

FTS DOC CONFERENCING

**Moderator: Mark Holliday
June 21, 2010
2:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in listen-only mode until the question and answer session of today's conference. At that time you may press star 1 if you'd like to ask a question. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. I'd now like to turn the call over to your first speaker, Mark Holliday. Sir, you may begin.

Mark Holliday: Good morning, good afternoon, everybody. This is Mark Holliday from NOAA Fisheries. I'm convening the call today on behalf of the MAFAC Recreational Subcommittee and its Recreational Fisheries Working Group. Pleased that all of you have been able to join us today.

Our objective for the next hour to two is to get your feedback and your comments on the draft Recreational Action Plan that was sent out to the group on the 11th of June.

Our intent is to get comments today over the phone, as well as any other thoughts you might have that you'd like to submit via email so that we can use that information to inform the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee and the

subcommittee that Ken Franke chairs, because that MAFAC meeting is going to be held later this month in Juneau. In fact it starts next Tuesday.

So this is one of the opportunities for the Rec Fish Working Group to inform the subcommittee, the Recreational subcommittee, about your comments and suggestions and ideas relative to the Action Plan, and inform them and MAFAC in order to take action and provide a thorough review and a thorough assessment of the plan, and give that feedback to NOAA and to the department.

So that's our purpose. If you have any questions along the way, the way we've arranged it -- because we have almost, you know, a couple dozen people on the phone -- rather than have everyone speak at once, we'll proceed by giving a brief introduction and after that we'll open up the phone lines and as the operator said, we'll take peoples' comments and suggestions.

And we'll try to have a dialogue in turn as we go through the afternoon. So with that I'd like to turn the floor over to Ken Franke, who's the MAFAC member and chair of its Recreational Subcommittee, for a few opening remarks. And he'll be leading the call, you know, throughout the rest of the afternoon, and we'll be here to help him and make sure that this is a successful event.

As you heard the operator, we are recording the call. We'll be providing a transcript and posting that for you, also as a record for us. And from that we'll be able to summarize the comments that you're making, you know, orally so that we'll make sure that they get to the full MAFAC in time for next week's meeting, and have a permanent record of what our business was conducted this afternoon. So without further ado, Ken, please take it over.

Ken Franke: Thank you, Dr. Holliday. First of all, welcome everybody. And when I make an initial comment -- thank you all hardworking people for taking your time out to come and assist us -- I'm one of you. I have a business and I know your time is very valuable. We really appreciate you taking the time out of your day to try and help move forward with this Recreational Saltwater Fishing Action Agenda.

Dr. Holliday and the rest of his staff worked their rear ends off to help us put together a good forum for the summit back in Washington, and I think the product of this is what we see before us as far as the draft materials. And at this point we're getting where we need to get the material digested and reviewed and ready for MAFAC. And that's where you all come into play.

At this point I'd like to turn it over to Russell Dunn. And he's going to at this point review, go over the draft materials, and then we can move on to your comments, which is why we're here. But thank you all for taking the time to join us.

Russell Dunn: Hi. Thanks for joining us. So I just wanted to touch briefly on the document, essentially how we got to it and sort of where we want to go at this point. And I think almost everyone on the phone call was at the summit, so I won't spend too much time there.

But if you recall, at the summit we developed sort of four over-arching themes which were our visions for success in the future through the pre-summit survey. And then we sat down and developed a series of challenges to be overcome in achieving those successful visions, as well as solutions for those challenges.

And so what we have done in the Action Agenda is to take what we heard at the summit and try and condense it down and capture it in about one step back from the level of detail that was heard in a number of cases there at the summit.

And if you recall, our four vision themes were, to condense them down, improve and open communication and cooperation, increase trust; improve quantity, quality and timeliness of data; fisheries management decisions that were based on a more complete understanding of the recreational fishery and its socioeconomic contribution; and finally ensuring broad access to the greatest possible range of recreational fishing opportunities.

So what we did is take each of those four themes and pull together what we interpreted as the will of the summit, and the comments and suggestions made. So what we would like to do during this call is essentially hear from you all about whether or not you feel we accurately captured what occurred at the summit.

Did we accurately represent it in this document? Are there missing critical pieces that were pieces that you all, as members of the Recreational Working Group or participants in the summit or both, feel should be there? Are there some which should not necessarily be in here that we grabbed the wrong piece, say, from the summit?

And then sort of as we go through them, what are the priorities for you all among the items that you see here -- among the objectives, the goals and objectives? And are there real pros and cons to focusing our effort more heavily on one set of goals and objectives than another?

Obviously there's a lot in this document, and it's not going to be something that's accomplished all in six months or a year. So we need to sort of prioritize and focus our efforts. So with that said, I guess I just want to touch on the document and I'll skip over the information on the first page -- that's just more sort of background -- and jump right into it.

So the first sort of set of goals that we included was one of the vision themes there, and it's improve communication. And without getting into all the minutiae under each one, I just want to touch on the objectives within each goal.

So under improve communication, a key one from our perspective and what we felt we heard at the summit is to have more regular and better communication with the recreational constituency to ensure appropriately balanced stakeholder representation in a whole range of decision making processes.

And obviously the thing that comes to mind there for many people are the councils, but there are a number of other advisory panels and whatnot. The next objective that we identified there was to increase the number of cooperative research opportunities and partnerships with recreational fishermen.

Under the second goal, which was data related -- improve recreational catch effort and status data -- we identified improving the accuracy, precision and timeliness of the catch and effort data through implementation of MRIP; to increase the frequency of stock assessments for important recreational stocks, which can help support management needs.

For the third goal or vision theme of - was improve socio and economic data for recreational fisheries. And under this there were a number which was to - the first objective is to provide economic data suitable for managers to make allocation decisions and evaluate the impact of actions. Next is to improve the understanding of human dimensions in recreational fishing.

Third is to understand the socioeconomic impacts of natural disasters, and the Deep Water Horizon oil spill. Now that one obviously was not a big one at the summit. I think it had just started and no one really understood the magnitude of this spill.

So this was one that was not necessarily identified at the summit, but we felt was important to add in given the enormous and ever-growing disaster which we're undergoing here in the Gulf; as well as finally to review the allocation process and goals, and I know that is certainly a key one for a number of folks.

All right, the final goal was to improve recreational fishing opportunities and essentially, you know, ensure access to the fisheries. So the objectives we identified there were to develop management tools that really can work best for recreational fisheries. Obviously things like full closures to all recreational fishing is not something that really works best for recreational fisheries, for example, in the Gulf of Mexico.

I don't know if anyone followed what was happening with the gag grouper, but the council is looking at a full closure of the recreational fishery for gag grouper. And I guess the question is, are there other management tools which may be as effective but less onerous. The next objective was to identify and evaluate potential management measures that account for recreational values.

And the fifth goal, which was not directly one of the vision themes, but linked to what was the number one concern that was identified by participants at the summit, and solution, which was to incorporate recreational values -- meaning sort of principles -- within the NOAA mission theme.

And so we took that into the institutional orientation goal. And that clearly was a theme at the summit that people feel there is essentially a, or has been a, commercial bias at the Agency. So within institutional orientation goals, it's really to better integrate the recreational values into the NOAA core mission.

And that is really - unless someone has some additional questions, I just wanted to run down what's in the document. Put us all on the same page. Make sure we're all looking at the same thing. And again, sort of touch base to see, you know, do you all feel that we accurately captured the big picture there from the summit.

Are there missing pieces? Are there pieces that are less important that you would prioritize much lower? And as you think about your responses to these sort of themes and objectives, are there pros and cons of addressing ones more rapidly than another? And with that, I will turn it back over to Ken and Mark.

Man: Okay, operator, I think we're ready to enter the question and answer phase. So if you remember, those of you out in the field on the line, if you want to ask a question or provide a comment, it's star 1. And it will form a queue and take the comments and suggestions in the order in which they were put into the lineup. So, operator, do we have any questions in the queue?

Coordinator: Yes, we do have one already. It comes from Bob Zales. Your line is open.

Bob Zales: Hi, Mark, everybody. I just got on here, so I had to call (unintelligible) to find out how to speak on this thing. Was there a roll call so we know who's on this call and who's not? Or are you all just going to send that to us? Because I got on; I had to get off because I had a BP call, and then I'm back on again.

Man: Right, so at the conclusion of the call we automatically get a list of the people who are on the call, and we'll email that out to everybody on the call as a record of who was on.

Bob Zales: Okay, so my next thing is, if it's okay -- because I've got a list of things for this, and since down here in the Gulf we've got a lot of things going on other than fishing at the moment -- if I could, could I just run through everything here now and be done with it? Or how do you want to do this?

Man: Bob, that's fine. We certainly understand and, you know, those of you who are directly - we're all indirectly impacted by the spill, but those directly impacted, we realize that you've got very many things going on. So, Bob, if you want to go through your list, please do so and we'll let you go and get back to your other business.

Bob Zales: Okay. First off, when it comes to priorities, my recommendation -- and I suspect anybody in the Gulf would probably agree with me -- your goal number three, with the objective to understand the socioeconomic impacts of this disaster, that that be moved up past priority. I don't know what you would call it above priority, but something to be immediate.

And the reason is, part of it in here is to work with DOC and NEPs and everybody on here to collect the baseline socioeconomic information to work to ensure appropriate consideration of recreational fishing interest in relief and aid packages. That is a critical component.

The reason is, is because if these charter guys don't get money in their pocket soon, you ain't going to have a charter fishery from Louisiana to Northwest Florida to worry about, probably on down through the Keys. Because one thing that is of extreme concern to us, besides the fact that we don't have any money, is the future. And the future is very unknown.

We're not real happy with the fact that the Fisheries Service, for whatever reason, didn't highly object to the EPA allowing the use of this dispersant that apparently nobody knows, or has a clue, as to what the short- and long-term impact of that dispersant, with that oil mixed in with it, will do to our resources -- to the coral reefs, to the natural bottom, to the artificial reefs and to the adult species of the fish that's in the Gulf of Mexico.

We have sought answers from everybody we can think of, and we're getting none. And apparently nobody knows about this dispersant. So the future of the Gulf of Mexico with the amount of oil here is of critical concern from pretty much everybody that uses this resource and cares about it. So to that, the fact that these guys need money to get them by, that's critical.

And when we're looking at relief packages and aid packages -- while cooperative research is nice and we appreciate that because NACO has now gotten a contract from NOAA to provide vessels to continue to do some research, ferry your scientists out there to sample fish and things like this which will help these guys out -- that's all long term.

They need short-term immediate relief. And so when we're dealing with these relief packages, anything you all can do with your congressional people and the liaison that you all have with them, is to stress extreme importance that all

the peripherals are okay, but these guys have got to have money in their pocket.

Man: Point made.

Bob Zales: Now when we get into the, let's see here, the catch share information where it says work with councils to evaluate pilot recreational catch share programs, e.g., Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Unless somebody can tell me how you intend to allocate a recreational red snapper allocation to a for-hire boat where they've never had any kind of official record to keep track of what they caught, then we would suggest that you don't even consider that.

Primarily because of the fact that if you take 1300 federally permitted reel fish vessels and just equally apply red snapper catch to each one of those, that's not going to work. Because somebody that's been in business - and I'm a newcomer. I've only been doing this 45 years.

There are people been here a lot longer than me. Somebody that's been in it a year that will get the same allocation as somebody that's been in it 60 years is not fair and equitable. So short of trying to figure out how to do that, I don't see any reason to discuss it until you can figure that part out, because that's a critical component.

The issue of council appointments that are pending -- I'm assuming they haven't been made yet.

Man: That's correct.

Bob Zales: Okay. At the summit, we made the strong suggestion to (Erik) and Dr. Lubchenco that from our perspective in the Gulf especially, that a good-faith

effort to show that you really intend to work with us would be to make some serious changes in past performance in the Gulf of Mexico.

There's two critical states. Number one's Mississippi. They haven't had a recreational or for-hire person sit at the table representing Mississippi. I can't even tell you the last time that they had one. I think the last one they had, he stayed there about a year and quit. And that was several years ago.

The state of Texas hasn't had one since DeGraff Adams was put off, was not reappointed, back about six years ago, seven years or so ago now. So those two states are critical in the appointment process that if you really want to look at showing some good faith, that you all make some changes in those council seats. And...

Man: One quick note there. We anticipate that the council appointments will be announced the end of this week, because I think if my recollection is correct, they actually have to be out by Saturday the 26th, and so they're looking at making them later in this week. I don't know what the final answer's going to be, because I don't sit in those meetings with the Secretary. But we should know soon.

Bob Zales: Okay, that'd be good if you all can help with some input there. That would help us out. And on recreational data on MRIP, I've already suggested on things. Unfortunately with the pilot program that we've really been working hard to get out for several years, it was finally coming. It's coming out at probably the worst time that it could ever be.

Probably from my estimation, from Louisiana through Northwest Florida, you probably have now three-quarters of the for-hire fleet that's working for BP. When you work for BP, you pull all your fishing tackle off the vessel. They

don't allow any fishing. You go to work for them, you're available 24 hours a day. And if there's a rod and reel on that boat and they come on and check it, then you lose your contract. So everybody's put all their tackle off the boats.

Those boats that are going to be playing in the panhandle with that pilot program, and Aransas Pass with that pilot program, you'll probably get some good information out of Aransas Pass. But I doubt you're going to get very much good information coming out of the panhandle.

The increase of the current for-hire survey -- we're up to 40% sampling on the effort side -- is a great thing, too. But unfortunately it's only going to work for just a handful of boats that are fishing. I've suggested to them that a way to ease the burden on those of us that are working for BP - because in most cases you're working a minimum of eight hours a day; in some cases, 12 hours a day.

In some cases you're at sea. You don't have any access to the Internet. You don't have any access to a cell phone. You don't have the ability to communicate. I've suggested to Dave Van Voorhees and everybody on down that they get with the people at Gulf States to establish contact with these people that are on the (frame), try to find out who is and who isn't on this program.

I'm sure they'll be glad to tell you when they got on. They'll probably be glad to tell you when they got off, so that they can get back into the (frame) part of the thing for fishing if there is fishing down there again, and do that. That will help these people with a little bit less work to do than what they're doing now.

When you're working for BP, you're spending a lot of time because they want precise records. You're having to keep a daily log. You have to then copy that

daily log to another daily log to send in for your invoicing, so that you hope to get paid at some point in the future. And so the paperwork burden they've got now is tremendous. So by adding more to them, it's just going to put more frustration to them over what we have already.

Man: One quick question. The MRIP pilot program you mentioned, is that the electronic logbook one?

Bob Zales: Yep, yep. And with that electronic logbook thing too, what's going to make that even more difficult to comply with and, you know, I understand the fact that it's going to be mandatory. There are going to be situations, especially as this stuff keeps moving further to us - I mean we've got tar balls on the beach here now. We've got oil about 15 miles off the beach here in Panama City.

And clearly it's going all the way around there from Louisiana here, and it's moving south as we speak. And it's also increasing in magnitude. The big part of the problem with that dispersant -- what you're hearing about and what you see on the surface is a very small amount of the oil that's in the water column.

That water column is just engrossed with oil that we don't know where it is and what it's doing. So, you know, this whole thing is just going to get worse as it goes. And that's another part of the fear that we have. We don't know what the future's going to be in this.

Man: Well thanks, Bob. Those are some pretty dire circumstances that your folks are having to deal with there. Appreciate the insight. Did you have any other comments on the Action Plan that you'd like to get on before you have to get back to business? Or...

Bob Zales: No, I'm going to hang up with the call here. But I just wanted to get some stuff out there pretty quick, because of maybe having to get off. And working with BP, when you see a number with a certain area code and a certain prefix, you drop everything you're doing and answer the phone, because trying to call them back is next to impossible.

Man: Understood. Bob, appreciate the time and the energy that you've given us. It's been great. Thanks, Bob.

Man: Thank you, Bob.

Coordinator: We'll take our next question from Tony DiLernia. Your line is open.

Tony DiLernia: Oh, hi. Yeah, good afternoon, everybody. Thanks, Mark and Russell and everyone for putting this together. I was listening to Bob there, and I feel for him there. I don't know what we would do up here if something like that happened to us here. I think he's a good man, though, to lead that group of fishermen down there in the Gulf to deal with this. So, you know, Godspeed to him.

On your goals here, probably the number five goal really, in a sense, really captures it all. And that is, you know, better integrate recreational values into NOAA and NOAA Fisheries core mission. I mean everything that we're talking about doing here, the entire document, really could be summarized into that one statement.

How do we better have the Agency react and adapt and deal with the recreational fisheries that exist and that will be emerging and will continue to emerge, really, on our coast, as we see our populations age, recreational time increase, people moving more and more to the coast?

I mean some of those things we discussed in our Vision2020 document when I was on MAFAC. And it's important for, you know, the Agency to recognize that. What is it, that 88% of our seafood now comes in from - is imported. Only a - what is it, that's only 12% is produced domestically. Yet there are entire recreational fisheries produced domestically, and we have to recognize that.

The best way, I think, for us to improve our communications would be then to go to - let me get my papers here. I think it was goal number one actually. Once we take Goal 5 and say we recognize that's what we should be doing, and that's really goal number one -- improve communications.

And I've said it before. I said it as a member of MAFAC and I said it at the summit and I'll say it again. You really need, you know, boots on deck. You need boots on the ground. You need news folks out there. I think about back to the days when Jack Casey ran the shark program, how everybody wanted to cooperate with the shark tagging and just understand the shark fishery up here in the Northeast.

I think about the old days when Dick Schaefer ran the recreational shop and, you know, how fishermen could get a hold of Dick Schaefer and talk to him. I think what you need to do is you need to have your regional recreational staffers from the different regions -- you need them out in the field.

You need them to be at council meetings. You need them to be at fishing club meetings. You need them to go to all those winter fishing shows that exist. And you need to have them doing face-to-face discussions with fishermen. Sometimes explaining, sometimes passing out cards saying, you know, if you have a question, call me.

I mean every time a fisherman calls the recreational representative rather than a congressional office, that's a lot less time the Agency has to deal with. Because the minute you get a letter from a congressional office, I know what happens there, and how much time the Agency has to devote in answering that letter.

Well if you could divert some of those letters just directly to the Agency, to a recreational representative, I think the Agency would be doing itself a favor. So you really - it's more of a comment than a question. You really need to have folks out there, one on one.

Fishermen should know who their recreational folks within the regions are, so that they can direct their comments and their questions and their issues to those persons -- not to the (RF) regional director or regional administrator. That's too high up. They're too busy with so many other things. You need that recreational person right there.

And in keeping in with that, one of the things that those regional recreational representatives should be doing is really talking to the press, to the outdoor press -- the writers for the local fishing publications. There should be an open dialogue there all the time.

Very often - well at times, the press gets things wrong. And if there was more resources that the press could go to, to ask for questions, to ask for clarifications, stuff that was wrong wouldn't make it into print. You know, once it makes it into print, it goes viral. And everybody hears it and begins to believe it, when it's really not so.

Or it's been twisted in such a way, not intentionally but very often unintentionally, by the writer, that it does create problems. You know, think back to that one article where it said that the President wanted to ban recreational fishing that came out a couple of months ago. Think of the mess that caused. And that was simply a misinterpretation of what one writer had said.

So, you know, if the Agency wants to improve its relationship with the recreational community, we need folks at the Agency who are fishermen and who do fish, so that they can understand the recreational values. And we need folks from those different regions out on the docks, on the ground, talking with fishermen and making sure fishermen know who they are, so they could call them as well as their council representatives.

I don't know if anybody has any questions for me. If not, I'll get off my soapbox and pass it on to the next person. Mark?

Man: Very helpful, Tony, because we actually were just having a conversation about how to best utilize the recreational liaisons that are in each region, and developing that whole plan. So that's very helpful. Thank you.

Tony DiLernia: Yeah, thank you.

Man: Thank you, Tony. Right-o.

Tony DiLernia: Thanks. I'm here - I sail in about an hour, so you've got me for another hour. I can sit in here and listen. I got to go run a fishing boat.

Coordinator: We'll take our next question from Bill Brown. Your line is open.

Bill Brown: Thank you. Can everyone hear me okay? I hope so. I have some more general comments on the document. First, everything's in it. I think I do remember seeing that at the summit, and it brought things to memory and that sort of thing. But I guess my general problem is it is so general, I don't see any teeth in it.

I mean for example, one of the objectives is to ensure appropriately balanced stakeholder representation. We want to do that, but how are we going to do it? And what in this document, or what in the next action stage will do it?

For example, the North Pacific Council has one sport fishing representative on it, and the rest are commercial fishermen. They make their living as commercial fishermen. It's been like that for a long time, and they've made lots of decisions that have really hurt sport fishermen. Lots of the charter boats are going out of business now. It's not just recession. It's rules they've made on halibut.

And what I hope is that if we're going to have this group, if we're going to have a document like this, that somehow we can be sure there's teeth in it. Just communicating doesn't do it. Where's the next action? And that's frustrating to me, because, you know, we had a good meeting. I met a lot of people. That was the best part about that meeting.

But so many people told me this. We're spinning our wheels. Nothing's going to come of it. And if I think in those terms and then read this document, how do I know we're going to go on with the North Pacific Council's one sport fishing representative? And I'm sure it's like that in other parts around the country.

So that's my only general comment. If we can somehow be assured there are teeth in this document and that we're going to make some changes in allocation, we're going to recognize sport fishing as part of the overall NOAA charge, it's a good thing to do. That's all I had to say.

Russell Dunn: Can, before you click off, this is Russ Dunn again. Can we just take a specific example that you used there? So under that, there were a number of bullets that were sort of the actions that we would begin to take. Can you help define for me what you mean by teeth? Give me, if you would, an example sort of.

Bill Brown: Let's look at the second bullet. Evaluate current advisory panels.

Russell Dunn: Yep.

Bill Brown: What are you going to do once you evaluate them? I just told you we got one sport guy, and I think it's ten commercial guys. So that doesn't take a lot of in-depth study to get those numbers. What's the next step? That's what I'm looking at, and I don't understand the politics or, you know, the appointment process and whatever. But things like that need to be done.

And when you do mention how the problem's in here somewhere. I mean one thing that the North Council did this past year is they said that in my area of the state, people fishing with charters can only catch one halibut. But in other areas of the state, people fishing with charters can catch two halibuts.

The end result of that, or partial result of that, is three lodges in Elfin Cove closed this year, because other lodges nearby can catch two halibut. Well that's a huge impact. And, you know, I don't think all the implications were thought about there. But they would have been had the council had a different make-up, I hope.

Russell Dunn: So you were looking for - just to go back to the document, sort of more detail. And we intentionally did not include every step, because in some cases the steps may be different for different, like for the example you just gave, different panels. There may not be a problem for one. Or if there is a need to rebalance, so to speak, the steps for the council would be different than they would be for, for example, the Highly Migratory Species Advisory Panel.

So we want to simply give an idea of, okay, we're going to examine this. Then when we identify a problem we'll have to make a plan, as opposed to trying to fill the document with - or completely detail it. Because if we had done that for every step, the document would be about...

Bill Brown: I know. I recognize that. I guess I'm just a little frustrated or worried that we have terms like "evaluate", without an action...

Russell Dunn: Okay.

Bill Brown: ...associated with it. I mean we can evaluate it and say, "Well we're going to do something about it next year, once we solve the Gulf crisis." I mean, I'm not saying the Gulf crisis isn't a problem, but you know, that could be ten years down the road.

Russell Dunn: Yeah.

Bill Brown: So anyway, those are my comments. I - generally I like the document. There isn't anything I disagree with it. I just - I hope that we get teeth associated with it. We, at least in the last, we've got some changes I hope we can make very soon.

Russell Dunn: Okay, thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Lee Blankenship). Your line is open.

(Lee Blankenship): Hi, just my questions - or my comment is kind of a follow-up to the discussion we just had. I guess I'd start it off by saying, you know, "I appreciate the opportunity that we - that we're having for input, and appreciate the actions that NOAA NEMS has taken so far in improving marine recreational fishing opportunity.

But the point I wanted to make was, what I'd like to see in the document is kind of a follow-up on the next part of the goals and the objectives, in that there are specific measures of success, so that there are, you know, identifiable, measurable outcomes of - or indicators of success.

And that's kind of adding some teeth, or at least an evaluation of this action plan that's put forth - that they've put forward. So that there's, you know, some way to follow-up to determine success or not. And it gets - it makes it less general and puts more teeth into it, I think.

So that was the main, missing critical piece that I saw in this action plan. And hope that we can get those measurable outcomes identified.

Man: Right.

(Lee Blankenship): That's what I have. I pretty much agreed that it was a good document and liked the priorities as they were listed.

Man: All right, well that makes our first theme. We have a theme now. Specific measurable measures of success; I think that's good, that's helpful.

(Lee Blankenship): That's all I have. Thanks.

Coordinator: Our next question or comment comes from (Bruce Freeman). Your line is open.

(Bruce Freeman): Thank you. Just several comments; one is, it seems to me this document would be somewhat more effective if we had a summary of the (Redfish) Summit. And I know people have been working on that. I guess we all have been called to get clarification.

And according to the document, we should receive that shortly. But I think if we received it before this it would be helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You should have received that. The Summit Final Report was finalized and released on the 3rd of June, I believe. And I thought we sent copies out to everyone. And it was posted up on the Web. So if you did not get one that was a mistake on our part. So I apologize.

(Bruce Freeman): I didn't get one. And it may have been a mistake on my part. But good, I'm glad it's out.

Secondly, the great majority of the issues in the document are very commendable, I think we all support them. But the issue is -- and I think this has been mentioned before -- is how quickly does the agency believe it can implement these?

And this has always been an issue with the Recreational Fishery, going back to almost the formation of the Fishery Service, where commitments had been made on certain things being done. And since the '70s we really haven't seen some of these being carried out.

So the credibility, again, lies with the agency and the implementation. So I think it's going to be extremely important to work out how these items will be accomplished.

The third point is; I know that some of the NEMS Regional Rec Fish Coordinators are full time devoted to just that, but many have other duties and responsibilities. So they only spend part of their time on recreational fishing issues.

And I believe, at very least the agency should make certain that these positions are full time, and the people spend their time on recreational issues. Otherwise I just don't see us accomplishing very much.

And the fourth point is although we spent considerable time at the Summit talking about issues we've been facing and have faced in the past, it appears to me that already there - new issues are raising themselves in importance, and particularly in relation to the oil spill in the Gulf.

And I see a tremendous amount of effort now going into alternative energy such as wind generation as a replacement for petroleum products, at least in the next 10 to 20 years. And I see, if we had the Summit today, one of the issues that I would raise from an ecological standpoint are; one of the - what are the advantages and disadvantages of wind generation in ocean waters?

And I think these issues will have to be faced very quickly. And there may be advantages such that it would encourage wind generation at sea. I'm just - I can see advantages, I can also see disadvantages.

But NEMS has a large cadre of environmental people that probably have a lot of technical information that could be presented -- and I believe should be presented. And that concludes my remarks.

Man: Thank you (Bruce).

Mark Holliday: Thanks (Bruce). Just for everyone's information, I just resent via email, the link to the Summit's Summary Report, for those who haven't had a chance to see it. So you can look for that in your inbox.

Man: Good.

Man: Operator, could we have the next caller in the queue please?

Coordinator: Sure. Our next question comes from (Dick Brain). Your line is open.

(Dick Brain): Good afternoon.

Man: Hi (Dick).

(Dick Brain): Hey. I've just got a couple of comments. I agree with most of the warnings that the (unintelligible) said; it's a good document. But it seems to be light on things to do. It's very heavy on evaluate, and coordinate, and look at things.

But for an example, you know, you say you want to evaluate a pilot recreational catch/share program. Well, you can't do that before you do an

allocation. And you can't do an allocation before you can figure out a way to do it.

So rather than look at doing an allocation, I think NEMS should pledge to do one. NEMS and the Councils, and you've got the data on summer flounder and Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper, if you say, "Here."

So rather than consult or advise, let's go ahead and do one and see what comes out of it in terms of the - the information that comes out, and how we might go about an allocation process.

So it's really - and then they're in other instances in here where we need to have -- I won't belabor it, because it was brought up before -- specific measurable goals to come out of this. And that's it.

Man: So the message is really one of, you know, doing first things first. And I - that's from your example, the takeaway that I'm seeing here. Not all of these things ought to be done simultaneously. And you are identifying some of the core things that need to be done first.

(Dick Brain): Yes. And that things need to be done and not (unintelligible). I think we're passed the stage of figuring out whether or not - or how we're going to do unlisteds (sic) to do them.

Man: Right, the action of actually doing them. Right.

(Dick Brain): Yes.

Man: Got it. All right. Thank you.

Coordinator: Okay. Next question, (Ed Watermore), your line is open.

(Ed Watermore): Yeah hi. First I want to address Bob and you know, give him sympathies from us. I can't imagine what you guys are going through down there. Well, we're thinking about you every day.

So and, let's see. I also wanted to address Tony's comment about face-to-face. (Craig) and I both, as soon as we got back from the Summit, we both wrote articles; (Craig) to the Hawaii Fishing News, and myself to the Lawai'a Magazine -- both widely read by all the fishermen in Hawaii.

And we are making a point to do face-to-face confrontations, and anytime that we can to Council meetings and also to upcoming Fisherman's Forum. And we're passing out information and cards. And just opening up the channels so anyone can contact us any time.

On the other line of communication, I would like to see email info on all of the Recreational Fishing Working Group members. I noticed that there's just the listings that don't include any contact information. So that might be helpful.

I also wanted to agree with the discussions being too generalized. And I think it would help to see more of a region by region specifics to a lot of these issues. I - and I think you know, it'd be easier for us to relate to things also that are being addressed, instead of so generalized is a lot of times hard to wrap your head around what's being said. If it were more specific region to region, I think we could get it, you know, understand it better.

Let's see, well we also in Hawaii have a problem with the - our Council members. And in fact, we've got, I think a seat or two that's being vacated.

And it would be nice to see recreational fisherman being represented in - on the Council a little more than it is. I think that's all I've got to say.

Oh well, I also want to say that the Socioeconomic Impacts, I think should be of high priority. In our state here, the Board of Land and Natural Resources has a - has kind of an out, where they don't have to consider socio and economic impacts.

And we've seen what's being done, because it's really a top down type of decision making, and a lot of it is hurting the fisherman of Hawaii. And I would hope that that could be a whole different scenario as far as the national policy goes.

So anyway, that's about it. And thank you very much for listening.

Man: Thank you (Ed).

Russell Dunn: (Ed), I will be - this is Russ again. I'm in New England next - or this week for the Council meeting. But then I'm going to (unintelligible) out in Honolulu for the Westpac meeting. So I will hope I can see you there and have a chance to talk with you more.

(Ed Watermore): Oh that'd be great, thanks. I'm looking forward to that Russell.

Russell Dunn: Great.

(Ed Watermore): Thank you.

Coordinator: Next question comes from (Polly Fisher). Your line is open.

(Polly Fisher): Hi. There's been two disasters here in the Anacortes area of Washington State; we had an explosion at Tesoro in the latter part of April where ten men were killed; and then last Friday the Shell refinery had a fire at 9:15, and I looked over there and saw that huge cloud. There are disasters occurring other than in the Gulf, is what I'm trying to provide you.

The other thing that is of great interest to us here, particularly in the Sound, are the net pens. And there's an excellent printing in the Seattle Post Globe on the 16th of June, on the fish farms. And it's about - I've got about 17 pages of it here. But it is a real impact on our natural fish -- our Chinook and our Salmon -- because they are non-native and a real difficulty.

And it's all owned by one company; the American Gold Seafoods. And a subsidiary of Icicle, which I believe is Norwegian. I hope I'm correct on that. But we do need a report from each of these regions like this. That's the important thing that I've got.

And by the way, the document's just fine. The socioeconomic should be higher up in the grouping, but that's you guys. You can take care of that.

Any chance that we can do this more often in just this regional report?

Russell Dunn: I - to this point we hadn't thought about, or at least I hadn't I should say...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Russell Dunn: ...breaking it down region by region. But I...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Russell Dunn: ...do think that's a very excellent idea and...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Russell Dunn: ...make it much more effective. The one caveat I have to insert there is that is going to take some significant amount of time...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Russell Dunn: ...to you know, have each - break it down within each region and see how that might be possible. But I think in the end that can help accomplish the other goal of putting more measurable accomplishments in there, if we'd look at it...

(Polly Fisher): Right.

Russell Dunn: ...on a region by region basis.

(Polly Fisher): Things that impact the welfare of the resource.

Russell Dunn: Yeah.

(Polly Fisher): I certainly don't - I am certainly not ruling it out. I think it's something we will look at...

(Polly Fisher): Okay.

Russell Dunn: ...a lot more closely.

(Polly Fisher): Okay.

Russell Dunn: But I don't want to promise a timeframe that's not realistic and... You know, but yes, this is certainly - we can certainly have more conversations like this.

(Polly Fisher): Thank you. Thank you so much. And thanks for all your efforts.

Man: (Polly), one of the things that we asked about in the outgoing email were areas where people might have a particular interest in working on a topic.

So it strikes me as one of the suggestions about regionalizing the report is, rather than waiting Russ or - and Russ' staff, and i.e., Russ, to do this, maybe you know, interested members from different regions might step up and help, you know, collaborate on making it a regional report rather than waiting for Russ to do it and then reacting...

(Polly Fisher): Right.

Man: ...to it. Maybe stepping up, you know, it's something we can think about in the process of, "How do we get there from here?"

(Polly Fisher): Do a bulletin board daily.

Man: We could use technology, absolutely. There's...

(Polly Fisher): Absolutely.

Man: ...lots of different ideas. So perhaps this is something that as a follow-on to this meeting, we can brainstorm and submit some ideas and email about how we could carry this out and what...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Man: ...individual members of the Working Group's interest would be...

(Polly Fisher): Yeah.

Man: ...in helping to further that objective.

(Polly Fisher): Yeah. Thanks again for all your efforts on our behalf.

Man: Thanks for joining us.

Coordinator: Bob Zales, your line is open.

Bob Zales: Yes, thank you again. I've got a couple other things on the AP issue. And I think it's a good thing to try to get input from the various APs.

In the last reauthorization, there were provisions put in there for the Councils to, if they choose, to offer compensation to AP members and SSC members. I understand - in the Caribbean, I understand they are compensating both. In the Gulf, they're only compensating SSC members.

Fishermen, when they give up their time to go to an AP meeting, they either give up their trip, or they have to pay somebody to run their trip. So they lose money when they do this. I'm one of these people.

So it would be nice; not that we're looking for a whole lot. I think in the Caribbean they're paying like \$100 a day. For a good recommendation to come from y'all, MAFAC, whoever in the upper end of the administration to recommend to the Councils subject to gov.

That they take some of their budget money that I'm sure they can find a place for it to try to help these guys out. It would help get better participation, you would probably get a better quality of an AP person on there, and it really would help with the public relations part of this thing.

Another issue is you're looking at the possibility of maybe expanding this Working Group, when you mentioned enlisting people from the Caribbean, which is a good idea.

Early on, we suggested that especially since you're going to this Coastal Marine Special Planning stuff, and the Great Lakes now become a key player in this situation. It used to be that y'all didn't play with the Great Lakes at all, but now you are.

There's a large constituency of recreational boaters and fishermen in the Great Lakes. There's a huge charter fishery in the Great Lakes, when you include all of them. And you probably need to consider somebody from the Great Lakes region so that you can have some good advice from them.

Another issue is in the communications. And I've brought this to the attention because everybody today -- especially in government, and a lot of us that play on computers -- we lose sight of the fact that there's a lot of people out there that don't play on computers.

I don't care what you do with eNewsletters, I don't care what you do with fantastic, beautiful, very nice Websites; people are not going to see them because they're not going to play there. They - some of them don't want to do it. Some of them are not able to do it.

But there's a huge amount of people that don't get communications because you forget them and the old style way of things of sending a newsletter, or sending them a letter, a notice, or something like this. There's a way to capture that.

In NACO we've got 3400 and some odd members, we've got I think somewhere in the neighborhood of about 1900 email addresses. That tells you that there's a whole lot of people out there, if they are playing they don't want you to have their information. But people I've talked to, they're just not going to play on a computer.

And this festival opportunity thing, I found out - I've worked in three places in the past three weeks with this thing. And Apalachicola I will mention, because there's a huge constituency down there, especially on the commercial side. Not so much in recreation but they got some of them there.

A lot of those guys, they don't know how to operate a computer and they don't want to learn. They're past that; they're older people. And so they need to have communications in there too. So you need to think about doing a newsletter and getting some addresses and sending them out there.

And other than that, I was going to tell you, "I hadn't been called about the thing either (Mark), but I got your email just a few minutes ago." So I'm good with that.

Man: Thanks Bob. I appreciate that feedback. I think we do need to be mindful of all the different - the diversity of all the different constituents that are out there. Those that don't even have English as their primary language, that are important stakeholders that we've got to make a better effort to reach out to.

Operator do we have someone else next in the queue please?

Coordinator: Yes, I do have another question. (Michael Kennedy), your line open.

(Michael Kennedy): Thank you. Again I appreciate this. I take the - you know, I wrote my questions earlier and they've kind of been a work in progress. And I think that's exactly kind of what this report is. It's - our agenda here is - it's very broad, it's probably too grand. I think we need to prioritize and set a few deadlines.

It's also very clear we have different regional and national issues. And the best example is what we heard from Dr. Brown regarding the Alaska Council, while we heard from Bob on the Gulf Council.

And we have a whole different issue in the South Atlantic. The South Atlantic we have a split; it's basically one rec, one commercial, and one obligatory plus the administrator to give us the, you know, an odd vote.

So we don't have the same exact issue, but I fully appreciate Dr. Brown's issue. And I - and we fully appreciate Bob Zales' issue that he raised about the gulf management Council -- we need to deal with it. Clearly the oil spill has got to come up to the top.

When it comes to the catch share issue I think we need to encourage the Councils to take a long look at those and to stop processing those. Particularly for example, the Red Snapper Fishery in the Gulf. We don't have the data to do it.

They appear to be charging ahead to do it. And once they do it, it's going to be very difficult to undo it. We need better socioeconomic data. We need to

understand the full economic impact, not only of this oil spill, but of the fishery in general. And that goes back to the culture of NOAA.

I would pick a couple of these things; for example, the Red Snapper Fishery Socioeconomic Study, I would put a deadline on that. And at the same time, ask the Council to hold its fire until they see what the real impact of this decision is to make a decision on catch shares that could impact the charter industry that could impact the recreational fishery without enough data.

It's a fool's mission. I don't know why that's going forward. And this is a prime area that we can make a difference in. Those are my general comments.

Man: All right, thank you.

Coordinator: Okay, I have no further questions on the phone lines.

Russell Dunn: All right, well I just want to make one additional comment. (Mike) did just hit it right on the head, this is a living document, so to speak. So this is the first iteration, and we wanted to make sure that we obtained your input before we got too far down the track.

Now we have some good really useful guidance. And we can come back and as we continue to try and pick off pieces in here and finalize additional plans, we can go back and amend the plan and incorporate the suggestions that we heard here.

But it is - be assured this is a living document, so to speak, that will continue to evolve. So thank you.

Ken Franke: Yeah, Russell, this is Ken Franke. I've got one other comment to make from the subcommittee group, we're as committed as everybody here is to moving forward.

And one of the things that I think there's a common thing among us is, we wanted to make sure that we get good input from you all. As well as our ultimate goal is to get a good strategic plan put together with recommendations dealing with measurable action items and due dates, et cetera.

So I appreciate all of the input everybody's provided. That'll give us something of substance to prepare and move forward in the MAFAC meeting next month.

((Crosstalk))

Mark Holliday: Ken, this is - and everybody, this is Mark Holliday again. There are some things that I'd like to just make sure everybody is aware of. In terms of making the group more effective and how we relate the Working Group to the subcommittee and to MAFAC.

Ken mentioned, you know, the MAFAC meeting that's coming up next week. It's in Juno, Alaska. And although we don't have the resources to pay for Working Group members to travel to Juno to this meeting, Bill Brown, or others who, you know, are in Juno are certainly - it's an open, public meeting. It's being held at the prospector hotel.

But we encourage you to look at the MAFAC agenda and see how - what the agenda looks like, what the rec subcommittee agenda looks like. If you go to the NEMS Home page, on the left hand side there's a button that says

Advisory Committees; you can click on that and that's the - or your entry point to the MAFAC Web site.

It also includes information about the Working Groups. So and I think that's something that you should keep in mind as you try to understand how the Working Group and the subcommittees work together to help MAFAC do its job.

The next MAFAC meeting's going to be October 19-21, here in the Washington D.C. area. So those Rec Fish Working Group members who are in this area, who'd like to attend that meeting, keep an eye on that Web site and you'll see more details as we get closer to the meeting, on the agenda.

And again, what the role of the Working Group will be will largely be - for MAFAC, will largely be a result of what comes out of this June meeting.

With regard to that, we are going to -- as I've mentioned at the start of the call -- develop a summary of the discussion that was here during the conference call. We'll have a verbatim transcript from the conference facility. Both of those will be distributed to the membership of the Working Group, as well as to MAFAC -- all of MAFAC. And we'll post that information on the MAFAC Web site.

Once MAFAC meets next week and takes actions, what normally happens, they make their recommendations and their advice to NOAA and to the department, we'll copy the Rec Fish Working Group on the outcome of that - of those meetings, so that you have a sense of where your comments and how they got used in the MAFAC process, and what they resulted in terms of advice to the department and to NOAA.

And from there I hope that that feedback will provide some fuel for the next meeting of the Working Group.

Again, this is at the - meet at the discretion of Ken and the subcommittee, but I would say, using conference calls, you know, in the intervening time between MAFAC meetings is going to be a regular routine process. And we'll get assignments and tasks from MAFAC or the subcommittee to look at certain policies, look at certain questions and provide input and feedback to the subcommittee.

And that means of doing so and developing that input is going to be a fairly regular process that I hope people will continue to see as an important use of their time, as Ken so rightly put. This is not your day job, this is voluntarily given to the government and to the public to help us do a better job at fisheries, and we appreciate that.

There was an earlier comment about, you know, contacting other members of the Working Group by email, so we will provide the specific contact emails for each member for the group.

But you should know that right now there is a group mailing address that anybody can use to reach every member of the Working Group. It's what I use. And I think it's still - and I think it's working properly. It's MAFAC. - so it's M-A-F-A-C, MAFAC.R-F-W-G, Rec Fish Working Group, @noaa.gov.

So the emails that I'm sending out, that should be the header that it comes out under. And you can send an email to everybody on the workgroup and that'll serve in the interim. As we get individual emails, if you want to send something specifically to Bob, or to Tony DiLernia or something, we'll make

sure we get those direct email, and other contact information so you can have a more effective communication between these conference calls.

With that I'll turn it back to Ken for any closing remarks. If there's no one else in the queue for any questions, operator, we'll have some closing remarks and then wrap things up.

Coordinator: Well we do have a couple questions in the queue.

Mark Holliday: Oh we do, very good. Then I think we should take advantage of them, because we've got plenty of time on the call left.

Coordinator: Got one from (Bruce Freeman). Your line is open.

(Bruce Freeman): Yes thank you. Mark, in the document you talk about groups that are involved, and mention MAFAC and the NOAA Recreational Fishery Coordinators. There's also one called the National Policy Advisor for Rec Fish. And it indicates it's a new position. Could you speak about that a little bit?

Mark Holliday: I think I'll let Russell take...

Russell Dunn: Yeah that's - this is Russ Dunn; that's me. And where this position came from was from Dr. Lubchenco's Recreational Fishing Engagement Initiative, back when she started. Back in October, there was a, I guess I would say, "A public recognition on her part that the relationship between the recreational community and NOAA Fisheries, was (unintelligible) could be or should be.

And she committed to doing a number of things; one of which was the Summit that we drew on for this document; and one of the other -- there were

four or five commitments -- one of which was establishment of the position which you just mentioned, The National Policy Advisor for Recreational Fisheries.

And so I was fortunate enough to be offered that job in, oh when'd I start, I guess, the first week of April, I think I started. And my role is to help ensure that recreational issues are given the appropriate level of attention by NOAA leadership, and to bring (Eric)'s attention back to recreational fisheries when it gets distracted by other issues.

As I'm sure you can appreciate, there are a number of brush fires every day -- you know, oil spill aside -- that often pull his attention away. And part of my job in being a direct report to (Eric), is to make sure that the recreational issues stay on his radar, so to speak, and to help develop a plan for improving this relationship, which this action agenda is - you know, sort of forms the basis of.

I don't know if that answers your question, or?

(Bruce Freeman): Yes, and that's very helpful, thank you.

Russell Dunn: Sure.

Coordinator: Our next question or comment comes from (Craig Severence), your line is open.

(Craig Severence): Yeah, hello everybody. Sorry for waiting in line. I did email detailed comments earlier, so I hope you'll all see them. And I may email a few more. But just a couple of additional things.

I agree with a number of the people that this is a little general; I use the term, "Mom and apple pie." I think there needs to be some clearer prioritization of the new term, hopefully now is the measurable goals. But maybe even put some timelines on some of them.

I also made a comment similar to Bob Zales' comment about key communications not reaching everybody and our need to deal with people who have limited English proficiency. We need to think that out more carefully.

And I support (Ed)'s comment about getting more of a regional perspective. And one of the reasons I do that is that what I haven't heard yet today is who's interested or willing to work on what. And if we're going to start communicating internally as a Working Group, and maybe have informal subgroups looking at certain issues, we kind of need to know who's interested in what, and who has what kinds of expertise.

Just for example, as an anthropologist, I'm interested in looking at the human dimension stuff, and even you know, commenting on research agendas and research priorities for human dimensions research. Not just economic, but you know, the social and cultural values of being able to continue to participate -- hard to measure economically, but still very important.

But I know what we need in our region. I'd like to know who to communicate with to get more information about other regions. So maybe if we've still got time, or maybe this is better handled by email after the fact, people should sort of come forward and express an interest in working in certain sub-areas, if they have the expertise and if they can afford the time.

That's it from (Craig).

Russell Dunn: Okay, thank you. Yeah that is going to be a key component, is people plugging in. And obviously this conversation has been very helpful in and of itself. But as we get to where the rubber meets the road, we will need to engage your expertise and contacts, and - to better enable us to achieve the goals that we set out.

Coordinator: There are no other questions at this time.

Mark Holliday: So in response to (Craig)'s question about, you know, where do people's interests and availability lie, I think it's - I think there are a lot of people who would like to work on particular things, but they're probably not quite clear what the implication is at this point.

I mean one of the takeaways that I heard from the discussion is, "that at the level that the action plan was written, there are sort of few specifics." And I think that was partly intentional to not get into 100 page report.

But we need to strike a balance so that people understand what the outcome is that we're seeking under these different objectives, and what some of the timeframes, what some of the, you know, the critical paths are to get to an outcome that people would be saying, "Hey, I have some expertise," or "I have some time in the area of communications," or "social anthropology" or, you know, "I really have some experience in dealing with this in my region, and I would like to transfer that knowledge to others."

It perhaps may just be difficult for people to relate at that level right now given the general nature of the action plan.

But I would plant the seed in your mind, that perhaps as an organizing principle for the future for the Rec Fish Working Group, that there could be, you know, smaller groups of two or three people who say, you know, "We share a common idea about how to take some very specific action in working with the regional rec fish coordinators of the Fishery Service, working with Russ and other staff." You can come up with a critical mass.

Because I think, you know, part of what we're trying to do is to get the - that intellectual capacity of the people on the phone here -- your experience, your contacts, your knowledge -- and the benefit of that to apply to these different objectives and these different goals.

And rather than just be as advisors, it'd really be nice to have you, kind of shoulder to shoulder with the Fishery Service people in figuring out the specific actions and activities that will lead to, you know, completion of some of these tasks.

So I realize it may be difficult to specify right now on the phone, but I would, again, plant a seed that perhaps that's the direction you may want to go into for the future. And I certainly would encourage you to, you know, think about it.

And if you have some strong feelings either way -- whether it's a good idea or a lousy idea -- to share them others through the email. And let us know, and what you think might be, you know, your preferred way forward, to make sure these are more than just ideas on a list in a public document, but that just sits on a shelf somewhere.

So that's the last, worst outcome that we could hope for. And I want - I would like you to think about how to make sure that doesn't happen here. I think

we're not going to let it happen. But again, the value of having such bright minds working together is that, you know, we have a much greater chance of being successful, working in collaboration.

So that's my soapbox speech. And I'll turn it back to Ken again and see if we have some closing thoughts from him.

Ken Franke: I just - I think I've pretty much said everything that I had to comment on. Thank you again everybody for your valuable input.

Mark Holliday: Okay. Russ, your good?

Russell Dunn: I'm good. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: We do have a late one come in - that came in. Do you want to take it?

((Crosstalk))

Mark Holliday: Sure, we can do that.

Coordinator: It comes from (Ed). Your line is open.

(Ed Watermore): Hey there. This is (Ed Watermore). I just wanted to come back as far as (Craig)'s comments about specifics. And I think both he and I can put together some kind of a Regional Report from Hawaii.

And personally I kind of have the honor of being President of the Wailea Boat Club. And I - through that I get to be involved in a lot of grassroots types of fishing issues. And I'm sure that I can lend a hand in communicating some of these issues to the MAFAC.

So anyway that's - that would be my contribution. Thanks.

Mark Holliday: Thanks (Ed) I appreciate that offer. Operator are we clear on any further commenters or?

Coordinator: Yes we are.

Mark Holliday: Okay. So I think we'll wrap up the call then. And again, on behalf of NOAA and the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee and the staff, Ken, Russ, and everyone else, thanks for your time and effort. And look forward to our next call. Thanks everybody and have a good day.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

END