

MEETING MINUTES

June 27, 2011

Marine Fisheries Advisory Council Conference Call – Commenting on the Full Content Outlines of the Strategic Action Plans

ATTENDEES

MAFAC Committee Members: Heather McCarty (Chair), Bill Dewey, Patty Doerr, Phil Dyskow, Ken Franke, Cathy Foy, Steve Joner, Julie Morris, George Nardi, Tom Raftican, Keith Rizzardi, Larry Simpson

NOAA Staff: Mark Holliday, Heidi Lovett, Joshua Stoll

Meeting began at 3:00 p.m. EDT

Minutes (as recorded by staff)

Heather McCarty opened the meeting. She said that MAFAC has one task today: finalize comments to send to the National Ocean Council on the Full-Content Outlines of the Strategic Action Plans. She noted that a workgroup has prepared comments on each plan and overarching comments on the documents as a whole. This past week, the draft document was sent to the full committee for review and members were asked to participate in a poll to gauge their views on the suggested comments.

She said that the poll was used as a way to determine whether there were strong views on one or more of the comments. If there were, she wanted individuals to offer suggested changes. Eight people took the survey. Based on the results, there were no parts that were unacceptable to the full committee.

In addition to taking the poll, Keith Rizzardi suggested that committee preface critical comments with a paragraph that complements the work that has been done to date.

Heather McCarty noted that Vince O’Shea also submitted comments, but he could not be on call.

In reference to Keith Rizzardi’s comment, Phil Dyskow said that in looking at the general comments and the comments on the individual SAPs, the committee has a lot of issues with this NOP [National Ocean Policy]. If the committee is going to make a general statement, it can be complimentary, but the committee needs to state that it has issues with the policy as it is written.

Continuing, Phil Dyskow said that if the committee is willing to deal with this as is, OK, but if there are general concerns with what is written, than the committee needs to state that.

Cathy Foy gave an overview of the process of developing the draft comments. She reported that the document was broken into each of the 9 sections and individuals were assigned to spearhead the drafting for each section. She noted that this is why the document lacks one ‘voice,’ but said that it was still good work.

Heather McCarty then went over each overarching comment, as outlined in the draft document. Overall, commenters noted that the documents need more specificity, and she anticipates that the specificity will come when the full SAPs are written.

Following Heather McCarty's overview, there was a short discussion that the term 'net benefits' could be further clarified as 'relative to costs' and so language was used to change the title of the comment from 'Net Benefit' to 'Benefit Relative to Cost.'

Under Resources, Larry Simpson noted that he hopes people understand that prioritization is important and that to do all this will require new funding. 'New costs' was underlined to add emphasis.

Under Division of Labor, a comment was made that it is unclear what the division of labor among federal and state agencies and tribes will be and that clarity should be added. Heather McCarty noted the second sentence may be unnecessary.

Larry Simpson noted that it is a subtle point. Most people think that 'responsibility' equates to 'authority,' but that is not necessarily so.

Under Specificity, a comment was made that although these are just outlines and not intended to provide the full specificity that people want, these MAFAC comments provide good guidance.

Under Engagement, Julie Morris suggested taking out the last sentence related to 'top-down.' Cathy Foy said she likes the language, but understands the need to soften it. Keith suggested it seems to be coming from a regulatory approach, vs. a stakeholder approach. The language was changed to reflect the desired change.

There was no initial discussion about Reduce length/specificity and Near-term focus.

Heather McCarty said she wanted to take out bullets in this section to emphasize the topics.

Following this comment, the committee reviewed draft opening paragraphs for this document. Heather McCarty suggested adding 'without negatively impacting the current mission of NOAA.'

Cathy Foy said that Dave Wallace and Paul Clappitt were concerned that the SAPs will become too cumbersome for small stakeholders as the document gets much longer as the Outlines are fleshed out. In her opinion, this raises the question, how do we balance this with the desire for more specificity? Heather McCarty acknowledged this observation, but she said she was not sure how it could NOT be lengthy.

Cathy Foy suggested that maybe we could add something along the line of making sure that there is a way to engage small stakeholders.

Keith Rizzardi asked how the policy is going to differentiate from the status quo? At the end of the day, he said, it has to be a detailed document and the devil will be in the details. He said that maybe it needs to state that stakeholders need to be at the table early on.

Phil Dyskow suggested one change that folks may not agree with. He suggested changing 'difficult' to 'not possible.' He suggested MAFAC cannot endorse them *at this time*.

Cathy Foy asked if committees are supposed to endorse documents. She said she was not sure if it is MAFAC's role as an advisory committee to NOAA to 'endorse' an executive document.

Mark Holliday clarified, saying that it is not possible, from the outlines to endorse them without more detail...

Julie Morris commented that when you are operating at the level of 'goals and principles,' it is possible to get agreement.

Tom Raftican noted that no 'deal breaker' came out of the survey.

Heather McCarty asked Phil Dyskow for clarity, asking if he was saying that he disagreed with the NOP itself?

Phil Dyskow said it lacks specificity and that MAFAC doesn't know what the NOC is going to do, and how it will be funded, etc.

Patty Doerr said that the Committee is saying that it does not agree with some aspects of the SAPs and so it is asking for more detail on specifics, costs, etc.

Keith Rizzardi noted that failure to consider the economic consequences and how we are going to pay for it is a mistake. He also said that it would be worth specifying this in the opening paragraph of the MAFAC comments

Heather McCarty said that she would like to take out the word 'surprising' and add "...who will carry out these plans, and..." Also, add another sentence "Experts in the various fields as well as stakeholders will need to participate in the further development of the SAPs and the implementation of the plan."

MAFAC then discussed each of the comments specific to the nine SAPs.

SAP #1

Heather McCarty asked to add the comment that Vince O'Shea had submitted via email. The committee agreed.

SAP #2

Heather McCarty asked if there were any concerns with SAP #2. Hearing none, the committee moved on to SAP #3.

SAP #3

Julie Morris noted that the SAP was unclear and inconsistent with its use of near-term, mid-term, and long-term and that the milestones did not make sense with the timelines as presented. It was agreed that a general bullet noting this would suffice, and the rest can be shortened (take out specific references per bullet).

Cathy Foy noted that this is an issue for SAP 5 as well, and that maybe this should be a general comment at the beginning. Julie Morris noted that it should emphasize the importance of sequence and standardizing it across the documents.

SAP #5 and #8

Cathy Foy suggests there be appendices that capture relevant documents that provide better background. For Climate and Arctic – why have we gone to ecosystem management? She suggested there needs to be case examples in several of the sections.

There was a comment that language in the written comments captures this in part, but may be better as an appendix. Point was discussed.

Julie Morris thought specific examples of ways things are changing and how we are responding is important and provides clarity in the document (bullet #2).

SAP #7

Heather McCarty asked if there were any concerns with SAP #7. Hearing none, the committee moved on to SAP #8.

SAP #8

Heather McCarty said she liked the second bullet. She said the point on ‘need for adaptive management’ will cover the possibility that new fisheries may emerge in the Arctic. Cathy Foy suggested adding “...and MSA [Magnuson-Stevens Act]” at the end of the sentence.

SAP #9

The committee liked the comments on SAP #9 as they were written.

After reviewing the comments on the nine SAPs, Heather McCarty quickly reviewed the suggested changes.

Heather McCarty reviewed that the committee agreed to take out people’s names next to each of the comments. She said that the first section will be transformed into a narrative, removing the bullet points. She ended, asking if anyone had any closing comments?

Heather McCarty said she assumed that Mark Holliday will make the changes and send the document out to the group.

Tom Raftican put forth a motion to adopt the comments. Cathy Foy seconded the motion.

Heather McCarty said this is a motion to send recommendations to the NOC. The motion passed without objection. Cathy Foy thanked Mark Holliday for helping with the process.

Meeting closed at 4:34 p.m. EST