7,9,12 | represents 279:8 |
| recreation 293:8 | 195:4,17 269:21 | reject 290:5 297:21 | 3:14 20:6 21:8 | reproduction |
| 294:18,20 | regarding 27:6 | related 216:14 | 39:14 43:8,12,14 | 180:22 |
| recreational 3:14 | 209:19 295:17 | 227:4 230:4 | 46:2 139:4 156:16 | request 58:14 62:2 |
| 142:17 143:5 | 317:15 | relationships 344:2 | 156:19,21 157:2 | 276:10 277:3 |
| 183:3 207:17 | regardless 201:1 | relative 54:5 | 169:2 207:12,18 | 290:6 299:14 |
| 229:6,9 263:19 | 201:15 286:5 | 242:18 245:17 | 208:12 209:4 | 304:13 309:1 |
| 264:2,14,16 267:9 | regards 302:10 | relatively 18:10 | 214:7 221:10 | 320:9 |
| 267:10,12 268:16 | Regency 1:11 | 186:3 312:21 | 222:18 228:15 | requested 53:8 |
| 269:1 270:2 272:1 | region 11:10 28:11 | release 270:2 | 229:2 259:7 | 280:3 |
| 272:7 274:15 | 89:20 251:5 265:9 | releases 256:2 | 290:21,22 307:15 | requesting 242:19 |
| 275:21 278:8,9 | 267:6,20 268:9 | releasing 246:6 | 308:5 314:2 | requests 242:17 |
| 279:9,12 280:5 | 269:16,20 270:4,8 | relevance 22:10 | 315:19 | 279:3 293:19 |
| 281:16 282:14,21 | 271:2 272:6 | reliance 137:22 | reports 14:3 17:6 | 294:4 |
| 283:11 284:19,20 | 277:19 292:5,11 | 138:16 | 33:1 208:7 229:16 | require 181:17 |
| 285:10 286:1,5 | 292:11 304:3 | reliant 138:5 | 314:10 | required 25:18 |
| 290:1,18 292:3 | regional 26:6 94:5 | relieve 230:11 | reposition 85:10 | 42:4 43:21 46:7 |
| 293:9,20 294:6 | 250:20 259:12 | relocated 166:9 | represent 140:6 | 52:17 53:4,7 |
| 295:15 296:19 | 261:4 263:8 264:2 | 173:15 189:9 | 154:19 281:11 | 73:15 114:6 118:9 |
| 300:13,18,21 | 264:4,18 265:8,14 | 199:11 | 286:10 339:14 | 118:22 188:3 |
| 302:11,13 304:4 | 265:22 269:3,7 | relocating 190:21 | 341:8 | requirement 5:18 |
| 305:3,5,12,15,20 | 270:19 273:12 | 190:22 202:7 | representation | 180:9 |
| 313:12 | 274:20 276:19 | relocation 165:19 | 247:6 250:9 | requirements |
| recruit 282:14 | 282:10 302:15 | 169:5 173:9 | 273:14,15,20 | 181:19 294:14 |
| red 270:6 | 303:5,10,10,14 | rely 248:1 250:6 | 274:8 275:21 | requires 26:1 115:9 |
| reduce 126:12,14 | 304:6 327:1 | remain 174:17 | 276:14 277:17 | 115:11 116:3 |
| 160:3 270:1 | regionally 63:19 | remaining 232:15 | 278:3 279:4 280:3 | 120:19 221:6 |
| reduced 41:21 | regions 170:8 | 232:19 233:5,12 | 281:17 287:10 | research 50:15,15 |
| 99:13,14 101:22 | 244:7 250:19 | remains 42:11 51:9 | 289:8,16 292:2 | 60:16 66:15 69:2 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 71.7.06.2.11 | 1 11611 | 107.11 | 000 10 004 10 | 222 10 225 12 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 71:7 96:3,11 | responded 16:11 | retention 107:11 | 292:18 294:12 | 332:19 335:12 |
| 131:2 133:2 | responding 283:18 | rethink 64:15 | 296:1 299:17,17 | 344:17 |
| 135:19 138:1,17 | response 29:11,20 | return 233:11 | 302:21 308:19 | roles 344:21 |
| 173:8 230:5,5,22 | 38:6 56:20 60:20 | reveal 68:10 69:18 | 316:9,22 318:14 | rollout 140:20 |
| 238:21 239:16 | 84:11 92:3 123:7 | reverse 210:16 | 325:9,14 331:8,12 | room 12:19 46:11 |
| 243:18,22 244:7,9 | 124:21 129:17 | review 11:7 16:21 | 341:14,16 343:7 | 56:9 60:9 77:21 |
| 245:17,22 246:5,6 | 139:1 156:6 | 35:3 36:1 175:4 | 343:15 344:13,16 | 254:3 262:3 |
| 246:21 247:1,22 | 164:22 216:9 | 188:3 247:11 | 345:7,7 349:12 | 334:12 348:21 |
| 248:2,6,21 251:1 | 226:12 229:21 | 298:15 | rights 109:20 110:1 | 349:1 |
| 251:12 252:21 | 242:17 245:9,13 | reviewed 271:4 | 144:19,21 | round 348:6 |
| 254:12 255:21 | 257:20 290:5 | 274:3 | rigorously 265:2 | rounded 222:12 |
| 256:3 270:8 306:7 | 307:4 | reviewing 35:8 | rise 63:5 | round-robin 70:17 |
| reside 186:17 189:3 | responses 56:9 | revision 271:9 | risk 121:21 144:19 | routine 234:19 |
| resilience 27:22 | 69:5,9 | revisions 38:4 | 338:21 339:9 | 245:21 252:16 |
| resisting 94:10 | responsibilities | 228:22 | Rizzardi 1:21 3:10 | row 75:18 |
| resolution 219:2 | 194:7 | revisit 280:1 | 14:12 19:20 20:13 | rub 189:3,11 |
| resolve 71:13 | responsibility | revolving 266:12 | 48:14,17 113:19 | Rubino 252:15 |
| resonance 161:19 | 283:21 | rewarding 342:20 | 115:20 116:11,13 | rule 200:18 283:10 |
| resorting 202:7 | responsible 49:3 | re-vote 33:8 | 117:5,11,14 128:1 | rules 125:16 |
| resource 29:4 92:7 | 102:19 104:22 | rhetoric 6:8 108:11 | 128:5,20,22 | 181:19 182:2 |
| 92:21,21 94:2 | 198:5 | Richard 80:22 | 133:19,22 134:19 | 296:3 |
| 111:6 133:1,5 | rest 50:19 283:15 | right 10:12 29:3 | 137:17,20 138:16 | run 33:3 36:2 |
| 135:18,22 149:15 | 291:8 341:2,20 | 38:11 39:9,12,20 | 150:5 151:10 | 107:10 315:4 |
| 149:19 266:20 | 348:11 | 39:21 40:14,15 | 153:13 156:17,20 | running 139:21 |
| 268:4 | restated 280:2 | 42:15 46:20 50:20 | 157:4,7,16 158:21 | 340:16 345:5 |
| resources 3:9 25:17 | restatement 274:7 | 58:8 60:10 61:18 | 159:12 163:21 | runs 86:18 91:22 |
| 25:22 26:19,20 | 296:3 | 65:11 67:11 75:8 | 164:8,15 165:6,11 | rush 142:12,13 |
| 28:5 31:19 63:17 | restaurant 327:21 | 80:20 85:7,18,18 | 165:13 173:6,12 | 202:22 |
| 79:7 88:4 97:11 | restoration 20:8 | 95:3,12,22 97:8 | 179:16 180:14 | Russ 2:8 263:17 |
| 100:8,16,21 115:3 | 23:13 96:11,12 | 100:4 107:10 | 185:13 192:16 | 264:9 265:20 |
| 131:13 136:19 | 133:8 136:3 222:9 | 109:5 113:16 | 199:6 203:5 219:1 | 268:17 274:19 |
| 139:21 150:9,13 | 269:18 329:2 | 115:12 117:12 | 219:8 220:4 | 290:19 306:15 |
| 151:12,14,16,18 | restoring 202:5 | 118:7 119:6,9 | 221:13 246:9 | <u> </u> |
| 156:1 157:2 165:4 | restrictions 185:8 | 120:7,7 128:22 | 253:12 302:4 | |
| 165:7 199:8 | restricts 183:8 | 134:22 142:4 | 315:10 323:2 | sablefish 105:21 |
| 200:21 202:4 | result 8:18 78:12 | 143:6 153:3,7 | 331:20 332:2 | SAGAR 2:5 |
| 217:13,16 220:14 | 175:3 254:21 | 156:16 159:11 | 349:14,18 | salary 329:19 |
| 220:18 230:20 | 271:16 | 164:7,11,11 | road 8:7 167:6 | salmon 115:4 192:4 |
| 274:19 295:19 | resulted 273:18 | 166:17 176:2,17 | 241:14 271:13 | 300:9 |
| respect 255:13 | results 60:8,18 | 178:14 182:8 | roadmap 211:22 | Saltonstall-Kenn |
| 346:16 | 74:12 75:13 96:15 | 200:21 214:15 | roast 348:17 | 230:6 |
| respected 44:13 | 98:20 161:4 | 224:4 229:10,11 | robust 107:17 | saltwater 269:11 |
| respective 246:21 | 162:15 315:20 | 235:13 242:9,9 | rockfish 273:7 | sampling 265:4 |
| respects 11:3 56:8 | resume 40:17 | 249:1 254:16 | Roger's 35:1 | San 326:21 327:7 |
| 57:11 93:1 | resumed 39:5 | 258:3 260:3 | role 24:18 32:1 | sarcastically 84:6 |
| respond 15:18 | 156:12 206:5 | 267:14 280:7 | 43:4,9 143:19 | Sarri 216:14 |
| 137:4 | 262:22 | 281:19 288:1 | 304:7 332:11,16 | 220:15 223:21 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 224:14 225:8 | 58:9 62:11 83:7 | sea 28:3 242:18 | 244:20 246:11 | 307:5 344:8 |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| satellites 54:7 | 85:18 89:9,12 | 243:11 248:22,22 | 304:21 | seek 131:3 247:1 |
| satisfaction 48:10 | 91:13,19 93:4 | 254:6,10,20 270:9 | Secondly 187:14 | 276:3 |
| | 94:16,19,22 96:1 | 301:5 | seconds 228:2 | |
| satisfying 98:8 save 78:1 102:9 | 96:9 99:4 102:5 | seal 165:17 166:1 | | seeking 132:8 seen 17:13 51:9 |
| save 78:1 102:9 saved 38:18 | 107:5 108:5 | 167:8 181:22 | second-guess 167:13 | 92:1 96:2 97:20 |
| | | | | 111:20 197:17 |
| savings 26:4 27:2 103:18 105:9 | 109:10 110:5,18 111:14 131:21 | 182:5 184:7,17 | Secretary 179:21 194:1 196:10 | select 282:7 |
| saw 20:16 90:8 | 136:14 143:17 | 191:4 192:13,14 192:20 199:15 | | selected 27:17 |
| 212:18 250:17 | | seals 165:20 166:10 | 198:16,17 282:2 337:20 | |
| | 155:1,10 260:3,11 | 185:3 186:17 | | selecting 265:22 selections 284:10 |
| saying 23:19 51:6 81:2 84:16 90:11 | 261:6,21 262:10 280:10 289:2 | | Secretary's 290:5 section 79:20 | |
| 93:22 100:22 | 297:2 304:2 | 189:7 190:13,13 190:19 198:5 | 181:14 199:10 | self 326:14 selfish 32:7 |
| | | seat 40:17 261:4 | 201:10 | |
| 103:14 126:11 146:8 159:2 | 308:13,16,20,22 | 290:13,17 | sections 58:17 | selfishly 35:17 self-assess 94:1 |
| 162:19 163:12 | 309:5,10 310:15 315:15 321:22 | ′ | | |
| 167:22 168:13 | | seats 274:10 327:1 Seattle 266:9 | sector 5:3,12,15 6:3 7:3 138:5,6 285:4 | self-evident 136:11 |
| 175:15 178:17 | 322:3,6 324:7,10 324:14 325:20 | 326:22,22 327:6 | 285:4 287:10 | self-explanatory 246:14 |
| 185:19 214:9 | 324:14 325:20 | 320:22,22 327:0 | 289:16 292:7 | self-identify 340:14 |
| 219:3 234:3 249:9 | 333:10,17 335:8 | 330:1 342:13 | 298:9,10 | self-interest 114:1 |
| 249:12,15,17 | 336:2,8 338:17 | 348:4 | sectors 6:15 295:16 | |
| 292:1 296:9 | 340:22 341:2,5 | seawater 187:20,21 | sectors 0.13 293.10 sector-based 6:21 | self-preservation |
| | 340.22 341.2,3 | 187:21 | | |
| says 70:4 71:7 82:6 97:9 232:10 | | second 29:15 33:22 | security 272:10 see 6:9 7:13 8:8 | self-regulated 326:14 |
| 248:12 253:15 | 344:11 347:11,14 348:3 | 34:1 39:10 51:14 | 15:22 22:17 23:21 | |
| 342:6 | science 22:9 31:15 | | 23:22 25:4 38:20 | Self-sustaining 244:5 |
| | | 52:1,1 54:10 72:4 | | |
| SBIR 255:14 | 32:2 33:19 54:17 | 95:7 119:7 125:11 | 41:18 48:4 50:16 | sell 111:1,4 |
| SBIRs 254:11 | 55:9 56:12 63:15 | 133:18 136:4,6 | 57:14,17 60:15 61:18 69:14 71:5 | send 38:13 75:22 |
| scale 84:10 | 94:8 120:22 | 139:3 141:16,17 | | 162:12 208:17 |
| scales 23:8 scared 108:6 | 167:11,16 168:2 | 145:18,20 146:20 | 75:1 80:15 90:2,3 96:5 99:12,21 | 296:1 308:8 |
| | 182:18 200:2 244:9 | 147:17 153:13,19 154:13 155:18 | ′ | 312:12 323:11 sense 5:14 48:2 |
| scary 171:21 scenario 65:14 | science-service-st | 164:17 186:10 | 101:16 102:9,22 104:2 106:15 | 52:12 94:5 108:11 |
| | 57:18 | | | |
| 99:14 scenarios 102:1 | scientifically-valid | 211:13 218:17,18 | 107:3 135:3 137:5 151:2 162:20,21 | 109:21 140:18 193:18 256:2 |
| schedule 3:19 | 93:14 | 228:1 231:8,10 240:2,3 244:17 | 163:3 171:12 | 276:13 293:8 |
| 320:12 324:19 | scientists 112:9,12 | 246:9 274:17 | 175:9 185:14,14 | 296:15 304:10 |
| scheduled 320:11 | 189:5 | 276:3,3,5 302:9 | 186:3 195:1 | sensitive 236:19 |
| schedules 201:6 | scope 106:3 166:19 | 304:18,19 321:12 | 202:11 222:1 | sent 16:8 17:4 |
| scheduling 9:3 | scope 100.3 100.19 score 46:4 | seconded 34:3 | 266:17 268:15 | 20:21 168:12 |
| scheme 84:15 | scratch 88:9 | 119:7,19 125:18 | 270:13 277:21 | 208:12,18 |
| 92:16 | scratching 205:17 | 134:17 135:14 | 282:8 303:6,22 | sentiments 341:6 |
| Schwaab 2:9 3:3,20 | screaming 203.17 screaming 23:20 | 136:8 141:19 | 321:20 325:16 | separate 58:17 |
| 4:5,10,13,16 10:7 | screen 38:14 52:3 | 145:9,22 164:19 | 327:13 330:20 | 275:14 |
| 11:2 12:22 13:10 | 133:14 | 177:2 186:12 | 343:20 | separately 142:19 |
| 13:16 18:5,11,17 | scroll 41:16 47:2 | 212:14,21 218:20 | seeing 13:13 | September 322:16 |
| 19:2 40:8 53:12 | 167:9 | 231:12 240:5 | 245:14 257:21 | sequestration 37:4 |
| 17.2 70.0 33.12 | 107.7 | 231.12 2 1 0.3 | 273.17 231.21 | sequestiation 57.4 |
| L | l | | l | I |

| | I | I | I | I |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| series 181:3 333:12 | shifted 290:17 | 30:21 100:3 | smooth 208:1 | 119:13 125:7 |
| serious 34:9 98:10 | ship 85:1 92:2 | 192:15 317:3,13 | snapper 270:6 | 141:20,20 146:7 |
| 99:2 214:19 | ships 91:22 | 343:1 | soapbox 70:1 | 149:1,6 150:20 |
| serve 211:21 244:7 | shockingly 4:22 | sing 342:17 | 288:11 | 165:11 168:13 |
| 282:10 288:10 | shore 105:14 | sit 39:20,21 40:1,3 | social 24:5 27:21 | 173:1 185:1 204:4 |
| 319:11 | shoreline 169:16 | 252:4,18,19 | 244:9 | 231:20 237:15 |
| served 345:2 347:3 | 169:17 171:2 | 260:18 | societal 24:5 | 308:21 319:19 |
| service 54:6,7,17 | 188:19 | site 97:12 215:10 | socioeconomic | 321:21 322:3,6 |
| 66:22 233:19 | shorelines 169:12 | sites 180:21 | 267:12 | sort 4:18 6:4 7:19 |
| 309:19 | short 14:22 258:6,7 | siting 244:2 | sockeye 300:11 | 8:15 12:1,12 |
| services 25:1 31:16 | 262:19 338:1 | Sitka 300:5,8 | 328:12 | 18:15 43:13 50:8 |
| 32:3 33:20 36:8 | short-term 92:9 | sits 23:21 141:6 | soft 253:14 345:19 | 53:13,21 54:2,8 |
| 37:4 101:20,22 | shot 73:9 158:18 | sitting 80:11,18 | solely 55:21 | 54:11,12,15 55:7 |
| 133:4 135:21 | shoved 140:22 | 167:11 252:11 | solicitation 255:5 | 55:16 56:5,21 |
| service-specific | show 81:10 203:17 | 254:2 301:4 | 256:16 257:5 | 57:13,18,20,21 |
| 55:4 | 204:1 241:21 | 319:15 | solicitations 246:6 | 58:9 59:8,20 63:1 |
| serving 345:13 | 242:4 301:18,21 | situation 84:8,9 | 255:16,21 256:3 | 64:9,15 65:18 |
| SESEPASARA | 328:20 330:5 | 170:16 184:16 | solicited 217:3 | 73:11 77:1 83:11 |
| 1:21 | 342:17 | 187:4 200:5,6 | 254:7 | 84:10 85:9,10 |
| session 10:12 18:15 | showing 173:9 | 215:16 300:16 | soliciting 245:21 | 93:13 94:9 96:4 |
| 19:1 139:10 | 295:8 | six 104:20 213:20 | solidifying 303:3 | 101:6 107:15,20 |
| set 18:6 71:15 | shown 143:2 | 242:13 285:1 | solution 294:16,21 | 107:21 108:8,10 |
| 95:20 162:3 258:8 | shut 287:5 | 292:17 327:18 | solutions 275:5 | 108:10 110:6 |
| 268:7 300:11 | shutting 87:10 | size 67:14 169:17 | solve 83:20 84:20 | 113:10 116:3 |
| 324:19 333:4 | side 36:21 284:4 | SK 230:20 231:4,16 | 127:2 | 125:10 136:15 |
| 343:12 | 286:5 315:19 | 232:3,9,14,16 | solves 280:1 | 159:3 161:12,16 |
| sets 343:13 | 331:10 | 234:2,18 235:14 | somebody 81:15 | 163:16 194:10 |
| setting 67:8 | sideboards 12:1,11 | 235:15 236:13,13 | 88:17 106:13 | 202:15,16 211:8 |
| set-aside 96:3 | sidesteps 238:6 | 236:16 237:1 | 146:12 154:22 | 214:5 260:18 |
| seven 194:18 | sign 15:15 97:8 | 238:22 239:1,14 | 155:6 159:13 | 261:12 280:1 |
| 213:21 242:1,11 | 319:8 338:12,12 | skew 60:18 | 186:1 203:12 | 289:7,9,14,15 |
| 242:13 | signed 338:13 | skiff 90:16 | 225:12 251:17 | 290:4 291:6,17 |
| share 20:14 58:4 | significant 191:13 | skill 341:14 343:18 | 260:21 301:9 | 292:6 297:14 |
| 123:11 187:17 | significantly 32:11 | skin 140:9 141:4,5 | 304:7 306:6 313:6 | 304:9 308:7 |
| 188:12 191:12 | silent 173:13 | 143:7,8 | someplace 339:12 | 313:11,17 326:3 |
| 277:13 298:9 | similar 251:8 252:2 | slate 289:22 297:19 | somewhat 35:17 | 334:10,14,17 |
| 327:3 | 252:22 282:6 | slide 31:14 | 36:19 | 338:18 339:7,19 |
| sharp 158:3 | similarities 69:9 | slightly 6:14 159:7 | Somma 165:10,12 | 340:13 343:14 |
| sharpened 25:21 | simple 97:4 315:6 | 324:19 325:5 | 177:16 | sorts 81:16 |
| shed 188:12 | simplified 144:2,9 | smack 331:9 | soon 18:10 186:3 | sought 169:18 |
| sheet 53:16 68:22 | 161:17 | small 7:7 188:20 | 201:8 312:13 | sound 103:5 191:20 |
| shellfish 32:8 36:3 | simplify 159:6 | smaller 300:5 | 343:20 | 192:2 230:11 |
| 36:7,9,18 191:18 | simply 55:22 | 333:12,20 | sooner 313:13 | sounded 180:5 |
| 221:20 222:3,9,10 | 107:11 173:12 | smart 56:3,21 | sorry 16:2 30:22 | sounds 240:9 303:7 |
| 243:13 327:13,20 | 181:8 289:9 | 243:20 | 34:19 40:8 42:22 | 304:8 326:13 |
| 328:21 | Simpson 328:4 | smile 346:15 | 43:17 47:5 59:21 | source 306:9 |
| shelter 180:21 | Simultaneous | 347:20 | 74:4 103:3 113:2 | south 28:6 270:5 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | I | I | I | 1 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| southeast 270:4 | 193:17 194:4 | 165:8 199:17 | startling 170:6 | 312:5,14 |
| 273:22 277:19 | 195:22 202:1 | 203:18 205:9 | state 16:7 33:16 | stepped 298:17 |
| Southwest 267:16 | 217:4 224:12 | 217:12 219:5,18 | 36:13 112:11 | stepping 257:4 |
| 268:12 270:8 | 227:11 230:6 | 221:7 226:4,6 | 170:21 171:1 | 345:12 |
| space 48:8 180:19 | 249:2 253:2 271:1 | 227:12 228:6,22 | 188:19 191:16 | steps 5:3 |
| spatial 23:10 244:4 | 278:16,19 279:5 | 241:22 263:18 | 234:20 252:6 | Steve 1:19 3:13 |
| speak 15:8 119:8 | 333:7 | 271:12 272:7 | 280:16 284:17 | 45:19 80:21 88:16 |
| 148:6,12,14,19 | specifically 149:16 | 276:11 302:11,16 | 285:21 286:2,9 | 92:10 93:17 112:4 |
| 152:21 192:10 | 152:12 201:10 | 303:17 306:6 | 293:19 295:13 | 207:7 209:1 |
| 196:1 200:13 | 217:3 277:16 | 314:21 330:15 | 298:17 300:3,12 | 299:18 301:14 |
| 201:22 204:21 | 281:15 296:16 | 334:12 346:18 | 301:1 | 328:9 341:6,13 |
| 213:9,10 246:12 | 302:10 | staffer 188:4 | stated 283:22 293:3 | 348:10 |
| 272:13 283:17 | specificity 197:16 | stage 99:2 | 299:16 | stewardship 54:18 |
| 289:13 328:10 | specifics 74:1 | stakeholder 139:20 | statement 14:22 | 54:19 |
| speaking 30:21 | specified 180:4 | 245:17,21 246:4 | 25:14,19 48:19 | stick 255:19 |
| 49:6 100:3 121:17 | spectrum 12:5 | 248:13,14,15,20 | 122:18 136:17,22 | stimulate 31:20 |
| 122:13 148:7,8 | speed 73:1 151:7 | 249:3 250:5,11,22 | 175:9 200:17 | stimulators 244:8 |
| 192:15 199:13 | spend 41:14 83:2 | 253:4 254:14 | 231:6,15 259:14 | stock 6:6 63:21 |
| 212:16 232:2 | 110:9 123:9 131:7 | stakeholders 78:19 | 275:19 279:3 | 64:4,11 88:22 |
| 317:3,13 339:21 | 227:2 289:4 | 113:22 160:16 | statements 15:14 | 92:4 100:1 131:10 |
| 343:1 | spending 9:19 20:3 | 247:6 252:18 | states 82:3,16 86:2 | 133:5,7 135:22 |
| speaks 217:9 | spent 5:1 120:5 | 281:11 | 214:2 264:19 | 136:2 267:11 |
| special 9:17 20:13 | 285:13 298:7 | stalls 213:6 | 281:10,13 286:11 | stocks 5:19 6:19,21 |
| 181:15 321:15 | 309:11 | stand 155:6 278:4 | 291:20 297:13,16 | 8:3 89:3 |
| species 6:13 22:12 | spirit 31:19 | 350:1 | 300:19 | Stockwell 13:6 |
| 22:13,19 23:11 | spoke 123:6 | standard 25:1 37:5 | state's 281:21 | STOLL 2:5 38:20 |
| 27:13,16 44:1 | spoken 34:4 | standardized 90:4 | state-related 55:1 | stood 349:10 |
| 50:15 91:6 102:19 | sport 272:21 274:8 | 90:5,6,18,19 | statistics 227:16 | stop 9:2 10:2 45:9 |
| 105:17 115:2,2,8 | 287:22 | standing 307:16 | status 23:5 89:2 | 263:3 266:5 276:1 |
| 115:16,19 121:3,4 | sportsman 301:10 | 313:5 349:6 | 264:22 267:11 | storytelling 341:17 |
| 123:21 132:7,7 | spot 51:4 345:19 | standpoint 79:11 | statute 179:7,17 | straightforward |
| 165:14 166:2,6,14 | spreadsheet 68:20 | stands 253:8 | statutorily 114:7 | 16:22 120:18 |
| 166:15 167:5 | 75:7 | stand-down 39:1 | statutory 56:7,7 | 339:9 |
| 168:2 170:12 | spring 291:11 | 258:7 | 114:8 180:9 | straits 29:6 182:9 |
| 172:16 174:5,8 | 320:15,22 321:6 | start 51:11 53:5 | 199:21 295:20 | strategic 3:6 41:3 |
| 177:19 179:2,10 | 321:14 | 64:19 70:14 86:18 | stay 42:1,16 124:3 | 57:21 263:19 |
| 179:12,15,19 | spring's 312:18 | 87:8,10,13 88:9 | 219:12 303:17 | 272:8 |
| 180:2 181:2,12 | spun 4:22 | 135:9 172:16 | 306:18 319:6 | strategically 56:2,3 |
| 182:7 190:4 | squeeze 71:2 | 178:9 276:8 303:3 | stayed 173:12 | strategies 63:5 |
| 191:19 192:4 | squeezed 95:13 | started 29:8 69:22 | staying 340:16 | strategy 25:13,16 |
| 198:7 200:11,17 | stabilizing 8:4 | 87:19,21,21 | stays 316:12 | 25:18,20 26:6,21 |
| 202:5,7 215:3 | staff 2:3 39:7 63:16 | 117:13 140:11 | steer 158:4,12 | 28:2,13,18 29:1 |
| 273:7 | 85:2 87:2 112:11 | 265:1 | Steller 301:5 | 42:9 114:11 132:4 |
| specific 27:6 41:6 | 112:12 116:16,20 | starter 116:21 | step 74:10,12 80:3 | 178:5 |
| 44:9 48:19 51:19 | 116:22 117:3 | starting 68:10,13 | 87:14 111:14 | stream 305:15 |
| 77:3 176:3 179:8 | 120:12 157:17 | 70:6 71:14 73:9 | 259:22 266:11 | street 335:19 |
| 192:12,13,19 | 158:22 159:8,9,9 | 73:11 208:22 | 276:15 290:7 | stridency 153:21 |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | • |

| -4-:1 221.12 | 204.17.207.15 | 102.16.102.15 | | 110.01 110.4 |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| strikes 231:13 | 294:17 307:15 | 102:16 103:15 | support 21:5,19 | 112:21 113:4 |
| striving 133:20 | 313:2 317:16,19 | 104:5 105:2,3,12 | 25:16 92:4 99:10 | 269:12,14 270:5 |
| strong 24:14 | 317:22 318:21 | 110:21 272:10 | 122:18 162:10 | surveys 56:15 |
| 165:16 283:8 | 319:7 336:14 | 276:18 | 173:16 192:11 | 84:19 86:20,22 |
| 335:1 | 345:4,5 | successfully 23:6 | 231:4 249:15 | 89:7 91:12,13,15 |
| stronger 27:21 | subcommittees | 263:22 | 253:9 261:17,19 | 92:4,6,7 93:20 |
| strongly 261:17 | 19:13 208:3 | succinctly 33:17 | 269:12 272:11 | 98:17,19 99:12 |
| structure 163:8 | 219:13 317:18,21 | 219:21 | 277:7 286:16 | 105:22 106:2 |
| 244:13 300:20 | 318:7,13 345:3 | sudden 106:20 | 287:1 288:19 | 131:2,10 |
| 336:16 337:9 | subject 255:16 | suffers 89:3 | 293:13 296:20 | survival 190:4 |
| structured 123:18 | 329:15 | suggest 31:10 58:2 | 301:4 302:10 | suspect 79:8 |
| 161:12 | submission 21:1 | 64:16 71:17 83:9 | 303:19 306:14 | 106:13 |
| struggle 290:11 | submit 282:16 | 126:18 201:1,7,11 | 346:19 | sustain 12:3 42:5 |
| struggling 93:6 | 318:8 | 237:8 249:11 | supporter 142:1 | 43:22 73:16 |
| studied 214:7 | submitted 285:16 | 282:13 293:17 | supporting 154:6 | 118:10 119:1 |
| studies 27:17 | 322:13 | 317:2 | 260:2 276:14 | sustainable 8:4 |
| stuff 12:18 39:2 | submitting 295:12 | suggested 53:1 | supportive 213:12 | 92:14 |
| 43:13 82:4 94:9 | 295:13 | 55:5 137:9 223:22 | 214:8 | sweetheart 347:19 |
| 112:17 144:9 | subsector 292:7 | 239:21 240:18 | suppose 330:11 | switch 129:2,3 |
| 280:18 290:20 | subsequent 68:2 | suggesting 35:6 | supposed 15:19 | swordfish 270:3 |
| 313:10,12,13 | 71:16 | 74:1 79:15 80:17 | 30:2 281:11 | sympathetic 238:4 |
| 314:8 320:7 | subsides 23:20 | 92:11 105:6 125:2 | sure 15:9 22:11 | synthesize 61:8,12 |
| 346:12 | subsistence 300:4,6 | 172:3 200:3 | 24:8 37:6 38:17 | 162:14 |
| subcategories 72:7 | substantial 19:4 | 222:17 238:10,13 | 42:10 48:8 59:17 | system 100:11 |
| subcommittee 3:5 | 21:10 108:19 | 248:11 294:8 | 74:21 78:10 91:8 | 268:7 |
| 3:7,9,12,14 14:2 | substantially 83:17 | suggestion 72:16 | 91:15 102:5 | systems 12:3 |
| 19:8,10 21:13 | 83:18 | 124:21 126:20 | 111:10 128:13 | system-oriented |
| 25:12 39:9 41:5 | substantive 334:9 | 150:12 152:1,17 | 130:10 142:15 | 92:6 |
| 46:2 47:12 50:1 | substitute 144:2 | 158:15 | 144:21 160:1 | S-E-S-S-I-O-N |
| 65:13,17 66:14 | 145:13,19,22 | suggestions 130:13 | 174:2 186:6,8 | 207:1 |
| 67:13 71:21 87:17 | 146:10,19 147:2 | 238:17 321:9 | 191:14 194:12 | |
| 157:3 159:4 163:8 | 147:20,21,21 | suggests 124:2 | 218:13 223:16 | |
| 163:9 168:10 | 148:5,7,9,12,15 | 126:1 | 226:5 227:8 | table 23:21 46:8 |
| 176:21 200:22 | 148:19 150:3,3,15 | suited 99:16 | 232:17 234:6 | 48:18,20 59:2 62:13 63:1,16 |
| 201:7,13 202:14 | 153:1,10,14 | suites 22:13 | 235:6 249:16 | , |
| 203:7 204:18 | 155:20 240:1,5,7 | summarize 61:8 | 250:5,7,8,11 | 66:16 67:13 79:10 |
| 207:12,18 208:5 | 240:18,22 241:1,8 | summary 264:22 | 268:20 280:10 | 80:11 99:1 101:10 122:1 137:1 148:5 |
| 209:4 212:15 | 241:15,17,20 | 308:8 | 299:9 306:16 | 162:18 200:15 |
| 218:6,8 219:4 | 242:3,12,14 | summer 20:12 | 312:16,19 318:19 | |
| 220:9,22 223:6,17 | substitutes 147:1 | summit 265:14 | 328:15 339:13 | 203:12 220:19 |
| 226:3,7 227:12 | subsumed 100:13 | Super 328:9 | 340:11 | 237:13,18 252:12 |
| 228:4,21 229:2,7 | succeed 302:18 | supersede 49:7 | surprise 70:3 | 255:1 298:20 |
| 229:9 235:5,7 | succeeded 299:12 | superseded 148:8 | surprised 252:7 | 310:6 |
| 243:9 245:2,6 | succeeding 22:6 | supplemental | surprising 183:4 | tablets 90:8 |
| 253:6 263:15 | success 21:17,20,20 | 323:10 | survey 60:8 63:22 | tabulate 316:22 |
| 264:8,16 271:4 | 22:16 212:3 269:6 | supplementing | 64:10 89:17 95:3 | tack 6:13 305:6,8 |
| 274:2 293:9 | successful 102:14 | 173:5 | 100:1 112:4,5,8 | 331:5 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| tooking 125:10 | 333:11 335:15,16 | temporal 8:17 | 258:2 262:6,17 | 13:1 24:3 25:8 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| tacking 135:10 take 12:6 15:16 | talking 8:22 10:17 | temporary 171:18 | 275:10 277:4,6 | 31:8 37:12 43:22 |
| 24:12 33:4 38:22 | 17:12 26:13 27:19 | tendency 231:2 | 283:16 286:12 | 44:1,5 53:18 |
| 42:14 43:15 65:10 | 29:8 43:5 44:5,7 | tension 167:4 | 289:2,3 295:2,22 | 64:10 65:7 69:13 |
| 71:8 80:3 89:18 | 65:7 83:3 90:20 | 194:11 | 299:10 301:14 | 71:12 73:19 75:15 |
| | | | | |
| 104:19 105:17 | 102:17 110:10 | tentative 323:6 | 302:8 304:14 | 76:8,14,16,21 |
| 125:20 126:2,6 | 111:11 114:21 | tenure 345:11 | 305:1 307:6,8 | 81:7,17 82:7,19 84:2,4,15 85:20 |
| 127:4 146:19 147:20 155:3 | 122:1,4 158:5 | term 125:14 305:13 | 310:7,8 320:4,8 | , , |
| | 162:5 185:5 | 318:18 319:22 | 332:2 333:10 | 87:9,11 88:10,13 |
| 158:7,16 168:18 | 188:19 197:17 | 344:19 | 335:7 336:2 344:1 | 92:17 97:4 99:20 |
| 170:22 171:19 | 217:22 326:20 | termed 198:12 | 345:12 346:18 | 102:15 103:9 |
| 176:8 181:19 | talks 291:1 | terms 124:4 169:19 | 347:11 348:2,12 | 105:8 108:16 |
| 191:9 193:16 | tally 316:1 | 251:19 326:12 | 349:14 | 118:19 121:12 |
| 194:2,3 195:9 | targeting 321:5 | Terry 1:15 13:5 | thanks 13:9 14:4 | 131:5,6,8 137:22 |
| 199:9 201:7 203:8 | task 20:8,15 | 96:19 99:7 111:16 | 19:18 20:13 21:3 | 151:7 159:2 |
| 236:15 237:9 | tasked 139:6 304:5 | 204:21 240:8 | 21:4 43:20 60:22 | 160:12 161:20 |
| 247:17,18 250:3 | 332:21 334:14 | 277:4 280:8 | 126:8 155:8 165:2 165:5 213:3 263:1 | 172:10 190:2,17 |
| 256:21,22 257:12 | tasking 341:10 | test 75:8 76:18 | | 193:22 196:10,14 |
| 258:6,12 262:19 | tax 94:1 | 270:9 | 284:11 285:19 | 197:4 210:11 |
| 271:17 276:16 | Taylor's 213:20 | testing 265:3 | 286:13 343:22 | 219:11,20 228:5 |
| 293:6 303:18 | teach 335:20 | text 271:22 | that's 237:11 | 250:10,16 265:16 |
| 310:5 316:22 | 342:18 | th 117:6 164:2 | thematic 242:20 | 266:17 270:12 |
| 326:3 333:21 | team 142:3 | 168:15 209:5,7 | theme 265:12 | 300:19 306:5 |
| 336:18 337:6 | tear 310:18 | 312:6,12 316:12 | themes 267:8 | 308:10 311:2 |
| taken 11:14 177:9 | technical 39:1 | 320:17 321:5 | 270:22 271:8 | 313:7 314:9 327:3 |
| 215:17,18 290:7 | 63:15 68:4 | 322:10,10,13,20 | 311:20 | 327:4 330:20 |
| takes 49:22 61:15 | technique 184:15 | 322:21 | thing 5:13 27:2 | 331:11 334:17 |
| 250:21 | technologies 64:5 | thank 3:20 4:12,13 | 34:22 49:6 51:11 | 338:15 342:8,21 |
| talk 7:21,22 8:10 | 107:16 215:6,12 | 4:16 9:22,22 | 54:10 63:9 73:9 | 347:20 |
| 14:21 16:3 33:9 | technology 22:9 | 13:10 15:10 17:22 | 74:6 80:19 81:10 | think 5:5 6:8,16 |
| 39:10 41:8 79:18 | 97:13 215:17 | 19:16 29:21 38:1 | 81:20 100:18 | 9:10 11:2 13:18 |
| 82:13 90:21,22 | 243:12,21,22 | 38:7 58:12 62:11 | 104:7 105:10 | 15:7 19:2,12 |
| 105:1 194:18 | tee 225:10 | 74:14 78:2 87:15 | 108:21 111:19 | 23:18 24:3 25:7,8 |
| 201:14 204:9,19 | teleconference | 96:18 99:8 102:2 | 120:3,9 128:9 | 25:14,15 30:6 |
| 208:3 229:14,15 | 135:1 205:3 | 102:7 107:5 108:5 | 136:11 146:2 | 31:22 32:8 33:12 |
| 258:6 260:10 | 217:11 219:4 | 113:18 127:15 | 154:6,14 174:3 | 34:4,12 35:13,14 |
| 263:13,14 307:13 | 223:22 308:4 | 129:19 139:2 | 184:2 188:15,18 | 37:1,6,16 38:15 |
| 313:14 317:12 | 312:17 | 141:22 153:22 | 195:12,12 196:20 | 38:16 46:13 47:3 |
| 328:5 338:13 | teleconferences | 154:2,15 155:7 | 197:9 208:2 | 47:22 49:9 52:20 |
| 339:4 342:2 | 219:10 312:15 | 156:8,22 168:8,19 | 215:15 240:12 | 55:7,12,15,19 |
| 347:19 | telephone 307:20 | 168:21 177:6 | 266:14 280:13 | 56:5,11 57:11 |
| talked 7:12 8:9 | tell 81:5 90:13 | 182:19 185:15 | 292:16 294:13 | 58:2,22 63:2 65:5 |
| 13:1 15:2 41:5 | 120:3 174:11 | 188:21 189:1 | 296:8,9 298:19 | 65:21 66:1 68:14 |
| 66:5 71:20 96:13 | 199:18 214:18 | 198:2 204:4 207:3 | 300:2 332:5,6 | 68:15 69:13 70:19 |
| 103:1 117:3 132:6 | 310:22 | 216:11 223:3 | 338:8 339:7 | 71:4,6,18 73:21 |
| 165:14 266:15 | telling 154:21 | 226:9 229:1 230:1 | things 4:22 5:11 | 74:15 77:6,21 |
| 308:3 332:7,18 | tells 234:5 | 249:19 250:14 | 8:1,8,14,20 11:7 | 78:7,14,15,20,22 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 79:5,12 80:8,14 | 198:2,9 200:20 | 348:10 349:10 | threw 134:6 298:19 | 347:3 |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|----------------------|
| | 201:3 202:12,13 | 350:1 | thrive 189:8 190:20 | timelines 20:22 |
| 80:19 81:2,8,20 | The state of the s | | | |
| 82:12,18 83:8,8 | 202:17,18 203:1 | thinking 35:17 49:5 62:17 63:10 | throwing 72:21 | timeliness 124:5 |
| 83:13 84:3,8 | 203:14 204:10,12 | | 327:5 | 269:13 |
| 86:11,14,17,19 | 205:7,11,13 206:1 | 64:19,21 66:9 | thrust 238:4 | times 64:3 98:11 |
| 87:8,12 88:12,14 | 213:3,7 215:22 | 75:15 82:12 93:11 | thumbs 328:5 | 169:19,19 312:4 |
| 88:21,21 89:8 | 218:8,9 219:8,10 | 102:8 103:7 110:9 | THURSDAY 1:7 | 320:10 332:8 |
| 92:8,10,12,16 | 219:17 222:11,18 | 134:22 137:11 | tide 331:8,10 | 346:7 |
| 96:1,7,10,17,22 | 224:3,19 225:2,15 | 246:18 249:5 | tight 5:17,20 64:3 | timing 134:21 |
| 97:21 99:1,9,15 | 228:9 231:21 | 333:18 | 274:17 | 325:3 326:13,13 |
| 99:19 100:9,15,18 | 233:8 235:12,17 | thinks 146:13 | time 9:10,19 12:17 | today 70:3,22 |
| 101:7,8,13,18 | 235:17 237:11,12 | 163:12 238:12 | 12:21 15:22 16:4 | 74:18 172:9 |
| 102:20,21 103:9 | 238:4 239:2,4 | third 4:8 34:22 | 18:19,20 19:19 | 187:15 197:10 |
| 103:17 105:1,11 | 240:13,16 241:7 | 68:19 95:11 | 20:4 21:3 22:3 | 337:6 |
| 106:4,17 107:2,19 | 241:18 246:13,19 | 154:14 173:22 | 29:7 33:12 34:9 | today's 161:8 |
| 109:13 110:5,15 | 247:21 248:4,21 | 211:19 323:11 | 41:14 42:14 47:11 | told 52:7 90:12,17 |
| 114:9,16 115:21 | 249:5 250:1 252:3 | Thirty-seven 273:4 | 49:22 50:1 51:4 | 144:16 207:18 |
| 116:13,15,15,17 | 253:7,9,14,19 | 273:5 | 57:5,21 59:10 | 226:21 |
| 116:18 117:1 | 255:12,13 256:5 | thorough 246:22 | 79:19 83:3,14 | Tom 1:20 3:5 19:11 |
| 118:1,5 119:18 | 259:18,20 260:3 | thought 30:8 61:13 | 85:1 92:2 97:11 | 19:16 30:13 32:21 |
| 121:17,18 123:7,8 | 261:7,16 266:7 | 68:11 74:3 108:1 | 101:14 102:3 | 141:20 143:21 |
| 123:17,19 124:3 | 267:1 275:14 | 114:19 116:3 | 104:4 110:9 120:6 | 148:11,14 242:9 |
| 124:13,20 127:1 | 277:19 279:22 | 132:1,17 159:19 | 123:9 130:17 | 276:4 304:20 |
| 127:17 129:21 | 280:14,18,19 | 169:22 172:8 | 136:10 145:4 | 308:18 309:7 |
| 130:21 131:15 | 281:17,20 286:2 | 201:17 223:14 | 154:4 161:8 163:4 | 316:3,6 342:6 |
| 132:2,5,10 134:8 | 287:12 288:14,16 | 227:9 248:6 | 163:15 166:5 | 343:8 348:10 |
| 134:16,20 135:7,8 | 289:18 290:9,16 | 250:17 277:9 | 179:20 180:3 | Tom's 65:3 308:13 |
| 135:9 136:10,15 | 290:22 291:18 | 291:12 298:3 | 202:20 204:22 | 308:16 |
| 136:16,21 137:2 | 292:1 293:9 | 332:10 333:11 | 205:2,11 207:4 | Tony 14:11 61:1 |
| 137:13 138:12 | 294:13,16 297:9 | 336:13,20,22 | 208:18 211:1 | 71:4 96:19 99:7 |
| 139:14 143:13,17 | 297:11 299:22 | thoughts 67:4 81:8 | 229:9 234:16 | 126:9 127:16 |
| 148:4 149:20 | 301:3,10,12,15,16 | 123:11 | 237:21 242:21 | 141:19 143:21 |
| 150:15 151:6,7,19 | 303:3,4 304:2,12 | threatening 258:15 | 247:11 258:22 | 146:14 162:8 |
| 152:6,16 153:16 | 307:12 311:3,14 | three 27:11,20 41:6 | 259:10,18 261:21 | 174:19 177:6 |
| 155:2,16 160:5,22 | 312:20 313:12 | 41:19 42:17 54:15 | 263:2 266:19 | 241:7 246:16 |
| 161:11,15,22 | 317:17,18 324:7 | 66:17 73:11 79:17 | 268:10 275:14 | 248:11 310:20 |
| 164:19 169:3 | 324:10 325:4 | 104:8,18 113:19 | 280:9 283:2 289:4 | 315:9 |
| 170:4,7,7 171:7 | 326:13 329:13 | 147:10 195:15 | 293:2 294:3,19,21 | Tony's 66:2 150:21 |
| 172:7 173:5 | 330:3 331:13 | 211:7,10 212:8,14 | 305:4 309:12 | 180:16 |
| 174:21 175:10,11 | 332:9,13,14,16 | 214:22 222:3 | 313:2,16 320:20 | tool 50:11 52:8 |
| 175:16 176:1,7,16 | 333:8 334:9,21,21 | 230:3 242:7,8 | 321:2 323:20 | 59:19 61:4 66:1 |
| 177:8 178:17 | 336:10,21 337:2,8 | 285:21 291:10 | 327:16 329:7 | 68:6,6,13 78:7 |
| 184:5 186:21 | 337:13 338:16,20 | 300:18,18 307:11 | 333:18 334:1 | 79:16 158:11 |
| 187:11 189:2 | 338:21 339:9,19 | 323:4,22 324:6,11 | 337:1,7 338:1 | 244:5 335:16 |
| 190:18 193:19 | 340:4,7,14 341:14 | 334:11,12,14 | 339:16 340:7,22 | 337:14 |
| 194:4,10 195:6,15 | 343:4,7,11,14 | 347:4,6 | 341:1 342:16 | tools 6:5 52:10 62:6 |
| 196:6,14,19 197:5 | 345:9 347:7 | threshold 107:21 | 343:5,7 344:9 | 66:16 69:17 70:20 |
| | | | | |

| 306:18 | 343:18 | 214:2 275:8 | 245:15 257:22 | unfamiliar 74:19 |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| tool's 68:9 | trend 210:17 | 286:21 315:2 | 307:6 | unfolds 291:11 |
| top 50:12 63:5 67:9 | trends 311:20 | turned 316:9 | uncertain 340:7 | unfortunate 210:10 |
| 75:17 116:4 | tribe 328:16 | turning 7:13,22 | uncertainty 56:15 | Unfortunately |
| topic 172:7 174:22 | tribes 341:9 | turns 317:17 | 92:22 93:2 95:15 | 189:7 |
| 211:9 333:19 | tried 37:2 54:12 | turtles 188:6,9 | 210:12 213:19 | unfunded 306:5 |
| total 232:3 264:17 | 75:22 297:18 | tweak 7:3 | 248:19 | unhappy 97:17 |
| totally 37:7 218:13 | trim 158:7,16 | Twelve 204:6,7 | unclear 43:4 | uninhabited 189:4 |
| 299:20 | trip 108:14 331:6 | Twenty 312:1 | 319:20 | unintended 120:10 |
| touch 47:17 332:22 | trouble 36:8 40:21 | twice 19:19 144:16 | uncomfortable | unique 36:19 347:1 |
| touched 189:2 | true 102:21 250:18 | 209:6 | 153:20 278:12 | United 82:16 214:2 |
| tough 59:10 157:22 | 251:4,5 254:18 | two 12:19 14:10,13 | underlined 147:13 | 264:19 |
| 182:9 273:8 | 279:6,15 280:22 | 14:18 17:3 19:13 | underlying 297:3,3 | universally 234:20 |
| tour 327:19 330:18 | 281:2 287:20,20 | 27:8,9 34:18,19 | underlying 297.3,3 understand 23:10 | unknown 34:13 |
| tourism 171:5 | 290:14 329:22 | 41:15,19 47:3,7 | 26:7 49:1,11 61:3 | 277:10 |
| tourists 273:8 | 336:21 | 47:10 50:5 54:13 | 72:13 75:10 80:12 | unwieldy 51:22 |
| town 9:5 339:3,3 | truly 78:12 310:10 | 60:2 61:10 72:3 | 107:3 112:18 | unwieldy 31.22 update 211:20 |
| track 102:18 220:1 | truth 81:6 | 79:17 90:21 116:8 | 113:10 120:13 | _ |
| 290:19 323:15 | | 147:10 180:15 | | 216:14,15 227:6 227:12 |
| | try 16:22 26:18 36:3 52:10 58:14 | | 134:19 146:17 | |
| traction 70:10 | | 188:4 204:7 208:7 | 153:8 173:6 | updated 212:1 |
| tradeoff 109:22 | 65:3,13 67:13 | 215:2 224:14 | 178:17 186:16 | 227:16,19 311:19 |
| tradeoffs 68:15 | 76:20 80:17 158:1 | 225:14,17 241:19 | 195:13 207:7 | updates 209:14 |
| trades 344:16 | 158:7,16,22 | 242:7 267:21 | 217:7 220:13,18 | 211:16 312:11 |
| trading 31:17 32:2 | 159:16 190:5 | 272:4 274:4 275:7 | 257:12,15 259:13 | 333:3 |
| 32:8 33:21 | 210:16 273:9 | 284:21 291:10 | 274:16 285:6 | updating 228:8,16 |
| training 18:15 | 275:3 291:17 | 295:10 320:10,12 | 302:21 305:19 | upland 244:14 |
| 103:19 131:6 | 307:2 312:20 | 322:11 324:13 | 306:22 307:1 | urgently 211:3 |
| transfer 93:13 | 321:1 327:10 | 326:19 327:1 | 338:22 | USDA 252:16 |
| 243:12 | trying 32:16 36:12 | 331:10 333:19 | understandably 345:20 | use 39:18 46:11 |
| transferability | 56:22 71:1 76:17 | twofold 74:16 | | 52:1,9 56:10 |
| 22:8 transferred 215:7 | 79:21 83:8,15 | two-way 335:19 | understanding | 63:15 68:1,12 69:17 88:12 97:20 |
| translerred 213:7 | 123:15 127:19 | two-year 210:6 | 28:3 48:18 72:10 | |
| | 131:15 134:13 | type 65:19 170:4 | 104:4 183:7 | 101:13 112:20 |
| translates 62:22 | 146:17 153:17 | 175:1 | 217:13 218:20 220:21 228:11 | 113:4,8 125:14 |
| translocations 198:11 | 160:2 187:9,19 | types 22:20 | | 133:6 136:1 158:2 |
| | 234:17,22 249:8 | typically 75:3 | 229:8 235:1,12 | 158:4,9,11 159:7 |
| transmitted 190:14 | 255:14 260:12 | U | 246:20 248:11 | 163:7 185:8 |
| transparency 339:20 | 261:12 292:20 | ultimate 266:13 | 257:16 319:3 understands | 199:10 200:9 |
| | 293:11 298:8 322:5 | 268:16 294:11 | 120:12 338:18 | 230:20 231:4,15 |
| trap 114:15 | tubes 86:5 | ultimately 11:4,20 | | 232:16 233:1,13 |
| travel 131:6 329:20 travels 9:18 | | 260:15,16 268:15 | understood 55:8 277:15 | 233:14 234:20 |
| trawl 6:1 102:12,13 | Tuesday 21:8 139:11 | 290:4 297:20 | undertake 54:21 | 236:13,17 267:18 284:7 323:8 |
| 1 | tugs 42:2 | unable 190:20 | | 334:19 335:18 |
| 105:22 109:2,8,9 | O | unanimous 330:9 | undertaking 11:19 undertook 264:10 | |
| 112:2 301:6 | turf 140:5 143:2,4 | unanimously | | useful 57:13 58:15 |
| treatment 181:16 | 268:5 | 226:14 230:1 | under-represented | 64:18 65:22 81:13 |
| tremendous 270:18 | turn 8:2,6 69:3 | 220.11230.1 | 152:10 279:10 | 159:19 161:15 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | l | | 1 | 1 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| useless 120:15 | verklempt 311:14 | 153:2,8,9 176:12 | 130:16 133:18 | 293:17 299:12 |
| user 99:19 268:11 | version 5:6 312:9 | 176:18 199:3,4 | 137:4,21 140:19 | 306:14 309:21 |
| users 244:2 | versus 7:6 115:8 | 202:19 203:4,12 | 141:7 142:1,15 | 311:3 314:1 |
| uses 183:3,3 189:17 | 303:17 340:1 | 203:14 204:4 | 143:9 144:20 | 318:11 332:14,17 |
| usual 98:18 | vessel 112:13 | 216:5 238:3 241:5 | 148:12,14,19 | 335:10,22 342:16 |
| usually 183:10 | vessels 95:6 133:7 | 241:16 242:5,10 | 152:16 153:1 | 348:2 |
| utility 107:21 | 136:2 | 251:16 286:11,17 | 157:4,7 161:7 | wanting 214:20 |
| utilize 26:18 | vet 247:12 | 295:6 301:16 | 163:20 168:18 | wants 10:3 12:8 |
| 187:21 | viable 44:20 | 305:16 316:2,7 | 172:20,21 173:2 | 49:14 161:10 |
| utilized 95:5 195:7 | vice 14:9,13 164:6 | 330:7 331:18,19 | 178:18 180:14 | 193:16 231:21 |
| utilizing 217:16 | 315:7 | voted 20:20 239:11 | 185:19 194:12 | 236:22 247:17 |
| U.S 1:1 22:8 24:21 | vice-chair 164:5 | 241:1 316:4,6,18 | 195:3 201:18 | 307:18 327:3 |
| 186:21 215:1,14 | 331:18 | 339:22 | 202:22 203:3 | 336:18 349:2 |
| 270:5 | Vice-Chairman | votes 292:18 | 208:4 210:5 213:8 | warmth 343:19 |
| ▼7 | 315:11 | 320:14 | 213:9 219:3 | Washington 1:11 |
| V | view 97:3 108:18 | voting 74:17 121:7 | 222:13,14 223:11 | 1:11 191:15 259:2 |
| V 2:2 | 264:10 329:6,12 | 125:21 203:6 | 224:11,18 234:6 | 300:21 301:2 |
| valuable 12:21 | 333:22 | 225:20 251:15 | 234:14,20 237:8 | Washington-based |
| 66:1 78:8 80:2,16 | viewed 185:9 | 284:16,18 285:3,5 | 241:10,13 246:12 | 292:6 |
| 96:22 106:21 | vigorous 140:16 | 315:22 320:17 | 248:1 249:16 | wasn't 15:4 28:13 |
| 123:14 132:2 | 142:8 | | 254:8 255:2 | 38:12 40:7 67:20 |
| 136:22 161:4 | vigorously 143:9 | W | 258:14 268:7,21 | 112:10,16 162:11 |
| 337:14 | Vince 251:10,10,22 | Waikiki 166:22 | 268:22 275:11 | 169:6 179:4 |
| value 21:18 23:12 | 285:18 286:13 | 169:14 187:3 | 276:16 280:9 | 184:15 199:20 |
| 31:15 32:3 33:19 | violate 90:4 | wait 95:14 298:18 | 281:6 288:8,17,18 | 218:9 223:16 |
| 78:15 84:17 95:18 | virus 190:14 | waiting 267:18 | 293:5,5,7,16 | 232:17 235:10 |
| 100:10 101:20 | vision 3:16 11:9,16 | 313:18 | 299:19 300:9 | 245:2 247:3 |
| 117:8 159:2 160:2 | 27:5 227:13 229:2 | walking 116:22 | 305:14 306:17 | 259:15 331:6 |
| 160:6,21 161:12 | 229:11,15 271:4,9 | Wallace 1:22 14:15 | 307:12 313:14 | waste 104:16 |
| 162:20,21 163:3 | 272:1 307:13 | 19:20 29:15 113:2 | 314:4 316:18 | 160:12 |
| values 24:2,5,5 | 308:11 318:3 | 113:6 119:15,18 | 320:6 324:16 | wastes 12:17 |
| 54:6 244:14 | visioning 11:19 | 119:21 120:5 | 325:6,11 327:12 | wasting 113:11 |
| variety 130:6 | VMS 131:11 | 282:5 315:13 | 328:10 331:11 | watch 105:13 110:2 |
| 171:14 | vocabularized 66:6 | want 4:20 10:11 | 339:4 340:20 | 209:11 263:3 |
| various 142:13 | vocal 5:10 98:4 | 11:21,22 12:7 | 344:1 346:18 | watched 215:10 |
| 216:17,22 244:7 | voiced 165:18 | 17:15 37:18 39:17 | wanted 10:20 13:11 | water 32:4 36:11 |
| 273:12 302:20 | volunteered 47:15 | 39:20 41:14,15,20 | 31:10 41:7 47:9 | 64:9 180:20 183:2 |
| vast 300:1 | 311:4 314:7 | 42:9 45:5 49:4 | 58:16 139:17 | 187:22 209:11 |
| VA'AMUA 1:21 | volunteering | 51:20 63:11,11 | 148:6 152:11 | 216:3 311:10,12 |
| vehicle 139:13 | 158:20 159:6,12 | 71:7 74:20 77:7,9 | 157:12 158:14 | watered 77:1 |
| 143:11 | volunteers 268:3 | 79:18 80:6,12 | 168:5 173:18 | watersheds 27:9 |
| ventures 94:13 | 282:7 314:21 | 91:17 100:5,12 | 182:4 192:10 | way 6:4,8 18:14 |
| venue 16:6 286:7 | vote 14:18 32:18 | 101:12 102:3 | 209:15 213:13 | 47:4 48:20 49:3 |
| 317:9 340:10 | 33:4 47:21 118:13 | 105:2 108:7,10 | 226:19 227:7 | 51:15,19 52:13 |
| venues 341:7 | 121:10 125:12 | 118:8,11 119:8,9 | 240:20 248:16 | 53:10 54:11 55:4 |
| verb 124:2 | 126:4 129:13 | 121:20 124:1,2,4 | 249:4 270:13 | 55:13 56:1 58:19 |
| verifying 265:3 | 146:20,22 147:20 | 124:18 126:11,15 | 283:17 288:22 | 59:20 60:18 62:12 |
| | , , , , , | | | |
| | I | ı | ı | ı |

| 65.6 70.12 19 | 164:2 | wholes 199.5 0 | 22.5 22.22 25.5 | |
|---|--|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 65:6 70:12,18 | _ : | whales 188:5,9 | 22:5 23:22 25:5 | worried 94:11 |
| 74:13 80:20 82:22 | websites 236:6 | whichever 38:15 | 30:20 31:2,4 33:5 | worry 82:1,9 |
| 84:7 90:12 91:8 | Wednesday 259:7 | 287:10 | 55:8 111:10,20 | worse 82:3 |
| 91:11 94:13 97:3 | weeds 77:5 | whispering 131:22 | 112:6 130:14 | worst 65:14 |
| 99:9 102:16 | week 16:10 108:2 | white 214:7 | 137:12 138:3 | worth 66:18 138:12 |
| 105:13 109:21 | 216:22 312:8 | whiting 301:6 | 158:1,21 159:8 | wouldn't 40:2 |
| 110:3 111:21 | 320:17 322:10,10 | whooping 184:13 | 163:4 168:15 | 113:8 196:20 |
| 117:7 121:5 | weeks 15:18 18:12 | 184:18 | 182:15 208:11 | 197:1 248:1 |
| 123:17 124:14 | 116:9 161:9 | wide 8:14 | 211:20 228:16,22 | 251:18 297:12 |
| 133:13 145:22 | 224:14 225:9,14 | widely 69:15 | 233:6,10 241:9 | 331:4,4 |
| 149:22 158:1 | 225:17 | widely-held 236:5 | 245:7 246:19 | wow 178:5 |
| 159:6 161:17,18 | weigh 60:15 84:17 | wide-ranging 59:8 | 263:10,17 264:6 | wrap 201:19 |
| 171:9,9 173:14 | 111:21 | willing 95:16 98:2 | 264:11 268:22 | write 48:11 64:13 |
| 176:17 181:7,9 | welcome 4:8 30:11 | 155:7 158:21 | 269:2 271:15 | writing 130:1 |
| 183:2,10 188:17 | 218:11 291:6 | 159:13 165:15 | 276:12 284:3 | 257:11 |
| 195:2 197:21 | 334:22 335:3 | 172:13 | 286:8 291:13 | written 271:19 |
| 198:9 199:13,20 | well-explained | win 255:10 | 298:8 306:4,6,15 | 308:5 |
| 200:10 202:20 | 74:3 | wind 141:2 142:21 | 309:17 312:5 | wrong 52:21 98:6 |
| 231:7 238:14 | well-written 169:1 | 142:22 | 317:6 333:6 338:3 | 128:9 196:20 |
| 248:8 259:10,20 | went 6:14,15 10:17 | wise 31:22 101:13 | 342:12 346:2,17 | 219:9 235:13 |
| 261:11,14 268:8 | 39:4 49:11 109:6 | 241:11 | worked 19:11 | 288:1 303:9 |
| 268:13 271:13 | 123:16 156:11 | wish 32:21 65:20 | 213:17 265:9 | |
| 280:22 281:20 | 206:4 260:6 | 140:10 | 267:6 289:11 | Y |
| 283:14 290:14 | 262:21 266:5,22 | wishes 313:4 | workhorse 347:18 | yay 154:15 260:6 |
| 294:19 300:8 | 298:14,15 304:3 | withdraw 118:13 | working 6:19 11:17 | year 6:15 16:4 |
| 305:8,9 315:4 | 308:2 | won 331:16 | 12:18 22:17 26:11 | 83:17,18,19 |
| 316:5 319:14 | weren't 16:1 | wonder 175:10 | 58:14 81:14 | 102:11 104:10,15 |
| 321:1 337:19 | 225:13 | 202:1 | 157:17 178:15 | 104:20 106:1 |
| 345:20 | west 6:1 15:3 16:7 | wonderful 207:20 | 185:18 213:17 | 178:21,21 211:21 |
| ways 49:16 54:13 | 86:4 89:21 | 327:2,19 348:6 | 225:1 228:4 | 251:2 256:4 |
| 64:6 67:14 101:22 | wetland 136:3 | wondering 238:2 | 262:12 263:8 | 264:11 289:5 |
| 137:11 154:7 | wetlands 133:8 | 262:4 285:1 325:8 | 264:14,20 266:6 | 290:16 324:2 |
| 163:7 195:20 | we'll 8:10 16:22 | woods 250:18 | 267:16 268:1 | 332:10 333:11 |
| weaken 288:9 | 38:22 43:14 | 305:5 | 271:7,12 273:12 | 345:13 346:20 |
| wealth 79:9 | 109:11 146:19 | word 10:22 32:20 | 309:15 310:3 | years 27:9,12,16 |
| Weather 233:19 | 155:11 191:9 | 124:1 191:4 | 312:15 313:6 | 66:18 77:15 81:3 |
| web 290:22 306:8 | 229:14 265:18 | 238:14 255:19 | 314:3,19 333:5,5 | 83:12 97:21 98:5 |
| webinar 72:17,18 | 316:1 327:10 | 261:19 276:10 | 335:12 345:18 | 110:11 112:8,15 |
| 79:1 80:7 116:9 | 343:19 344:8 | 284:7 294:18,20 | 347:6 349:21 | 120:2 166:12 |
| 116:15,22 157:8 | we're 18:5 39:6 | wording 125:2 | workload 13:3 | 188:4 192:2 |
| 157:13 158:12 | 71:3 156:7,8 | 253:22 | works 38:15 | 213:21 214:19 |
| 159:3 161:5,6 | 207:16 238:1 | words 45:4 140:19 | 236:13 250:19 | 215:10 289:12 |
| 162:1,21 163:1,3 | 255:6 | 146:22 302:14 | workshop 5:2,13 | 298:8,14 312:2 |
| 264:13 268:2 | we've 7:16 56:6 | 344:1 347:10 | 330:16 333:20 | 327:18 345:2 |
| 271:18 279:7,19 | 261:16 280:6 | 349:3 | workshops 333:13 | yelling 23:20 |
| 283:20 314:18,22 | 326:18 342:11 | work 6:5 13:8 | world 83:1 216:2 | yellowtail 112:20 |
| webinars 71:16 | whale 341:21 342:3 | 19:10,15 20:12,14 | 303:4 343:9 | 112:21 113:3 |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 17.10,13 20.12,17 | 303.1313.7 | |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee

Before: NOAA

Date: 10-27-11

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &