

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

San Diego, California
Wednesday, April 29, 2015

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 Members:

3 KEITH RIZZARDI, Chair
Assistant Professor
4 St. Thomas University School of Law
Environmental Sustainability LLM Program

5 JULIE MORRIS, Vice Chair
6 Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, New
College of Florida

7 EDWARD (TED) AMES
8 Senior Advisor, Penobscot East Resource

9 TERRI LEE BEIDEMAN
10 CEO, Vast Array Corporation

11 JULIE BONNEY
Executive Director, Alaska Groundfish Data
Bank, Inc.

12 RICHEN (DICK) M. BRAME
13 Atlantic States Fisheries Director
Coastal Conservation Association

14 HEATHER BRANDON
15 Ocean Policy Coordinator

16 COLUMBUS H. BROWN
17 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Retired

18 PAUL CLAMPITT
Owner, F/V Augustine

19 JOHN S. CORBIN
20 President, Aquaculture Planning and
Advocacy

21 DAVID DONALDSON
22 Executive Director, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
Commission (GSMFC)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 PHILLIP J. DYSKOW
Yamaha Marine Group, Retired

3
4 RANDY FISHER
Executive Director, Pacific States Marine
Fisheries Commission(PSMFC)

5
6 KEN FRANKE
President, Sportfishing Association of California

7 MICAH McCARTY
Executive Officer
8 Nisqually Tribal Council

9 MIKE OKONIEWSKI
Pacific Coast Seafood

10
11 ROBERT RHEAULT
Executive Director, East Coast Shellfish Growers
Association

12
13 VA'AMUA HENRY SESEPASARA
Representative, House of Representatives American
14 Samoa Legislature

15 PETER SHELLEY
Conservation Law Foundation

16 PAMELA YOCEM
Senior Research Scientist and Executive
17 Vice President Hubbs Sea World Research
Institute

18
19 NOAA Fisheries Participants:

20 NORA BERWICK
Senior Natural Resource Specialist, Office
of Protected Resources, West Coast

21
22 THERESE CONANT
Recovery Coordinator, Office of Protected Species

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 PAUL DOREMUS
3 Deputy Assistant Administrator for
4 Operations

4 RUSS DUNN
5 Senior Advisor on Recreational Fisheries

6 CRAIG HEBERER
7 Regional Recreational Coordinator, West
8 Coast

9 HEIDI LOVETT
10 Policy Analyst
11 Office of Policy

12 JENNIFER LUKENS
13 Director, Office of Policy

14 RICHARD MERRICK
15 Director and Chief Science Advisor for NOAA
16 Fisheries

17 WES PATRICK
18 Acting Branch Chief, Fisheries Policy,
19 Office of Sustainable Fisheries

20 HEATHER SAGAR
21 Senior Policy Analyst, Office of Policy

22 EILEEN SOBECK
Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

KRISTINA TROTTA
Program Analyst, Office of Policy

ROBERT TURNER
Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable
Fisheries Division, West Coast Region

CISCO WERNER
Director, Southwest Fisheries Science
Center

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 Other Participants:

3 SVEIN FOUGNER
4 Hawaii Longline Association

5 DON HANSEN
6 Pacific Fishery Management Council

7 DON KENT
8 Director
9 Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute

10 JUAN CARLOS PERDOMO
11 Compesca-Sport/Recreational Fishing, Mexico

12 JAMES SLAPE
13 Nisqually Tribe

14 LOUIE ZIMM
15 Pacific Fishery Management Council, Groundfish
16 Advisory Panel

17

18 * * * * *

19

20

21

22

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

A G E N D A

ITEM:	PAGE
Report from the Assistant Administrator	6
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">EILEEN SOBECK, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries</p>	
Recreational Fishing Topics	61
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">RUSS DUNN, Senior Advisor on Recreational Fisheries</p>	
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">CRAIG HEBERER, Recreational Fisheries Coordinator, West Coast</p>	
MRIP and Transitioning to a New Survey	114
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">RICHARD MERRICK, Director, Scientific Programs and Chief Science Advisor</p>	
National Standards - Proposed Revisions to NS1, 3 and 7	142
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">DR. WESLEY PATRICK, Acting Branch Chief, Fisheries Policy, Office of Sustainable Fisheries</p>	
Climate Change - California/West Coast focus	205
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">CISCO WERNER, Director, Southwest Fisheries Science Center</p>	

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

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

2 (8:35 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: This morning we've
4 got Eileen Sobeck with us, and she's going to be
5 providing us the report from the Assistant
6 Administrator on the state of NOAA Fisheries. I
7 know there was a really healthy budget discussion
8 yesterday, and I look forward to doubling back
9 with Paul when I find him, catching on some of
10 that. But Eileen, thank you, for joining us.

11 MS. SOBECK: Mm-hmm. Are you ready for
12 me?

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely. You are
14 first on the agenda.

15 MS. SOBECK: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: You are number one.

17 MS. SOBECK: Craig, thank you. Thanks
18 everybody. Good to see everyone here. I saw a
19 few of you last night when we came in, and took to
20 -- see both, and to say, thank you to Keith. I'm
21 glad that Richard and Paul will be here for the
22 whole meeting. I will be here for the entire

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 meeting today, and then I'm going to continue up,
2 and visit with some of my laboratories and
3 facilities and regional folks up in the Pacific
4 Northwest, starting tomorrow.

5 It's good to see Dave and Randy. It's
6 good to see our colleague from Mexico, thank you
7 for joining us. Really, I'm happy to have as many
8 people as possible to participate in the meetings
9 and have good input, and hear input from Advisory
10 Committee. So, I want to welcome our four new
11 members. Could you guys raise your hands so I can
12 make sure? Great. Great. Good to see you guys,
13 all. Really good to have new blood and to have
14 the transition that's gradual, and there are seven
15 members who are acquainted, and then I guess the
16 rest of you are still -- aren't in the rotation
17 yet; but thank you to you all.

18 It's a very full agenda, it sounds like
19 you had a good discussion yesterday, and I really
20 don't have to tell you guys, and I did hear it
21 from a few people yesterday evening, that this is
22 not a typical Federal Advisory Commission, I don't

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 think, or Committee. You guys, I think, provided
2 us more substance, input, and I think that the
3 dialogue we have between this Committee and the
4 Agency to try to identify some areas where your
5 input could really make a difference to us, is a
6 very fruitful -- from the Agency's point of view
7 it's very fruitful.

8 There are a lot of other Advisory
9 Committees that have a lot of interesting
10 discussions, and as an Agency representative I
11 participated in a lot of those. And those
12 discussions are helpful, and they are informative,
13 but because they are so casual their influence is
14 pretty fleeting, and so I think that when you all
15 put together more substantive reports, or comment
16 on specific Agency documents, you have actually a
17 much more -- much more of an impact than a typical
18 committee.

19 So, it's up to you to decide what -- how
20 you want to operate, but that's just my input to
21 you, after working with various committees from --
22 you know, serving three different agencies,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 working with several different committees over the
2 years. So I really want to compliment you on the
3 way that you do, do your work, and the way that
4 you do organize yourselves efficiently.

5 I think that's important. These
6 committees are -- you know, these committees are
7 not cheap, they are not cheap for the Agency to
8 fund your travel. They are not cheap for you all,
9 because it takes a substantial amount of your
10 actual personal and professional time, to
11 participate in these committees, we definitely --
12 I definitely recognize that. I don't think that
13 you should be making these kinds of time
14 commitments if you don't really -- aren't getting
15 something out of it, and if we aren't getting
16 something out of it. So, I really want to commend
17 you and your service on that.

18 And speaking of that, I do know that you
19 have staffed up two new task forces, on climate
20 marine resources, and aquaculture, and it looks
21 like you have some really qualified folks sitting
22 on those, those are clearly areas that we as an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Agency are going to be spending a lot of times in
2 the next couple of years, thinking about what
3 direction to go, and how and where, and what kind
4 of resources to commit, so again, I think this is
5 a great example of your timely input, is going to
6 make a difference.

7 So what I wanted to do was just touch on
8 a couple of topics, and then I'm happy to take
9 questions if we have time on the agenda. But a
10 couple of topics that aren't -- a couple of them
11 really aren't on your agenda in any other place,
12 but they are important policy initiatives or
13 commitments at the NOAA, NOAA-Fisheries level, and
14 I just wanted to let you know sort of what's
15 happening and where we stand so that you are aware
16 of that, and so that it can kind of -- you can
17 have it in the back of your mind as you consider
18 your work, and you consider what topics you all
19 want to take on, in what form over the next year
20 or two.

21 So the first has to do with -- I think
22 something, like I briefed you on at one point

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 which was the presidential task force on combating
2 IUU fishing and seafood abroad, and that taskforce
3 is co-chaired by -- was co- chaired Kathy Sullivan
4 from NOAA, and the State Department, Cathy Novelli
5 at the State Department, we had quite a bit of --
6 we had webinars, we had a couple of public
7 hearings, we had comments admitted through the
8 Federal Registry Notice. We sought input from
9 foreign countries through the State Department's
10 process. We tried to be as inclusive as we could.

11 Given the charge that the taskforce got
12 from the White House, the taskforce came out with
13 15 recommendations in December, they went through
14 another public comment process to get public
15 comment on how to implement those recommendations,
16 and then in February at the Boston Seafood Show,
17 we came up with the implementation plan for the
18 taskforce's recommendations.

19 And this document is online. I have to
20 say I think it's actually set up really nicely,
21 which is, each recommendation is set up in the
22 document, just a short articulation of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 recommendation, a short explanation of the
2 recommendation, and then some very concrete
3 implementation milestones with dates, and many of
4 these dates are very aggressive.

5 This is a Presidential Taskforce, these
6 dates are all within this Administration. Now we
7 are not going to do everything that we want to do
8 to combat IUU fishing and seafood fraud, in the
9 next 18 months, but this Administration is pushing
10 us really hard, to do what we can while this
11 Administration is still here.

12 So, I want to talk about a little bit of
13 -- I mean this report is online on the NOAA
14 Fisheries website. If you are interested, I
15 really commend this to your attention, because Dr.
16 Sullivan chaired this Committee, she is taking a
17 real personal interest in this. The White House
18 is taking an interest, the folks at the White
19 House asked Dr. Sullivan every time they see her,
20 how she is doing on implementation, and you know,
21 tell her that they really don't want any deadlines
22 to slip.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, we are under a fair amount of
2 pressure here, which is good. I think that we
3 really want to do what we can in a responsible
4 way. So you'll be hearing and seeing about
5 various milestones in this document, if you want
6 to see how it fits into the larger plan, I really
7 recommend this to you.

8 Two of the recommendation have kind of
9 been -- merged isn't quite the right way -- but
10 they've really been merged together and its
11 recommendations 14 and 15, which have to do with
12 traceability. Now, traceability and certification
13 are not identical, but MAFAC spent a long time
14 looking at certification and various options and
15 made, you know, very significant report to us, and
16 we -- and it was very timely.

17 That report was still up for public
18 comment when the President charged IUU Taskforce
19 to start looking into its recommendations, so we
20 make sure at every taskforce meeting that the
21 larger taskforce members that, you know, many,
22 many other Federal Agencies were involved. We

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 were getting lots of recommendations from NGOs,
2 from industry about where we should land as a
3 taskforce on the traceability question.

4 We made sure that you're report was out
5 there, and was considered by the leadership, and
6 we made it very clear that we had had a lot of
7 thoughtful input from this group, and that we were
8 not starting from ground zero, in terms of where
9 we -- our thinking. The reason that I really
10 recommend that you guys take a look at this report
11 and the implementation plan, is that a lot of the
12 reports in the press have been not quite accurate.

13 The traceability recommendation in this
14 report has been characterized as baked to plate,
15 that's actually not the case. The recommendations
16 and the sort of obligations that the taskforce
17 took on, and the administration took on, is a
18 traceability to the point of entry into U.S.
19 commerce. So for foreign -- for foreign fisheries
20 products that's for -- at the point of
21 importation, for U.S. Fishery products at the
22 point of landing.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Obviously we are interested in seafood
2 fraud no matter where it takes place in chain of
3 commerce and we are looking some of our
4 enforcement options and gaps, about how better to
5 deal with fraud throughout the chain. But we are
6 not talking about a certification program that
7 would allow public access at every step in the
8 supply chain all the way to the supermarket or the
9 restaurant table, that would be publicly
10 available. I think it's kind -- we still think
11 that this is an important step, we just did not
12 feel that it was within our ability to
13 overpromise, and to say that we were going to do
14 something, but we actually don't have the current
15 authority to do. In various versions of the
16 Magnuson Act that have been floated in the last
17 couple of years, some of them have contained some
18 pretty significant certification or traceability
19 provisions, and that go farther than the
20 recommendations that are in this task force.

21 We are pretty clear in saying that we
22 didn't think that we had current authority to do,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you know, a totally big, comprehensive
2 traceability certification program. You know from
3 the discussions we've have in your process what
4 some of the issues in terms of both resources and
5 authorization were. So it's going to be an
6 interesting process, there are a few steps that
7 coming up this summer and fall about, we are
8 trying to figure out what kind of information in
9 terms of -- you know, what kind of data would we
10 request from importers.

11 What kind of information do we already
12 gather from our own domestic fishermen, we are
13 trying very hard, we know that we collect a lot of
14 information, and that the states collect a lot of
15 information. We are trying to not impost new
16 obligations on domestic fishermen if we already
17 collect the information.

18 We are trying -- it's not all collective
19 in the same way, in the same format, by the same
20 people, but we are trying to pull together all of
21 our data streams to minimize or preclude having to
22 ask for new information, and then figure out what

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 information in terms of where the fish was caught,
2 species identification we would want to ask from
3 -- with regard to imported fish.

4 There will be a couple of significant
5 opportunities for public comment over the next few
6 months, so I really urge you guys to take a look
7 in your -- you know, as Committee, but in your
8 individual capacity and get the word out to your
9 various communities if you were interested,
10 because this is -- you know, this is something
11 that's moving very quickly.

12 We don't really have -- we are not going
13 to have the ability to stretch out the comment
14 periods. We are going to be making some pretty
15 significant decisions in a pretty short frame, and
16 we are dictated by the dates -- these dates were
17 approved by the White House and they are going to
18 hold us to it. So you can just, right now, just
19 rip up and throw away that request for extension
20 of comment period, because it's not going to
21 happen.

22 SPEAKER: What are the dates?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. SOBECK: I'd have to get back to you
2 about the specifics. If you look at -- again,
3 it's recommendation 14 and 15 at the end here, and
4 there are some pretty significant dates coming up.
5 Yeah, by June 2015, our Committee will put out a
6 proposal for the minimum types of information for
7 a 30-day public comment period, and by September
8 2015, we'll finalize recommendations. So, again,
9 in the next, you know, couple months we'll have a
10 proposal out, there will be a fairly short comment
11 period, we'll have the final recommendations out
12 by the fall. That's step number one.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Can we interject?

14 MS. SOBECK: Of course.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So, I was actually
16 looking online at the report and first, I want to
17 say not only -- I'm thrilled by this, because I
18 think it's an opportunity for NOAA Fisheries to
19 raise its profile, we'll attract champions on The
20 Hill through this effort, we are protecting U.S.
21 commerce, we are engaging in law enforcement role,
22 or engaged in environmental protection

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sustainability.

2 But this last piece on traceability, I
3 want to point out for all the members, overlaps
4 tremendously with the effort that we undertook,
5 and the recommendations that we made to generate
6 some form of traceability program, because if we
7 had a way to enable the U.S. Fishery products to
8 brand themselves as Magnuson compliant, they would
9 be able to have an easier time entering into the
10 market.

11 So, we generated a pretty substantial
12 report, we submitted that, I know that NOAA has
13 put it out for comments and looking at the
14 deadlines, there is a hard deadline on this where
15 the next piece of this is done by September.

16 MS. SOBECK: Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Which means that we
18 do not have the luxury of waiting until our next
19 meeting, but I would like to encourage the members
20 to think about how can we directly get involved in
21 that process, and I, certainly, for one, am
22 willing to take a role in that process. But

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there's definitely an opportunity for our
2 Committee to, again, be a voice on this issue.
3 We've done it once, and I think we really should
4 do it again.

5 MS. SOBECK: So the other piece of this,
6 and in addition to what kind of information is
7 going to be required, you know, what are the
8 criteria that we really want to -- that we need to
9 know to have a decent traceability program.
10 There's also -- we are not going to do it for all
11 species all at once, this was a big -- there was a
12 lot of internal debate on the IUU taskforce about
13 this, and we -- you know, a lot of the
14 implementation burden on this comes you know, we
15 are down to NOAA Fisheries.

16 Talk is cheap, it's easy to have big
17 ideas when you are looking through the lens of,
18 oh, my, god, how are we going to do all this, it's
19 kind of a different story we -- the goal is to
20 collect -- the longer-term goal is to have --
21 whatever we agreed that this is the information
22 that we need to have at the point of entry of the

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 U.S. Commerce is, the goal is to have that
2 requirement for all fish products, we are going to
3 start on risk basis.

4 We are going to start by identifying
5 some at-risk species where we think that there's
6 the greatest need to gather this information, and
7 one of the very earlier steps is identifying those
8 at-risk species. We do think that we actually
9 probably already -- you know, we don't run a
10 completely arbitrary program over here at NOAA
11 Fisheries, in fact we actually think that we have,
12 you know, some fisheries are going to by RFMOs.

13 You know, we already have some, we
14 already have identified at-risk species and are
15 probably already gathering the information that we
16 need for some of the species, but the idea is to
17 not start with everything, to identify an at-risk
18 -- a risk-based list and then move on from there.

19 So this first phase we are going to be
20 taking input from whoever wants to give on the
21 at-risk species that we should be looking at
22 first. So, we can continue to give you updates on

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 where this goes, but just, you know, the train is
2 pulling out of the station and it's moving fast,
3 NOAA has primary responsibility for a number of
4 these recommendations, but other agencies have
5 responsibility -- you know, State Department, for
6 getting certain treaties implemented through
7 Congress, or leading -- there's some joint
8 responsibilities for taking recommendations and
9 trying to get them implemented with respect to
10 enforcement and other practices that are FMOs.

11 So, we have -- you know, there's a whole
12 laundry list. We have had a lot of good partners,
13 I do think that one of the real benefits of this
14 task force, and then again, I've been on a lot of
15 inner Agency taskforces, and sometimes, you know,
16 sometimes they are very disorganized, sometimes
17 people are dragging their feet, sometimes people
18 just offer up things they are already doing.

19 This is the taskforce that really was
20 leaning in, in a big way, the good thing I think
21 was that agencies are really important to us, like
22 Homeland Security, CPB, the Justice Department,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 FDA, they were very active. They really stepped
2 up, we really learned a lot. We do at the staff
3 level, have good relationships with FDA
4 inspections, and the same with Homeland Security.

5 Homeland Security has a lot of issues on
6 its plate. Fisheries is not necessarily at the
7 top of that list, but I think that it moved up a
8 notch or two. I think that we have a point in
9 time here where we can make some progress, we can
10 ask them to help us, we can do some targeting work
11 with them. It's getting high-level attention.

12 The same with FDA, we had a very -- you
13 know, a very productive set of discussions with
14 the FDA, where I think we each understand our
15 authorities better, and there were some, kind of,
16 shocking misconceptions among us about how they
17 ran their programs and how they traced other food
18 products, and other people, what they thought our
19 statutory authority was or wasn't.

20 So I think there actually has been, you
21 know, beyond these kind of goals, a much -- you
22 know, a very good working partnership at a higher

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 level than usual established, and so we need to
2 take advantage of that. And so, again, the fact
3 that we were prepared and had some thoughts, and
4 had this thoughtful report and discussion with you
5 all, got us ready to deal with the traceability
6 issues, and there is this other plethora of issues
7 that we were able to work on as well.

8 I will say that one of the other gaps
9 that identified in this report, is that if you
10 look at Fisheries enforcement mechanisms, they've
11 really been -- in the Magnuson Act, they are
12 really based on how we want to enforce domestic
13 fishing, you know, dockside enforcement on vessel
14 enforcement. And really not kind of -- they
15 weren't really written to deal with, how do you
16 look at the chain of commerce, how do you go -- we
17 don't have the ability to go inspect processing
18 plants, or to look at product once it's imported
19 product once it's left the border, so if we are
20 really going to focus on seafood prod, looking at
21 commerce at -- you know, we are not going to catch
22 every bad batch of seafood at the border, but once

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it leaves the border and enters into commerce, we
2 have very limited tools, so recommendation 12
3 focuses on the kinds of -- notes the fact that
4 there is an authority gap for enforcement. Not
5 kind of a huge wish list of enforcement to
6 criminalize everything under the Magnuson Act, but
7 some very specific tools that we would need for
8 effective IUU enforcement.

9 So, when we rolled this out in Boston,
10 one of our industry colleague said, you guys
11 already have the nuclear option with the Lacey
12 Act, why do we need more enforcement authority
13 and, you know, my response to that is, sometimes
14 you need something between a peashooter and an
15 atomic bomb, and we don't always want to use the
16 nuclear option. We don't always to go criminal
17 under the Lacey Act, sometimes you just want the
18 ability to really inspect and be able to gather
19 evidence, and then decide what your appropriate
20 enforcement tool is.

21 So, here is a lot, I don't want to just
22 talk about traceability, there are other elements

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of this report. So it's important, I commend you
2 guys too, I think that this will be kind of a --
3 you know, Fisheries are so importantly regionally,
4 it's so important to our economy, but it doesn't
5 often rise to, you know, the level of --
6 presidential-level initiative and this has, this
7 is the piece of fisheries, it might not be the
8 most important piece of fisheries in your
9 particular world, but this is the part of
10 fisheries in this administration that's getting
11 way past attention and lower level attention, so I
12 think it's worth thinking about. So, touching on
13 Magnuson Act, we have to -- Oh, yeah?

14 MR. BROWN: Has there been any
15 collaboration with the official monitors, with
16 your Port Inspection Program, because (a) a lot of
17 goods that come in, have to go through that
18 process?

19 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. There's been a
20 little bit. It's interesting, there's been much
21 more cooperation with them on the Wild Life
22 Trafficking Initiative, and we really have focused

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 on them with ports. They were actually not very
2 -- they were a member but not a very active member
3 in this, but I think as we move forward with the
4 specifics of enforcement at the ports that we will
5 talk to them about their inspectors.

6 We don't have as many -- they have
7 restrictions about specific ports that Wild Life
8 can come into that we don't have for fisheries, so
9 they only have to cover up -- they could cover a
10 more limited number of ports, but, yeah.

11 MR. BROWN: But there products that go
12 through (inaudible)?

13 MS. SOBECK: Right. Exactly. Exactly.
14 But that's a great point. So, Magnuson Act,
15 there's the Young Bill, which is essentially the
16 same as the -- I'm blanking out -- that Bill last
17 year, the --

18 SPEAKER: Hastings?

19 MS. SOBECK: -- the Hastings Bill last
20 year, very, very similar, it's been marked up
21 tomorrow, so we'll be looking at that, we'll be
22 looking to see how much -- how Red Snapper

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Amendments there are or aren't, and then I guess
2 -- then we move into the world of, everybody has
3 their own crystal and can try to make a prediction
4 of where that's going to go. You know, Senator
5 Begich was sort of the champion of Magnuson
6 reauthorization last year, and he's no longer
7 there, so it's not quite clear who is leading the
8 charge in the Senate.

9 We've had some discussions about this
10 last night, I think everybody can bet their
11 quarter on what is or isn't going to happen. I
12 don't think -- I think we at NOAA Fisheries, you
13 know, want to be prepared and have been thoughtful
14 about what we think about both the Handbill and
15 where we will ultimately like to land in the
16 Magnuson Act. I think we've told you guys a
17 number of times that we are pretty pleased with
18 Act the way it is now.

19 We think it's working well, we that it's
20 made a huge -- the last set of amendments were
21 extremely significant, we've made a big
22 difference, we've made a huge amount of progress,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we are still implementing those, we don't see the
2 need for major changes. One thing that we have
3 said over the last few months and years, 18
4 months, is that some advocates of significant --
5 more significant amendments to the Magnuson Act,
6 we thought that those were necessary because they
7 didn't think there was adequate flexibility in the
8 Act, and there was, I think that we -- No,
9 Fisheries thought that some of those issues could
10 be addressed through regulatory mechanisms rather
11 than through statutory changes. In the last few
12 months, I don't know when it came out, maybe --
13 when did National Standard 1 draft go out?

14 SPEAKER: January.

15 MS. SOBECK: January? It's long, it's
16 complicated, but it's our -- it's only in draft,
17 it's out for a extensive comment period through
18 the end of June. We thought it was important for
19 us to be able to put out on the table areas where
20 we thought we could make some changes, propose
21 some changes based on the changes to the national
22 standards, rather than to the statute itself.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I think we are very open to discussion
2 about, you know, it is a true draft proposal, that
3 why we had such a lengthy comment period, going to
4 all of the Councils, having numerous opportunities
5 for public comment. But we really wanted to have
6 out there, a Draft National Standard, during the
7 regulatory -- during the statutory debate, so
8 we'll see how that -- so we've done that, and we
9 can see whether or not that influences where we go
10 on MSA.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And there's going to
12 be a presentation on that, I think, at 11:00
13 today.

14 MS. SOBECK: On the procedures?

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: On the National
16 Standards. Yeah.

17 MS. SOBECK: Yes. Thank you.

18 Aquaculture, I'm very excited that you guys have
19 an Aquaculture Taskforce, I think that's very -- I
20 think that's very timely, that's another area that
21 Dr. Sullivan, our new Administrator, is interested
22 in, and she was making a keynote address at the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 SeaWeb Conference in New Orleans a couple of
2 months ago, and mainly she wanted to talk about
3 the IUU Initiative, but she sat through the Panel
4 on Aquaculture.

5 And we had a small lunch with
6 representatives from the aquaculture industry. I
7 think that she is really interested in ways that
8 we can help move aquaculture forward in a
9 responsible way. So I think that that, you know,
10 she is looking to find a few -- a very small
11 number of areas where here personal attention, or
12 her request to either the Secretary of Commerce,
13 or others in the administration can make a bit of
14 a difference, and I think that she sees
15 aquaculture as one of those potential areas.

16 Not necessarily that, you know, it's
17 going to become, that we are going to have a
18 bigger increase in our funding of aquaculture, but
19 trying to raise its profile and be a little bit
20 more thoughtful about how and in what way we can
21 contribute to aquaculture. She's very taken with
22 her New England statistic that, in terms of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 fisheries revenues landing values, that number 1
2 and 2, fisheries in New England, and not just
3 federal fisheries, but state fisheries, lobster
4 and scallops, number 3, aquaculture products.

5 New England ground fish, number 8 coming
6 in at half of the value of aquaculture products;
7 you know, that says something. So, this is a bit
8 -- You guys spending time on this is very timely,
9 you know, coastal shellfish aquaculture, we know
10 that there are some issues in permitting through
11 the core. We are trying to give those some
12 attention. Again, we haven't taken those to Dr.
13 Sullivan yet but, again, it's another possible
14 route to try to help move us out of stalemate if
15 that happens.

16 She's interested in the permitting
17 issues. She's interested in the Gulf --
18 aquaculture regulations throughout the summer, so
19 I think it's actually going to be quite an
20 interesting year for aquaculture. Yes?

21 MR. CORBIN: Has there been any
22 discussions in NOAA to actually put a definition

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of aquaculture in the MSA, since it's being used
2 as the legal basis for developing aquaculture in
3 Federal Waters?

4 MS. SOBECK: I don't know. I'll have to
5 ask. We'll have to see who our experts are on
6 that.

7 MR. CORBIN: I believe MAFAC recommended
8 some discussions on that.

9 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. It is not clear to
10 me that that is -- that we've decided that that's
11 a good idea or not. I'll have to get back to you
12 on that.

13 MR. CORBIN: Thank you.

14 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. Thanks for raising
15 that. I think Russ is going to make a
16 presentation to you on where we are on Salt Water
17 Recreational Fisheries, you know, this is
18 something that I kind of stepped into the minute I
19 got this job, and it's really been my privilege to
20 follow up on it. I don't take any credit for
21 starting it. I think NOAA have already -- No,
22 Fisheries had already recognized that, you know,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we some problems and that we weren't necessarily
2 as open to and weren't very good at listening to
3 the concerns of salt water, recreational sector,
4 and so we tried to turn that around with our
5 Recreational Summit, a year-pus ago, and then
6 coming out with the Salt Water Fishing Policy in
7 less than a year. A pretty short -- you know, I
8 call it the Declaration of Independence with the
9 Gettysburg Address, pretty short, but you know.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'd like to tell
11 people that.

12 MS. SOBECK: Well, you know, there were
13 some people that were thinking that it was too
14 brief. But you know, I think a policy statement
15 is a policy statement, it's not a to-do list
16 necessarily. The real governing principle in my
17 mind, and I think where we really tried hard to
18 change culturally, is not that we are always going
19 to side with rec fishing interest. I think that's
20 already a given, and that there's no doubt in my
21 mind that those of you at this table who come from
22 that part of the world, already have a laundry

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 list, that even though we've come out with a
2 policy, that we've probably done a few things that
3 you weren't happy about.

4 And I know there a bunch of people in
5 the Gulf who think that, but my pledge was the
6 interest of rec fishermen, the contribution of rec
7 fishermen, the importance of rec fishing goals,
8 both in terms of conservation of the resource, and
9 to the economics of the State Munitions are
10 extremely important, and are ensuring in the
11 Magnuson Act, and that we need to take them into
12 account at every step of the way.

13 At the end of the day, we at NOAA
14 Fisheries are going to make decisions based on,
15 you know, a multitude of our legal obligations and
16 responsibilities based on science, and what our
17 legal responsibilities are. Our responsibility is
18 not to the result, but it is to the process, and
19 this is really. The policy is really meant to
20 change the process, and open up the process and to
21 make sure that we are listening to the full range
22 of stakeholders and partners.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And I know that we are going to have
2 many failures, but I think that I've tried to push
3 the message out through Russ Dunn and his team,
4 and I really wanted to, not just be -- as I said
5 to -- we do have rec fishing positions in most of
6 our regions, and they asked me at one point when
7 they were meeting together whether we were going
8 to increase, double, triple, quadruple, now that
9 rec fishing is so important as a policy matter.

10 And my answer was, no. That ideally
11 it's to get rid of those positions, because they
12 won't be necessary, because there shouldn't be --
13 that shouldn't be -- you know, we don't have a rec
14 fishing person in the commercial fishing, we
15 should have a NOAA Fisheries that serve us at all
16 levels, that thinks about all of those interests.
17 We shouldn't have to have individual champions.

18 We did follow within 60 days of coming
19 out with the policy itself, and another
20 implementation plan, which we tried to -- which is
21 a bit more of I think -- much more of a to-do
22 list, specific actions that we plan to take on a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 national basis over the next three years, 2015
2 through 2018, and next -- Is it next year, in a
3 year that we come out? And the next step is in a
4 year to come out with regional implementation
5 plans that are going to step down one level from
6 this.

7 So I think we've actually -- Again, I
8 think we've accomplished a lot, I hope. I think
9 that we've had more of an open door to specific
10 interest. I think that we committed at the policy
11 level, we committed at the implementation level,
12 we are going to be moving back down to the
13 regional level. But again, this is turning, it's
14 a work in progress and Russ can give you a more
15 detailed update soon.

16 MR. DUNN: I think you've pretty much
17 covered it. I'm done.

18 MS. SOBECK: Oh. Sorry about that Russ.
19 Did you guys already get the priorities for these
20 initiatives rundown yesterday? Yeah, so this is
21 something we are giving a little preview. You
22 know, we've been getting a lot of -- we are an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Agency that has sort tow main missions, one is
2 promoting sustainable fishing and fisheries, and
3 one is conserving and recovering protected
4 resources, and on the protected resources side,
5 the Agency speaks (inaudible) and the MMPA are
6 often -- are often considered to be impediments
7 and incredible burdens, and it's a one-way street.

8 All we had is more and more species
9 going on the list and more and more restrictions
10 being imposed on fishermen, on people who want to
11 dredge ports and construct marinas, and by DoD who
12 needs to do military exercises, and while there
13 are regulatory responsibilities, and sometimes
14 going through -- there is a process and it can
15 slow things down, especially if we don't have the
16 resources to do it in a timely way. It's also
17 true that some of these species really are being
18 recovered and were we really think hard about what
19 can be done to turn the species around and to stop
20 a decline, and to address threats that are
21 addressable, we can make a difference.

22 Fish and Wildlife Service has some great

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 examples of this, and we do too. When commercial
2 whaling stopped, humpback whales have really
3 rebounded, we've proposed breaking the humpback
4 listing into distinct population segments, and
5 because there's been such substantial global
6 recovery of humpback whales, a number of those
7 didn't require the DPSs, didn't require listing.

8 I think those of you in New England are
9 -- from New England are familiar with the North
10 Atlantic white whale story where focusing on
11 reducing ship speed, and therefore ship strikes,
12 and gear conflicts, fixed-gear conflicts, has
13 taken that species which was on sort of a
14 nosedive, and really turned it around.

15 So recognizing that we can't do
16 everything for every species, we'll do the parts
17 that we are required to do. We will fight like
18 hell to do the things that we have the resources
19 to do, but our thought is to focus on a handful of
20 species where some limited -- where there are
21 stressors that could be addresses, not necessarily
22 by us, but maybe by other Federal partners by

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 states, by tribes.

2 That we focus on those, that we reach
3 out to partners to those same states, tribes,
4 private entities, NGOs, and really try to focus
5 for a short period of time on these species and
6 get the declines either leveled out or going in
7 the right direction. So we haven't quite gotten
8 our catchy name for this, you know, species of
9 concerns, spotlight species, we are still looking
10 for the catch phrase.

11 It's very serious, it's based on --
12 well, when it rolls out you'll see that we have
13 set of criteria to choose these, and that we
14 really are going to focus on partnerships. We've
15 recognized in our recovery plans for endangered
16 species, that the Feds can't do it all, and since
17 in the recovery plans, we often identify actions
18 to be taken by states, tribes or other partners,
19 we really want to be supportive of that and look
20 to that community and try to see whether there are
21 grant resources, or other things that could be
22 kind of focused on these species.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 It's not unlike our concept of habitat
2 blueprint, and habitat focus areas. Many species
3 are worthy, we wish we could help them all, that
4 is not where we are as program, and so we really
5 want to make a difference on a few species, and
6 really remind ourselves, or partners and
7 stakeholders and the community at large, that
8 species can be recovered, and they can be turned
9 around, and to really focus on those that can.

10 And I think those are the things I
11 wanted to touch on. I've probably gone over my
12 time, I apologize for that, but I always like to
13 make sure that you guys have a sense and a little
14 bit more of a preview of what's coming so that you
15 are not totally blindsided by the big thing that
16 the agency is going to do, and I think those are
17 -- in addition to the topics that you are going to
18 be briefed on, those are kind of some of the
19 issues that are going to be taking up a fair
20 amount of my attention.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Eileen.
22 I'm going to note something and then turn it over

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to questions. I heard a series of points raised
2 in the dialogue, and I'm feeling very proud of
3 this body. I feel like this body is clearly
4 plugged into the priorities of NOAA, and is having
5 an impact. If you think about the list that
6 Eileen jut went through. IUU and traceability,
7 and national state of one, or efforts where this
8 Committee has provided direct comments and
9 feedback.

10 Aquaculture and recreational fishing
11 policies, we've got taskforces that have been
12 working on these issues to help shape priorities.
13 The issue of protected resources and setting
14 priorities and recovery, we've issued reports on
15 this. Habitat and ecosystem management has been a
16 theme for us. So it's really clear to me that
17 this body is having an impact, and Eileen, I
18 really appreciate the opportunity to continue to
19 collaborate with NOAA and ESSAC.

20 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. Absolutely. So I
21 think that when we have discussions with you guys
22 and suggest areas that you might want to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 concentrate on, it's because we know they are
2 going to be of concern, and we do want your input,
3 so we are not trying to steer off into some
4 esoteric area that's, you know, secondary to our
5 priorities.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Questions, comments,
7 for Eileen, anybody? Peter?

8 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah. Eileen, I just
9 wanted to -- without sound hopelessly naïve,
10 comment from our tour of the Fishery Science
11 Center yesterday, that despite the push-pull that
12 many of us have with your Agency there's a lot to
13 be proud of, really, in terms of the science, the
14 capacity, the types of people who are committing
15 their professional lives to the mission that we
16 all share, and it was a really important field in
17 that context.

18 And I think it's something some -- you
19 know, so much energy is spent on pulling apart
20 particular science, I think sometimes we lose
21 track of the value of the body of science, that
22 your agency is capable of. And that's going to be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 really important to support in a budgetary sense,
2 and a lot of sense, because of the challenges that
3 are coming, that are going to push all those
4 individuals to their limits in terms of trying to
5 help us understand what the challenges are and
6 react to them intelligently, and make choices
7 about the things we can do and the ones we can't
8 do; because we are going to be highly dependent on
9 your Agency to help us through that minefield.

10 MS. SOBECK: Well, I appreciate those
11 comments, and I don't think they are naïve, I
12 think it is the reality. I think -- you know, I
13 want to give Richard Merrick a lot of credit for
14 being -- as our Chief Scientist, who directly
15 supervises the science center, he's really
16 thoughtful about how to take these science centers
17 that are full of really smart, rally dedicated
18 people, and really try to think through, and this
19 is a journey, it's not a done deal, but to figure
20 out, you know, we are a science-based, service
21 Agency, we are not the National Academy, we are
22 not Scripps.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 You know, we do have, you know, some
2 pretty specific missions. On the other hand, we
3 need to not just deal with the stock assessments
4 of today, and tomorrow, but think through some of
5 the bigger issues of, you know, looking on
6 Mainland climate change and other issues. And
7 looking for that balance, looking for how we shape
8 the science to inform the management side of the
9 house, but still allow enough of the science, the
10 freedom to think into the future.

11 I think that these periodic reviews
12 focused on specific issues that Richard has
13 instituted, has really given me a much better
14 basis for going into funding discussions with The
15 Hill and others, saying, you know what, we
16 actually do have a principled reason for why we do
17 this many stock assessments here, versus there,
18 you know, and so trying to -- because it's very
19 easy to say, we need more here, and they have too
20 much there.

21 Or why don't we all get exactly the same
22 amount of money? Or whatever the question is;

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 having the ability to look at things both in terms
2 of the need of a particular region, or a
3 particular fishery, but also to be able to answer
4 as a national program, is really important in
5 these days of scarce resources. Being able to go
6 up to The Hill and say, if you want better
7 information on which to build your management, you
8 are going to need to fund what kind of science.

9 Richard has been going up and doing
10 quarterly briefings on our stock assessments to
11 the Appropriation Staff, because those guys are
12 controlling the money, and they need to understand
13 what we are doing with it. So we are trying very
14 hard. You know, this facility here is gorgeous,
15 state-of-the-art.

16 MR. SHELLEY: With a little envy, I have
17 to be honest.

18 MS. SOBECK: I know.

19 MR. SHELLEY: Woods Hole is not quite as
20 lucky.

21 MS. SOBECK: And we are painfully aware
22 of that. You know, we don't have a capital

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 budget, and keep pouring over the budget with you,
2 we've been really trying to be disciplined and
3 thinking about our facilities and our facility
4 needs into the future and the needs for
5 recapitalization of the overall NOAA fleet
6 including, not just the fisheries vessels but the
7 overall vessels.

8 Withhold the Miami Lab facilities that
9 need -- that are really aging, aged out but really
10 expensive to replace. This lab was funded by ARA
11 Funds, you know, having the plans, being ready to
12 go, when money fell from heaven was, you know,
13 really necessary -- we need to -- again, we are
14 trying to think about those things in a
15 disciplined way, because you've got to have plan,
16 you've got to be able to act and react when the
17 opportunity presents itself, but in a reasoned,
18 disciplined way. And I think that's what we are
19 trying to do. We had some discussions, Paul has
20 really been instrumental, and Richard too, in sort
21 of saying, we need to have our labs, our science
22 centers have to have strategic plans, our regions

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have to have strategic plans, we have to engage
2 our partners in coming up with those plans, and we
3 have to move towards merging those plans.

4 We can't have science centers with
5 strategic plans going this way, and regions
6 strategic plans going that way. These guys all
7 have to work together, they are not absolutely
8 identical, but they've got substantial crossover.
9 It's a journey, we are getting there.

10 It's not going to happen tomorrow, but I
11 think that we don't really have an option, and
12 again, I think that we've been trying to be more
13 open and transparent and getting input into those
14 strategic plans, to the extent they are done or
15 posted on our websites, they are living documents,
16 we are going to revisit and I invite all of you
17 guys to go and look at your region, your center,
18 or others, and give us input. All of those
19 things, I think, reinforce our ability to justify
20 what we do and what our communities get out of our
21 work.

22 MR. CLAMPITT: Just as a point of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comment, on a local regional basis. I just want
2 to point out Cisco Werner and Staff, Craig
3 Heberer, they stay in constant, really good
4 communication with the industry and seek out those
5 low- hanging fruit. We have several cooperative
6 projects that the industry is going to fund.
7 Electronic logbooks have already gone live within
8 the last two weeks, and if we -- we are going to
9 do some cooperative research sampling of highly
10 migratory species aboard the boats at sea.

11 There's a lot of initiatives, but I have
12 to compliment the Southwest Science Center, the
13 scientists get out of the office, they come down
14 to the boats. I'm talking, for years now we've
15 got really good relationships. You've got some
16 good people working up there.

17 MS. SOBECK: Great. Thank you.

18 MR. RHEAULT: On the subject of
19 traceability, serving the FDA's Food Safety Modern
20 Improvement Act, has made it a widespread chain of
21 trace back, traceability, and I would encourage --
22 you know, they don't have the ability to go to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 source to seek inspection, and we don't have the
2 authority in NOAA to go the food chain, plate
3 four, basically, what I say.

4 MS. SOBECK: Yeah --

5 MR. RHEAULT: But they've got an insane
6 amount of money given to that Food Safety Modern
7 Improvement Act now being circulated.

8 MS. SOBECK: And we have been talking to
9 them. That is the -- again, it's not transparent
10 and available to the public, it's a trace-back
11 mechanism, so it's there but it's -- and it
12 applies to fish. I mean they don't -- but you are
13 right, and we have been finding out a lot more
14 about that, we have been talking to them, and we
15 are trying to make sure that we are not -- that we
16 are not being duplicative, that we are not
17 reinventing the wheel, and that we are taking
18 advantage of their money.

19 MS. BRANDON: Two comments, they aren't
20 really questions, but when the taskforce is
21 working on identifying the species like most of
22 us, that they'll focus on -- being that I've been

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 working on this issue quite a bit, and I'd like to
2 encourage the taskforce members to choose a couple
3 of species that are difficult to work on. That
4 are not low- hanging fruit necessarily, and it
5 will be a challenge, and we think that there will
6 be lessons learned there.

7 And I personally work a lot on crab, and
8 crab coming from Russia competes with the Alaska
9 crab, so that will be the one I would suggest that
10 you take right there. Actually there are others,
11 and I know a lot of times will be given to that,
12 but we think those other high-risk species are --
13 that you should choose. That's one comment.

14 And the other one is your Agency -- we
15 had a presentation yesterday and your Agency is
16 picking protected resources that will be
17 priorities for the Agency, and it will be a list
18 of, it sounded like less than a dozen, and who
19 knows, if it's -- it sounded like they hadn't been
20 picked yet. So if you are looking in Alaska and
21 from (inaudible) we'll say, let's encourage your
22 Agency not to forget about more specific right

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 around.

2 To critically engage the species where
3 there's probably less than 30 left, and we know
4 very well, how that will -- only two of that are
5 being tagged. So don't give up on that species,
6 they can come back from only 30 individuals.

7 And then we could learn a lot and maybe
8 that could be -- could end up on your list, or
9 please, at least, to at least consider that.

10 MS. SOBECK: So, you know, about species
11 at risk, so we take your point, we are not just
12 looking for the easy species. On the other hand,
13 you know, we are going to give to species like
14 crab, consideration for sure. I don't know where
15 we are going end up, but I will say, you know,
16 this is like a -- this is a huge tsunami of
17 responsibility. As you guys know, we have this
18 many new resources to deal with this, this many,
19 this many. So everybody who is fully occupied at
20 NOAA doing everything they are doing, is now going
21 to be responsibility for this huge new
22 responsibility.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So there is something to be said for us
2 not screwing up the first set of species that we
3 take on, but I hope that you guys understand that
4 that's part of what's driving us. We want to --
5 we don't want to just do the easy stuff that we
6 already do, but we also want to build a system in
7 a way that's not going to overwhelm us, drown us,
8 and condemn us to failure from the outset.

9 So I take your point, and we will be
10 trying and we heard a lot from the crab fishermen
11 during all the public comment period so, you know,
12 that's definitely on our radar. The species at
13 risk, I appreciate, you know, your input and we'll
14 explain more when we announce this, what our
15 criteria are, but part of it is focused on, are
16 there already identified recovery mechanisms out
17 there, that we can focus on and try to get into
18 place.

19 So, for you know, for our friends in
20 Mexico with the vaquita, that's also severely
21 endangered. One of the challenges with that, is
22 because it's a species that's found exclusively in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Mexico, a lot of us -- including us and from World
2 Wildlife are doing a lot of great things for
3 vaquita. But we've sort of said, you know,
4 because it is an entirely -- it is a species
5 that's entirely within the territory of Mexico, we
6 are really not in control of some of the major
7 recovery elements.

8 And so it might not fit this short list.
9 And lack of information versus -- it's not that we
10 are not going to be thinking about those, they
11 maybe not going to be the focus of this group,
12 because we are focusing on implementing known
13 recovery measures. So, there are a lot of ways to
14 slice and dice this. It's going to be a very
15 short list, we are giving it a try. We are not
16 giving up on other species. It is not that we are
17 not going to spend money on other species. It's
18 not that we are not going to have science directed
19 at other species, so it's an attempt to try to get
20 partners engaged with our assistance, on how to
21 try to make some different scenarios where we
22 haven't really done much.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, I appreciate that we are taking --
2 you know, this is going to be a -- what am I
3 trying to say, a dynamic list over time, so
4 interested in that input, and I hope that
5 everybody will understand that we are not going to
6 have every species of concern.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Heather, given you
8 are interested in recovery, please make sure you
9 participate in the Recovery Project at 2:30 in the
10 sub-committees. We'd love to have your
11 perspective, and I think we've got time for one
12 more question. Pam?

13 MS. YOCHER: I was just going to say, I
14 take Heather's point, but I also see the need to
15 have something to celebrate, we've got a colleague
16 that goes to these meetings and he expresses his
17 disappointment that there's always jubilation and
18 dancing in the hallways when a new species is
19 listed or added, and there is never any
20 celebration or talk about the positives of when
21 things are taken off.

22 SPEAKER: Absolutely!

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: And so, I don't think it
2 would be a bad thing to focus on a few of those,
3 and give people some enthusiasm for them.

4 SPEAKER: Here! Here!

5 MS. YOCHER: It is possible to me with
6 to tackle that --

7 MS. SOBECK: Yeah. And I do think that
8 we let both ourselves and some folks who are not
9 that enthusiastic about protecting species, the
10 sense that nothing ever happens, that there's just
11 this endless expansion that we are never making
12 any progress. And I also think that we don't give
13 our, either ourselves or our partners, including
14 you guys, you know, the kind of credit that's due.

15 You know, we have a monk seal hospital
16 now on the big island of Hawaii, and not a Federal
17 dollar went into it, you know, it's all the Marine
18 Mammal Center. No, they work closely with us, so
19 that, you know, it's complementary to our Monk
20 Seal Recovery Program, but you know, we need to --
21 you know, we have the National Park Service, that
22 has little hatching programs in the Gulf.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 You know, we have lots of NGO states,
2 other Federal agencies that are investing a lot,
3 and I just we are trying to carve out a corner of
4 the world that could use the challenge use the
5 extra attention, but we are hoping that we are
6 going to have successes at the end of the day, but
7 we are not to give up on everything else.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Eileen,
9 for an excellent presentation. Russ is going to
10 be next, but before I allow Russ to move forward
11 with the presentation. Ken, I know you have a
12 special guest here, would you take a moment to
13 introduce?

14 MR. FRANKE: Yes. First of all for the
15 new members, as a point of introduction, my name
16 is Ken Franke, I'm President of the Sport Fishing
17 Association of California. This is our home,
18 welcome to San Diego. We have almost 200
19 companies in Southern California, and our
20 association, this year we are expecting a
21 transport of about 1.3 million people. So it's
22 big business in this town. I hope you have an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 opportunity to visit the landings. We have the
2 largest sport fishing fleet of its kind in the
3 world. We have boats that go to French Polynesia,
4 Central America, a lot to Mexico, all over the
5 West Coast, but I think you'll enjoy it.

6 That said, relationships are really,
7 really important for us, especially in the
8 countries that we visit, and we are honored today,
9 we have a guest. My friend Juan Carlos Padermo is
10 here, from Conapesca, Mexico, has opened an office
11 within the last two weeks, a new office up here in
12 San Diego, so that anybody from the United States
13 will be able to go and get their licenses, and ask
14 questions in order to visit Mexico.

15 We are very happy to have one here, he's
16 been here about a year, and we've been working on
17 a lot of things. I just returned from Mexico
18 City, and as an example they rolled out to a
19 delegation from San Diego a brand new process for
20 all Americans to visit Mexico by yacht, boat, what
21 have you. All their permits, their questions
22 answered, et cetera, all on a new website, and it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 was front page news in this town when that process
2 went out.

3 And I actually met with the Commissioner
4 of Immigration in Mexico a few days ago, they are
5 excited about working with the United States to
6 improve relations, so the fact that they are
7 investing in a new office in San Diego, we are
8 very excited about. So, welcome, Juan.

9 MR. PADERMO: Good morning.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Juan Carlos, do you
11 want to say anything to the group?

12 MR. PADERMO: I'd just like to say,
13 thank you, to all of you and thank you for your
14 hospitality. I'd just like to say a few words
15 that, we in Mexico, we know that we have to work
16 in a big effort along with the United States to
17 try to rescue, and leave the chance to vaquita, we
18 are doing our best, and our office in Buena Pesca,
19 we are glad to take hold of the questions, and all
20 the things that we can help to improve the
21 relationship.

22 And believe me, the way to -- we are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 saying that about the -- the way to make the
2 process, more efficiency instead of bureaucracy,
3 is with respect and friendship, and we are working
4 very hard to go -- what we are saying about the
5 fishing log, and what we are trying to do some
6 lawsuits. Then new permits that have been -- So
7 this is just a small result of what we've been
8 doing in terms of working together along with
9 mission in Mexico. Thank you. Thank you for
10 having me.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you for
12 joining us today.

13 MR. FRANKE: Mr. Chairman, I would like
14 to also make one last comment. What he just
15 mentioned is really important. We just rolled out
16 the new electronic ROGG System for our fleet.
17 It's a pilot but I think a permanent program.
18 We've worked to standardized what's required for
19 the U.S. boats, and the Mexican operations to be
20 the same thing. The data comes out, the pipe, it
21 goes in three different directions, but it's same
22 data collected, real time. That's going to give

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 all government agencies NMFS, the Mexican
2 Government, et cetera, real accurate information
3 on exactly what's being caught and when, which is
4 going to help the regulators to make their
5 decisions.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, both, for
7 that contribution today.

8 MR. PADERMO: I'm sorry, but I forgot,
9 what we were going to, and this our webpage, that
10 is www.sportfishinginmexico.com, and then you can
11 all get -- and he's going to get all (inaudible),
12 and then you can all get, and he's going to get
13 great stock for all of us to. Then use that --
14 include the requirements that you have to get in
15 order to go and practice responsible fishery in
16 Mexico, is now our webpage,
17 www.sportfishinginmexico.com.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank
19 you. Russ?

20 MR. DUNN: Thanks. I am to advise the
21 -- it's to China, I have to get us back on
22 schedule. For those of you who I have not met, I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 am Russ Dunn, I'm the Policy Advisor on
2 Recreational Fisheries, and this is Craig Heberer,
3 he is our West Coast Regional Recreational
4 Coordinator, he is our true expert on the ground
5 here.

6 SPEAKER: Thank you.

7 MR. DUNN: Heather is passing out to you
8 copies of the Rec Policy and the Implementation
9 Plan, and I wanted you all to have that as we walk
10 through this presentation. So we are going to
11 talk a little bit today about recent activity at
12 the national level with regard to rec fish, and
13 then and then since we are not in D.C., we thought
14 it was appropriate to have a discussion, an
15 overview of the activities and issues that are
16 occurring here in the West Coast, and that is what
17 Craig is going to handle. So, let's get started
18 here; if you could help me; if I knew how to work
19 this thing.

20 SPEAKER: Is it turned on?

21 (Off the record)

22 MR. DUNN: So, I am really excited to be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 here, and because I really could not be more proud
2 of what NOAA Fisheries has accomplished this year
3 in terms of rec fisheries. We have had an
4 extremely productive year, where we have held in
5 the last -- well, in 54 weeks we held a national
6 summit, developed a national policy, and an
7 implementation plan. And it was a lot of hard
8 work, by a lot of people, and I think in the end
9 it came out very well all around.

10 So, we are going to talk today. I'm
11 going to talk quickly about the policy, sort of
12 how we got to where we are and what it says. I'm
13 going to very briefly touch on the implementation
14 plan, because as Eileen said, that is more akin to
15 a to-do list, and there's no point in reading 50-
16 plus bullets. And then I'll talk a little bit
17 about where we are going, and we'll move on from
18 there.

19 So, 2014 really started with a bang.
20 Eileen had just come on board, and actually, let
21 me step back for a second, and I say that I think
22 Eileen is being way too modest when she says she

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 just stepped in to an ongoing program. Yes, it
2 was underway when she walked in the door, however,
3 it was under her leadership that the Agency agreed
4 to develop and move forward with the policy, and
5 the National Implementation Plan. So she is much
6 too modest in giving credit to others.

7 Morris Deal Commission, when she first
8 came onboard, we zipped down to the Miami boat
9 show, and a coalition of national recreational
10 fishing interest groups released the vision for
11 Saltwater Recreational Fisheries, also known as
12 the Morris Deal Commission, it included six
13 recommendations, one of which was to develop a
14 national policy for recreational fisheries.

15 Just a few weeks later, we held a
16 National Angling Summit, Saltwater Summit in D.C.,
17 and there was a very strong sentiment expressed at
18 the meeting that NFMS should indeed develop a
19 summit. We thought about it, and they got
20 commitment to do so, and not only to do it, but to
21 do it quickly, within a year, as Eileen said. So
22 we started up the Bus, and went on a whirlwind

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 scoping tour. We did 30 -- I think it was 38
2 meetings between the first week of June and the
3 first week of October, and Drew Hannan sat down
4 and drafted up a policy -- a draft policy based on
5 what we had heard there, and at the summit, and
6 over a series of other meetings over the last few
7 years.

8 We then put that document out for
9 comment, it was at this point, I believe, it was
10 the last presentation we did with MAFAC where we
11 had a draft of the document, which MAFAC provided
12 input on. It went out for comments, November and
13 December, and then we finalized it January,
14 February and released it -- actually at the Miami
15 Boat Show again, since a year -- I don't if it was
16 to the day, but a year to the event, from when
17 Morris Deal Commission came out.

18 So, what does it say? We did all of
19 this work, we moved toward, well while the entire
20 document is considered the policy, you can really
21 sort of boil it down to the quote on the screen
22 there. That it is our policy, NMFS policy to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 foster support and enhance a broadly accessible
2 and diverse array of sustainable saltwater
3 recreational fisheries for the benefit and
4 enjoyment of the nation. That, really, I think
5 summarizes the various component parts fairly
6 well.

7 And I think the significance of the
8 policy is that regardless now of who is sitting in
9 Eileen's seat, or who is sitting in my seat, that
10 recreational fisheries is a part of the Agency
11 thinking. And that is where Eileen was going when
12 she was saying, it's sort of our ultimately -- our
13 goal to get rid of my position and the regional
14 position, its recreational fisheries should just
15 be part and parcel of the everyday thinking of all
16 parts of the Agency, and I think we are
17 effectively moving that direction, hopefully not
18 too fast, because I have three kids to put through
19 college, so. So they are 13 and 11, so 15 years
20 or so maybe.

21 SPEAKER: Okay. Well, I don't know.

22 MR. DUNN: Fifteen years, or so, maybe.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 SPEAKER: No problems.

2 MR. DUNN: Policy goal, so what did we
3 say in the policy. Well, we decided to support
4 that general policy statement that we just put
5 there with three goals, support and maintain
6 sustainable saltwater recreational fisheries
7 resources, including healthy habitats, these are
8 slightly truncated. Promoting saltwater
9 recreational fishing for the for the benefit of
10 the nation.

11 There was a little bit, I think, of
12 handwringing over this idea of promoting saltwater
13 fishing, but it is entirely consistent with the
14 Magnuson-Stevens Act, where the second objective
15 of the act is to promote commercial and
16 recreational fishing for the benefit of the
17 nation. So it is entirely on tract and consistent
18 with our statutory mandates.

19 And third, really, the whole point of
20 doing this is to allow people to get out there and
21 fish, and not just today or tomorrow, but over the
22 long term. And how do we do that? We do that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 through science-based conservation and management.
2 So, those are obviously fairly broad, and so we
3 have -- this is a sort of iterative document where
4 you have to keep stepping it down, and frankly the
5 implementation plan is just an extension of that
6 process.

7 So we decided to support the policy
8 goals, with a series of principles that we, as an
9 Agency, all our component parts, can look at and
10 think about as we are undertaking actions, how to
11 implement the recommendations, the alternatives.
12 Directives that come from the councils, that come
13 from this body and others. So, first and foremost
14 is to support the ecosystem conservation and
15 enhancement.

16 If you don't have healthy fisheries you
17 don't have satisfying recreational opportunities.
18 I have cherry-picked just a few handful of
19 bullets, of some of the kinds of activities that
20 can support these principles, so I'm not going to
21 walk through all of them, but there is a broad
22 range of activities that fit under each of these

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 guiding principles, and frankly many of the
2 examples that are given can fit within multiple of
3 the guiding principles.

4 So, things like, habitat enhancement,
5 conservation, restoration, things like supporting
6 best practices which improves early survival, can
7 contribute to ecosystem conservation enhancement.
8 Promoting public access to rec fishing
9 opportunities, this could be things like giving
10 greater consideration to expanded fishing
11 opportunities, based on conservation gains.

12 Traditionally, one of the things we
13 heard regularly, as we go around the country is,
14 people feel like the council process and NOAA,
15 sort of give a red light, red light. There's
16 never a red light, green light after developing
17 amendments and regulations. Meaning, they tell
18 you when to stop, but they never tell you when you
19 can start things back up again.

20 We are quick to shut things down, we
21 curtail things, and often that is appropriate, but
22 we also need to do the thinking up front about

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 when is it, what are the benchmarks that we need
2 to make in order to begin to loosen up
3 restrictions, and I think, frankly, that can apply
4 to both commercial and recreational. Many of
5 these will apply to fisheries management as a
6 whole.

7 Another issue that -- where we can look
8 at promoting public access is by reviewing
9 allocation, it doesn't necessarily mean allocation
10 is going to shift, it's not going to necessarily
11 push it one way or the other, but it means that we
12 need to have a process that works that is open to
13 looking at allocations as the need arise.

14 Coordinate with Stat, Federal management
15 entities. We heard broadly and regularly, you all
16 need to do things more like the states, we like
17 the way the states do things. Now, if you talk to
18 the state directors they often get a message from
19 their constituent, by they tell us, do things more
20 like the states.

21 So, we are committing here, sort of
22 doubling down on this effort. This is something

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that we should be doing, we do, do, but clearly we
2 don't do it quite well enough. So, we are going
3 to focus on our partnerships with the state, and
4 our other federal management entities. We have,
5 for example, an easy one is Fish And Wildlife. We
6 have, I would say -- and we had a cordial
7 relationship with them, but we haven't really, at
8 least in my time in NOAA Fisheries, at the
9 recreational --on recreational issues, really
10 coordinated with them, so we are starting to beef
11 up those efforts, and align our work, try to align
12 our work with them.

13 Advancing innovative solutions to
14 evolving challenges; this is something that falls
15 into both the management and the science side of
16 the house. There are fantastic new development of
17 things that Ken and others in this room have been
18 involved in. Developing tools, for example, to
19 better assess species in untrawlable areas. High
20 resolution acoustics and coupled with high
21 resolution video, NOAA Fisheries is a body which
22 needs to and does, support advances in these kind

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of tools and others.

2 Management approaches, they are -- we
3 need to be open and flexible to looking at other
4 approaches to manage recreational fisheries, not
5 just necessarily pounds landed. So, providing
6 sound scientific advice -- I mean -- sorry,
7 information, this can take the form of improving
8 trust by better engaging constituents right from
9 the get-go in corporate research, and things like
10 that, because when you are part of the project,
11 you feel like you have helped, participate in it,
12 and shape the direction of the project you will
13 often have a little more buy-in, a little more
14 support of it.

15 One of the things we are doing to try
16 and look at the trust issue is, in part is we have
17 committed to do an NRC review of MRIP, and I think
18 Richard is going to talk more about MRIP, I think,
19 in a few minutes. There is, as some of you may
20 have heard, sometimes there's a little bit of
21 skepticism or concern over the MRIP process, and
22 the data.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 My personal opinion is that we have a
2 very sound process, and sound science that backs
3 it, and one way to sort of reaffirm that, or
4 affirm that, or not, is to have an independent
5 body review. So we are going to go back to NRC
6 and have them take a look at, how are we doing in
7 terms of implementing the NRC recommendations from
8 the past, and get an honest -- a neutral review of
9 it.

10 Finally, I think an issue which every
11 Federal agency and large bureaucracy struggle
12 through it is, communicating and engaging. This
13 is something that I think an issue that never goes
14 away. It's something that we can always do better
15 with, and this again, can cover things such as,
16 getting out more, hiring more, one approach here
17 is our enforcement force, we are increasing our
18 NOAA Enforcement Staff, and part of their mission
19 is going to be more explaining to fishermen,
20 working with fishermen to explain what the
21 regulations are and why it's important for
22 conservation to follow those instead of just

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 writing tickets.

2 One of the things we've done in
3 Massachusetts already since the policy came out is
4 we have a series of port agents, who are on the
5 docks working with fishermen. Traditionally they
6 have focused on commercial fisheries. They are
7 now taking a portion of their time and working
8 with the recreational community to try and
9 explain.

10 Here is what's going on in the
11 management process, the science process, here is
12 why, here what you need to do. So that's just one
13 example of many different actions and activities
14 under the communiqué to engage. So, as we rolled
15 out the policy, we committed to a rather short,
16 60-day turnaround in developing an implementation
17 plan, and we achieved that on April 13th, so we
18 had committed, I think -- I think it was February
19 12th, when we rolled out the policy and made the
20 commitments, so we made it to the day.

21 That was a heavy lift, and it involved
22 essentially all of the headquarters national level

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 programs, and it covers a four-year timeframe, 15
2 through 18 included. And it's built around the
3 framework of the six-policy principles, guiding
4 principles in there, and identifies around 50
5 commitments, many of which are very specific,
6 things like hold a workshop on artificial reefs to
7 identify state of -- excuse me -- the state of the
8 science end, you know, actions which might be
9 appropriate to look into with regard to reefs.
10 And others are more broad, such as trying to
11 better engage fish and wildlife, things like that.
12 Some of it you can't project out four years,
13 necessarily. So we have some broader language,
14 but we have a number of very specific actions as
15 well.

16 So, what is next? As Eileen noted, next
17 year we will release regional implementation
18 plans, they will essentially use the same
19 framework, but will be blank slates for each of
20 the regions to tailor to the issues and priorities
21 within their regions. They will work with
22 constituents to sort of identify within the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 framework what are the issues that really need to
2 be addressed, and of course it will be within the
3 constraints of fiscal and statutory constraints
4 that the regions work under.

5 But it will be an opportunity, or is an
6 opportunity for the regions to work with
7 constituents, identify where do we have these
8 mutual priorities, where is a real ability to make
9 change, and to customize their plan, on a
10 region-by-region basis. Then we will, in 2017
11 we'll have a status update, looking at how we have
12 been doing, or a big part of this entire rec
13 initiative, starting in 2010, has really been
14 making -- moving the ball the forward, through
15 action, not just lip service.

16 So we will put out a status update,
17 providing some accountability showing what have we
18 done, what have we not done, where do we need to
19 make a course correction? I guess that is it.
20 So, why don't we do a couple of questions, and
21 then Craig -- so Craig has time to do his, we have
22 some questions, and then if there are more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 questions after Craig has spoken, we can go back.
2 Does that sound good, Mr. Chairman?

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Of course.

4 MR. DUNN: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I want to start with
6 a point that Pam made though. Pam, before you
7 said we need to be celebrating our successes in
8 the context of recovery. I think we need to be
9 celebrating our successes in the context of
10 recreational fishing management, and this is
11 definitely one of them. If you think back about
12 where this Committee has gone over the last few
13 years, you know, back in the 2000s and managing
14 our nations fisheries conferences, you had this
15 theme coming from the recreational fishery, that
16 they didn't have a voice, they were frustrated,
17 they wanted more participation.

18 2009, this Committee leads in effort,
19 and with the support staff, we created a working
20 group and suddenly 25 recreational fishermen had a
21 voice. And Ken Franke was serving as he Chair of
22 the working group. I think we've seen a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 fundamental shift in awareness of recreational
2 fishery and its importance, and how NOAA deals
3 with the issue.

4 And these two documents are certainly
5 the culmination of that effort. And I for one,
6 want to take a moment to applaud both Ross Dunn
7 and Franke for all they've done on this issue.
8 (Applause) I'm sorry if I'm steering the
9 conversation a little bit too much, but I mean, I
10 look at this and I just find it remarkable that we
11 have accomplished --

12 MR. DUNN: I think we can adjourn.
13 (Laughter).

14 MR. FRANKE: I want to echo the
15 comments. Russ and his staff, you know, five
16 years ago, he started with no staff, no money,
17 barely an office, and now we have regional
18 coordinators, regional plans. The emphasis in the
19 very beginning when he came to MAFAC, and this was
20 MAFAC driven, for those of you that don't know.
21 It was how do we strategize to work to make good
22 recommendations, and the beginning recommendations

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 were funding a line item, coordinating, regional
2 plans and Russ executed, and the NMFS staff with
3 him executed and no complaints.

4 Everything is a work in progress, we
5 know that it's got to work all the way down to the
6 regions, but I applaud Russ and his folks, they
7 really did a good job, and we really appreciate
8 it.

9 MR. DUNN: Thanks. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Phil?

11 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you. Russ, I echo
12 what everyone else has said about the tremendous
13 of work and progress that's visible. You've got
14 to be proud of these two documents. What I hear
15 back, obviously is a lot of recognition of the
16 effort, and appreciation and excitement about the
17 documents, but the question I hear, is how are you
18 going to interact with the regional councils to
19 translate this policy and this action plan into
20 reality, because that's, I think is the most
21 challenging part. And it's a very broad subject,
22 but it involves many things, including appropriate

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 representation on the council's work does not
2 exist. Some places it does, some places it
3 doesn't. How are you going to do all that? How
4 are you going to implement that aspect of it?

5 MS. SOBECK: So, if I could speak to
6 that a little bit. So, I think the way we are
7 going to do it, to the extent that NOAA
8 participates, NOAA Fisheries participates on the
9 Council and the Council process. We are going to
10 make sure, and if we don't we expect you guys to
11 let us know, that recreational interest and
12 concerns are represented and discussed, I'm not
13 making any promises about plan and results, in
14 terms of NOAA Fisheries representatives, whether
15 it's in committees, scientific committee, or our
16 seat on the councils, that we are going to
17 consider those, and staking our positions, and our
18 own priorities and councils, and we are going to
19 consider the recreational views in coming up with
20 our positions.

21 But the councils are the councils and
22 they are not NOAA Fisheries, and so just like with

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 other elements of representation on the fisheries,
2 it's still incumbent on the partners, the
3 stakeholders figuring out how to best get
4 themselves -- their views before the other council
5 members. And we know that some council seats are
6 designate for the directors of state agencies.
7 Others are recommended by the Governors.

8 And so, again, because the councils are
9 independent, there's a lot that we can do within
10 NOAA Fisheries to kind of -- to influence to take
11 into account, to advocate and then there are other
12 aspects that really are going to be up to the
13 community itself to go to the states, to the
14 governors, to other independent members to make
15 their case.

16 I will say that we, you know, we are in
17 the middle of the council membership
18 identification process now, and this is something
19 that we look at when we make an Agency
20 representation based on the recommendations that
21 we get from governors, we don't have the ability
22 to identify the candidates, we can help choose

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 among candidates and we take those discussions
2 very seriously.

3 Russ sits in on them, and whether it's
4 -- we also send out a letter at the beginning of
5 the process to the governors, rethinking what we
6 are going to be saying in that letter. And we are
7 looking at representation issues, not just
8 vis-à-vis rec fishing, but also in terms of other
9 kinds of diversity of representation, so we will
10 be trying to reach out the states, I don't want to
11 say give them guidance, but let them know what our
12 concerns are.

13 So I think that we are trying at
14 multiple levels, but I would be the first to say
15 that, you know, the good news about councils is
16 that NMFS doesn't really direct councils, that's
17 pretty clear. The bad news is, we don't direct
18 council so -- and I don't mean to be flip, I just
19 mean I think that's the reality.

20 MR. DYSKOW: I think you are exactly
21 right, the way to properly do this, is by
22 providing input direction on the front end, but if

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the appointments by the governors, do not fit
2 within the prescribed criteria, as you've outlined
3 it, doesn't NMFS have the authority to return that
4 list to the governors? Russ is shaking his head,
5 no, and I've always thought it did.

6 MR. DUNN: No, we have -- if they are
7 deemed to be -- I can't remember the exact legal
8 term, but not qualified, we can reject a
9 candidate. But we have zero ability to go outside
10 the slate of the nominees that the Governor gives
11 us.

12 MR. DYSKOW: Say that again, please?

13 MR. DUNN: We have no authority to go
14 outside of the slate of candidates that a Governor
15 provides.

16 MR. DYSKOW: I understand that.

17 MR. DUNN: We can reject a candidate if
18 they are --

19 MR. DYSKOW: And that's my point.

20 MR. DUNN: -- not qualified.

21 MS. SOBECK: But if it's -- we can give
22 in to the --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Can we push this
2 discussion to, say, absolutely (inaudible).

3 MR. DYSKOW: Absolutely! But that is
4 again, that's the key element of this entire
5 implementation policy.

6 MS. SOBECK: I guess I would say, the
7 actors are very carefully structured, so that we
8 really -- there are no designated specific rep
9 seats, and so do not say -- we cannot say, well
10 Governor, you know, because you haven't given us
11 that --

12 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: But diversity is
13 clearly part of the process.

14 MS. SOBECK: That is true, but for any
15 particular specific slot, the ability to say,
16 sorry. So I'm just -- I'm saying we are willing
17 to work on this, but again, it's the -- it's a
18 little bit of -- the system has been set up to
19 make the states, give the states a lot of
20 influence, that's the kickback.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And can I encourage
22 you to tackle this a little further when you get

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to the rec fish sub-committee discussion?

2 MR. DYSKOW: You can, sir.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. All right.

4 MS. SOBECK: Okay. Great.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So we've still got
6 Craig to go, can the questions wait until after
7 Craig? Dick, Julie, is that okay?

8 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So go
10 ahead, Craig?

11 MR. HEBERER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 And thank you all for inviting me today to
13 introduce myself, and give you a few slides about
14 our West Coast Region, and fisheries update. I
15 think addressing what both Eileen and Russ had
16 mentioned about in the future there won't be a
17 need for recreational fisheries coordinator, I'm
18 kind of a current hybrid as it is now. I work for
19 10 years with NMFS as a Highly Migratory Species
20 Lead Biologist for the Council's Fishery
21 Management Plan, they covered both rec and
22 commercial fishing for (inaudible) shark.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, I totally agree with that statement;
2 and both professionally and personally I've had a
3 foot in each camp. I'm a fourth generation
4 Croatian-American, tuna fishing family member from
5 St Pedro, California. So I've got the commercial
6 tuna fishing aspect, they are well-engrained from
7 DNA, and osmosis from my fishing family, but I've
8 also been a lifelong recreational fishermen. And
9 I think that the thing that I hope to bring to
10 this job, is the fact that both commercial and
11 recreational fishermen, when you peel back the
12 onion, basically want the same thing.

13 Healthy habitats, opportunities to
14 pursue their livelihoods, and the things that they
15 enjoy and benefit, and the sustainable fishery; so
16 I think the thing I hope to bring is the dialogue
17 that brings these groups to be stronger rather
18 weak or apart.

19 So just a quick overview, you know, our
20 West Coast fisheries, as Ken pointed out, is
21 highly diverse. We have highly migratory species,
22 I mentioned tuna, billfish and shark, and in the

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 West Coast, salmon, rockfish, Coastal pelagic
2 species, you know, sardines, mackerel, and sword
3 squid which we use as bait for the fisheries, and
4 in 2012, 1.6 million anglers completed almost 7.5
5 million trips.

6 And that's a lot of trips, a lot of
7 money, as Ken pointed out earlier, almost close to
8 \$2 million in trip and expenditures, supporting
9 18,000 jobs, and \$2.5 billion in sales. So in
10 recognition of that importance, and as Eileen
11 stated, walking the walk, we hired this position
12 that I'm in now, on December 2014, and Eileen and
13 Russ were instrumental and also with the support
14 of our leadership at SFP with Bob Turner, and who
15 is here as well. This became a priority for the
16 West Coast region, and I'm glad to be here to
17 begin this initiative with you all as well.

18 So, in this initiative some of our key
19 goals are to enhance recreational fisheries
20 opportunity as been stated. On the ground we are
21 doing that, for example, through our council and
22 our partners in Oregon, and California right now

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 looking at, potentially a mid-water sport fishery
2 for rock fish, that is going to target some
3 healthy stocks and yellowtail and chili pepper
4 rockfish stocks, but avoiding those species of
5 concern that are deeper.

6 So this is a potential that could expand
7 opportunity to reward folks for conservation and
8 benefit measures that are now showing results.
9 Improving recreational data, Ken has talked about
10 the e-log book, about length-frequency sampling
11 program that's coming into place.

12 We put in some funding request through
13 Bob in our SFP Division to help support that
14 effort, and our science and region staff have been
15 helping with the design and feedback on that, and
16 I'm happy to say, Ken, that we did receive that
17 additional funding, and so we will be working with
18 the specific states and our co-managers to get
19 that money out, and it will help with commercial
20 and recreational bluefin sampling and monitoring
21 going forward.

22 We also have our socioeconomic end, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 our science center, and we have economists that
2 are working on developing better catch data,
3 better estimates of the impacts of the fleets in
4 the different areas in the West Coast, and I think
5 that's going to be vitally important as we infuse
6 that information into management decisions. And
7 then, finally advancing communication between
8 anglers in the Agency, and we committed to really
9 put a lot of effort behind that particular goal,
10 and we have a series of fishing shows, for
11 example, here in Southern California, the Fred
12 Hall Fishing Boating Shows. Close to 50,000
13 people a year come through those doors, and we
14 work very closely with the show, with Ken, with
15 sport fishing groups to, not only be there and
16 have outreach of our research and management, but
17 also serve on a Panel of bluefin tuna, that we
18 have Ken. Russ flew out, and we had a constituent
19 breakfast with some of the leaders.

20 We were on the radio discussing that
21 impact, and we've set up a list of all the West
22 Coast region, contacts that we are building daily

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to keep everybody up to date. Russ mentioned the
2 implementation plan, we previously would call
3 these action agendas, and we have one that we are
4 working off of now, that has been developed in
5 close consultation with stakeholders to help guide
6 our actions and activities. We will be updating
7 that for the 2016, 2018 timeframe, and I guess
8 we'll call them implementation plans now.

9 SPEAKER: You've got it.

10 MR. HEBERER: And we know in NMFS, we
11 are an action Agency, where implementations go.
12 So now I'd just like to give you just a quick
13 couple of slides on some of the pressing issues,
14 and activities here in the West Coast. And many
15 of you have probably read the news about, bluefin
16 tuna, both stock status and the management
17 conservation. They are experiencing overfishing,
18 and are considered over- fished.

19 Our conservation measures are developed,
20 or they are being developed at both the domestic
21 and international level. On the domestic level,
22 I've been writing a rule with support from staff

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 on reducing the bag limit from 10 bluefin per day
2 to two bluefin per day, and requiring some at sea
3 (inaudible), requirements that will allow
4 enforcement personnel to better identify between
5 the species.

6 That rule is currently open for public
7 comment. That comment closes on May 6, and we
8 will be moving to final rule, in time, hopefully,
9 for the majority of bluefin season. For many of
10 you who have been following it out here, it really
11 hasn't been an end to the season, from last year,
12 we've had bluefin availability, almost every
13 month. And I wouldn't be surprised with the full
14 moon coming up, if the (inaudible) back,
15 targeting, getting some bluefin here, in the U.S.
16 waters if they are available.

17 I'll just make note, with our honorable
18 guest here from Conapesca in Mexico, also has
19 management measures, and conservation measures,
20 both international and domestically, their current
21 regulations allows 5 bluefin per day. We are
22 proposing that U.S. anglers, when they return from

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 fishing in Mexico that they would be abiding by
2 the U.S. limit. Those limits were used to
3 calculate the conservation games and benefits at
4 our regional partnership at IATTC.

5 So we are proposing that that would be
6 the only implementation. And just to note that 80
7 percent of our sports catch is taken in Mexican
8 waters from ports in Southern California. You
9 know, listening to people's concerns at the Fred
10 Hall Show, and in the Panel, Ken and I, in the
11 California Fishing game run, people were concerned
12 about access to continue fishing in Mexico. Last
13 year there was a -- when they reached their
14 international conservation building quota, the
15 fisheries was closed to all gear types and there's
16 concern again, it's that going to repeat in 2015,
17 and so I'm just passing on what we are hearing
18 from our constituents on that front.

19 Sardines, I think you've all been
20 hearing in the news about sardines, this
21 population fluctuates, and it's had a period of
22 low recruitment, and now it's below this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 precautionary biomass threshold, and so we've
2 closed the fishery, directed fishery for
3 commercial, effective, I believe it's Tuesday,
4 that fisheries have now been closed.

5 I just point out that our sport fishing
6 industry, particularly in Southern California uses
7 2 to 3,000 tons a year of sardines and other CPS,
8 mackerel, anchovy, squid for bait, that fishery
9 was not part of a closure, thanks to a lot of good
10 discussion that went down in the Council, in the
11 history of that management. That continued live
12 data is vital to the industries economic
13 wellbeing, and we are glad to see that was a
14 carve-out to continue that.

15 However, if the population continues to
16 decline and the biomass drops below the
17 over-fishing level, there could be restrictions
18 placed on that fishery as well. So this is just a
19 heads up that if we see that trend line continuing
20 in the wrong direction, that there's going to be
21 some additional economic pain.

22 Sea lions, I understand that you guys

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 had a discussion on this already, so I won't spend
2 a whole lot of time, but the stock of California
3 sea lion has recovered and it's well known for
4 300,000 animals now, so that's a success story
5 under the MMPA. However, it's proposed -- you
6 know, it's brought some challenges for us at the
7 Agency in terms of how we now manage a recovered
8 stock, and the interactions with many sectors,
9 commercial, recreational, tribal, ports and
10 harbors. And our scientists are looking at the
11 where the population may be at carrying capacity
12 predation or impacted, and risk salmon and
13 steelhead stocks is an issue as well as some
14 species that aren't listed, but could be a concern
15 in the future, such as white sturgeon. So in the
16 top picture you have the California sea lion, with
17 the salmon in the bottom picture, I believe is the
18 stellar sea lion with white sturgeon in the
19 Bonneville area.

20 Another project that we've been working
21 on with our partnerships with the Pacific States
22 Marine Fisheries Commission, and Randy, here with

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 his team, with Steve (inaudible) have been doing
2 excellent work, and we work closely with them, and
3 it's to talk about rockfish barotraumas, and I'd
4 like to point out that the support that our center
5 has had from Ken Franke and his fleet of vessels,
6 and members, and we've been able to demonstrate
7 the effectiveness of the center devices for
8 increasing the survivorship of rockfish, but also
9 the outreach that has come out of that, has been
10 important and has helped the other states as well
11 in it.

12 So, hats off to the hard work, that not
13 only goes into doing the research, but then
14 telling folks about it, so we should celebrate
15 that success. And part of that success has led us
16 to some more management flexibility, and allowing
17 some vessels to have additional 10 fathoms area to
18 fish in the Southern management area. And again,
19 we've been working with our partners to increase
20 the device used for giveaway program, and targeted
21 outreach.

22 MR. DUNN: If I could just interject

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there. And all of this barotrauma work, and more
2 or less the payback, for lack of a better term, to
3 the recreational fishery for their willingness to
4 partake in best practices here, is really seen as
5 a model in other parts of the country. Everybody
6 is looking at the West Coast saying; hey, look,
7 these guys got on board, they started to implement
8 this, and they are seeing some return.

9 And so now, other parts of the country
10 are saying, what is it that we need to do, what
11 data do we need to collect? What are the devices
12 that we need to consider how we get this info into
13 science and the management -- ultimately back into
14 the management process? So, hats off to the West
15 Coast, and to the Council, and everybody who
16 participate in this, because you guys are far and
17 above, ahead of everyone else.

18 MR. HEBERER: Sorry about that. I'm
19 going to back to the sea lion slide before I wrap
20 up. So this is consistently not only in new
21 position but in the 10 years I was on the HMS
22 Team, as Chairman, the consistently number one

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 issue that our Southern California anglers, now
2 I'm leaning as I've worked my up through Oregon
3 and Washington, a consistent issue is there as
4 well.

5 So we are hoping convene, maybe later in
6 the year, on information-sharing workshop, to
7 bring together sectors that are being impacted to
8 share information, and at least get everybody on
9 the same page of where things are. And begin the
10 dialogue of what, potentially, can be some
11 solutions we are looking for. Whether it's more
12 funding and research needed to look at non-lethal
13 deterrents, or deterrents methods, whether it's to
14 talk about fixes and solutions, so we'll keep you
15 abreast as we move forward. We are working with
16 all of our partners to pull that workshop
17 together.

18 MR. McCARTY: Craig, if I might? I'd
19 just like to add, I'd be more than willing, and
20 heavily motivated to be involved through the
21 Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission that
22 (inaudible), to be involved in that working group.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Excellent.

2 MR. McCARTY: We understand that the
3 adult males are the ones that come up in the
4 (inaudible) after they get done foraging in the
5 Columbia River.

6 SPEAKER: It's always the males, isn't
7 it?

8 MR. McCARTY: Yeah. Anyhow that's what
9 I wanted to talk about.

10 MR. FRANKE: And first, Craig, I think
11 you've been doing an outstanding job, and I've
12 already mentioned that. With regard to the
13 barotrauma, because it's the nationwide, the
14 impact of it, we've rolled them out, then sending
15 devices to the entire sport fishing fleet in
16 California. All the commercial passenger vessels
17 which is the lion share where the passengers are,
18 and we've been releasing thousands of fish with
19 them, so that is a success.

20 More importantly, the fact that NMFS
21 stepped up in the beginning to start process, and
22 we kind of jumped on the bandwagon. That was

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 clearly a collaborative game from beginning to
2 end. Absolutely, everybody, including the NGOs,
3 was high-fiving each other. It doesn't happen
4 very often so we, again, appreciate NMFS starting
5 the ball rolling.

6 Going back to the bluefin tuna, I just
7 wanted an additional piece. So Mexico has
8 limited the bluefin tuna and it's five person, but
9 regulatory-wise they have it closed right now,
10 while they evaluate what their management
11 direction is going to be based on the IATTC
12 direction. We flew down with (inaudible) Juan,
13 and met with Conapesca, and we just recommended to
14 the government that they mirror what the U.S.
15 government had done, and they have two on both
16 sides of the border at whatever time they reopen
17 it. So they are working out the details of their
18 commercial fishery, first I think.

19 But anyway, so that recommendation has
20 been made, and for all intents of purposes, we are
21 not fishing South of the Border right now,
22 everyone is fishing in the U.S., and I'm happy to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 report the airplanes this morning reported a whole
2 lot of bluefin in San Diego.

3 SPEAKER: So, we'll see some Friday?

4 MR. FRANKE: Yeah -- No, no, a little
5 bit further offshore.

6 SPEAKER: We'll have an update.

7 MR. FRANKE: We have an oceanographic
8 condition, I'll just tell you that is pretty
9 amazing, and the disconnect is, is the stock
10 assessment report that IATTC uses is almost
11 exclusively based on Japan, on recruitment, et
12 cetera, in Japan. We are 9,000 miles away,
13 there's a mix in the fish.

14 We are working with the Southwest
15 Science Center on, we've had multiple meetings
16 with Cisco, and all the statisticians and
17 scientists, how do we incorporate what we are
18 seeing, and data collection out here into that
19 model, so we can make some good sense of it,
20 because like Craig alluded to, we usually end
21 finishing tuna season in September. It's October,
22 November, all the way until now, every single

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 month it's the most tuna that we have ever seen a
2 bluefin out here out here before.

3 So we it's an oceanographic condition,
4 but you can't ignore when we are seeing all this,
5 and different of fish, we just want to make sure
6 the regulators get good information when they make
7 the decisions, to limit public access. So, what
8 came out of the pipe with the Council though, is
9 the right thing to do. I think 2 from 10 is a
10 good move.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Dick and Julie, did
12 you want to?

13 MR. BRAME: I wanted to stick more to, I
14 guess what, I believe that Russ said that, I think
15 NOAA should be commended for not just doing this
16 in-house. They took the (inaudible) Commission,
17 and with the advice of MAFAC, and convened the Rec
18 Summit, and took the advice of anglers, and didn't
19 develop the policy. They did not do it in-house
20 amongst themselves, they took -- I think they've
21 been commended for taking that step in taking the
22 outside advice as hearsay, and for somebody who

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 has been involved in this way, way too long; has
2 kids in college.

3 What I would love to see is a change in
4 culture, that's what I would say, and I think that
5 would address a lot of the concerns with
6 (inaudible), and I think this is a start in that
7 direction.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Julie and then Paul?

9 MS. MORRIS: So, I'm really interested
10 in different and better management tools for
11 recreational fishing partners, and so I'm seeing
12 the implementation plan, you've got this,
13 investigate alternative management approaches to
14 recreational fisheries management and
15 satisfaction. And you mentioned in your remarks,
16 not just going by pounds, but if you could expand
17 a little what the thoughts are that you'll be --
18 if you going to work on that in the next three
19 years that will be great.

20 MR. DUNN: Yeah. So we have underway
21 right now a working group within sustainable
22 fisheries, it's an informal one, that is looking

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 at -- more flexible approaches looking at, for
2 example, using more F-rate management approach,
3 sort of akin to the similar waterfowl examples and
4 things, trying to see, are there other ways we can
5 still meet the statutory requirements, but may not
6 necessarily be driven solely by pounds.

7 Now, of course there will always be the
8 ACL requirements, there will always be those
9 ultimate -- and ultimately it all gets translated
10 back in pounds anyway, but there may be
11 flexibility in the meantime, so we have a couple
12 of staffers who are looking at, what are the
13 characteristics of fisheries which may be
14 appropriate to manage in that way. There are some
15 species which, clearly would not be very well
16 managed F-rate, for example, rip flow, long-lived
17 species like blobfish.

18 And so they are trying to build that
19 list, and one of the ideas they are playing with
20 is sort of a decision matrix, okay, let's put
21 through and see what comes out and, sort of, they
22 are at the point of trying to figure out what are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the boxes that that decision matrix should be
2 comprised of. And so as we come -- move a little
3 bit further forward, we'll bring that out into the
4 public to say, these are our best ideas.

5 Here is some -- here is 50 or 20 example
6 of species around through this is how it comes
7 out, what do you want or think. Are these the
8 right boxes? That sort of thing, so that that's
9 the current project that would fit under that.

10 MS. SOBECK: And then that will call for
11 sessions with the states and fishermen, not
12 necessarily --

13 MR. DUNN: Yeah. Yeah. The Council --
14 obviously we can't mandate, a new management
15 approach has to go through the councils, so this
16 is the very first step in saying, here is an idea,
17 let's flesh it out, see if it works.

18 And if it appears to be working in the
19 right way, then just shoot from the hip, perhaps
20 we can find a fishery -- a council that's willing
21 to provide a pilot fishery, so let's take this
22 fishery put it in here and see if it works.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BRAME: If I may, Keith, I mean, I
2 brought that up at the summit and it actually
3 started with a conversation in a duck blind with
4 the guys, I've been duck hunting for 37 years.
5 And he said, what's this ACL stuff? And I said,
6 well, imagine the Atlantic Harbor Council said you
7 could kill 12,217 males, and then we are going to
8 close the season. He said, well, you can't do
9 that, it's bigger. So I said, there's a better
10 way, and recreational fishery -- the samples to
11 fishery as it exists is not as it's projected.

12 So if you get improvement out here we'll
13 fish, and you go over your ACL and you get
14 ratcheted down, at least the nonsensical outcomes
15 that doesn't fit today, and what we are asking for
16 is, managed workers of Fisheries with data you
17 have today, and you tailor management to that
18 construct.

19 MS. SOBECK: So, if I may?

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Please, do.

21 MS. SOBECK: I mean, I'm really
22 interested in pursuing that, I guess, having spent

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 five years at Interior, you know, they have a
2 different -- I mean, we all have the same
3 management goal of conservation and
4 sustainability. On the other hand, you know,
5 we've developed different kinds of science --
6 different kinds of science, you know, as it
7 relates to population with waterfowls in exactly
8 the same as it is estimating populations of fish.
9 They have different statutory methods and criteria
10 than we do.

11 SPEAKER: That's true.

12 MS. SOBECK: But we hear you that there
13 might well be more than one way, and waterfowl
14 management has been very successful, and it's very
15 accepted and well bought into by the community,
16 and so we all look to that and figure out whether
17 we can incorporate some of those principles and
18 methods in our fisheries metrics. So we are
19 willing to do that, understanding that, you know,
20 there are some differences.

21 MR. BRAME: Maybe it will work, maybe it
22 won't.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. SOBECK: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Appropriately, the
3 next item on the agenda is marine recreational
4 improvement program, the MRIP. So we are going to
5 be talking about getting better data, and a lot of
6 these questions are going to be pertinent to that
7 presentation. So, any other questions on this
8 one? Yeah, Ted?

9 MR. AMES: Yeah. Just an observation,
10 I want to commend NOAA and the Rec Fishery for
11 focusing on this barotrauma problem. In main, the
12 Balsa fishery has a major problem with that, and
13 it's been one of those things that's always slid
14 under the table, and now it has surfaced, and
15 there's been work, at least through Sea Gram in
16 our area searching for a solution, and we haven't
17 found it yet, but I feel confident that with
18 continued efforts this is a big step forward.

19 MR. DUNN: Great. Yeah. We've just
20 provided the region, GARFO now, with dollars to
21 buy a number of sort of release kits that they can
22 distribute, provide to the state, so that they can

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 reach out to anglers more effectively to say, to
2 all of the New England States, here you go. These
3 are some of the devices you should be using out
4 there to help these fish, I'm trying to multiply
5 our message.

6 SPEAKER: Well, full speed ahead.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Paul Clampitt has
8 been very patient.

9 MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you. A quick
10 question; I'm looking at that rockfish in the
11 upper right-hand corner with the eyes bulged out,
12 which we see a lot. So I'm wondering, is that
13 recoverable? How does that -- I mean the eyes
14 would like they -- I mean I can see that the air
15 bladder could be distorted, but the eyes?

16 MR. HEBERER: Yeah. So let me address
17 that, because that's part of the outreach we had
18 at our fishing shows. We had our Center
19 scientists there, as well as our regional
20 biologists, and they've actually conducted
21 research in cooperation with Ken, and his vessels,
22 where they've tagged these fish, they've put them

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in release cages, and they've videoed being put
2 back down to depth, and it's amazing to watch that
3 video, and I can share a link with you as a
4 systemic --

5 MR. CLAMPITT: Great.

6 MR. DUNN: We've got that same video a
7 part of MAFAC.

8 MR. HEBERER: Yeah. And then the
9 release happens about 120, 30 feet, on this video,
10 and then the tags are acoustically tracked for
11 long-term sort of duration survivorship. So
12 estimates are, depending on species, but in
13 aggregate about 70 to 80 percent survival rate to
14 when they are properly used. One thing that we
15 did encounter in our outreach was the impression
16 that people have that venting fish is still an
17 effective technique, and we spend a lot of time
18 talking about and showing pictures of infected
19 bladders that our State Co-Managers shared with
20 us, pictures of. So that's I think still an
21 outreach needed, we need to push forward is the
22 old advice that we used to give of a hypodermic

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 needle or a -- fillet tip is not advice that we
2 want to continue in -- to the anglers.

3 MR. DUNN: And in fact based on some of
4 this, the Gulf Council actually repealed its
5 venting requirement for snapper-grouper species,
6 (inaudible) fishes.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Ken?

8 MR. FRANKE: With regard to what Paul
9 was just talking about, we actually, with NMFS, we
10 have a group of scientists working on our boats
11 right now, that on a sea mount, right off of San
12 Diego, 35 miles, it's basically an aquarium. They
13 have transmitter receivers on the sea floor, and
14 then all the fish that you see in this picture,
15 are on that sea mount with tracking devices, and
16 they are monitoring them day-to-day, and at the
17 end of the year they are going to pop the
18 receivers.

19 I think they are actually doing it right
20 now, and they are going to be able to analyze it,
21 but yeah, it seems like a really good recovery
22 rate. I wanted to mention one last thing though,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 with what Craig is doing, it's all cooperative,
2 it's all collaborative.

3 Randy Fisher from Pacific States, I've
4 got to tell you, just threw us a bone, it's huge.
5 They funded the logbooks for us to put on our
6 boats. We are the boots on the ground on the
7 boats but, you know, \$50,000 worth of logbooks
8 really help get the program going. We need to,
9 like, work together as often as we can, Southwest
10 Science Center, Fish and Wildlife.

11 Fish and Wildlife developed the computer
12 program, Mexico has accepted the program, there's
13 a lot of good things going, but we ought to really
14 seek out those opportunities to figure out, who
15 can pay for what, maybe you can't pay for it all,
16 but the sampling program that Craig was just
17 talking about, we are going to help fund things
18 well.

19 Having the boats and the equipment, but
20 then having those items that need to be
21 accomplished, clearly identified, but more
22 importantly, where is the money going to come from

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to pay for them. I think that's where we need to
2 really work really well on the ground level, make
3 those decisions, and then we can have a plan that
4 everybody can share and a lot better work will be
5 done on the end.

6 So I've just got to publicly say without
7 Randy and his group, we wouldn't have electronic
8 logbooks, and our goal is to have the whole state
9 done probably within about two months. So we are
10 working hard on it.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank
12 you, to all the members. One last comment, we'll
13 make this, Julie?

14 MS. BONNEY: I had a question. I don't
15 know if it's -- I'm afraid, to go back to the
16 implementation plan.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Sure.

18 MS. BONNEY: I guess based on one
19 conversation here, on the implementation plan we
20 have a comment period, that meet the requirements
21 from 2015 through 2018, and there's a lot of
22 report, and it seems like a pretty heavy lift to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 me, all of the mandate, or suggested mandates in
2 the implementation plan. I was just wondering,
3 you know, with budget constraints and, you know,
4 the new initiative, I'm assuming money is just
5 coming -- getting reached from within the Agency,
6 and then you have the implementation plan, and
7 then have some pretty heavy requirements, on how
8 you are going to make those things happen within
9 your --

10 MR. DUNN: Do you mean this
11 implementation plan, or do you mean the IUU?

12 MS. BONNEY: This one.

13 MR. DUNN: This one. So, this one, the
14 way we constructed this, was we spoke with the
15 National Programs, and we said, we need you to
16 develop concepts, projects, activities that fit
17 within this framework, which you have -- a
18 reasonable expectation will be accomplished. And
19 so, some of that were very easy, some, you know,
20 for '15, '16, they know their budget for '15, they
21 are hopefully fairly certain about the project
22 they are going to do in '16, and then they looked

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 forward in making commitments.

2 So, we have a -- we are confident that
3 it will be executed. I don't think this is going
4 to require new dollars that are coming into the --
5 to come into the system.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank
7 you, everybody, for a very robust discussion on
8 the last two topics. Sorry that we've run
9 entirely into our break so I want to take at least
10 10 minutes to give people a chance here. It's
11 10:30, so let's reconvene at 10:40, please.

12 (Recess)

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So the
14 next topic on our agenda is with Richard Merrick,
15 he's our NOAA Fisheries Chief Science Advisor
16 presenting on --

17 MR. MERRICK: Do you want leave some of
18 the queue exercise.

19 SPEAKER: Yeah. I'll just get someone
20 to handle it.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. He's
22 presenting on the Marine Recreational Information

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Program, and this is an update, this is for
2 information. This is following up on some of the
3 things we've commented in the past, we've called
4 this MRIP. We've been looking at the program as a
5 whole and how we are working on getting better
6 data from the recreational fisheries, because it's
7 one thing for us to say that we are promoting
8 recreational fishing, and considering recreational
9 fishing, and then NOAA is doing a great job now
10 taking that into account in their management
11 decisions, but of course, that also requires
12 better information about the system itself, and
13 how many fishing are being taken, and what are the
14 consequences. So that's what this session is
15 about, and it's, again, informational for MAFAC.
16 So, Richard, thank you.

17 MR. MERRICK: So I'll go through basic
18 here, given that we have some new members, who
19 don't know anything about their work.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Yup.

21 MR. MERRICK: And also as, Eileen did
22 mention these congressional full briefings in June

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 for approach staff, it just amazes me how little
2 they really understand about how to manage the
3 fisheries. So maybe a little bit of that, it
4 won't be a whole lot. But what we try to tell
5 them, is that for us NOAA Fisheries, you know,
6 there's really two parts to it, one part is an
7 assessment, the other part is catch count.

8 The assessment requires information
9 abundance by all the catch, the catch has two
10 parts, recreational and commercial. And you can
11 sub-compartmentalize that with the buy catch
12 versus (inaudible). It's basically, you know,
13 commercial versus recreational, and if you look
14 around the country, the importance of those two
15 are parallel.

16 So if you go to New England and you go
17 and look at most of their fish stocks in New
18 England, commercial catch dominates. Though there
19 recreational catches for most of them, but if you
20 go into the Gulf of Mexico, the recreational
21 catches dominate for most species, at least 50
22 percent. So we have to have ways of accounting

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 for both.

2 And there are challenges there. One of
3 the big challenges for recreational fisheries, is
4 the multiple sections we have to deal with there,
5 and how different they are. If you look in the
6 Gulf, we deal with recreational fisheries that
7 include charter boat, head boat, recreational
8 fisheries in their own boats, people who are
9 fishing from shore.

10 And trying to understand all those parts
11 and estimate what's the recreational catch is a
12 real challenge, particularly if you are trying to
13 provide a statistically, robust, unbiased estimate
14 about the catches. So MRIP is really designed to
15 try to bring to bear a sort of a default mechanism
16 for estimating quantities for what the
17 recreational catches are.

18 For agents around the country, what we
19 are talking about here really is the MRIP
20 limitation for the East Coast and the Gulf, and
21 most of the folks here on dealing with the
22 recreational anglers working out of on the coast,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 or from shore. There are also protocols that MRIP
2 is developing for the charter boats and dealing
3 with head boats, but we are -- for this
4 conversation mostly, on those submitted to the
5 fishermen, they'll have their own boat or fishing
6 from the shore.

7 So, basically, as I've said, I'm going
8 to talk about shore and private boat fishing. We
9 had a study by the National Research Council some
10 years ago, they gave us a series of
11 recommendations on how improved catch limits for
12 recreational fisheries over the proceeding
13 mechanisms, and that is something called MRRFS.

14 What we are talking about now, is there
15 are three basic components in MRIP, they are all
16 under process now of being implemented so the
17 recreations that R.C. Davis, close to a decade
18 ago, are now all in the process of being
19 implemented. And certainly, what I want to talk
20 about today, is that of it deals with estimating
21 the number of anglers, so a fishing effort. And
22 the other message here is that for us to actually

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 implement this last part, it's going to take a
2 couple of years to do it, and I'll describe why we
3 have that. So we actually began this current
4 iteration of recreational -- you know, catch
5 estimation, but the study in 2006 by the National
6 Research Council, this is a study we initiated,
7 and basically we asked them to look at the way
8 we've been estimating catch and see if there's a
9 better way to do it. And about the same time,
10 2006, 2007, Magnuson was reauthorized, and that
11 also led to the push to develop better methods.
12 MRIP itself was established from here, and we were
13 beginning a series of projects, working with both
14 the stakeholders as well as the American Indians,
15 and statisticians, and it's all a better approach.

16 And there are a series of steps to
17 follow from that. All these were basically
18 recommendations that came out of NRC Report, one
19 part was it's over Angler Registry, and that was
20 basically to establish a universe who was a
21 fisherman. And then serially, the next steps were
22 to come up with heavyweight actually due to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 estimation regardless of the data that were being
2 used, then to come up with a better way to
3 estimate, that's what was being caught by
4 individual anglers, that's what they would call
5 the Intercept Survey.

6 And then finally the stage we are in
7 right now, to estimate how many anglers are out
8 there, what the average is. And in contrast, a
9 lot of things we've done, this is one where we
10 really try to pull together a lot of stakeholders
11 to build the governance, as well as to give us
12 advice. So this is the basic structure for this.
13 MAFAC has been heavily involved in this, and
14 that's now the Executive Steering Committee, Randy
15 and Dave, Bob Dooley is not here, and Dick were
16 all participants in that discussion.

17 And just looking, for example that the
18 lower right-hand box, that has representatives
19 from all the effected councils and commissions, as
20 well as most of the states. There are a lot of
21 people involved in this, in this conversation, and
22 in a lot of ways it has helped us, and when

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) made the presentation to the rest of
2 NOAA on how we try to transition our science from
3 the operations, we used MRIP as an example of how
4 we are trying to make this better. The
5 stakeholders involved and it's crucial to doing
6 this right, which is only different from what
7 happens in a lot of the rest of it, where
8 stakeholder involvement isn't a major issue.

9 MR. DUNN: If I can interject there.
10 Just that on each of those teams we have external
11 stakeholders. We have private individuals, and we
12 have state representatives, and/or commission
13 representatives on every one of those teams, so
14 they are all integral to the process.

15 MR. MERRICK: So the Transition Team,
16 for example, is large enough that we -- as we
17 began rolling out the transition, it took me the
18 better part of today just to call every one of
19 them a partner to this. So that's what this part
20 of it, what's happening. And I mentioned there
21 were three parts to it, and these all came out in
22 the NRC Report.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 One part is, how we estimate, you know,
2 trips of the anglers, and then how they estimate
3 the catch for individual anglers, and that's an
4 intercept survey that follows what the methodology
5 is. Remember those three parts, and most of the
6 conversation today deals with the effort part.
7 Hopefully you've got slides That's the complete,
8 that slide there, and you can look at this as
9 well, but we implemented the first part of this,
10 lowered into here, the implementation of the new
11 methodology for estimated catch.

12 Their survey came after that, and now
13 for the last couple of years, reduction are mostly
14 focused on the effort survey. And this has been a
15 very good quest, this is the big deal in a lot of
16 ways. Just depends on how many anglers are out
17 there, it's really the biggest statistical
18 challenge. It's not that difficult to sample
19 anglers when they are coming to shore, that the
20 estimation methodology itself is not that
21 difficult. That's just a statistical exercise.

22 And actually coming up with a way to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 estimate how many anglers there has been a real
2 challenge. And before, the traditional method I
3 did with telephone survey, but how many of you
4 still use a landline? And that's been a big
5 challenge, is that so many people have switched
6 over either to the cell phone only or have caller
7 ID on their landlines, so they reject any calls
8 from someone they don't know, that phone surveys
9 are either pretty much proven to be an ineffective
10 thing.

11 So this method is moving over to using a
12 mail survey. We've tested this, we did a pilot
13 study a year or so ago, and there are a series of
14 talks and studies leading up to that, and we have
15 found from this initial pilot survey, is that
16 there are new clear improvements over the prior
17 methods. One is that we've got much better
18 response rates. People just weren't returning our
19 calls. We find out with the mail survey we are
20 getting back at least in the 20s if not in the 30
21 percent, which is a good return. We get
22 information back as fast through this, as we were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 getting back from the telephone surveys, which was
2 a surprise. And importantly, one of the things
3 this does, is it reduces some of the sampling
4 biases, that we were only sampling people who had
5 a landline, and that's wrong.

6 We got a hard time without using the
7 angler registry of finding people who worked the
8 coastal states who also fished. So this new mail
9 survey, we will actually take the survey outside
10 coastal states to come to identified individuals
11 who come to Florida, for example, from outside of
12 Florida and fish, and then they go back to New
13 Jersey, for example.

14 And there's a significant portion of the
15 angler industry that does that. So as we
16 transition here into this new methodology, it's
17 going to take a while to do it, and I mentioned
18 earlier that all the catch data we get, use
19 both -- gets used both in stock assessments and
20 also in the actual estimation of landings that's
21 occurred within the season.

22 The implications there are that both the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 stock assessment, and the landings data, or the
2 quota setting have to be in line. So you have to
3 have a ALC, say, process, that use the stock
4 assessment, that's facing the same data series as
5 the ACL and then the landings data that it's
6 calibrated to. We also need to make sure that the
7 new landings data we are getting back from this
8 process, aligns with historical data.

9 Most of the stock assessments require a
10 time series, so maybe the fish stocks were the
11 only -- on the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico
12 have a long-time series for the recreational
13 fisheries data. Shifting from one method to
14 another is problematic. They are different, they
15 estimate differently, so we have to develop these
16 calibration approaches that will allow us to
17 compare the new time -- catch time series to the
18 old time series.

19 So the way we are proposing to do this is
20 that we have already begun this year, actual full
21 implementation of the mail survey. We are also
22 doing the telephone survey. So we continue that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 time series. We've got for two years, so we've
2 got enough that we can calibrate between the two,
3 and then in the third year we'll switch over to
4 the new time series and use that for the catch data
5 and at that same time also rerun the stock
6 assessments that we need to run in the catch data.

7 So at that point both the stock
8 assessment and the landings data that we are
9 getting back to managing the fishery come from the
10 same perspective, the same estimation of the
11 development. So the goal is to transition fully
12 to the mail survey in 2017, even though we are
13 doing it now, we do it this year, we do it next
14 year, and then 2017, we'll discontinue the phone
15 survey and go with the mail survey.

16 We are going to research, and you may
17 recognize or have heard that we are working with a
18 lot of coastal states to develop, potentially,
19 alternative ways of estimating catches, when so
20 many stocks and time in fisheries were so short,
21 are very difficult to estimate from MCs in
22 management using the MRIP. MRIP is great for this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 good default mechanism. Everybody is using it on
2 the East Coast and in the Gulf, but for some of
3 these fisheries, where the seasons were really
4 short, and I gave it like a quick answer, MRIP may
5 not be the total answer to manage those. So we
6 are funding work in Alabama, Texas and Louisiana,
7 to look at alternative approaches to this.

8 And then finally, we are now in the
9 process of going back to NRC and commissioning a
10 second review. Again, this is an independent
11 external review, to have them vet them at the --
12 as we have implemented them, and you'd think that
13 we have actually followed, to a tee, what they
14 have proposed to us, the statisticians that were
15 on the original NRC Panel, has actually been
16 involved through this whole discussion for the
17 last two years. So we did, we followed it, but we
18 weren't having the external review to make sure we
19 are doing it right. So, I'll pause for questions.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Terri?

21 MS. BEIDEMAN: It seems that a lot of
22 this new method hinges, and I applaud it, because

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I live on the Coast, and I know how many empty
2 houses there are that might have been even when we
3 had the landlines, hinges on the National
4 Saltwater Angler Registry.

5 SPEAKER: It is.

6 MS. BEIDEMAN: Do you have any idea of
7 the level of compliance with that?

8 MR. MERRICK: I can't get you that
9 directly, but I'll get you the answer on it.

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay.

11 MR. DUNN: I can't speak to the exact
12 level but, you know, the way the registry has been
13 established is that we have made MOUs with all the
14 states to provide us their state licenses
15 databases, and/or in New Jersey the registry --
16 their state registry in New York. And so the data
17 -- so they have had to meet certain data, interim
18 data requirements that we felt were necessary to
19 satisfy the need to the registry.

20 So, more or less you could say that the
21 compliance rate for the registry is the same as
22 for any given states like -- compliance with their

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 licenses requirements. So we know there are gaps,
2 I mean one of the gaps that arises around the
3 country, be it as many states having exception for
4 people under a certain age, juveniles, they are
5 fishing. How do you capture that?

6 MR. MERRICK: Mm-hmm.

7 MR. DUNN: Or retirees who are over 65,
8 68, whatever is the states have for that. So
9 there are some gaps that are difficult to figure
10 out how to fill.

11 MR. MERRICK: You know, we are
12 attempting to developing protocols to deal with
13 those gaps, for the lower age and the overage.
14 But for compliance with the appropriate ages, the
15 rate is pretty high.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Is there some sort
17 of tool for benchmarking the data that gets
18 reported to you against what you really see in the
19 field? Like how do you know that folks aren't
20 under-reporting?

21 MR. MERRICK: We've always had that
22 problem.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So do you make
2 statistical adjustments for it?

3 MR. MERRICK: You can't. I think the
4 goal is that since we've -- those will be dockside
5 interviews, they will make a pretty good evidence.
6 The bigger concern would be trips at sea. Right
7 now there's not a really good way to get that,
8 other than have them report it.

9 MR. DUNN: So the catch on a given drip
10 is captured at dockside, and then what Richard was
11 talking about at the end here, is actually the
12 estimating effort. So more or less what they do
13 is, as you get interviewed at the dock, and you
14 tell me the sample appears, yeah, I've caught 4
15 mackerel, and 3 cod. That is then essentially
16 multiplied against the effort that's estimated in
17 the end.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And that's not all
19 effort, that's some percentage of the effort where
20 you've got some observer out there --

21 SPEAKER: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: -- who is doing

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 interviews periodically, in that, so that's your
2 real-time data, but then you are using to
3 benchmark, and then you've got the self-reporting
4 system that is obviously going to be really
5 important with the mail, but we need to know about
6 it --

7 MR. DUNN: But that mail is just
8 speaking to developing the estimate of effort, not
9 the number of fish that were caught. So that's a
10 multiplier basically, for the number -- Richard,
11 correct me where I'm off track here.

12 MR. MERRICK: You're correct.

13 MR. DUNN: For the number of -- so we'll
14 call it, you know, the average fish per trip that
15 are caught, and you multiply that by the effort
16 that this mail survey will generate. And that
17 will be the total catch.

18 MR. BRAME: That's just one of the trips
19 -- pounds catch per trip, the people's catch, and
20 the mail survey just -- you know, they do that to
21 first call upon questions where they come up with
22 some ways they can get back at the recreational

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 catch and sort of fall by. Each trip kind of
2 catches the drift.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So once we get the
4 mail that tells us effort --

5 MR. BRAME: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: We are using
7 statistical multipliers to say, okay, given that
8 much effort we are assuming a certain amount of
9 fish got caught?

10 MR. DUNN: That's correct. Yeah.

11 MS. SOBECK: We have been independently
12 estimating catch rate of fish, and so --

13 MR. BRAME: And it worked really well
14 coast-wide, it works very good regionally, less so
15 state-wide, you get down to a -- by mode, then you
16 get these huge variances.

17 MR. MERRICK: Sure.

18 MR. BRAME: So it's really designed for
19 large- scale, so I'm not -- I mean, I hate to say
20 it, in the Gulf the red snapper fisheries are
21 small fisheries, right. Very few people do it
22 relative to red ground fishing, so that's what

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 hard to come up with estimates over.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: The point I'm
3 raising is that anytime you are dealing with a
4 system that's got a multiplier in it, and under
5 estimate gets magnified in that. Right? So if
6 you've got an underestimate --

7 MR. DUNN: Or overestimate.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Or an overestimate
9 for that matter, right. So, that's why I was
10 asking about how are we benchmarking that initial
11 number?

12 MR. DUNN: They got the data through a
13 work -- I can't remember, what's the name of the
14 group when they develop the initial estimates and
15 it goes out for review.

16 SPEAKER: Isn't that the QA/QC?

17 MS. SOBECK: But isn't the point that
18 you were right, Keith, and that's what NRC said to
19 us at the beginning? They said, basically, the
20 system you are using isn't doing a very good job,
21 which is why we are going through this whole
22 revamping, so it still got some of the fundamental

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 questions that you are raising that we are dealing
2 with them in a better way going forward.

3 MR. MERRICK: Without actually knowing,
4 the absolute number of fish caught is unknown.
5 What we can do through each -- through these steps
6 is, for example, from the intercept survey you can
7 establish a position that's been around that, and
8 you can use that, plus the position as per number
9 of trips, to give you the variance in what your
10 estimate is going to be.

11 And that then can form the stock
12 assessment and as a part of the management process
13 it can inform how you want to manage. Hopefully
14 that variance is relatively small because when you
15 set the ACL, that's the last step in that ACL, so
16 the process is how well do you trust your catch
17 price?

18 MR. AMES: Yeah. On capturing the
19 individuals in a household, that children or
20 elderly who might be fishing with it, it would be
21 practical if you simply added a question on the
22 form that's filled up -- that the application can

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 simply say, other members of household who fish.

2 MR. MERRICK: Yeah, that's a great idea,
3 that's where we are headed now I think.

4 SPEAKER: Yeah. I agree.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Terri Lee?

6 MS. BEIDEMAN: So I know a little bit
7 about this particular thing, not as much as you,
8 but I watch the LPS, you know, with regard to the
9 highly-migratory species, the Large Pelagics
10 Survey. And I happen to live across the street
11 from a boat ramp for a lot of years, and for a
12 period of time these dockside intercepts were only
13 allowed in public places, certain private marinas
14 would chew away the dockside collection. Of
15 course those are the folks that are going out for
16 shortlist tunas, marlins, et cetera, what they
17 were trying to find.

18 The chance that you were likely going to
19 see somebody, trailering a boat and, you know,
20 catching any of those things was minimal, although
21 I'm sure it happens. So I'm glad to see that your
22 diversity in trying to reach them through the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 mail, I think I also believe that the insides
2 works pretty diligently what the private marinas
3 to encourage their allowing the dockside
4 interviews and those types of things.

5 So I think it has improved over time,
6 the question I have with just the straight on
7 survey is species identification. Do you have
8 some method to educate them to better estimate, or
9 this just broad species groups that you are doing?

10 MR. MERRICK: Those are two of the
11 species.

12 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay.

13 MR. MERRICK: There are stock issues
14 there, but there are ways to deal with that, but
15 basically it's the species ID issue. And we are
16 funding this basically through the states, and the
17 states will deal with our training of folks to be
18 able to do the ID.

19 MS. BEIDEMAN: Great. Thank you.

20 MR. MERRICK: Yeah. I mean for us, this
21 has to be regionally based, so how the states will
22 do the surveys is really important to this. Like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in the states, develop alternative methods. The
2 only issue there we have is making sure there is a
3 calibration process and a vetting process, so the
4 little orange with the current series.

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. So do you think
6 that you might be moving, eventually to the
7 (inaudible) type of situation -- or DM?

8 MR. MERRICK: That would be the ideal.
9 An excellent -- one of the issues with, like,
10 snapper is just making sure you have both the ID,
11 correct. But then secondly, make sure you are not
12 biased in some way. And that's been turning out
13 to be the big issue. If you have wage, you know,
14 potential buys of people who were able would
15 report more than another. Then we can go to that,
16 and now we'll simplify everything.

17 MS. BEIDEMAN: And electronic
18 monitoring, you know, some of them might work out
19 well, through to question some of the discord
20 issues, but you really can't resolve necessarily,
21 clearly. We are moving in that direction all
22 around the place, I understand, so, you know.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MERRICK: So electronic reporting is
2 the first step in that process, so as part of the
3 -- you heard yesterday about the (inaudible)
4 Initiative, plus in this initiative direction --
5 electronic reporting -- electronic boundary, we
6 expect a significant portion of those funds to be
7 used in the Gulf, probably for head (inaudible)
8 from the (inaudible)

9 MS. BEIDEMAN: Terrific. Thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Julie?

11 MS. BONNEY: There's no doubt that there
12 was in there, and it this is an ID questions, but
13 they are working with the commercial fishermen --
14 it is -- if you are self- importing the catch
15 data, and that self-importing catch information is
16 going to drive a closure for your fishery, how are
17 you going to audit that to know that people are
18 under-reporting, because they don't want affects
19 of --

20 MR. MERRICK: That's to buy strong, with
21 the e- logbooks, with people who are importing the
22 catch at sea --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. BONNEY: So you don't think that
2 there would be a ground for this, or anything?

3 MR. MERRICK: He ran through the advice
4 samplings, a portion was individuals at dockside
5 that, you know -- that's the goal.

6 MS. BONNEY: Have you ever thought about
7 putting like monitors on charter vessels, like
8 some of the private boats?

9 MR. MERRICK: Yes. And there are --
10 that's being discussed.

11 MR. DUNN: And some of the head boats do
12 carry observers.

13 MS. BONNEY: They do?

14 MR. DUNN: Yeah.

15 MS. BONNEY: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Ken, a last
17 comment?

18 MR. FRANKE: Yeah. In answer to your
19 question just now, because we are going through
20 that right this minute; we are putting it on the
21 electronic logbooks, and then the California
22 Department of Fishing Wildlife, game- plan-wise,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is going to do random, intercepts on the boats,
2 and the law is, that we have to have them
3 completed before the lines are tied up on the
4 dock, otherwise you get a ticket and you get to go
5 to court. So it's pretty cut and dry and we think
6 that's going to work.

7 MS. BONNEY: And that sounds like a good
8 project.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Dick?

10 MR. BRAME: Keith, she's talking about
11 self-reported data, and that's always a problem.
12 And we funded the -- the air operation from --
13 MRIP has funded a product by Texas A&M, where he's
14 going to take the snapper application in
15 developing a panel survey, where he is going to
16 randomly pick people, where they can then report,
17 because the problem with just -- lay people report
18 willy-nilly, we know that it introduces bias.

19 So, we are looking at a way to --
20 because the most common question I get, and I'm
21 sure most people get is, there's got to be some
22 button on this volume I can push that will give us

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 better data. We've got to, and there's none.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank
3 you, everybody, for a good discussion. Thank you,
4 Dr. Merrick.

5 MR. MERRICK: Just one final comment.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes, sir.

7 MR. MERRICK: The issue of bias, that
8 was one of the biggest criticisms in the NRC
9 review, is that we weren't sampling appropriately
10 in your biases, and they pointed out for example,
11 with the intercept survey, that we weren't
12 sampling early enough or late enough so there are
13 trips that go out in the dark, and come back in
14 the dark and we weren't sampling them, so there's
15 advised against those really long trips.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Dr.
17 Merrick. All right so, Dr. Patrick? All right,
18 the next topic is informational update on the
19 national standards, revisions, efforts, MAFAC has
20 commented on this in past.

21 DR. PATRICK: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: This is a chance for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 us to see what's happened since then. It's been
2 raised at managing our nation's fisheries, it's
3 been discussed here a number of times, and Dr.
4 Patrick, is the Acting Branch Chief for Fisheries
5 Policy, in our Office of Sustainable Fisheries.
6 And thank you, Doctor, for being here today.

7 DR. PATRICK: Great. Well, thank you,
8 for inviting me. I'll try to get this done quick
9 so we have some time for some questions before
10 lunch.

11 So, as you all know Eileen has already
12 talked about this a little bit, but we came out
13 with our proposed rule to revise the National
14 Standard 1, 3 and 7 Guidelines, back in January of
15 this year. And we made sure we had a long comment
16 period to make sure that we had enough time to go
17 and visit our councils and let them have a couple
18 of different meetings before the deadline was up
19 to give their comments.

20 So I've been on, kind of, the council
21 circuit, since February, and we started out with
22 the Council Coordination Committee, and going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 through here, we make it through the fact finally,
2 and we'll be wrapping this up later in June, with
3 the Council Coordination Committee. I think you
4 all are very familiar with the National Standard
5 Guidelines and that, you know, NOAA Fisheries is
6 responsible for writing the guidelines for the 10
7 National Standards within the Magnuson-Stephens
8 Act.

9 And our proposed rule, primarily, makes
10 revisions to the National Standards 1 Guidelines,
11 which is about achieving on a continuing basis,
12 the outcome yield for fishery. But it also is
13 going to make revisions, or proposed visions to
14 the general section of the National Standards of
15 Guidelines, which is really just the introduction
16 portion to the National Standard of Guidelines.

17 It talks about how National Standard
18 Guidelines, which is really just the introduction
19 portion to the National Standard Guidelines. It
20 talks about how National Standard Guidelines will
21 be used to evaluate MFP and MFP amendments. Also,
22 in National Standard 3 which is about how to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 manage fisheries as a unit throughout the range,
2 and then also National Standard 7, which is about
3 looking at the cost benefits of any national
4 measures that are currently recommended for
5 amendment.

6 So, why are we doing this right now?
7 Eileen mentioned this a little bit, and we've been
8 getting the feedback from stakeholders, since
9 we've implemented the 2009 guideline revisions
10 that implemented annual catch limits and
11 accountability measures. We've had some time to
12 see what's working and not working through the
13 regulations we've been putting forward, there is
14 also then, a lot of different congressional
15 hearings about ACLs, and then draft Bills, and how
16 they reauthorize it.

17 And we thought that if were to put out
18 this proposed rule, we could show that there is
19 some flexibility in how we can meet these annual
20 catch limit requirements for rebuilding
21 provisions, and hopefully, address a lot concerns
22 that we've heard over the years. And we started

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 this process, off, in 2012, whether that's part of
2 this rulemaking, and you all provided comments to
3 us at that time.

4 But since then, we've had a lot of
5 different types of meetings to get additional
6 input like managing the regional fisheries. We
7 also had a National Research Council report on
8 rebuilding programs within the U.S. Fisheries
9 Management System, as well you all had your
10 Recreational Fisheries Work Group, provide some
11 recommendations on how recreational fishery is
12 provisioned to be improved through MSA mandates.

13 So, using all those different types of
14 inputs, we've come through and put together a
15 proposed rule that we hope shows how we can be
16 more flexible in implementing these regulations.
17 The main thing that you need to take away from the
18 proposed rule is that we are not establishing any
19 new requirements that requires the councils to
20 revise their current national plans, all we've
21 really done, is add additional clarity and
22 potential flexibility on how we can meet these MSA

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 mandates.

2 And one of the examples that I'll show
3 you here in a few minutes, is really examples that
4 we've taken from what Council has already been
5 doing over the last couple years, and putting
6 those and highlighting them within our guidelines
7 to show how flexible these guidelines could be
8 used. Some other points here is that, you know,
9 we are going to be maintaining the requirement, to
10 have any catch limits and accountability measures,
11 because we are going to be staying within the
12 guiderails of the MSA in this proposed rule.

13 And I will have to go outside MSA
14 mandates. And that any type of flexibility that
15 we are recommending in this proposed rule, we are
16 noting that we are still responsible for using the
17 best scientific information available. So you'll
18 see that like in a lot of examples I give, we
19 often will provide a caveat about how you need to
20 use this available science to put together a
21 reasonable approach for your measurement.

22 So, there is a lot of revisions relating

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to this proposed rule, maybe you'll look at the
2 Redline version, you might be able to do one
3 because we did a lot of editorial things, in
4 trying to reduce a lot of repetitive statements
5 that we made throughout the guidelines.

6 But overall we made seven major
7 revisions to the guidelines and I'll go over those
8 relatively quickly. This first one that I'm going
9 to go over is in increasing flexibility and
10 rebuilding programs. It's my longest section, if
11 we can make it through that one, the rest of them
12 should go pretty quickly.

13 So, this has five sub-topics. The first
14 one is on calculating T-Max. So, currently, in
15 our National Standard Guidelines, we have guidance
16 in there about how to calculate the maximum time
17 to rebuild, which we call T-Max. For stocks that
18 require more than 10 years to rebuild. So, if you
19 can rebuild within 10 years, well, 10 years is
20 your maximum. But if you can -- if it's develops
21 the stock and won't allow you to reveal within 10
22 years, well, then we had this calculation, or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 methodology for calculating T-Max, that is T-min,
2 plus one generation time.

3 Or, generation time is the --
4 essentially average age of the spawning
5 population. Over the years we've found that
6 calculating generation time is -- can be a data
7 intensive kind of process, because you have to
8 know the age structure of the population and some
9 other factors, so that is like history. And as a
10 result that can mean that councils have to come up
11 with proxies to calculate these T- max
12 calculations.

13 So in the proposed rule, what we are
14 doing is trying to provide two additional ways of
15 calculating T-max, that aren't so data-intensive,
16 and can be used for these more data-limited and
17 data moderate stuff that may be listed as
18 overfished sometime in the future. And that two
19 approaches here are two times T-min, and the time
20 needed to rebuild to BMSY; when you fish at 75
21 percent of MFMT, which is your maximum fishing
22 mortality threshold, of FMSY.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, the 75 percent of MFMT might sound
2 familiar because that's already in the guidelines,
3 when we say that -- and you reach the end of a
4 rebuilding plan, and you haven't yet rebuilt to
5 BMSY, you can continue on fishing at F- rebuild or
6 75 percent of MFMT. And so what we've done is
7 taking that same guidance and use it as a way for
8 capturing data for T-max. Also, these two
9 additional ways for calculating T-max, providing
10 very similar assonance of T-max compared a more --
11 the way that we've been calculating over the last
12 20 years, the team then plus one generation time.

13 So, what I have here is just a graph,
14 kind of showing you how these three different
15 methods overlap with one another whenever you
16 apply it to 11 different species here. So, the
17 X-axis down here is just an index for how
18 productive the species is, so if you have a score
19 of 1, you are going to be like a tuna, or a
20 herring. And if you are over on the left-hand
21 side you'll have a value of 0.1, you are going to
22 be more like a shark species or rockfish, the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Pacific Coast rockfish that is.

2 And then we T-max here on the Y, so you
3 can see that altering lines overlap a lot. There
4 is going to be some areas here though, where there
5 is going to be like 5 or 10-year differences
6 between T-max, and when there comes up situations
7 where accounts looking to calculate all three ways
8 of doing T-max, we have guides that says, you need
9 to provide a rationale for why you chose one
10 approach over another. And we are thinking that
11 it's probably going to come down to data quality.

12 The next sub-topic on rebuilding is
13 about adequate progress, the MSA requires the
14 Secretary to determine if adequate progress is
15 made in the rebuilding plan, and that security
16 should monitor every two years to figure out if
17 the adequate progress is being made. Currently
18 our NS1 Guidelines don't have any guidance about
19 what is adequate progress, and how do you monitor
20 it every two years.

21 So, we've clarified in this proposed
22 rule that the way that we've been doing it in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 past, for monitoring how well we've been meeting
2 our rebuilding program, is looking at recent stock
3 assessments and that's usually done every two
4 years, but in some cases, we don't have the money
5 to do that every two years, so what can you use
6 instead?

7 Well, we've been using comparisons of
8 catch too, new catch limits to look at how well
9 we've been meeting our levels of harvest, and
10 there may be other appropriate performance
11 measures that Council identifies later on.

12 We also provided a definition of when
13 adequate progress isn't being made, and we say
14 that's happening when your fishing mortality is
15 continuously exceeding your F- rebuild, or the
16 associated annual catch limit, and that your
17 accountability measures are not effective. So the
18 key point there is that they are continuously
19 being exceeded, so if you exceed your annual catch
20 limit at one time in the rebuilding, it doesn't
21 mean you are not making adequate progress.

22 It's the continual, exceeding the annual

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 catch limit, and your accountability measures
2 aren't effective in correcting that overage. You
3 also might find that you are not making adequate
4 progress if you are getting these stock assessment
5 that gives you a totally different view of
6 rebuilding expectations for that stock.

7 So this recently happened in the
8 northeast for the Gulf of Maine cod population,
9 where they had a rebuilding plan, they have been
10 keeping their catch under the annual catch limit
11 for several years, and they actually thought that
12 they were going to have a rebuilt stock around
13 2010. However, when the new stock assessment came
14 through, they found out that they had misestimated
15 some different ground burst, and that actually
16 they haven't been overfishing for the last couple
17 of years, that really reduced the overall size for
18 their population, and they were looking at like 80
19 percent reductions in catch.

20 And so that's an example of whenever you
21 are looking at a significantly different status of
22 your stock, it's 80 percent off from what you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 thought it was going to be. So in those cases
2 what you can do is that's for interim measures,
3 that in -- or that reduces but not necessarily
4 ends overfishing, so that comes out of our MSA
5 mandates here, and basically it's an 180-day
6 provision, and it can be extended for one-time so
7 you can get basically one year of reduced fishing
8 effort, and if that doesn't necessarily end over
9 fishing, but in that second year you do have to
10 prevent over-fishing.

11 We didn't have any guidance on how this
12 works out here, because we never really used this
13 interim measure protocol in the past until cod
14 came around. And so we wanted to make sure that
15 the gadgets that we gave New England is going to
16 be also in our guidelines here.

17 And basically our proposed guide that
18 says that inner measures should really be used and
19 if we are going to use some of these three
20 criteria that needs to be met. Which is that
21 there's an unanticipated and significantly changed
22 and understanding of the stock status, that any

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 number of fishing immediately would result in
2 severe social or economic impacts, and that during
3 the center of the period, the biomass must be
4 increased for that stock. Moving on for the next
5 subtopic on rebuilding is extending timelines.
6 Basically the way that things kind of happen now
7 with the rebuilding plans, is that as we are
8 getting these stock assessments, there's usually
9 discussions on whether the F-rebuild should be
10 increased or decreased based on probability of
11 reaching T-target on time. And there is also some
12 councils look at modifying their T-target and
13 T-max calculations based on new information.

14 And while that's useful, because they
15 are using their best scientific information
16 available, it also adds in some issues with
17 transparency, and not, you know, basically
18 changing the rebuilding plan every time you get a
19 new stock assessment. And we've also been getting
20 evidence that we've been putting emphasis on
21 trying to make a stock rebuild from a biomass
22 perspective, rather than trying to just focus on

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 maintaining your fishing rate that's less than, or
2 equal to your F-rebuild.

3 And so, in our proposed rule here, what
4 we are trying to clarify here, is that once you've
5 gone through this initial process of calculating
6 the F-rebuild for your rebuilding program. That
7 the primary objective would be to maintain your
8 F-add or less than F-rebuild, and if you were to
9 do that we would expect that your stock would
10 rebuild, on average, by key target.

11 Sometimes they rebuild quick, and
12 sometimes they take a little bit longer. And we
13 are trying to stay away from the viewpoint of --
14 we've specified, say, a seven-year rebuilding
15 plan, but the biomass isn't responding so we need
16 to do something about that. We are trying to
17 focus more on F-rebuild even biomass as an
18 important issue in rebuilding.

19 And lastly on rebuilding is about
20 discontinuing the rebuilding plans. Currently the
21 way that we do rebuilding plans, is once you've
22 been notified that the stock is overfished, the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Council has two years to develop the rebuilding
2 plan, and they also have that two-year period to
3 maybe do another stock assessment to double check,
4 to make sure that the stock really is overfished.

5 But once you implement that rebuilding
6 plan, you can't discontinue it until the stock is
7 rebuilt to BMSY. However, from, let's just 2013,
8 National Research Council Report on rebuilding
9 found that whenever we are looking at biomass
10 estimates for stock assessments, those are some of
11 the more uncertain estimates we get from the stock
12 assessment relative to fishing effort.

13 And when they reevaluated some of the
14 stocks we had in the rebuilding plans naturally,
15 36 percent of them were later discovered to have
16 never been overfished. And so those are
17 situations where a Council and the Fishing
18 Community is going to be in a situation that they
19 are going to be at a low F-rebuild rate for the
20 stock for several years, even the best available
21 science shows that stock was never ever
22 officially, it probably shouldn't really be in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 rebuilding plan.

2 So the proposed rule is trying to
3 address that issue, by saying you can discontinue
4 rebuilding plan now, if the Secretary determines
5 that the stock was never overfished as originally
6 felt based on, say, a new stock assessment that
7 shows, looking backwards that the stock biomass
8 was above the minimum stock size threshold. And
9 that in its current condition based on that new
10 stock assessment, the biomass is above MSST.

11 All right, so we made it through element
12 one, so the rest of these, we have improving
13 management of day-limit stocks. That was
14 something we heard a lot from our NPR, and over
15 the last couple years, and what we are doing in
16 the proposed rule here, is clarifying that -- and
17 recognizing that for the Fisheries that we manage,
18 several of them are data-limited, or data moderate
19 stocks that you may not be able to calculate
20 maximum (inaudible) estimates for, and apply our
21 normal overfishing ABC/ACL kind of framework to.
22 That's usually in line with MSY.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 We are clarifying that in these cases
2 where you cannot estimate MSY for a stock, but you
3 can use these alternative approaches that promotes
4 sustainability, and we've been doing that for
5 several years now, in our different councils, by
6 using alternative approaches.

7 And I just have some examples here.
8 This isn't the full list, there seems to be a new
9 method developed every month almost, for data core
10 stocks. But using these alternative approaches,
11 like recent average catch, and BCs/ACs out here on
12 the West Coast, are some of these alternative ways
13 of calculating what is sustainable level of catch
14 and still applying those overfishing ABC and ACL
15 type of catch limits on those stocks with
16 estimates that maybe aren't maximum sustainable
17 yield, but they are agreed to be sustainable
18 levels of yield by your scientists.

19 And another point here, is that in the
20 guidelines, we wanted to try to emphasize the use
21 of stock complexes for managing data core stocks,
22 and we already do that in a lot of situations

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 where we had data core stocks and we put them into
2 the complex and measure them as a unit, but most
3 of the time whenever we do that, what we are doing
4 is basically summing up the catches, but then that
5 complex in setting some large OFL for it, and we
6 are trying to emphasize the use of indicator
7 stocks, which are assessed stocks in those
8 complexes as a way to better manage those
9 complexes using stock assessments.

10 The third element here is another big
11 revision we made, and stocks that require
12 conservation and management. Currently we -- the
13 way that we have our guidance on this issue, is we
14 have information in National Standard 1 about
15 ecosystem component species and stocks in the
16 fishery.

17 In National Standard 3 we have
18 affirmation about managing stocks as a unit
19 throughout its range and data- collection in all
20 its species, and then in National Standard 7, the
21 guidelines, we have 9 or 10 factors listed in
22 there about how to determine what stocks should be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 included in the FMP or not. And so rather than
2 have all that information spread across all three
3 guidelines, what we've done is consolidated all
4 that information and move it up into the general
5 section of the guidelines which is, again, that
6 introduction portions of the guidelines.

7 And we've also tried to address some of
8 the concerns that we've heard about our ecosystem
9 component species, a definition that -- that had
10 to be a non-target and it was generally not
11 retained that was causing some issues in different
12 regions where they always try to keep it even
13 though it maybe wasn't vulnerable to overfishing.

14 And so, when we consolidate all this
15 information down, this is what we came up with.
16 Basically, stock that require conservation and
17 management, and thus it will be included in the
18 FMP and have OFLs, MSYs, et cetera, those stocks
19 are those that are predominantly caught in federal
20 waters, and they are known to be overfished,
21 subject to overfishing, or they are likely to
22 become so.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So there's a risk factor in there. And
2 so you meet those criteria, you need to be
3 included in FMP and have all those different type
4 of reference points associated with them. We also
5 have a list of 10 other factors that mainly came
6 from National Standard 7, and it's almost verbatim
7 here, from the guidelines there.

8 And these are additional factors that a
9 Council consider whether other stocks that don't
10 meet those first two criteria I just talked about,
11 whether they should be included in an FMP or not.
12 And these are optional things to consider. So
13 this book has a unique number 2 and number 3 on
14 this list, doesn't automatically mean that you are
15 going to be include in an FMP, it's up to the
16 discretion of the Council to figure out what is
17 being include in the FMP here, using these factors
18 or even other ones that they've identified.

19 And what that boils down to now, is the
20 inner guidelines that we have basically three
21 categories of stocks. And we are also sensitive
22 to the issue that each Council often kind of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 defines through the stocks within our FMP in a
2 slightly different way. And so, this time around
3 we are saying that if you already had stocks that
4 are listed as stocks in the fishery, well, those
5 are the equivalent of stocks that require
6 conservation management, and that first group
7 there. Those are the ones that need SDCs and
8 ACLs.

9 If you had ecosystem component species,
10 listed in your MFP, well those are equivalent to
11 the number of -- the group up there, number 2,
12 stocks not in need of conservation management.
13 Those, again, you don't need to have SDCs and ACLs
14 for, but you can, like, prohibit catch for
15 by-catch regions, and things like that.

16 And then we have this third category,
17 which is a little odd one, but it's other managed
18 stocks, and that happens whenever we have a stock
19 that -- multiple fisheries catch. And because
20 it's multiple fisheries they might be managed by
21 two separate FMPs, and we have the issue of who --
22 because they are caught in both fisheries and they

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 are in need of conservation management, do I need
2 to specify SDCs and ACLs in both FMPs?

3 And what if they are managed by two
4 separate councils what goes on there? And so what
5 we say here, is that basically the Council needs
6 to identify what the primary FMP is, that's where
7 all the SDCs and ACL regulations belong, and in
8 the secondary FMP, all they need to do is include
9 it in there as other managed stock, and note that
10 any management measures that they are going to
11 use, to be consistent with the primary FMP.

12 This fourth element here is on ecosystem
13 approaches to management and some clarification
14 about optimum yield in the guidelines, basically
15 what we are doing here is trying to, not really
16 introduce because this concept has been around for
17 a long time, but introduce it into our guidelines,
18 the concept of an aggregate maximum sustainable
19 yield.

20 Currently, in the way that we usually
21 specify MSY is on an individual basis, however
22 using an aggregate where you basically group

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species together and come up with a maximum
2 sustainable yield estimate, can be beneficial and
3 is often looked at as an ecosystem approach to
4 management because it takes into account there's
5 an OP species interacts that you try to account
6 for through the ecosystem approach.

7 We also clarify that RAMSY could be
8 useful in specifying optimum yield for fishery, so
9 if you didn't want to specify optimum yield for a
10 stock or stock complex that maybe at this higher
11 fishery level, an RA approach should be a useful
12 concept. We also wanted to clarify the
13 relationship between optimal yield and annual
14 catch limit framework. We somehow missed that in
15 the 2009 guidelines.

16 We had in there, in the 2009, guidelines
17 that the MSY for individual species is equivalent
18 to the overfishing limit if you were to do it on
19 an annualized basis. But we never said how
20 optimum yield relates to this framework. And so
21 here we are just clarifying that if you were to
22 try to annualize the expression of optimum yield

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 which is not only a long-term goal, but if you
2 look at it on an annual basis it would be
3 equivalent to or less than ACL.

4 And lastly, we've made some little
5 tweaks to the optimum yield section about
6 basically the structure and how we go about doing
7 the assessment and specification and optimal
8 yield. And we also clarified in there that in the
9 past we've always said that this needs to be a
10 quantitative analysis, but that wasn't really
11 possible sometimes for some of the economic and
12 social factors that go into that specification
13 process.

14 And so we've, we say when you can't do
15 quantitative analysis, qualitative, like
16 expert-opinion- based analysis can be used to
17 better specify your optimum yield definition for
18 our fishery.

19 This fifth element here is another major
20 revision we made about providing more stability in
21 the catch levels for fisheries, and I have like
22 three topics here. The first one is going to be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 about multi-year finishing definitions, and that's
2 really looking at how we are doing size
3 determination or a stock. The second one is going
4 to be on the phased-in approach, and how we react
5 to self-assessment information. And then the
6 third one is on carryover, to bring these portions
7 of ACLs.

8 And the reason that we are including
9 these clarifications in the guidelines is to, you
10 know, recognize that we are dealing with a lot of
11 uncertainty. We have things like retrospective
12 bias where, often the most recent data point that
13 comes out the stock assessment is the most
14 uncertain, and as you look further back in time,
15 those estimates are what the true biomass or
16 fishing effort it was for the stock seem to
17 converge.

18 And so we are trying to recognize that
19 we should put less, maybe want to put less trust
20 in the last data point within the assessment and
21 look at a range of options. And also recognizing
22 that our reference points, we something think of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 them as accurate estimates but really their only
2 estimate -- they are just our best guess at what
3 the estimates are, and that between stock
4 assessments, they can actually change on average
5 by 22 percent.

6 So, you know, thinking about trying to
7 stabilize the catch within a fishery, but just by
8 new stock assessments as long as you are getting
9 20 percent fluctuations, can sometimes be
10 problematic depending on the type of fishery you
11 are looking at.

12 So, multi-year fishing; basically what
13 we are doing here is saying rather than use the
14 last data point within the assessment, the
15 councils have the option to use a multi-year
16 overfishing definition to try to minimize those
17 false negatives and false positives that may arise
18 from the stock assessment.

19 And if you are going to use this
20 approach, that multi-year period can exceed three
21 years, and that you need to document how the
22 approach won't jeopardize capacity, and starts to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 produce MSY. What we are already doing -- and
2 this is down in the South Atlantic, for example,
3 the Snowy- Grouper Fishery, they recognize that
4 there are some retrospective bias that comes out
5 of that assessment, and over the last couple of
6 years they've been using geometric mean of their F
7 to try to calculate the status of their stock.

8 And in this case it worked out well for
9 them in that they looked at the last three years
10 in the new assessment, and they looked at just the
11 -- the last year they would have declared the
12 stock as overfishing, but because they've been
13 using a three year average, the actual average is
14 only 0.59 and so they didn't declare this as
15 overfishing.

16 However, if you are going to use this
17 approach, it isn't like a light switch that you
18 can flip on and off and use the one that's the
19 best for you at the time, so if you had
20 flip-flopped this and said that this data point
21 was below the line, but that these two data points
22 were above the line, where their average would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have been something like 1.2 and they would have
2 declared it as overfishing.

3 Similar to multi-year overfishing
4 approach, a phased-in ABC control rule is
5 something that we've introduced into the proposed
6 rule, and this is basically a way or a tool for us
7 to minimize the dramatic shifts that can occur in
8 fisheries when we are getting the new stock
9 assessments.

10 This isn't a new concept, this is
11 something that a lot of agencies have been using,
12 like Pacific Halibut Commission and European
13 Union, and something to the multi-year of a
14 fishing definition, we limited the phased-in
15 approach to no more than three years. And we've
16 beefed up this caveat here, in that you need to
17 provide a comprehensive analysis of how the
18 phased-in approach prevents overfishing, and when
19 the control rule should and should not be used.

20 And the reason that we have a
21 comprehensive analysis in there, is that we are
22 trying to think along the lines of like a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 management strategy evaluation that really shows
2 us how this approach will allow the populations
3 who still recover from overfishing practices and
4 things like that. So we don't want to -- this ad
5 hoc user -- phased-in approach that maybe leads
6 to the population decline, which has actually
7 happened in the past with the Halibut Commission,
8 they had a phased-in approach that was actually
9 contributing to the population declining over
10 time.

11 And as a result, they had, basically, an
12 escape hatch that says, even though we said we are
13 going to use this control rule, we are going to
14 stop using it because it's contributing to the
15 decline of the population, and we are going to go
16 back to our normal ABC control rules. And so we
17 have the caveat here, too, about, you need to have
18 this analysis to figure out when it's a good idea
19 to use it, and when it's not.

20 To show you what this might look like,
21 on a very simple example, that is. It's,
22 basically, what I have here is what would -- you'd

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 only think of an ABC Control Rule that, you know,
2 you get a stock assessment every three years, and
3 you have maybe a standard catch for getting the
4 assessment here in 2014. And it says, oh, well
5 your new -- your new catch, your OFL is going to
6 drop down here, and then you apply your ABC
7 Control Rule.

8 And it says, well you are going to look
9 at a change in catch from 500 metric tons down to
10 360 metric tons in one year. Well, rather than
11 taking the 140-metric-ton reduction in the first
12 year, using a three-year phased-in approach, what
13 they can do instead is take a 50-metric-ton
14 reduction in the first year, but still keeps to
15 below that overfishing limit, and then you will
16 officially get down to your 160-metric-ton
17 reduction in the third year.

18 So, this is great for stabilizing catch,
19 but it's also got a counter effect in that, what
20 you are doing is you've said that this is the
21 buffer that you've been using for scientific
22 uncertainty, but using a phased-in approach, what

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you are doing is you are trading off that buffer
2 for uncertainty, for stability, so this first year
3 you run a much higher risk of overfishing in that
4 year. A little bit less risk, but still higher
5 than normal in the second year, and then you are
6 down to normal risk levels here in the third year.
7 So, that's a tradeoff that you'll be doing there
8 and that's another reason why we want that
9 comprehensive analysis.

10 And then thirdly here, is carryover
11 provisions. We've been using those in fisheries
12 for a long time, and actually they mainly were
13 used for catch share fisheries, and because they
14 were used in catch share fisheries. And because
15 they were using catch share fisheries, and usually
16 apply to individuals to allow them to not have to
17 go fishing in the last two or three weeks of their
18 fishing season to, you know, avoid adverse weather
19 conditions, and such, they can carry over that
20 little bit of catch the following year. On that
21 scale though what we are looking at was like 1 or
22 2 percent carryover.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 But the idea of carryover really took
2 off and non- catch share fisheries started using
3 it, but in these cases we are looking at carryover
4 mounts that are maybe 5, 10 or 15 percent, and
5 when that happens you get next year's catch with
6 the carryover provision to be higher than what SSC
7 had already specified in ABC to D. And sometimes
8 it's even higher OFL. And we, of course, got sued
9 over that, and lost, and basically what they said
10 out of court case was that if we are going to use
11 the carryover provision, we need to make sure that
12 there's a process in place that it doesn't allow
13 the carryover to exceed the SSC's ABC
14 recommendations.

15 So there needs to be some kind of
16 control rule or mechanism in place for the SSC to
17 recalculate what the appropriate amount of catch
18 is for the following year using these carryover
19 positions. And you can do this in a lot of
20 different ways, if you are doing self assessments
21 on an annual or a two-year basis, well, that's
22 going to be a much easier process before these

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 populations or stocks that are only assessed every
2 three to five years, it becomes a little bit more
3 of a mathematical challenge.

4 So, another option is maybe to do a
5 stock assessment, you could develop this kind of
6 matrix. I understand from talking to Rick Methot,
7 our Stock Assessment Coordinator, that you can
8 kind of create a matrix that says, you know, if
9 you only caught only 90 or 80 percent of your
10 annual catch limit in the following year, this is
11 how your overfishing limits and ABCs will be
12 readjusted in those subsequent years.

13 So that's one approach. And then I have
14 a very simple approach here, this probably
15 shouldn't be duplicated, but I just wanted it for
16 example purposes. And basically, I'm just trying
17 to show here, it's just like your cell phone
18 coverage, if you don't use all of your minutes,
19 you can carry them over to the next month, well,
20 the next fishing year.

21 But here, you know, the basis of
22 carryover is that if you are leaving fish in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 water that you thought you were going to take,
2 well, that means that the biomasses are going to
3 be higher the next fishing year. But of course,
4 it's not a one-to-one carryover, there's going to
5 be some natural mortality that occurs between this
6 fishing year and the following year, and so all
7 this sample is doing is showing how I can have a
8 10,000 difference in the first year, so I can --

9 The only -- that's the only that can
10 carryover 10,000 to the following year, but I've
11 been applying, in this example, a national
12 mortality rate of 0.2 and we annualize that, and
13 it was only -- we only get to carry over 8,200
14 pounds instead of 10,000 pounds.

15 The sixth element here is about depleted
16 stocks, and this is something that we've heard for
17 over a decade now, about how our current use of
18 the term overfish tends to emphasize or suggest
19 that fishing effort is the cause for a stock to
20 fall below its MSST. Well, we know that that's
21 not the case always and because environmental
22 conditions can also cause a population's biomass

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to fluctuate and fall below MSST.

2 But regardless of whether it's an
3 environmental or fishing effort, we always call it
4 overfish. And so you've seen this in the
5 congressional Bills that have been drafted up.
6 There is this move to try to call these stocks,
7 rather than overfished, depleted. Well, in the
8 proposed rule we didn't feel like we could get
9 away from just changing the whole terminology from
10 overfished to depleted.

11 And so we have two definitions there.
12 We have overfished stocks and have depleted
13 stocks; both of them require rebuilding plans,
14 it's just how we refer to them as why they've
15 fallen below their MSST, and then also looking at
16 what are some of the management actions or
17 mitigation issues that you might want to do within
18 these rebuilding plants, whether it's overfished
19 or depleted stock.

20 We also had some issues when we were
21 going through this process, about, well, who is
22 going to decide whether the stock fell below MSST

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 because the fishing effort were environmental
2 conditions. And they usually, it was going to
3 fall on the shoulders of your SSC or the Stock
4 Assessment Scientists, that could put them in a
5 difficult situation. And so we wanted to make it
6 a very black and white decision on whether it was
7 depleted or overfished.

8 And so what we've done here is say that,
9 it can be depleted when the stocks biomass falls
10 below MSST and it hasn't been experiencing
11 overfishing at any point, over a period of two
12 generation times over stock. And so you look at
13 two generation times of the stock if overfishing
14 has occurred at any point, we call it an
15 overfished stock. But if it hasn't been
16 experiencing overfishing we can call it depleted.
17 We also have a case where these are stocks that
18 are already in the rebuilding plans, and you've
19 been calling them overfished for a long time, but
20 something has changed in the environment, and they
21 are not responding. So a good example is a crab
22 fishery up in Alaska that's basically had no catch

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 for the last decade or so, but the biomass isn't
2 recovering. And so in this case we can say when
3 you're not showing any significant signs of growth
4 you can stop calling that a stock of fish and
5 refer to it as depleted. Again this is more a
6 terminology discussion because you still need the
7 rebuilding plans, but we're trying to address that
8 concern.

9 And my last element here is about
10 improving the routine review of FMPs. This
11 basically shows up in our general section of the
12 guidelines and we already had guides in there
13 about how the goals and objectives of FMPs are
14 important for our analysis of the National
15 Standard Guidelines to figure out whether the FMP
16 or FMP amendment are addressing those goals and
17 objectives and meeting National Standards. And
18 what we've added in here is one sentence that says
19 that we want to encourage councils to reassess the
20 goals and objectives of their fishery on a regular
21 basis to reflect the changing needs of the fishery
22 over time. And that's because we noticed that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sometimes these goals and objectives can become
2 kind of stagnant within the FMP, but we do have
3 some good examples here recently from like Alaska,
4 South Atlantic, and Mid Atlantic where they've
5 been kind of doing these kind of visioning kind of
6 processes to update their goals and objectives.
7 And also this could be a way for you to look at
8 allocation issues too. But basically what we mean
9 here by a regular basis is that we'd like the
10 councils to kind of specify a timeframe of their
11 choosing to go through this process of reassessing
12 whether their goals and objectives need to be
13 updated or not. And that can be say three, five,
14 seventeen years, whatever they think is
15 appropriate.

16 And I think that is it. Just wanted to
17 clarify again, we don't have any, you know, any
18 requirements for FMPs to be modified through this
19 proposed rule. All the revisions here are to try
20 to improve and clarify and streamline our
21 guidelines. And if you wanted to check out our
22 website we have a lot of other resources on there,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 like the Red Line so you can actually see all of
2 the nitty gritty edits that we've done to those
3 rules.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Dr. Patrick, a very
5 comprehensive presentation; a lot to digest. I've
6 got some questions, but I'm going to see what the
7 membership has first. Mike, and then Ted, and
8 then Peter.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I work primarily with
10 the West Coast Science Centers (inaudible) in
11 Alaska, but looking at the rebuilding, adequate
12 progress. And I know this is proposed guidance,
13 but I guess I'm looking in comparison of catches
14 to ACL when you're talking about rebuilding
15 (inaudible).

16 DR. PATRICK: So the adequate progress
17 was -- it's is your F exceeding F rebuild, would
18 be associated annual catch limits. So it's -- the
19 councils would specify a catch limit that equates
20 to that rebuild.

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So if they're
22 practicing avoidance and succeeding in that, then

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I guess it -- I don't know what the direct
2 relationship all the time amongst -- between the
3 catch and performance up to the ACL which you're
4 talking F rebuilding I guess and the other case
5 ACL.

6 DR. PATRICK: So the two should be
7 equivalent. So, you know, you only know your F
8 once you get your new stock assessment looking
9 backwards, but on the -- but whenever you specify
10 your fishing limit it's your current biomass times
11 FMSY, then you get the ABC control process. Well,
12 on a rebuilding plan you do the same thing, but
13 you'd be applying F rebuild times the current
14 biomass to get your catch limits.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But that's a year by
16 year presently consideration for a target not to
17 exceed.

18 DR. PATRICK: Right.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I guess if you're
20 practicing good avoidance or just avoiding it
21 because it might impact your target species, then
22 you may, I don't know, catch 50 percent of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 something. And it may look like you're -- the
2 avoidance may take you away from using that as a
3 measurable tool and accurate one, and it may not.
4 I just think it needs a little consideration from
5 you. Does that make sense I guess?

6 DR. PATRICK: I was thinking that if you
7 can avoid the species and come in at say 50
8 percent of your annual catch limit, well, then
9 that probably means that you're probably going to
10 be rebuilding faster than you originally thought
11 for that population. So that would be, you know,
12 a proactive measure; that issue would go more
13 quickly.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Not to get
15 argumentative, but the point being is if you use
16 it as a -- to gauge adequate progress then I could
17 see a kind of disconnect because --

18 DR. PATRICK: Because you're
19 underfishing then -- it's --

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

21 DR. PATRICK: Okay, I gotcha.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Mike, for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the feedback. Ted, then Peter.

2 MR. AMES: Well, first of all I'm
3 impressed with the amount of work that's gone in
4 here. The improvements really look they would be
5 improvements. There are a couple of places though
6 that I have concerns. Stock assessments, they're
7 really based on the spawning stock biomass in
8 various year classes. And my question is knowing
9 this, still continuing to use age at maturation
10 for the step of estimating spawning stock biomass,
11 or is it actually taking the age of the fish when
12 it first reproduces or at least half of that year
13 class will reproduce?

14 DR. PATRICK: So are you talking about
15 the calculation of generation time, what's the age
16 of maturity, and things like that?

17 MR. AMES: Yeah. You can calculate
18 generations by using point of maturity, but if
19 you're trying to rebuild the stock the critical
20 part is if you're catching fish at the point of
21 maturity you're catching them one to two years
22 before they actually reproduce and you're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 continuing juvenile fishery. So I was wondering
2 if that had been changed?

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any (inaudible)?

4 MR. AMES: In particular I'm referring
5 to cod fishing in the Gulf of Maine.

6 MR. MERRICK: I'm a little (inaudible)
7 for how that's dealt with. I'm sorry. I mean to
8 a certain degree it's specific to the assessment.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I don't think they
10 heard you.

11 SPEAKER: Don't know.

12 MR. MERRICK: I don't know that there's
13 --

14 SPEAKER: You can characterize all the
15 stock assessments in the same way.

16 MR. AMES: It's been a number of years
17 since I addressed this directly, but when I did
18 point of maturation was being used and a number of
19 us argued at that time that the problem with cod
20 in the Gulf of Maine -- this was way back in the
21 '90 -- the problem was dealt with Maine cod was
22 that it was really a juvenile fishery and the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 majority of fish were being caught prior to being
2 old enough to reproduce. And I think that was the
3 invaluable item to check at least for species that
4 are collapsed or depleted.

5 MR. MERRICK: Right. So in the stock
6 assessment, it's different than the way the -- if
7 you're talking about spawning stock biomass, those
8 are fish that are of the age to recruit or to
9 spawn.

10 MR. AMES: Yeah.

11 MR. MERRICK: But the fishery itself may
12 be prosecuted on the larger group of fish than
13 just the spawning stock biomass. So that's the
14 issue. I guess that's the issue of recruitment
15 over fishing. That's a classic problem with
16 guidance.

17 MR. AMES: Okay.

18 MR. MERRICK: I guess I answered the
19 question.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Ted, do
21 you have a final thought on that or?

22 MR. AMES: Well, yeah. Just that I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 think it would be valuable when you're trying to
2 rebuild the stock. First of all, you allow the
3 fish to grow to a size when they actually
4 reproduce. And if you're not doing that you're
5 affecting the rate of recovery. That's a decision
6 that -- you know, it's something that should be
7 waived when considering the changes that you're
8 introducing. It might be possible to include that
9 at least in exceptional situations where you have
10 a stock that's in really bad shape. The other
11 part since we we're still (inaudible) is that
12 another population structure like cod has multiple
13 spawning sites and it really would be helpful if
14 you could engage the fishing industry itself into
15 identifying where those sites are to try to
16 enhance reproduction during the period when the
17 stock is collapsed or in decline.

18 MR. MERRICK: If you're going to close
19 an area, as a management measure to protect
20 spawning fish, yes, it seems like that would be a
21 valid thing to do around these other signs. So I
22 think Sofie Van Parijs is working with you all to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 identify cod spawning areas?

2 MR. AMES: I'm sorry?

3 MR. MERRICK: The Northeast Center is
4 using acoustics to identify cod spawning areas --
5 Sofie Van Parijs. I thought she was working with
6 Maine as part of that conversation.

7 MR. AMES: I know the project is going
8 on; it's encouraging.

9 MR. MERRICK: But that assumes that then
10 the council will take that advice and close those
11 areas.

12 MR. AMES: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Peter?

14 MR. SHELLEY: Thank you. And thanks for
15 the presentation, Dr. Patrick. A number of
16 conservation groups have multiple concerns with
17 some of the proposals. And I won't go into the
18 details. I know you've been very accommodating in
19 listening to those concerns. And I suspect one's
20 enthusiasm or concern about some of these changes
21 depends on which council lens you're looking at
22 them through and how they might be used by a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 council for good or mischief. And I come from the
2 land of the New England Council where we have the
3 most overfished and overfishing going on the
4 country, and for some species, having been
5 overfishing -- like cod -- since I first got in --
6 since they defined what overfishing was, we've
7 continuously overfishing cod and that fish is now
8 commercially collapsed. So flexibility is not a
9 good term, at least for some of us in New England.

10 A couple of issues I just wanted to
11 mention. I think on the conservation and
12 management issue, I think waiting until something
13 is -- at least in our experience, waiting for
14 something to be overfished and overfishing to
15 occur is too late. A lot of times because you
16 have capital investments made at that point that
17 are very difficult to adjust, you have
18 expectations in fisheries, you have people already
19 in the game with significant incentives to
20 minimize management and hold it back. And so I
21 think that's an area that you ought to reconsider
22 the flexibility in rebuilding. I think obviously,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 at least in New England, continues to exist that
2 there's too much flexibility. And stable
3 fisheries -- again this is a good concept, but --
4 and if this was the North Pacific they may be very
5 enthusiastic or if it was a really healthy fishery
6 like sea scallops, you know, I think they should
7 get flexibility. I mean I think there's less of a
8 concern when a fishery is in good condition and is
9 being well managed. My concern is the fisheries
10 that aren't being well managed for whatever reason
11 and, you know, you don't want to stabilize a
12 poorly managed fishery, you want to recover it.
13 And the NRC report talked extensively about what
14 seemed to work as effective management. And
15 sometimes effective management isn't always based
16 on the consideration of short-term economic or
17 social costs. And sometimes you just have to bite
18 the bullet. And I'm afraid these may be headed in
19 the wrong direction in that respect.

20 And the final question I just had was
21 again, one of the things that interested me in the
22 NRC report on rebuilding fisheries that you don't

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 see here is that they seem to suggest pretty
2 strongly that there was value in considering -- I
3 don't know if they were calling a control rule or
4 how they were referencing it, but intervening
5 early when a fishery started to decline. You
6 know, was not overfished, not overfishing, but
7 something was going on. And they said this is an
8 area where that -- and I think that ought to be
9 something the National Standard Guideline --
10 reviewing that you ought to think about more than
11 you have so far, or at least it's not apparent
12 that you're thinking about that recommendation.

13 DR. PATRICK: So you're talking about
14 like a 40-10 rule that they use here on the West
15 Coast that Mid Atlantic started using here
16 recently too. And it's basically as the biomass
17 falls below BMSY you start reducing your fishing
18 mortality rate so that it's basically an automatic
19 rebuilding plan. So as your biomass is declining
20 you're reducing F and it's helping the population
21 rebound.

22 MR. SHELLEY: Or if it isn't it's an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 early warning system --

2 DR. PATRICK: Right.

3 MR. SHELLEY: -- that something else is
4 going on and that you really need to pay attention
5 to.

6 DR. PATRICK: Right. And so we've had
7 that type of idea in the guidelines since our 2009
8 revisions and it's still in there again. We
9 actually moved it around and tried to put it into
10 a better place. It didn't meet the cut for my
11 presentation, but that is definitely something
12 that we encourage the councils to use.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Julie?

14 MS. BONNEY: Yeah. I was just looking
15 at the timeline for comments, so you're accepting
16 comments through June 30, and I was wondering when
17 you were thinking that you would actually have a
18 final rule?

19 DR. PATRICK: Sure. So we're thinking
20 it's going to take several months to get through
21 the public comments. When we did the AMVR we got
22 45,000 comments through that process; only 100 of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 them were like, you know, letters from individuals
2 and then the others were all form letters. But
3 we're thinking it's going to take a couple of
4 months to get through that, figure out where we
5 stand on whether we need to revise the proposed
6 rule and start over, or get to a final rule. And
7 so -- and then we also have to consider what the
8 Congress is doing on MSA and whether, you know, if
9 we come out with something is it going to mess up
10 their process and vice versa, so.

11 MS. BONNEY: Keith, can I follow up on
12 that?

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah.

14 MS. BONNEY: Because it seems like a lot
15 of (inaudible) are really trying to be responsive
16 to the some of the things that are in the
17 Hastings-Young bill in terms of potential changes
18 to Magnuson. And I think at least from the North
19 Pacific side some of the proposals in the National
20 Standards Guidelines the fishing industry has been
21 supportive. So I'm just curious how do we
22 intersect changing the Guidelines and your

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 timelines that, you know, delay the final rule
2 proposal versus the potential for Magnuson
3 reauthorizations. So it seems like a lot of work
4 if they don't intersect at some point.

5 MS. SOBECK: If I could just answer
6 that. You know, I think our hope is -- sorry, I
7 can't see you down there -- but, you know, the
8 reason we wanted to get these out there is, you
9 know, that as -- you know, if the Young bill
10 starts moving or there are hearings we want to be
11 able to say that we think that some of the issues
12 in that bill can be and are better addressed
13 through this regulatory process and use the draft
14 proposal -- the fact that we've put forward a very
15 serious draft proposal, whether it's finished or
16 not, as evidence of that, and that, you know, I
17 think -- we don't have an official administration
18 position on that bill yet, but I think in general
19 terms, you know, it's pretty obvious that our view
20 would be that therefore the -- in general the
21 kinds of recommendations -- or the kinds of
22 changes that are in that bill might not be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 necessary because we think it could be done
2 through this proposed reg. I think that if -- so
3 we're not going to hold the reg in a proposed form
4 forever. On the other hand, if it looked like the
5 -- our moving towards a final regulation was going
6 to converge on passage of a final MSA we might
7 well hold that to make sure that we know what's
8 actually in the statute. We wouldn't want to have
9 a final regulation that wasn't a good fit, didn't
10 dovetail with what legislation there was. So we
11 just -- so you're right, they are going to have to
12 come together at some point. That's not really
13 within our control, it's in Congress' control.
14 We'll be kind of gauging timing based on where
15 Magnuson Act timing goes. If there's no movement
16 in Magnuson Act in six months, a year, eighteen --
17 you know, I mean we're not going to hold up our
18 proposal forever. On the other hand we're not
19 going to rush it. We want to do it right, we want
20 to -- we're anticipating a ton of comments. It's
21 a very detailed proposal. We want to get it
22 right. We don't do this that often. So I don't

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 know if that -- there's not an absolute answer but
2 I hope that gives you a sense.

3 MS. BONNEY: So it sounds like it's on
4 your radar because --

5 MS. SOBECK: Yeah, totally.

6 MS. BONNEY: -- and (inaudible).

7 MS. SOBECK: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Julie. I
9 think that we -- thank you. I have one last
10 question and I know we are already into our
11 lunchtime, so I'll try to be quick. I thought I
12 heard in the presentation and the discussion of
13 interim measures that there were potentially
14 timeframes on that and limits and renewal options.
15 Could you just explain what that was again and
16 where that is?

17 DR. PATRICK: Sure. It's under -- I
18 don't remember the particulars under the Magnuson
19 Act -- I think it's 304. It's in 304 I think, or
20 maybe 305.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Because I found the
22 provision in Magnuson, but I thought you had said

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that the -- and the issue I'm concerned about here
2 is this interim measure concept allows the
3 secretary to basically invoke an exception and use
4 even more flexibility during the rebuilding
5 period. And I'm worried about the exception
6 swallowing the rule, and we keep invoking the
7 exception over and over and it becomes a way to
8 undermine the ultimate objective here.

9 DR. PATRICK: So just to clarify. So we
10 have kind of two sections in the Magnuson Act that
11 talks about this interim measures. We have one
12 that is just for rebuilding stocks.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

14 DR. PATRICK: And that's the part I
15 talked about in our Guidelines. We have another
16 section that covers all stocks, whether they're in
17 a rebuilding plan or not. So for this the -- I'm
18 not sure where it actually falls in, but it's 180
19 day provision. You know, if you -- if the council
20 requests and the secretary agrees in this interim
21 measure, that allows you 180 days to reduce but
22 not necessarily end overfishing. So you're going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to have to reduce F by some point, and also show
2 that the biomass is increasing during that period.
3 So it's a do no harm kind of statement. And that
4 if council can request it to be extended for
5 another 180 days. It might be 186. I forget, but
6 it's somewhere in there. And that's it, one year.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And I just wanted to
8 make sure that there was something firm about the
9 deadlines and the limits on being able to renew
10 that option. And the other point is I noticed
11 that in your standard it was increase biomass of a
12 stock complex. And what I point out there is that
13 could mean some fish go up while others still go
14 down.

15 DR. PATRICK: That might be an error.
16 It's supposed to be for the -- these stock cuts in
17 the rebuilding plan.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Well, it also refers
19 to the complex. An when you're managing it in the
20 complex you wouldn't be -- there's the possibility
21 that you'll be invoking interim measures that will
22 allow some to continue to decline even more while

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 others go up. And in whole maybe it's good for
2 the complex, but for any given species it may not
3 be. So I just wanted to alert the way that
4 language is written I could see the potential for
5 economic and political decision making.

6 Ted?

7 MR. AMES: Yeah. And that really bring
8 a central problem to some assessments. And that
9 is a number of species have a discreet structure
10 within the stock range, and at the present time
11 there isn't any mechanism that allows you to
12 factor that in. The example I use is the area
13 from east of Casco Bay into Canada has been
14 without cod or haddock for 25 years. That's
15 virtually half of the entire Gulf of Maine coastal
16 shelf. And yet system wide stock assessment can't
17 detect it. There's got to be some reasonable way
18 that the National Fisheries Service is able to
19 detect these discrepancies and adjust their
20 management of the area in such a way that the
21 northern half for example could be brought back
22 while not inhibiting the southern section or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 western section. And to this credit, they've
2 started a process of rebuilding prey species,
3 opening up rivers and to the herring and like.
4 And that's a big plus, but there should be some
5 mechanism within assessments that allows you --
6 that's to address this discrepancy or the
7 existence of these smaller subunits of the stock.

8 MR. MERRICK: So I mean that -- the
9 problem is that's not really a Magnuson approach
10 to management, that's an ESA approach to
11 management because ESA really -- those who were
12 listening yesterday to the presentation on the
13 recovery, ESA allows you very simply to deal with
14 small units and rebuild small units. Magnuson is
15 awkward. So one way to do that is with stocks.
16 And stocks are really still pretty big compared to
17 what a DPS could be or a recovery unit, or any of
18 the smaller units that you use under ESA. So
19 unless we truly change the philosophy of how we're
20 going to address Magnuson it's not easy to do.
21 You probably recognize that. The reason that's
22 something's happening in Penobscot is that's an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 ESA issue, for the rebuilding there, the removal
2 of the dams. All that really dealt -- been
3 approached with the ESA perspective. So we've got
4 multiple tools we can use. But maybe that's a
5 good example if you can get those cod stocks or
6 haddock stocks off of casting and we start to
7 rebuild, we can use that a case study why we need
8 to do more of that. We can combine ESA and
9 Magnuson together.

10 MR. AMES: Yeah. Yeah. If you could
11 bring that area back into production where you're
12 talking about it, there is substantial increase in
13 the nursery habitat or potential reproduction
14 sites. So this is a big deal.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Micah, last
16 comment.

17 MR. MCCARTY: Last comment.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And then we'll break
19 for lunch. You get the last.

20 MR. MCCARTY: I just want to reflect on
21 some experience in (inaudible) about stock
22 structure concerns. One, you know, I noticed in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Wes' report about, you know, a lawsuit on recovery
2 plans. We followed one of those pursuant to
3 rockfish species and we had some empirical
4 evidence that we believe we're sitting a real
5 abundance. So some stock assessments look at both
6 wide stock assessment as opposed to regional. So
7 we invested in some Otolith research. We didn't
8 get very far on rockfish analysis, but what we did
9 to is we figured out that there's a separate stock
10 of halibut in the Puget Sound. And we intervened
11 on a couple of inter-tribal fisheries issues, but
12 there's still some work to be done for the IPHC to
13 account for this research. I mean it's been very
14 definitive. And I think in some ways it's still
15 be vetted, but I think that's a tool that needs to
16 be included in some kind of an adaptive management
17 and some kind of I guess a criteria for allowing
18 some degree of flexibility in stock structure
19 identification and management of the species that
20 might have multiple stocks.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Also sounds
22 like a good example of where we could have done

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 some cooperative research and cooperative
2 management going back to yesterday's stuff.

3 MR. MCCARTY: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank
5 you everybody for a robust discussion. Wesley,
6 thank you for an excellent presentation. That was
7 really comprehensive, there was a lot to digest in
8 there. And speaking of digestion I guess it's
9 time for lunch. So it is 12:15, let's reconvene
10 at 1:15, and we'll be back for public comment.
11 Thank you.

12 (Off the record)

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: We are already
14 slipping behind schedule; we're eating into our
15 committee time so I'd like to get us back into
16 action here. Before we start with the next round
17 of presentations, Ken Franke, if you could
18 introduce yet another person who is a guest here
19 today and who is going to be really important to
20 all of us.

21 MR. FRANKE: Yes, he will be on the boat
22 with you Friday. First of all, I've got to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 apologize to everybody. I've got to fly to
2 Mazatlan first thing in the morning to meet with
3 the government down there in Mexico. But in my
4 absence Captain Louis Zimm from our fleet is right
5 here. And Louis is going to be your host along
6 with Bob Fletcher. Louis is on our Groundfish
7 Advisory Panel at the council and a long time
8 Captain in the fleet, as well a Captain from the
9 Scripps Institution of Oceanography and, you know,
10 knows everything about everything as far as what
11 our fleet is doing. Very involved in the
12 descending device implementation. So Louis is
13 going to be there and he's going to explain some
14 of the dynamics of our fleet. So will Bob be
15 there. Bob Fletcher was a previous President of
16 SAC. When you arrive at the landing Friday
17 morning the office has already keyed up that
18 you're going to need to store luggage for many of
19 you. So you just go into the office at H&M
20 Landing, which is the big cut out right there in
21 front of the building. So if you're in a cab have
22 them drop you off. You go into the office;

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 they're expecting you. They'll store your luggage
2 while you're on the boat. There are restrooms on
3 the boat. It's about a 90 footer; it's called the
4 Premier. You need to have your fishing license
5 printed out ahead of time. I think everybody here
6 has the link. If you don't, just get to me and
7 I'll make sure to get you hooked upon that. It's
8 in your announcement notes that you got from Ivy.
9 When you're on the boat all the fishing rods will
10 already be aboard the boat for you, and the
11 tackle. The crew is used to having folks come out
12 that haven't been to our style of fishing. You
13 will be live bait fishing off shore. Fishing is
14 very good. You may have an opportunity to use
15 descending devices, but you're going to get a good
16 view of what Pacific Coast sport fishing is all
17 about. The boat will be back on time. Everybody
18 is worried about that for aircraft. Piece of
19 cake. You're less than five minutes from
20 Lindbergh Field. From right where the landing is
21 there are two real nice restaurants on either side
22 of the landing if you want to get lunch before

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 your flight. I think for most of you it will be
2 catch and release unless you want to take y our
3 fish if you're local. Just let the crew know that
4 and they'll release them for you there. You don't
5 have to actually even have to touch a fish if you
6 don't want to. A crew member will be there to
7 help you. But anyway, we want you to have a great
8 time. The weather is supposed to be absolutely
9 beautiful. You'll be fishing right off of San
10 Diego in the kelp beds. Some asked about blue fin
11 tuna. They're another 30 miles out so you won't
12 see those. But anyway, so that's pretty much
13 about it. Are there any questions about your trip
14 on Friday? Great, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Ken.
16 Thank you, Captain. Look forward to it.

17 All right. So our first session this
18 afternoon is with Cisco Werner. He is the
19 Director of the Southwest Fishery Science Center.
20 He's going to be talking to us about the
21 challenges of climate change and what it means for
22 the decisions that we're making on a regular basis

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in managing our species and our ecosystems. So
2 thank you, sir, for being here.

3 MR. WERNER: Thanks very much. And I'm
4 going to stand up here and do the presentation
5 this way and hopefully everything is okay, the mic
6 will grab it all and record it all. First of all,
7 welcome everybody to San Diego those of you who
8 are from out of town, to the home of the World
9 Series Champions in the year 2015. There's
10 absolutely no doubt in mind. Also I think some of
11 you had a chance to visit our lab yesterday. As
12 you could tell it was a freestanding lab and it's
13 a privilege to be able to work there every day.

14 I will talk a little bit about the
15 climate change, climate change issues and -- the
16 climate strategy I know has been reviewed and
17 comments have been offered by one of your
18 subcommittees. What I'll do is I'll get a little
19 bit more into detail perhaps with specific
20 examples of how we're doing some of these things
21 that are related to. The picture here is from the
22 lab or near the lab and part of the climate

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 change, or at least an unusual thing is this long
2 band of anchovies that showed up in La Jolla Cove
3 probably for the first time in 20 years is what
4 they told me that they hadn't seen. So this is
5 just a picture to get going in terms of some of
6 the unusual things that we are seeing out here.

7 So my outline is going to be four
8 things. I'll talk a little bit about the present
9 conditions in the Pacific, although I'll focus a
10 little bit more on the U.S. West Coast, a little
11 bit about the climate science strategy;
12 particularly I'm going to focus on examples for
13 the seven objectives that the climate strategy
14 has, and then some concluding remarks at the end.

15 MS. LOVETT: Cisco, I'm very sorry to
16 interrupt, but I have a representative on -- and I
17 need to just answer the -- put this on
18 (inaudible).

19 MR. WERNER: Okay. All right.

20 (Pause in proceedings -- phone call
21 being made)

22 MR. WERNER: All right. So I'll start

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 off with a brief description of the present
2 conditions and that should give hopefully the
3 background in terms of how well the climate
4 science strategy is needed, why it's needed, and
5 how we could use it.

6 So about a month ago there was formal
7 announcement of the arrival of an El Niño. Yes,
8 it's still relatively weak, but -- I put the but
9 in there because it -- we're still watching it to
10 see if it actually can strengthen. The point I
11 want to just draw your attention here is the -- to
12 the horseshoe shaped red area with the cold in the
13 middle here. And I'll come back to this in the
14 next two slides. This is a standard El Niño
15 picture, but it's also shown up in a couple of
16 other expressions that we have seen and in the
17 environmental signals that I want to talk about.
18 El Niños, you know, they happen not infrequently,
19 but not very often. I want to say every two,
20 five, seven years, and they last maybe for a year
21 or two. So they're an event that comes and then
22 they disappear and then they come back. The last

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 big one that we had was over 10 years ago. We've
2 had a couple of moderate ones but not ones like
3 the one we had in '97-'98. And again, you know,
4 they do have here in the El Niño pattern where
5 it's warm, indicated by the red on the eastern
6 side and the cold indicated by the blue in the
7 orange side. On longer time scales you have
8 what's called pacific decadal oscillation, same
9 horseshoe shape, same random horseshoe shape, but
10 rather than just being a year or two and then they
11 go (inaudible), as the name suggests it's a
12 decadal signal. And so these decadal
13 alternations, you know, between the positive and
14 the negative phases, you know, you can have a cool
15 regime for 10 years or so and then a warm regime.
16 And over the past 10 years or so, and even 14
17 years or so, we've been in what's called a cold
18 phase of the PDO, which has been like this. And
19 this is 2014. And we may be beginning to see a
20 shift. I mean as with all of things (inaudible)
21 it's hard to tell that you're in them until you're
22 in them. But they all have -- you know, many have

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 gone on our marine life. In this case you'll be
2 hearing about the impact of the PDO on the salmon,
3 you know, during a cold phase, which is what we
4 had up until now, what these appear to have up
5 until now. We have this cold water coming in from
6 up north, that it has these lipid-rich copepods,
7 these low plankers, which actually favor -- inject
8 a lot of energy into the food chain. So they're.
9 So they're actually pretty good for some elements
10 of the food chain like salmon and brownfish and
11 rockfish, and things like that. During a warm
12 phase you get kind of the opposite. You have warm
13 water coming in from the south and you have a
14 different kind of zooplankton injecting this
15 energy into the food map. Again if you want to
16 take a look at the potential colony beginning to
17 relate these climate signals and what we have
18 learned from the past in terms of what we see,
19 again during a warm phase the salmon numbers were
20 down, during the cold phase the salmon numbers are
21 up. Again if you look at -- other than salmon if
22 you wanted to look at sardine and anchovy,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 generally the cold phases, anchovy phases and the
2 warm phases are sardine phases. And I'll talk a
3 little bit about that in terms of how we did have
4 sort of a bump up in sardines right before this
5 last cold phase. And over the last 10 years that
6 sardine population has not been recruited. And so
7 that might be again sort of a relationship that's
8 (inaudible).

9 But it's been also quite unusual, and
10 you've seen this in the newspaper, the warm blog
11 and so on. It's been unusual in the North Pacific
12 because in the way that the warm has set up is not
13 the same that the warm normally sets up during El
14 Niño. During El Niño you get the propagating
15 signal coming from along the equator. The signal
16 goes north and south, south goes to South America
17 and north going to North America, and you get that
18 signal propagating in that -- and as I said from
19 the equator to the higher latitude. In this case
20 it's actually starting the other way around. It's
21 been unusual because we first started seeing the
22 warm in the Gulf of Alaska, Bearing Sea, and then

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we started seeing it here in (inaudible) Coast.
2 So it's been not the usual, you know, remotely
3 forced signal that we're seeing here. We have
4 seen not just that unusual signal that way, but
5 again this is off our lab here we saw an usual
6 population -- in this case false killer whales --
7 that we again haven't seen in a number of years
8 off of our lab.

9 Adding again to the curiosity of
10 unusualness if you will of a system, how warm has
11 it been? Well, it's been warmer than it has been
12 in the last 100+ years. But this is a 100 year
13 record and this is where we are right now, and
14 it's again two to three degrees centigrade warmer
15 than we've had before. And this is the average in
16 this box. And not only has it been warm in the
17 ocean, we also know that it's been warm on land.
18 So both the ocean and land conditions along the
19 Pacific seaboard have been significant in terms of
20 their extreme.

21 If we move onto the land side, it
22 appears there's interest in what happens for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 salmon as well. As I said it's not just the ocean
2 that's been warm, but the land has been warm as
3 well. So here this is about 100+ years, the same
4 114 time series again off the charts if you will.
5 And if look at a picture which is particularly
6 telling, this is just last year, temperatures last
7 year from Oregon to San Francisco to San Diego.
8 And this is a -- the smooth line is your, you
9 know, yearly -- it's cold in the winter, it's warm
10 in the summer versus cold in the winter and so on.
11 So that's sort of the smooth season signal. What
12 these little wiggles are is the daily average
13 temperatures every day for that year. And what
14 you see here is just about every single day was
15 higher than what the normal -- and there are a
16 couple of periods here in winter, but all of the
17 -- the entire West Coast was getting in an
18 unusually warm phase. And then I think you've
19 probably also seen we have the signals on the snow
20 cap. And this is 2013, '14, '15. And this is
21 correct for any one particular day. I mean when
22 you can -- again actually see that there's a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 significant visual decrease in the snow path. And
2 if you look and actually do some of the analysis
3 in the different phases you actually do see that
4 the entire -- again West Coast is well, well below
5 what we'd expect in terms of available snow, which
6 again is of course important for the salmon
7 fisheries.

8 So this brings me to the backdrop.
9 Okay, we have all of these events going on, all of
10 these signals going on. And so I think you've had
11 available to you the draft of the Climate Sign
12 Strategy and the goals are the whys because there
13 is increased demand for information on climate
14 related data. And again this is the examples I
15 gave before, or suggested, you know, we need to
16 make decisions based on these very unusual things
17 that we're seeing which may become more and more
18 usual rather than unusual. And also we need to
19 increase the production delivery we use -- climate
20 related information to support the agency and the
21 decision making process.

22 So now comes the -- and I'm getting a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 little bit into the details so I'm going to try to
2 slow down a little bit here. There are seven
3 objectives that are laid out in the strategy.
4 Three of them are management related, and I'll
5 talk about -- I'll talk about all seven -- and
6 four of them are more science related. The
7 management related ones talk about considering
8 climate in its establishment of the records point,
9 again considering climate, you know, in terms of
10 the strategies that we use or develop, considering
11 climate in any adaptive decisions that we need to
12 make if we see things happening and in progress.
13 The science ones perhaps are can we identify
14 future states, how do we do that? Can we identify
15 the mechanisms by which climate change is
16 affecting what we see? Can we track trends? And
17 what is the science infrastructure need to do
18 this? What I'll do is I'll try to present a real
19 example on each one of these. So for example,
20 I'll talk a little bit on climate informed
21 reference points and how we do the sardine
22 assessments and how do we do the decision making

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in the sardines. On robust strategies I'll talk
2 about (inaudible), a management strategy
3 evaluation that we're working on. The adaptive
4 decision has to do with closing the swordfish
5 population from the swordfish fishery side to
6 minimize in rationing the loggerheads.

7 For future stages I'll talk a little bit
8 about work that's happening in our system models.
9 In terms of mechanisms, how do we know what the
10 mechanisms are? How do we -- how can we actually
11 tease out the mechanisms? And one way to do it --
12 if I show this example, a couple of earth systems
13 models with things that are called visual aids
14 model. It's really a model based thing, but, you
15 know, there's not data in the future. So how do
16 we know what's going to happen. And we do have to
17 rely on models to be able to at least test
18 hypotheses and such. For the trends I'll talk a
19 little bit about the California Current Integrated
20 Ecosystem Assessment. And then on the science
21 infrastructure I'll talk a little bit about, you
22 know, just what we need -- what we have and what

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we need to continue to (inaudible). So the way
2 that this is -- how I'm going to set up the rest
3 of the presentation is that these are the seven
4 objectives, and I'll go down one through seven and
5 just kind of tell you the example of how we --
6 particulars from the Pacific, of course, and the
7 West Coast (inaudible).

8 So the climate objective number one,
9 identify climate informed reference points. So
10 the sardine, as you may have also read in the
11 paper recently, was closed down, the sardine on
12 the West Coast. What we've been able to do
13 through the CalCOFI Program, and this is a program
14 that, you know, here at the stations, the current
15 station locations of the CalCOFI Program used to
16 go from San Francisco down to Baja, but the
17 current CalCOFI pattern if you will is use the
18 temperatures from there in the establishment of
19 this harvest (inaudible). I mean in some ways
20 maybe it's a little baby step in terms of using
21 climate informed data for reference point, but it
22 is a step that it now formally prevented the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 council processing and actually uses the
2 temperature index and the productivity
3 relationships since last year to establish the
4 management decisions and establish the allowable
5 fishery end quotas. Just to give you the bottom
6 line of what happened last year, the fishery -- it
7 was closed and so this is about 20 years worth of
8 the fishery number and shows you that during the
9 warm phases before we started the cold phase,
10 although usually the warm phase is good for
11 sardines. So there was some improvement and it
12 made the population -- there was another warm
13 phase here, and another little bit of sardine that
14 may have been there, but overall we've been in
15 this prolonged cold phase and there's been a
16 decline in the population, irrespective of whether
17 there is or there isn't any fishery. So these
18 four lines here have to do with fishery levels
19 that are currently there and the purple line has
20 to do with had there been no fishery at all. And
21 so you seen then -- it's basically then an absence
22 of a recruitment into the fishery that's started

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the decline. Effected somewhat by the fishery,
2 but not really one that turning the population
3 decline. And so this year we fell below the red
4 line which is the cut off. And since we've gotten
5 below that red line the fishery was closed.

6 The second one is robust management
7 strategies. So the example I'm going to give you
8 here is albacore. And what we're going to do with
9 this is develop a strategy that includes the
10 climate information having to deal with spatial
11 structure of the distribution of Pacific albacore.
12 And in order to do that, including as I said
13 (inaudible) accounts, and that the albacore will
14 be the first issue that we will look at in a
15 series of efforts that we're going to do for the
16 International Scientific Committee on Tuna and
17 Tuna-like Species, PICES, which is the North
18 Pacific Regional Marine Organization, and
19 scientists at our center to take things will that
20 will be on developing this management strategy
21 evaluation of Pacific albacore. Very quickly,
22 albacore is perhaps a -- it's a safe species to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 start with. It's not overfished and there is no
2 overfishing. If you look at the Kobe plot, and
3 it's a nice place in terms of the health of the
4 population, but like many of these pelagic species
5 they do respond very strongly to environmental
6 signals which in this case is this North Pacific
7 Transition Zone and the California Current, and
8 they really kind of cue into these temperature,
9 oxygen, chlorophyll, et cetera fronts and regions
10 -- yes?

11 MR. MCCARTY: Just a quick explanation
12 please on the Kobe plot.

13 MR. WERNER: Yes. So the Kobe plot is
14 -- on this side is biomass, how much is there
15 right now relative to some reference point vis a
16 vis the biomass (inaudible) maximum sample field.
17 And this one is the fishing -- you know, how high
18 fishing that there is. So the amount of fishing
19 and the amount of biomass. And so if you're in
20 the green area -- let's start with red area. If
21 you're in the red area over here you'd have too
22 little biomass and too much fishing. If you're in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the green area you'd have a fair bit of biomass
2 and not a whole lot of fishing, so you're again in
3 sort of a safe area. And the yellow ones are --
4 they might be one or the other but not both at the
5 same time.

6 All right. So, as I said one of the
7 spatial structure of these populations is kind of
8 know. They're tagged to very clear physical
9 features in the environment. And this is a
10 satellite image of temperatures and distributions
11 and this actually a tag organism that we can see
12 how closely they follow, you know, again these
13 features. And that's not just theoretical. We've
14 also done some data from nautical log books where
15 this North Pacific transition zone effort, in
16 catching the effort pretty much lined up together
17 with some features in the California Current
18 System.

19 So studies show and predict that if you
20 do this forward projection say 100 years out, 100
21 year scenario, what you find -- what we should be
22 looking at is this picture here. What you find is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a shift in -- these are the three -- this is like
2 winter, spring, summer, and fall. And what you
3 see is that, you know, so what you see is that,
4 you know -- what you see is that there is a shift
5 in the species diversity and these are all linked
6 for top ocean predators like albacore, shark, et
7 cetera, et cetera. That if you look at this 100
8 year scenario there is a shift in their population
9 or the distribution patterns shift over some North
10 Pacific, tropical -- I'm sorry transition. So
11 there is something that we need to think about
12 differently as we move forward and as we get this
13 information about what the future may have for us.

14 Implementation of the management
15 strategy evaluation. I think this is something
16 that probably a lot of you know more about that
17 even I do, but it is an interface between science
18 and decision making where you really bring not
19 just the science, but the stakeholders, et cetera,
20 to the table and you simulate, you know, the
21 system dynamics, the decision process, the
22 assessment, the decisions, you include ecosystem

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 information in there. And you're given all of
2 these different components of what goes into an
3 evaluation or management strategy. You evaluate
4 them and you come up with different answers that
5 allow you to choose between which of the
6 strategies we want to follow. So this is an
7 example of what might come out. This is from
8 Southeast Australia. And you might have a number
9 of different strategies that you would consider
10 coming out of this. And some cases, you know, you
11 might choose one that, you know, makes your
12 management more efficient, or another one, you
13 know, you might choose one that has more of an
14 impact on the broader ecosystem. Or you might
15 have a management strategy that gives you more
16 certainty in terms of what you're going to do
17 based on your decision. So again it's an
18 evaluation process that looks at all these
19 different strategies (inaudible) and as I said
20 take this long, and again you're supposed to
21 include the climate and spatial structure
22 component in the decision making.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Okay. Three. This one is going to be
2 one slide. This is going to be an easy one. And
3 so this the adaptive decision one. This is an
4 example of what we did last year in response to
5 again the warming. This is the same picture I
6 showed before with the warming. So here we are
7 off our coast and it's warm; this is June 2014.
8 And when there is warm waters this attracts the
9 loggerheads to this region and it's also the place
10 where there is a swordfish (inaudible) fishery
11 going on. And so there is the mandates or the
12 rules that if there is an El Niño or something
13 like that then you have to close the fishery of
14 the swordfish in order to minimize the chance of
15 interaction between the loggerheads and the
16 swordfish fishery. And so last year with the West
17 Coast regional office we closed -- closing the
18 swordfish industry which we did to minimize this
19 interaction. And it was really based on the
20 expectation that we were going to get warm waters
21 in a sustained way, even though last year was not
22 an El Niño and we were able to adaptively manage

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to say okay, if you see something happening which
2 was let's respond before something happens, and in
3 fact the fishery was closed. It's always a
4 question of, you know, should these regulations be
5 revisited to allow more flexibility in how
6 adaptively manage these issues when they occur,
7 particularly again under expected or observed
8 changing conditions.

9 Okay. Four -- I'm done with three. Now
10 we're to get sort of into the science one. And
11 this one is going to be a little bit under the
12 hood, so bear with me okay. This is a little bit
13 tricky. It says how do we actually project into
14 the future, future conditions. And so what I'm
15 going to do is I'm going to show some examples of
16 work that actually we've been doing now for a good
17 number of years with colleagues from academia,
18 (inaudible) of Rutgers, Charlie Stock and John
19 Dunne at GFDL, that looks at future scenarios of
20 the California and steps for towards earth system
21 models. And earth system models, what they are is
22 a model that don't just include (inaudible),

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 chemistry, and winds, and water, and ice, but
2 actually goes all the way to including human
3 beings, and the whole human dimension aspect of it
4 as well. And I'll talk a little bit about how
5 this example works and I'm going to use an example
6 of my economic model that actually talks about not
7 only the California Current, but it talks about
8 the anchovy groove and the global fish market. In
9 response we're going to have to (inaudible). All
10 right. So I told you it's little bit (inaudible).
11 So the first thing you have to do is -- because
12 we're interested in something (inaudible) in the
13 California Currents. You take these large scale,
14 you know, global scale models and have to
15 downscale them into something that looks like the
16 California Current. So you have these models from
17 GFDL and they're running, you know, for centuries,
18 but what we really want to know is what's
19 happening there and how to force the situation
20 here. So there's a lot of work that goes from
21 looking at what happens at scales. It may not be
22 relevant to fisheries to bring it down to scales

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that are relevant to fisheries and be able to make
2 future projections. And it's not only coupling
3 with physics, but also coupling on biology,
4 chemistry, and so on. And so I want to just
5 really quickly say that we have been making some
6 significant advance and we did say almost 100 year
7 projection from 1970 to the next century. In this
8 case it was a one way and we forced the large
9 scale dynamics into a small scale dynamic and we
10 were able to get things that -- and you're going
11 to have to trust me for the better.

12 And so in this case it talks about, you
13 know, whether we were able to capture this in the
14 West Coast of the United States, but that we were
15 able to capture the right temperature signals.
16 And there's a large scale foreseeing you don't
17 when you actually include more detail than is
18 coupling with the models, you actually now begin
19 to get the kind of responses that you need to get.
20 And that's only part of the story. So this is
21 sort of an easy one. The other part is feedback
22 from small scales. They knew that the large

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 models would fall off because it didn't have the
2 right scales. If they keep forcing with this
3 large model without fixing it, it is going to
4 continuously force the larger scale -- impose the
5 large scale forcing which is incorrect on
6 something that you need at a smaller scale. So
7 then the question is how do you feed that from the
8 small scales back into the large scales to fix
9 some of these problems. And I think you are
10 getting into boxes where the problems are to be
11 similar to the California Currents.

12 So we all know that, you know, large
13 scale wind supports down to smaller scale waves
14 and thing like that, but again the trick is how
15 you feed back to the things you get, to get back
16 -- to fix the solution at the forces. So you're
17 actually going back and fixing the forces. And
18 it's something that we're doing with NCAR,
19 National Center for Atmospheric Research. So you
20 have a big model, a small model, you couple them;
21 there's a lot of stuff that goes into how you
22 couple them, and then you say what did I get, how

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 did things actually change. And so now I'm
2 focusing down here, you see here's Vancouver
3 Island, here's Baja, California. And we'll look
4 at these five places where I put five arrows
5 pointing to north and south. And generally the
6 winds here during the summer they blow from the
7 north to south. What this does is it says okay,
8 I'm just going to ad lib these as I go along. And
9 it says winds are negative, it just keeps going
10 and getting more and more negative. So it just
11 adds every day the wind stress. And the large
12 scale models give you (inaudible), so it just kind
13 of blows south. And you go from -- again from
14 Oregon down to Baja, and just generally a
15 southward blowing wind. What happens when you
16 couple things, the first thing that you notice is
17 that there's almost an order of magnitude
18 difference in the strength of the wind. So you
19 were getting the wind direction right and you were
20 off by the strength of the wind. Why does that
21 happen? Because you are now able to capture
22 through the coupling the differences in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 temperature between the atmosphere and the ocean a
2 little bit better so you get these temperature
3 ratings more properly represented that you then
4 feed back into the system that actually forces
5 what we have. You also begin to see some spatial
6 structure. It's not just south, south, south,
7 south, it's actually in cases where the winds
8 stops and in some cases it might even get worse.
9 And you came to get some things that you don't
10 get, and this is really important because we're
11 not at the point yet to doing these large scale,
12 you know, century long scenarios with the
13 resolution that we need without these couplings.
14 And finally the thing that comes out of the
15 (inaudible) as well is that, here's South America
16 and here's North America, and this is the
17 (inaudible). The difference between do you
18 include the high resolution model and you don't
19 include the high resolution model. And you
20 certainly expect off the West Coast of the United
21 States to see a difference, and that's what you
22 see here. But what you're also seeing is that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there's a difference that propagates away from
2 this region. So we're finding out by embedding
3 these high resolutions areas like the California
4 Current, through the Humboldt System or Embuela
5 Current, there is actually feedback from these
6 upwelling systems and all these boundary currents
7 into the larger scale response of the climate
8 system. And I'm going to get more into this.
9 It's sort of a -- it's not just the climate people
10 telling us what the answer is and fixing our
11 problem, we're actually giving an answer back to
12 them and in turn, you know, they actually get a
13 response as well. So that's as far as the physics
14 is concerned.

15 The third part of this better
16 forward-looking projection is that how do we put
17 humans into this discussion. And so this a very
18 nice case study by (inaudible) and others. And
19 the approach is kind of similar to what I just
20 talked about, looking at global future scenarios.
21 And same idea, you have some physics all over the
22 place and the physics forces the biology, and the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 biology forces the fish, to get fish. But then
2 all of a sudden you're interesting fishing, you
3 know, and you're trying to see how the markets say
4 in Asia for agriculture are riding the need for
5 the fishing going on here. So the question is how
6 do you couple -- how do you take this part about
7 the (inaudible) for the need for fishing and say
8 national (inaudible). So that's my (inaudible).
9 The idea is again focusing on this -- on through
10 Humboldt Current System and the (inaudible) that
11 happens there, but this also has a complete
12 anthropogenic part of our system model to say that
13 driven by changes in the prices of the fishmeal
14 and combined with expected environmental
15 variability such as El Niño and such, can come up
16 with (inaudible) that tells us how the system will
17 respond. And what we find is that if you look at
18 say changes in fishmeal prices, and they might go
19 up in over say 10-20 years, again in a simulated
20 way, what that does is that it will actually
21 impact in terms of, you know, what the total buy
22 amounts is in terms of what it is that you're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 extracting and how much is actually left in the
2 ocean, leave behind catch, and also the fishing in
3 the past days, so you're also talking -- also
4 probably how much you've increased the fishing
5 pace in response to that demand in fishmeal. And
6 rather than having a place where only El Niño is
7 the natural variability that allows for recovery,
8 you sort of get the expected answer that by
9 actually superimposing a certain scenario you can
10 actually grind down the biomass in the population.
11 Again, the point of this is to show you all the
12 kinds of things that have happened that allow us
13 to do some scenario testing on future conditions.
14 It's not just the physics, it's not just the
15 (inaudible).

16 The next one is information on
17 mechanisms that change, so why do these things
18 happen that we see. And I'm just borrowing some
19 quick examples from work related to what we were
20 talking about Kenny Rose at Louisiana State, and
21 Jerome Fietcher at UC Santa Cruz, and this case
22 has kind of identified what is it that drives the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 variability of sardine and anchovy in, you know,
2 in response to this large scale force. Did you
3 have a question? Sorry.

4 MR. MERRICK: I was just saying this is
5 CalCOFI.

6 MR. WERNER: Kind of.

7 MR. MERRICK: Kind of? That's what
8 CalCOFI is supposed to be about though, California
9 Current of Oceanic Fisheries Investigations.

10 MR. WERNER: We're finding -- trying to
11 find where all of these activities integrate
12 (inaudible). So it is, right. And so we can say
13 well what causes this. So again the question is
14 identifying the mechanism. We see things going up
15 and down, but what are the mechanisms is a
16 different question. So you can have things that
17 are now or you can have things that are
18 (inaudible) or you can have things are
19 (inaudible). We know that, you know, these change
20 in sardine -- actually fluctuations happen not in
21 just the California Current, but elsewhere, and so
22 can you tease out with that information. And

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 again with the hypotheses being driven by, and the
2 physics and the biology of the (inaudible).
3 Again, similar approach we throw really kind of
4 sophisticated, you know, best understanding of
5 everything we have into this and we come up with a
6 model that's a multi species model. We have
7 sardine and anchovy, albacore, fishing fleets. We
8 have a general model. We have explicit models of
9 growth and mortality and reproduction and so on,
10 and movement. And for the fisheries these
11 actually are one of the (inaudible). And my sheet
12 down here that indicates we are actually able to
13 track individual organisms. And by looking at the
14 individual traits of the organisms you can
15 actually build a statement about the whole
16 population. I think this is just a little
17 (inaudible) move all over the place. And we have
18 the anchovy, the sardine, we've got the albacore
19 swimming in there, you've got fishing fleets
20 throughout here as well. And you come up with an
21 answer -- boom. And you can run these things
22 forever. This took us about six years to get. So

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 they're all (inaudible) right now (inaudible) and
2 you come up with an answer. And you come up with
3 an answer that says these are the distributions of
4 anchovy and sardine as (inaudible) adults. It can
5 actually be -- I have an answer. I'm still trying
6 to find what the mechanism is. You can get an
7 answer, but so what. And you come up with
8 differences, you know, like sardine are further
9 off shore and potentially can be further from
10 shore, the distribution themselves are different.
11 The wiggles, anchovy has more wiggles. Anchovy
12 had the wiggle earlier in the decade or in
13 decades, then the sardine has -- it came out later
14 and has fewer wiggles. And you began to see
15 differences in merging from the simulation that
16 hopefully allow you to understand what happened.
17 And they say you've got and more and more and
18 more, wiggles all over. So what do you do with
19 all that? So how do you tease out? It's
20 basically like going out to sea, right. You go
21 out to sea and then I try to figure out -- okay,
22 make sure all that stuff is in order. The

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 advantage of model is that now you can actually
2 really look at every part of it. And you can say
3 well maybe we've got partial processes that I need
4 to identify, maybe there is also more (inaudible),
5 not just locally, but also large scale, and can I
6 tease out this information to then say what it is
7 that caused these variations. And so the answer
8 is the way that we did it. I told you we were
9 going to have (inaudible). So you got about 40
10 years in the ocean, and after you plot out the
11 sardine and the anchovy, where both of them turn
12 up, and you say well, which year is a good year,
13 and we'll call it a red, and which year is a bad
14 year and we'll call it a blue. And I'll do them
15 both for the anchovy and the sardine. And then
16 I'm going to look at the conditions that -- or
17 their common conditions that come out in the blue
18 and the common conditions that come out in the
19 red. So what comes out is a whole branch of each,
20 you know, cold temperatures emerge and (inaudible)
21 of high growth, warm temperatures and low growth
22 and zooplankton. And in some cases it's more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 temperature driven and in some cases it's more
2 food driven, in some cases it's physics, how much
3 current variability there is (inaudible). Looking
4 at sardines, we got something that's different.
5 If you go back and forth you see that they are
6 responding to different things. The model tells
7 you that high survival of sardine as to high
8 temperatures as to survival of anchovy. So you
9 begin to see what emerges. So the question was
10 how do we identify mechanisms, how do we know in
11 the future what it is that can drives these
12 things, and what drives these things, and what did
13 we need to know then as we, you know -- do we need
14 to do more laboratory experiments to find out
15 temperature response, do we need to do more
16 calculations on feeding responses. Are there
17 conditions that are going to be different from the
18 ones that we see now, acidification and
19 stratification, you know, et cetera. So it tells
20 you the way to look forward in terms of how you
21 tease out mechanisms. Status and trends and
22 (inaudible). And this is a briefing on the IEA,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Integrated Ecosystem Assessment, and this is
2 really led by two folks, Chris Harvey from the
3 Northeast Science Center, and Toby Garfield from
4 the Southwest Center. And this is looking at
5 trends and warnings in terms of what's there. And
6 it's really taking all this information, both from
7 the ecology and the socioeconomics and all of
8 that, and put into ways that can actually perhaps
9 do something. I've already talked about the
10 changes in the temperate that we've seen, I've
11 talked about the land temperatures that we've
12 seen. So how does this all translate into what we
13 see? And so you're going to see a bunch of little
14 plots like this where we develop these trends and
15 it allows you to look at what all the information
16 is out there over the last 20 or 40 or 50 years
17 depending on the length of the (inaudible). Green
18 kind of says, you know, what we have recently and
19 also begin to look at the currents that perhaps
20 are relevant over the time scale that's relevant.
21 So what have we seen that comes out of
22 the IEA? As I talked earlier during a time when

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you have a cold phase in Pacific decadal
2 oscillation we have these high fat zooplankton.
3 And now that we are getting out of the cold phase
4 into the warm phase you begin to see a decline.
5 During a warm phase you actually get to see the
6 animals that are very low fat and (inaudible) so
7 this is all trying to put this in perspective of
8 what we see, you know, what we expect and what we
9 actually see. So one thing this (inaudible).
10 Moving up the trophic level from the zooplankton
11 to the forage fish, then moving from zooplankton
12 to say the sardines, and the anchovies and the
13 other small fish. Again we begin to see that
14 there's a trend on certain species going down,
15 other species going up. Again, they go up the
16 food chain one step further. Again how is that
17 related -- how are these trends and signals
18 related to, you know, what we might see in terms
19 of (inaudible), they might not be doing -- they
20 might be doing okay, but something else like the
21 salmon may be (inaudible). Again this is -- and
22 actually try to integrate the sciences out there

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to tell us -- I show over here, you know, the
2 salmon, whatever salmon fish are here, but -- and
3 you can actually tease out a lot more information
4 that talks about not just salmon as a total, for
5 the aggregate development in terms of how they
6 different salmon in different parts of the West
7 Coast are doing. So again you develop these plots
8 and then you provide the managing councils
9 relative to the fishery's ecosystem plans, and
10 they begin to look at this in terms of how they
11 understand, how the broader -- when you take all
12 of this into account and you look at these.

13 Now I'm just going to jump to the last
14 one because I'm running of steam here. There's
15 just one part. And so this is the science
16 infrastructure to produce and deliver both the --
17 there's that word again -- the actionable
18 information. And this is the only slide I wanted
19 to show. And the fact is that we have a lot of
20 what we need to do this. I mean we do have -- at
21 least we have knowledge. We have the instruments,
22 we know how to integrate them, we know how to take

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 different signals and put something together
2 that's meaningful, showing what the models can do
3 and can't do. That's on the one hand, the sort of
4 hardware and software, but the other thing that we
5 need to focus on is also on the people side, on
6 the infrastructure and the fact that we have
7 people start thinking about this thing
8 differently. This is a picture from an article in
9 2005 that talked about the different groups that
10 came together to work on the human genome project.
11 So it wasn't just science, it was informatics, it
12 was ethicists, it was the legal side of the house,
13 it was the biochemists and all of that. And the
14 human genome project basically just developed this
15 normal network of what it is that actually comes
16 into play to take on these bigger projects. And
17 the example I chose before was because we're going
18 to need to train the next group of people in the
19 same way. It's not just about (inaudible) or
20 physicists working, we really need to integrate
21 and develop these teams that actually think
22 jointly to come up with these climate related

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 questions, because it's not just one thing, it's
2 everything.

3 And the final slide is then working
4 without a (inaudible) strategy. Who will be able
5 to track the ecosystem changes, we work to
6 understand the mechanisms that cause the change.
7 We will be able to develop year long-term
8 forecasts. We will be able to do climate
9 sensitive assessments and ultimately this will all
10 lead back to something that will provide us a
11 better management scenario (inaudible). This is a
12 picture from the southern tip of Baja, California.
13 There is this guy here standing there next to a
14 big group of bigeye trevally which are
15 (inaudible). And I may have gone too long, but
16 it's an ambitious I think science strategy, but I
17 think it's deserving of (inaudible) that comes
18 together and I'll try to see how we move forward.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Cisco, that was a
20 tremendous presentation, really eye opening in
21 terms of seeing the amount of information that has
22 to get absorbed and processed to put together just

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 one of these models. And to put this in context
2 for MAFAC, remember that NOAA has to do this in
3 every region for all the different fisheries. And
4 the bigger picture here, and the reason MAFAC is
5 thinking about these issues is we have this task
6 force, this climate and green resources task force
7 that's in place now with these climate experts.
8 And NOAA currently is working on their draft
9 climate science strategy which is trying to figure
10 out how does the agency plan to manage its science
11 and to do this kind of effort in all of the
12 regions for all of the fisheries. And it kind of
13 gives you a sense of the scaling effort that has
14 to happen. This kind of exercise needs to take
15 place all across the country, time and time again.
16 So how can NOAA manage its resources and best use
17 its resources to give us the best information
18 possible. And Roger Griffis has been the NOAA
19 point person leading the role. Roger, are you on
20 the phone?

21 MR. GRIFFIS: I'm here.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Hey, Roger. Really

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 appreciate your leadership on the macro level.
2 And I know a little later today Pam Yochem will be
3 leading the ecosystem subcommittee and they'll be
4 talking about the comments that have been passed
5 back to MAFAC on the drafted science strategy.
6 And before we have a larger discussion of this
7 particular presentation and eventually that
8 subcommittee meeting, I wanted to see if you had
9 specific comments.

10 MR. GRIFFIS: Well, I do not except just
11 to thank the subcommittee for all their hard work
12 and their patience and their attention.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Ken?

14 MR. FRANKE: Okay, Keith. First of all,
15 Cisco, thank you very much. Cisco and his staff
16 -- I had talked earlier about working together and
17 having it mean something and figuring out how to
18 pay for all this stuff that we want to do. And
19 when we did the strategic planning for the region
20 on the business side from the industry, we do it
21 every year in January and the Board of Directors
22 votes on it and approves it, but we actually got

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in touch with the science center and said we want
2 your input on our strategic plan because we have
3 money to fund X, Y, Z, and we welcome your input
4 before we dedicate those dollars. And as we've
5 moved forward Cisco has hosted meetings, we've
6 redefined some of the things that we're going to
7 do, but a lot of it involves -- as an example
8 we're going to have a highly migratory species
9 sampling project where we're going to measure the
10 weights and lengths of the fish aboard the boats
11 at sea. His center helped us develop the modeling
12 criteria that we're going to use. We're going to
13 fund part of the processing component, we're going
14 to work their staff as well when it come out of
15 the pipe, but that's an example of where we can
16 actually partner and share resources and such.
17 And I have to say the Southwest Science Center has
18 been consistently stepping up to the plate so, you
19 know, from us in the industry to them, we
20 appreciate that, it really means a lot.

21 MR. WERNER: And I'll just make a
22 response as to really having a two-way

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 conversation because when we talked to Ken a lot
2 of that was relayed -- like he said we're talking
3 about highly migratory species, and it does go all
4 the way back to the conversations that happened at
5 the table in the broader Pacific. I mean a lot of
6 these studies because of the nature of the
7 organisms that are involved have to have the
8 Taiwanese at the table, the Koreans at the table,
9 the Japanese at the table. So what we see here,
10 the fact that this conversation is one that also
11 makes us rethink not just what happens here but
12 also more broadly in terms of how we approach
13 these species in a specific way.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Peter.

15 MR. SHELLEY: It also strikes me that
16 this is a really exciting mechanism that is going
17 to unite and maybe integrate NOAA at a much higher
18 level, you know. There's always sort of this the
19 satellites versus the fish and all that stuff, but
20 it's -- and here's a real important applied
21 context for all those parts of the agency to work
22 together.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. WERNER: Yeah. And that -- this
2 figures in some way to be that, part of it being
3 fisheries, part of it being (inaudible). So I
4 mean it's all the different groups that need to
5 come together in order to look at it from all the
6 standpoints. To me it's always like (inaudible)
7 so powerful because it really does say that we no
8 longer can go this alone. And we were talking to
9 Richard about this, how again, you know, fisheries
10 have the (inaudible) Component, but it's, you
11 know, it's USGS, it's interior, it's NSF, and so
12 on, that they really do all come together in the
13 end. And I'm not sure, Richard, you -- only
14 because I know you've been in contact with Craig
15 and others exactly about how to perhaps link these
16 different groups within NOAA, is that fair?

17 MS. SOBECK: I guess what I would say to
18 that, Peter, is it seems like it makes sense and
19 it would be a natural point of connection, and it
20 is to a certain extent, but when we're talking
21 about kind of more traditional, one dimensional,
22 count the fish, crank in the biology, get your

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 basic fishery biologist -- I don't know, I'm just
2 a lawyer, I don't know, but you guys actually do.
3 But, you know, when it was a lot simpler, we
4 really had much more control of our fate because
5 both the science centers and the management side
6 of the house were in the same line. You know,
7 we've got a lot of satellite power, we've got a
8 lot of smart scientists on the weather and
9 atmospheric side of the house, but they're not
10 used to stepping it down into management usable
11 scenarios. They have a lot of demands to do that
12 coming from sectors other than fisheries and so
13 it's not actually -- even though we're trying hard
14 it's not that easy. And again there are a lot of
15 demands on their time and energy for stepping down
16 models to be used for a lot of different things,
17 and we're just one sector doing that. I mean
18 there is a lot of focus on water issues and
19 getting some of that information to do modeling
20 from water on land, you know. I mean and the
21 drought, that's a big deal. So we're saying, no,
22 no, we really want to know how many fish are in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the ocean and where they are. You know, there are
2 a lot of competing voices for the -- there's a
3 bunch of other stuff we need to know too. SO it's
4 a work in progress. And part of what we're
5 struggling with is how much of that -- I'm just
6 parroting what Richard and Cisco told me last week
7 -- but, you know, we're trying to figure out how
8 much we look to the rest of NOAA and how much
9 we're going to have to just take on and learn and
10 develop our capacity to do. Not because it's
11 duplicative, but because there is just so much
12 demand that we have to build more capacity
13 throughout all of the agencies to do this.

14 MR. SHELLEY: But you think -- just so
15 we can follow up -- you think that these models
16 would drive you to have to -- meaning this is when
17 you talk about water, how water is being
18 redistributed in the system by weather.

19 MR. WERNER: Yes. And there are system
20 models --

21 MR. SHELLEY: There's going to be
22 drivers for all this stuff that you're looking at,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 so it's almost --

2 MR. WERNER: Yeah.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I agree in a
4 constrained environment it becomes bewildering,
5 but --

6 MR. WERNER: Yeah, the aero system
7 models we actually get into a little (inaudible).
8 So it does actually look at how you're actually
9 redistributing the (inaudible) and all that. If
10 it is integrated and all.

11 MR. MERRICK: So the problem is trying
12 to get parts of NOAA to stop thinking the way they
13 used to think. They used to think OAR provides
14 service to weather service and that's it. Now
15 we're telling them, you know, we're a partner as
16 well, you should be providing us service. So if
17 you're stepping down models for the weather
18 service we should be able to get some sort of
19 information. And then the way OAR goes forward
20 with the weather service for a big FY17 addition
21 on water. They don't think about drought, they
22 think about floods. We have to stick ourselves

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 into that conversation and say drought is also a
2 water issue and you should really be thinking
3 about that as well.

4 MR. SHELLEY: But this is a powerful
5 constituency, this table.

6 SPEAKER: Hence the agenda.

7 MR. MERRICK: So you have to change the
8 culture.

9 MS. MORRIS: So do you envision the
10 predictive capacity feeding into adaptive
11 management? I'm envisioning myself at a council
12 meeting and the science staff is coming and saying
13 we predict in the next 10 years this is going to
14 happen to the fishery, and it's based on models
15 that have been informed. And we should adjust our
16 10 year rebuilding plans or our three year harvest
17 scenarios in anticipation of this predicted
18 effect. It seems like that is going to be a tough
19 sell until you've had some success with the
20 council. So there's kind of a -- how do you
21 envision that happening? Have you already done
22 that here on the West Coast somewhere?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. SOBECK: Sardines, tomorrow.

2 MR. WERNER: I have answer that --

3 MR. MERRICK: So sardines is a
4 short-term one?

5 MR. WERNER: Yes.

6 MR. MERRICK: But we in Alaska and the
7 Bearing Sea, the (inaudible) came to us and they
8 wanted to know should I build a new drawer for
9 30-40 years down the road. So the Alaska center
10 took the predictions from GFDL and predicted out
11 for 30-40 years for pollock. And their prediction
12 is that the biomass of pollocks decline by 30-40
13 percent. So that's long-term if we could -- and
14 then the short-term is with this council, dealing
15 with sardines. The same thing happened with the
16 North Pacific Council with respect to saying the
17 short-term forecast for pollock there, that they
18 were predicting -- our folks at the Alaska Center
19 were predicting that you're going to see a decline
20 in pollock recruitments and thus pollock biomass.
21 So you need to ratchet back a bit on the ABC. So
22 indeed there was a decline in biomass, and now

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it's gone back up again.

2 MR. WERNER: And another short-term
3 example is the salmon. And it's somewhat easy,
4 right, because things were so dire it's hard to
5 expect anything other than a difficult time for
6 them over the next couple of years, but again
7 there is this example, a short-term example where
8 we are hopefully again hopeful. Hopefully we're
9 wrong and things will be great. It builds that,
10 you know -- like you said the ability to trust the
11 responses. So it is a process that is just
12 starting and I think that, you know, this example
13 at the high latitudes with the pollock and us here
14 are two very specific examples that are already
15 happening at the council level where they are
16 beginning to pay attention carefully, but still
17 paying attention to something to work at.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mike, I know you've
19 been patient but I suspect Paul wants to address
20 the specific thing on pollock.

21 MR. CLAMPITT: No. It was something you
22 just said and --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Mike's first, unless
2 he --

3 MR. CLAMPITT: Okay, go ahead.

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I think it's been
5 addressed a little bit, but the question I have is
6 the warm water block, and we've talked about this
7 before, Cisco. We kind of understand that there
8 might be a relationship between the sardines and
9 the anchovies, but I've also heard (inaudible)
10 Alaska salmon is down, Kenai River will be down,
11 but I've never seen anything -- any papers or
12 anything, but people have said that now it looked
13 like there could be a drought going on and low
14 water, which isn't good for salmon of course.
15 Would you -- I mean is there anything to suggest
16 that Alaska salmon might --the kings up there and
17 some of the chums have been really poor returns,
18 but is there any kind of correlation or any kind
19 of thought process on that?

20 MR. WERNER: I don't know specifically
21 about that. I did see something about -- it was
22 pink in fact which supposedly didn't do well, but

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I don't know the specifics. And, Richard, since
2 you've (inaudible) do you want to take this one?

3 MR. MERRICK: I'm sure there are pubs on
4 that. Bob Francis did a lot of work on that from
5 the University of Washington.

6 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, yeah, that was my
7 -- was going to be comment, specifically what
8 salmon were you talking about because it was two
9 years ago we had record pink runs.

10 MR. WERNER: Yeah. Pink ones appeared
11 to --

12 MR. CLAMPITT: And then last year it was
13 supposed to be down near -- we still had basically
14 pinks in Prince William Sound (inaudible). And
15 this year they think it's going to be bigger than
16 the last two years. But of course, you know, I
17 think they're often -- so then you made a comment
18 --

19 MR. WERNER: So I was focusing on the --

20 MR. CLAMPITT: You made a comment and
21 you said hopefully I'm wrong, hopefully we're
22 wrong. And so that brought to my --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. WERNER: Well, I mean it in a sense
2 that, you know, nobody wants a bad thing to
3 happen.

4 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I understand what
5 you meant, but so how do you -- I mean I guess my
6 main concern -- I think it's a great tool, it's
7 fantastic, but my only concern is, you know, I --
8 with fishing we depend on (inaudible). You know,
9 what we're used to is, you know, having a fish and
10 looking at, you know, recruitment. And so you're
11 not suggesting that this is some kind of a --
12 we're going to have to replace it?

13 MR. WERNER: No.

14 MR. CLAMPITT: Another tool is going to
15 integrate?

16 MR. WERNER: Correct.

17 MR. CLAMPITT: Oh, that's a good idea.

18 MR. MERRICK: It's not going to be for a
19 lot of stocks. There aren't that many ones that
20 we really understand these relationships, but
21 where we can you can do this. For others we can
22 provide qualitative indices.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. SOBECK: But this is -- it's
2 complicated and expensive, but if it turns out to
3 be an accurate tool, it does allow this
4 forecasting and this planning, and at some point
5 given the constrained resources I think there's a
6 question of do we want more stock assessments for
7 today, tomorrow, and the day after that, or do we
8 need to save some of our resources to invest in
9 this longer timeframe so that we have a sense of
10 is there going to be a fishery in 20 years or not.
11 So I think it's --you know, it's not that we don't
12 -- it's not that we want to like trash current
13 stock assessments and move to this modeling, they
14 are not equivalent, but it seems like, you know,
15 in the best of all worlds we have the right amount
16 of both. And it's hard because these are big and
17 expensive and new and our complement of resources
18 is based on what we do now which is, you know,
19 your more traditional kinds of stock assessments.

20 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, that's great. I'm
21 worried about the prediction that the stocks would
22 be gone in 20 -- I mean as fisherman they're never

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 going to believe that. I mean we're -- what's --
2 you're all -- I mean that's all going to be
3 collapsed.

4 MS. SOBECK: But wouldn't we love to
5 have an accurate crystal ball that would say, you
6 know what, we predicted -- given these trends
7 we're in that boom/bust cycle of sardines and we
8 know that we're on the bust side of the cycle now
9 and we can predict more accurately, we can give
10 you more information farther ahead about when
11 that's going to happen. I mean it doesn't have to
12 be all new fancy climate change, it can be even
13 more traditional cycles that we're talking about.
14 And I guess I'm just saying that we are developing
15 more -- you know, I feel like Cisco has dangled
16 out this, you know, we've got these cool new tools
17 and yeah it's going to take a while to convince
18 councils and fisherman that they're going to work,
19 but it's going to take an investment to do them.

20 MR. WERNER: And in the case of the
21 salmon, I think it was 2007-08 there was again a
22 very poor ocean condition, and so while there were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a lot of salmon going back out into the ocean they
2 ran into this low energy level in terms of food
3 environment, and two years later they failed to
4 return. And so I think that's what we're
5 basing -- what we're seeing here now, what we
6 expect is going to happen given the conditions
7 that are there, and why we say that in two years
8 -- even if they manage to get out and say get out
9 ahead of the drought so to speak, they're going
10 into a feeding environment that's going to make it
11 tough for them.

12 MR. MCCARTY: That's what concerns me is
13 that it seems like with some fish stocks in
14 certain river systems that population is being
15 burnt at both ends.

16 MR. WERNER: Yeah.

17 MR. MCCARTY: And when we have success
18 stories of the MMPA and we have other green
19 mammals that are possibly, you know, competing for
20 the same keystone species, you know, so thinking
21 about sort of things that are stressors in this
22 model that we're looking at with the glacier

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 recessions and higher levels of bacteria in rivers
2 killing spawners before they can spawn, attacking
3 the gills. So it seems like what do we do to put
4 some of these other question marks and/or data
5 that we've collected to pinpoint some of these
6 problems into the model.

7 MR. WERNER: Yeah, so those first slides
8 is, I mean, we're pretty grim. It almost seems
9 like the perfect storm of all kinds of things
10 happening with these three or four years, these
11 last three or four years and presently. So all
12 the concerns you bring up are there.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right, John
14 Corbin and then, Julie Bonney and then, Terri Lee.

15 MR. CORBIN: This may be a little from
16 left field but do you have futurists working with
17 you on these projections? You know, futurists
18 make projections and predictions all the time and
19 there's books written on the various techniques.
20 Scenario-building is one of them.

21 And it seems to me that in addition to
22 this hard science quantitative you want to predict

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the social and cultural impacts, the soft sciences
2 and having some of those techniques to fold into,
3 utilize, you know, add to what you're doing would
4 be interesting to see.

5 MR. WERNER: Yeah, and that bio economic
6 model that I showed, you know, connecting the
7 fishery out in Peru with the markets off Asia,
8 it's baby steps, again, into these into social
9 what drives the price of the fishmeal and how is
10 that set and will the markets or other people
11 respond to it or not? Again, it's baby steps in
12 that direction.

13 The tricky part is how do you find that
14 currency that you take from -- for the models that
15 give you the total carbon or total protein that's
16 produced and translated into something that we can
17 -- and so, how do you translate nutrients or
18 carbon into dollars?

19 MR. CORBIN: Or human behavior?

20 MR. WERNER: Or human behavior. And so,
21 it's baby steps but I think it's a proof of
22 concept, sorry.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MERRICK: Some of it's pretty clear
2 and Mike and Paul might be aware, there was two
3 recent studies looking at the effect on climate
4 change on coastal communities in Alaska and a lot
5 of that was about changes that occur in fishery.
6 If the pollock fishery does, indeed, shift further
7 north which is what the prediction is over time,
8 then it's going to be harder for villages like
9 Akutan to get up there.

10 Get -- the smaller boats come back and
11 the (inaudible) pollock fisher can get back to
12 Akutan and process it. The fish are up farther
13 north. So there is analysis that is going on now
14 and I specifically charged our chief scientists --
15 chief economists with actually focusing on that
16 part of the climate strategy to make sure that
17 that's covered in there. Okay, so yeah, that's
18 the -- in the end, that's really the big deal that
19 for us, we're a management agency and we need to
20 conserve the stocks but at the same time on the
21 Magnuson we also have a charge to preserve coastal
22 communities.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right. Julie?

2 MS. BONNEY: So just two comments and
3 then, one I guess question. One is I'm from
4 Alaska and the Gulf of Alaska and the pollock
5 quota is the highest it's been since 1985. So
6 traditionally the quota's been about 40,000 tons
7 or 195,000 pounds. So maybe projecting
8 future-wise you could end up in the situation
9 you're talking about but as a harvester, you want
10 to take advantage of what's in the system today
11 versus projecting out what the -- how many fish
12 are going to be in the ocean even though none of
13 them have been born.

14 The other thing that we're finding on
15 the Chinook salmon and what the -- Alaska, they've
16 got an initiative and I think you had a slide up
17 there that showed -- I can't ever say it, the P --
18 the oscillation --

19 MR. WERNER: The P (inaudible)?

20 MS. BONNEY: Yeah. And so, showing that
21 at least on the Pacific-Northwest side, that the
22 conditions are favorable for Chinook salmon and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 they're not favorable in Alaska. And so, some of
2 your trends are suggesting that it's going to
3 shift the other way.

4 For the fleet that I work for, they are
5 being heavily impacted by King salmon that come
6 from the Pacific-Northwest, treaty fish, that feed
7 in the Gulf of Alaska and they're operating under
8 hard caps for King salmon. So as you develop a
9 management scenario where one fish is feeding
10 somewhere else but returning somewhere else it
11 really -- so locally they think, you know, the
12 King salmon that we're catching is affecting
13 Alaska but the reality is they're mostly BC and
14 Pacific-Northwest fish.

15 But I guess the comment and question to
16 you is when, you know, I attend the plan team
17 meetings and they, you know, you have your single
18 stock assessments but they also have what they
19 call the ecosystem component where they're
20 developing indexes of temperature, recruitments,
21 what water conditions and all that that are
22 affecting those outputs for quota setting

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 processes.

2 So, for example, in the pollock
3 assessment, they have some uncertainty. The
4 author reduces the amount of -- they've put in
5 uncertainly buffer in the -- on whatever's going
6 to be on the output. And so, instead of starting
7 a whole new climate arm versus the ecosystem arm
8 that's feeding into your quota setting processes,
9 doesn't it seem as if both of those kind of merge
10 together in terms of informing an assessment?

11 MR. MERRICK: So the ecosystem
12 considerations report that the North Pacific
13 Council does is the model for the rest of the
14 country?

15 MS. BONNEY: Right.

16 MR. MERRICK: That's one of the things
17 that's in the strategy. That's one -- we'd like
18 to have all of the Councils doing something
19 similar.

20 MS. BONNEY: So I guess my question to
21 you, though then, is climate is kind of
22 influencing ecosystem, right? And so, are they

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 two separate tracks in terms of forming an
2 assessment or --

3 MR. MERRICK: No.

4 MS. BONNEY: -- are they kind of merged
5 into ecosystem in general?

6 MR. MERRICK: Ecosystems in general have
7 always, in our view, had to deal with
8 environmental change. The difference now is that,
9 whereas environmental change, we always sort of
10 assumed -- it fluctuated around some average value
11 that was trendless. Now there's a trend.

12 But basically, I mean, all the tools
13 we've had traditionally, whether they were
14 regulatory tools under Magnuson or the science
15 tools or government change, it's just it's sort of
16 our perception of how we're going to use the
17 information. So, for example, in some areas where
18 fish stock is gone, it's not like it's going to
19 come back in a few years. It may have just moved
20 out of there. If you look at the east coast, a
21 lot of the work we're doing there, looking at the
22 movement of fish stocks, those stocks are moving

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 north or deeper.

2 It's not likely that they're going to
3 move back south again because the water
4 temperature's warming and they're responding to
5 that.

6 MS. BONNEY: Which makes management very
7 difficult if you're --

8 MR. MERRICK: Yeah but --

9 MS. BONNEY: -- licensed and you live in
10 those communities.

11 MR. MERRICK: -- and it's tougher for
12 the fishing community if all of sudden the stock
13 you've been fishing on for decades is gone and
14 it's replaced by something else, you probably
15 won't adapt to that but you need to have some
16 advice on how to do that. And also dealing with
17 markets, I mean, there's a lot to go on there but
18 that's only what we're trying to do is, you know,
19 provide that sort of advice to the Councils. What
20 you can expect to see for these stocks and how
21 they move.

22 It's not just the abundance. It's also

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 absence and presence. So if cod is moving farther
2 north in New England, it's not going to come back
3 probably. It's not going to turn around and come
4 back.

5 MR. RHEAULT: One fisherman I talked to
6 was speaking kind of like what you're saying and I
7 think in this case it was (inaudible) moving back
8 towards Canada but not so much in the West Coast.
9 But he says that there's other rock fish that are
10 kind of taking over the regime. And so, now that
11 they have got it occupied it's, in his view and
12 not scientific of course but, a long time in the
13 water, but he basically thought that it would be
14 difficult for (inaudible) to come back and
15 compete.

16 And whether they eat the same food or
17 not, I don't know but just as a spatial thing, not
18 only is it maybe not an environmental thing, you
19 may have other species competing once they move
20 out so.

21 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Terri?

22 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. I don't want to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 pretend that I knew a lot about what you were
2 talking about it occurs to me that, you know, my
3 interest mostly is in highly migratory species on
4 the East Coast. And to the extent that other
5 countries are harvesting those fish, do you have
6 any buy-in with the RFMOs or the intent to include
7 foreign scientists in this exercise?

8 It's all well and good to (inaudible)
9 200 miles but they don't. And you know, to the
10 extent that you can get their scientists, I know
11 most of the RFMOs have committees whether they're
12 actually functional or not (inaudible) but and the
13 fisherman as well. Because my fisherman will tell
14 you, you know, that they see everything moving
15 north just like you said. They're all moving
16 north and out.

17 MR. WERNER: So the quick answer is yes
18 certainly on the Pacific. So the examples that I
19 brought up on the albacore with the management
20 strategy evaluations that we're doing include the
21 WCPFC, the ITTC, the ISC which sort of runs
22 between them. I'm running out of letters here.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 PICES which is a science organization not an RFMO
2 but it's like you said. I mean these organisms
3 are pan-pacific. So we have to do these together.

4 And we actually have formal, not just
5 through the RFMO meetings and such, but we
6 actually are starting a working group that brings
7 all of these things together specifically to work
8 on understanding the spatial structure to then
9 better do the management. So yeah, this is a --
10 yeah, we've got -- we made sure we got everybody
11 at the table.

12 But as the -- for the rest of the other
13 ocean, so in a month if you guys want to come back
14 to La Jolla, we have a meeting on something called
15 close-kin genetics for blue fin and we were going
16 to have people from Australia, people from
17 Virginia, people from Florida, people from up and
18 down the West Coast and people all the way from
19 the Pacific Rim. So it's -- we want everybody at
20 the table and that's, again, in a month's time we
21 hope to be able to make some headway on this.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Cisco, you've gotten

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 everybody's attention but we need to keep this
2 agenda moving. I'm going to have Ted and Micah go
3 next and then, we'll move on to the subcommittees.

4 MR. WERNER: Okay.

5 MR. AMES: Yeah, kind of a dumb question
6 and probably it's already been answered.

7 Accompanying this warming in the West Coast, we've
8 had an accompanying cold weather period in the
9 North East. Does your model predict this to
10 continue or is this just an anomaly?

11 MR. WERNER: So I'm going to be -- okay.
12 So it's interesting. It may have to do with this
13 what they call it the Arctic amplification that's
14 going on which has to do with the fact that
15 temperatures in the Arctic are increasing. And
16 so, what's happening is that the differences in
17 pressure between the Arctic masses and say, the
18 continental land masses are actually decreasing.
19 The slope is decreasing which is causing these
20 very long and deep dips of the jet stream that not
21 only are deep and into the continents and causing
22 these differences in temperature from one side of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the continent to the other but there's actually
2 much slower. So they last a little bit longer.

3 So if you believe in arctic
4 amplification and, you know, there's good evidence
5 to at least continue to think about it. It might
6 -- we might see more of them, of that, and they
7 might be long-lasting and you'll be cold and we'll
8 be without water. So it depends on whether this
9 arctic amplification mechanism holds or not.

10 MR. MERRICK: Or whether that's
11 associated with what's going on in the warm blob
12 that's in the Pacific?

13 MR. WERNER: It again, if the jet stream
14 is coming in and blocking things coming in from
15 the Pacific it's -- fluids are so messy because
16 they're disconnected. So yes, in answer to your
17 question it would continue changing -- continue
18 holding that one block pattern so to speak.

19 MR. MCCARTY: So one more aspect, I
20 guess, about this model I'm interested in the
21 ocean chemistry side of it and I guess the
22 hypothesis that carbonic acid levels are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 concentrated in the poles theoretically because
2 the atmosphere ceiling is closer to the surface of
3 the earth in the poles. But then if
4 concentrations of carbonic acid in the water is
5 moving south and we've got species escaping warmer
6 waters running north.

7 I'm kind of curious about what sort of
8 facts -- which sort of feed might be more
9 resilient. Are we going to see more lipids
10 feeding the food chain and the lower energy feed
11 not surviving these phenomenon, this --

12 MR. WERNER: So you're talking about the
13 acidification?

14 MR. MCCARTY: Yeah, ocean acidification
15 and how it's going to affect the food chain and
16 how do we forecast how different species may
17 survive or die first?

18 MR. WERNER: Back when I was a sophomore
19 in college I decided I'm never going to take
20 chemistry because I broke every pipette. I
21 totaled, you know, anyway, so I don't know a lot
22 about the chemistry but what I do know is so I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 think the jury's still out in terms of how the
2 response is going to be to the change in
3 acidification.

4 Yes, there are immediate things that we
5 see having to do with the dissolution of the tests
6 and the shells of some of the organizations. You
7 see things that have to do with whether they will
8 adapt to being there and be smaller, where the
9 coastal region is because of the, again, the out-
10 blowing of the low oxygen and high pH or low pH
11 concentrations again.

12 I'm not quite sure about this
13 latitudinal high latitude/low latitude connection.
14 I'm looking -- is there a chemist in the room that
15 can help me out with this part of the question?
16 Yes?

17 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, the colder water
18 will push more (inaudible) --

19 MR. WERNER: Exactly.

20 MR. CLAMPITT: -- lower pH, low
21 (inaudible).

22 MR. WERNER: Yeah. Like if Coke

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) -- yeah.

2 MR. CLAMPITT: -- atmospheric pressure.

3 MR. WERNER: It's a temperature. So
4 there's physical effects and then there's
5 biological effects. And the physical effect is
6 yes you would have, like your Coke has more
7 bubbles because it's colder, so you would have
8 more carbonic acid and lower pH in higher
9 latitude. Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right, Cisco,
11 thank you so much. You got everybody involved in
12 that today and that was an excellent presentation.
13 I really appreciate your time today.

14 All right, so we're going to be picking
15 up on this presentation in the Ecosystems
16 Committee. The Ecosystems Committee Pam's going
17 to be leading and what I'd like to do is I want to
18 get a showing of hands of people who intend to go
19 with the different groups just so I can figure out
20 which room to send people to.

21 One task is the Ecosystems Committee is
22 supposed to get together now and discuss the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comments that we've received from the Climate
2 Change Taskforce. The second one is the rec fish
3 group is supposed to get together and complete
4 their tasks on working group and the third one is
5 the Protected Resources Committee is going to
6 convene and work on a recovery desk. Heidi, I
7 know you've got a room right next door for us.

8 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I was assuming the
9 climate discussion would stay here because we have
10 the court reporter and that could be helpful.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right. The other
12 room is a little bit smaller so if there's a large
13 group of people for climate that might work but if
14 all of the people want to do the other two --

15 MS. LOVETT: I'm at the Ecosystems
16 Committee time, right? So? Yes. Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Can I
18 get a show of hands on Ecosystems and Climate
19 Change Taskforce? Okay. And rec fish? You're
20 all over the place so. All right, so why don't we
21 do this? We'll keep Ecosystems and rec fish here.
22 Ecosystems you'll be using the mic and rec fish --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: There should be two sets of
2 tables set up in that next room.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: In that room?

4 MS. LOVETT: Yes. There's two sets of
5 tables for two small breakouts.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. I'll accept
7 the suggestion. So it's going to be rec fish at
8 one table and protected resources at the other.
9 And if I could ask, please, for the subcommittee
10 chairs after you're done tonight, please let me
11 know how things went because I need to shape the
12 agenda for tomorrow based on what happens and I'm
13 going to be bouncing around to everybody's
14 meetings to try to follow up but at this point,
15 it's in Pam's hands, Ken's hands and Julie's hands
16 so good luck with your subcommittee meetings and
17 thank you, everybody.

18 MS. MORRIS: And what's next after the
19 subcommittee meetings?

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: We've got a happy
21 hour at TGI Fridays right down the street at 5:15.

22 MR. FRANKE: Yeah, Keith, I'll be over

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there at 5:00 to welcome everybody. As you leave
2 here it's just several blocks down. You're going
3 to go to the right of the hotel and it's on the
4 other side of the street. It's right around the
5 corner on 5th Avenue about 100 feet. So a five-
6 minute walk from here.

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And Ken has invited
8 stakeholders from throughout the vicinity and the
9 community so we'll have some friends there when we
10 get there. So thanks everybody. See you tonight.

11 (OFF THE RECORD)

12 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Does everybody have
13 a paper copy or a copy on the screen of the
14 comments?

15 MS. LOVETT: So it's under the
16 subcommittee --

17 SPEAKER: Is there an actual paper copy?

18 MS. LOVETT: -- it's, yeah. And it's
19 under subcommittee at the bottom of the page. So
20 I'll show you where it is. I will pull that
21 (inaudible).

22 MS YOCHER: Great. If you can pull it

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 up, that would be --

2 SPEAKER: Oh, here it is. We're
3 watching it on the big screen? Okay, I got it.

4 MS. LOVETT: Well, it's kind of long so
5 but --

6 MS. YOCHER: Which was going to be one
7 of my comments. We -- I can't imagine that the --
8 well, maybe I shouldn't start out on a negative
9 but I can't imagine that we would go forward with
10 an actual recommendation on such a long document
11 just having seen it this one at least based on my
12 past MAFAC experience.

13 MS. LOVETT: It's been -- in this case
14 since it's sort of somewhat technical, the
15 Committee has submitted comments that were long
16 like this. So it's not unheard of.

17 MS. YOCHER: No, I'm just saying that in
18 terms of opportunity for discussion and to absorb
19 the information and so on.

20 MS. LOVETT: Right.

21 MS. YOCHER: At least, with past efforts
22 of this kind with MAFAC this has been something

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that's -- discussion's occurred over several
2 meetings, at least a couple of MAFAC meetings.
3 But we'll see how it goes.

4 MS. LOVETT: Okay, that's a good fair
5 point. So the comments that you all received or
6 the full subcommittee received is a compilation of
7 comments that came in from three different
8 subgroups of the taskforce that began working on
9 different parts and different comments.

10 One of them was very focused on socio
11 and economic input. Another one -- another group
12 of people were very concerned and sort of titled
13 their draft papers on risk and, Columbus, what was
14 it, risk and uncertainty.

15 MR. BROWN: Risk and uncertainty.

16 MS. LOVETT: And then, a third group was
17 going to work on data and data-related topics. So
18 that's how it broke out by the afternoon of the
19 one-day workshop that everybody had. Those groups
20 were a little slow to get started and really
21 drafting comments and so, a few people took the
22 bull by the horn and one subgroup particularly led

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 by Gale Vick decided to look at the actual seven
2 different objectives and make recommendations of
3 things they thought should be included in those --
4 as comments to those objectives.

5 The other group was looking more
6 overarching and developed comments on a variety of
7 topics. And so, this document that you have has
8 comments organized in two parts. Comments on the
9 entire scope of the proposed strategy and it's
10 numbered one through seven or eight, I forgot what
11 the number is now.

12 MR. BROWN: It's one through nine. No,
13 1 through 11.

14 MS. LOVETT: 1 through 11.

15 SPEAKER: This is a combined comment so
16 most recent one (inaudible).

17 MS. LOVETT: Okay, that one's slightly
18 different so this is a slightly revised and one
19 through nine. And then, it goes by more specific
20 comments organized by the objectives.

21 Now, the subcommittee recognized that
22 there is some overlap and maybe some redundancy.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 It was a little difficult to tease all that out
2 because it wasn't sort of one person from the
3 working group that wanted to take the lead to sort
4 of be the drafter. So I helped put the two
5 together.

6 The comments, a few people commented on
7 the document and some of those comments were left
8 highlighted and particularly on a few key areas.
9 And I thought at the time it got sent around the
10 working group I thought there was going to be a
11 little more give and take conversation within the
12 working group but it didn't really happen that
13 way. However, another person did come up and made
14 some, again, made some general comments but said
15 he did not agree with all the subject matter
16 deletions that Robert Leaf was recommending. That
17 was Rowan Baker.

18 So Keith thought that it was
19 appropriate, at that point, to at least so you all
20 had a chance to look at it and see it, to see this
21 and understand that there wasn't necessarily
22 unanimity but that that's not necessarily a bad

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 thing. And if this group can maybe come to some
2 conclusion and work through this and modify it to
3 where you all feel comfortable then it would be
4 something ready to submit.

5 So in Keith's way, as I understand it,
6 he doesn't necessarily want lots of wordsmithing
7 per se. He feels comfortable about the content
8 that came from the taskforce but if there's any
9 big ideas that you think are not really approached
10 correctly and you want them taken out of these
11 comments or if there's anything that you think is
12 lacking or missing from the comments, I think that
13 is what he was hoping the subcommittee would work
14 on making additions or deletions in a broad way.

15 And we can definitely go through the
16 things that are highlighted with the comment
17 blocks on the side because -- and I didn't want to
18 take those up because I think there was some
19 disagreement about what biological reference
20 points means exactly on that case. And I thought
21 you all might be able to resolve that one.

22 MS. YOCHER: So you're -- my

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 understanding then is that everything is agreed up
2 or can be considered a consensus for the taskforce
3 except these highlighted areas?

4 MS. LOVETT: Yes. And the highlighted
5 areas, the taskforce I think the other thing that
6 Keith had suggested was if you all agreed that
7 there might be some redundancy and you didn't mind
8 the taskforce massaging their document a little
9 bit more, just refining it and having confidence
10 that with Keith and my direction that that would
11 be accomplished without changing the content
12 dramatically if you know what I mean?

13 Like leaving it up to staff and Keith or
14 their taskforce chair which we've now -- it looks
15 like Samantha Danchuk will be -- step forward as
16 the chair or has been asked to be chair and she's
17 accepted I should say. That that kind of
18 refinement can still happen in the next week say
19 to pass it on to leadership. But that effort
20 would not change dramatically the content, it
21 would just be to take out any place we think this
22 is redundancy, too much overlap, make sure the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 words are, you know, grammatically it looks good
2 and accurate and such.

3 So the major comments that Robert Leaf
4 had was he didn't think people were understanding
5 what a biological --

6 MS. YOCHER: Let's go to those. Let's
7 just go through them one at a time?

8 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

9 MS. YOCHER: Well, first, before we do
10 that, I just want to hear from members of the
11 subcommittee, are there any other comments that
12 you want to make before we just look at what the
13 taskforce has done?

14 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I've been scanning a
15 whole bunch of documents and NOAA has been engaged
16 in a number of taskforces which other federal
17 agencies and other entities that have really
18 focused on a lot of these issues and to some
19 extent maybe further down the road then NOAA is in
20 terms of what's doing within its organization
21 because you've got an interior group. You've got
22 an EPA group and although they've all participated

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 together in some of these documents, in one of the
2 more recent ones that I looked at was climate's
3 mod conversation putting adaptation principles
4 into practice.

5 And this is something that was worked on
6 by the National Wildlife Foundation, Park Service,
7 Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, NOAA,
8 USDAS, EPA and the Corps of Engineers. And they
9 get into a number of the issues on adaptive
10 practices. They also have a very interesting
11 brief discussion about risk and uncertainty.

12 MS. LOVETT: Could you speak up a little
13 bit?

14 MR. BROWN: They also have a very
15 interesting dialogue about risk and uncertainty.
16 And it's -- I think some of the language in here
17 is probably a lot clearer and to the point than
18 what we have here.

19 MS. LOVETT: In those other documents?

20 MR. BROWN: Yeah. In those other
21 documents.

22 MS. LOVETT: So it's important to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 remember that this is a strategy strictly for the
2 science side of our house.

3 MR. BROWN: Correct.

4 MS. LOVETT: And it's not to be directed
5 to any of the other agency activities. It's
6 supposed to supplement and support the work that
7 the agency is doing alongside those other
8 agencies.

9 MR. BROWN: I agree.

10 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

11 MR. BROWN: But and you're dealing with
12 the part that talks about uncertainty is talking
13 about the scientist, is talking about the science
14 side and goes another step where they talk and
15 talk about how to deal with situations when you
16 don't have enough information. Now, they used a
17 term related to the use of experts. I can't
18 recall exactly what it was but I thought it was a
19 good way of saying how do you vet information when
20 you don't have sufficient data in a referee
21 journal but you've got experts that can talk to a
22 particular issue or a particular concern.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Well, we have a document
2 that was generated by this MAFAC-associated
3 taskforce.

4 MR. BROWN: Right.

5 MS. YOCHER: And as you've mentioned,
6 there are documents that have been generated by
7 other working groups.

8 MR. BROWN: Right.

9 MS. YOCHER: I mean, I don't know what
10 to do about trying to harmonize those.

11 MR. BROWN: Well, it's not just about
12 harmonizing them. How do you lift out then the
13 stuff that, you know, how do you save time? And
14 someone has already invented the wheel. We don't
15 need to invent it again.

16 MS. YOCHER: Right. Well, I think from
17 what Heidi's saying that our chairman's saying is
18 not to be concerned so much with that
19 wordsmithing, is that right, Heidi, in terms of
20 what Keith is requesting?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

22 MS. YOCHER: But if -- maybe if we're in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a place where we -- where there's a difference of
2 opinion, we can look into it then or you can -- if
3 you've got a specific example that applies to
4 since you were at the taskforce meeting.

5 MR. BROWN: Right.

6 MS. YOCHER: If you have since seen
7 something that better describes risk or
8 uncertainty, maybe we can try to capture that?

9 MR. BROWN: Yeah. And I just came
10 across this this morning.

11 MS. YOCHER: Uh-huh, okay.

12 MS. LOVETT: Okay. So I'm going to try
13 to put the Word version up on the screen just copy
14 it over there. Okay?

15 MR. SHELLEY: Pam, so do you see us just
16 walking through these comments and that
17 constituting the bulk of our work this afternoon?

18 MS. LOVETT: So and you both were, I
19 assume, reading and hearing and seeing the email
20 chains. So I'm happy for you all to pipe in with
21 your, you know, I wasn't trying to be directive
22 just supportive that you all have the opinions.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: No, I just, for me, and I
2 didn't have enough bandwidth to type in but
3 certainly the presentation today reinforces. I
4 think the critical piece in comment that's or --
5 that's most troubling to me in terms of this
6 current taskforce presentation is to do with the
7 objective seven which is building and maintaining
8 the infrastructure needed to fulfill all this
9 stuff.

10 I mean, it's -- in the report, you know,
11 in NOAA's fisheries report in objective seven they
12 say as someone commented NOAA fisheries existing
13 infrastructure is not adequate to meet those
14 science needs. I mean, that's kind of a given
15 here and so, it seems to me that in objective
16 seven a comment on it --

17 MS. YOCHER: Well, I think we also saw
18 in Cisco Werner's presentation, one of the
19 comments I was going to make had we had the time
20 was he referenced several times academic partners.

21 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

22 MS. YOCHER: And I think one of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 reasons that the genome project was so successful
2 and I'm going to use that as an example is it
3 wasn't all done by government biologists.

4 MR. SHELLEY: Right. Exactly.

5 MS. YOCHER: You had the government --

6 MR. SHELLEY: I guess that's my point is
7 that --

8 MS. YOCHER: We don't necessarily need
9 NOAA to build all the --

10 MR. SHELLEY: You don't but someone
11 needs to think through the architecture of that
12 network.

13 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

14 MR. SHELLEY: And part of it will grow
15 but someone needs to and some priority has to be
16 given to some of these sub-bullets in the
17 objectives because some of them are really
18 important and some of them are less important, it
19 seems to me.

20 And so, if you're -- and NOAA fisheries
21 might be operating under a budget constraint world
22 which is probably more likely future or a budget

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- enhanced budget world. They do have additional
2 resources. So in terms of the overall comment
3 coming back from the taskforce, I think there was
4 more discussion on just practical decision or
5 priority setting issues than showed up in the
6 report.

7 That's the one thing overall that
8 surprised me. And I didn't have enough time to
9 really jump in on it.

10 MS. YOCHER: So based on the -- I see
11 what you're saying. So the taskforce
12 conversations you had --

13 MR. SHELLEY: I thought it was richer
14 around that. At least, it was in some of the
15 conversations I was involved in.

16 MS. LOVETT: That's probably true. I
17 know that Roger was, at a couple of points, Roger
18 and/or I had said that not that we should forget
19 that totally but that this is supposed to be
20 aspirational --

21 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

22 MS. LOVETT: -- and not that when --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it's supposed to help direct the thinking of
2 budget requests and that whole budget process
3 which is always three years out.

4 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

5 MS. LOVETT: And we're planning -- we've
6 submitted '17 already I think or soon will be.
7 And so, there's other things that happen in the
8 priority world when it gets to the actual budget.
9 But it's always good to put out what you are
10 hoping to do because, as you said, you don't know
11 when -- well, yesterday was a good example.

12 Roger explained, you know, 15 years in
13 the making was that science lab. They had the
14 plans. They knew what they needed. They knew
15 what they wanted and when, all of a sudden,
16 dollars finally became available unexpectedly they
17 were able to get it moving because all the
18 pre-work had been done.

19 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

20 MS. LOVETT: So this is, I think, in
21 some vein similar. It's aspirational. It's this
22 is what we know we, you know, what or what they

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 think they know will be needed to be able to
2 address and work with the climate change that's
3 happening and do the science that's necessary for
4 fisheries and protected resources and habitat, et
5 cetera.

6 MR. SHELLEY: I think that's exactly
7 right but to use that example, I mean, this
8 fishery center got lucky because under the
9 President's economic stimulus they got all the
10 money they asked for. I mean, they had the whole
11 thing funded. They got stainless, I mean, they
12 got everything that was in there but that's very
13 unusual. I mean, what if they had gotten half of
14 the money that they needed?

15 What parts of the lab would they have
16 built? And which ones would they have said, you
17 know, that's -- stainless steel is pretty nice but
18 we can -- we'll just -- we can go with galvanized.
19 Do you know what I'm sort of saying? There's no
20 --

21 MS. LOVETT: Right.

22 MR. SHELLEY: -- this is such a big

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Chinese menu and there's -- it's all kind of
2 equally treated in terms of priorities and so --

3 MS. YOCHER: So you're saying this --

4 MR. SHELLEY: -- that's what troubles
5 me.

6 MS. YOCHER: -- this document?

7 MR. SHELLEY: That document. This
8 document.

9 MS. YOCHER: This document, okay.

10 MR. SHELLEY: And I think there was some
11 discussion around that.

12 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

13 MR. SHELLEY: And there are going to be
14 choices that have to be made.

15 MS. LOVETT: Right. So let me see.
16 There were sections that were drafted by Keith on
17 that topic and I thought that they were included
18 in here.

19 MS. YOCHER: So would that have been one
20 of the general?

21 MS. LOVETT: That was under the capacity
22 and limitations.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: What page are you on?

2 MS. LOVETT: On page 5. And he said
3 make -- so it's make the science strategy
4 operational not just aspirational, number 10 and
5 number 11. He -- that was based on the pieces
6 that Keith had and his subgroup had drafted.

7 MR. SHELLEY: And so, that's good but it
8 didn't end up in this other -- it didn't, I mean,
9 because we have got sort of this bifurcated thing.
10 I don't know --

11 MS. YOCHER: Well, and I think that's
12 one of the differences of opinion --

13 MR. SHELLEY: It doesn't really show up
14 the same way in the objective seven in the back.

15 MS. YOCHER: -- among the taskforce.

16 MS. LOVETT: Oh, okay. I see what
17 you're saying. I'm sorry. I didn't understand
18 you. Yes.

19 MR. SHELLEY: Do you know what I'm
20 saying? It's like --

21 MS. LOVETT: Okay. Well, that's a fair
22 -- so --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: I don't want to miss that
2 point.

3 MS. LOVETT: -- yeah, no, no. So it's
4 in the overarching and you think it should be --

5 MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

6 MS. LOVETT: -- in number seven?

7 MS. YOCHER: So yeah. So you're saying
8 objective seven needs to repeat some of the
9 thoughts that were in 10 and 11 of the previous
10 section.

11 SPEAKER: That's the most recent email.

12 MS. LOVETT: So if you want to --

13 MR. SHELLEY: Add some language?

14 MS. LOVETT: -- yeah. In that case, I'm
15 sorry, I just need to get my thinking cap on but
16 I'm happy to add a bullet. So I see what you're
17 saying.

18 MS. YOCHER: Well, why don't we go to
19 the -- you want to go to objective seven right
20 now?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

22 MS. YOCHER: And let's try to do that?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Skip ahead.

2 MS. LOVETT: Sure.

3 MS. YOCHER: And pick -- if you could
4 pick one sentence from each section maybe or
5 something like that and make a bullet point out of
6 it.

7 SPEAKER: What page is objective seven
8 on?

9 MS. LOVETT: Objective seven is near the
10 end.

11 MS. YOCHER: Is on page 9. Or starts on
12 page 8, the bottom of page 8. So you see these
13 bullets. We're talking about adding maybe on
14 bullet. I mean, why not just say make the science
15 strategy operational not just aspirational?

16 MR. SHELLEY: Or both.

17 MS. YOCHER: Is that the sort of -- or
18 make the science strategy both operational and
19 aspirational?

20 MR. SHELLEY: Sort of a sentence that
21 we're pointing to is on page 5. To assist with
22 this exercise, NOAA should review the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 recommendations, identify which ones involve
2 dollars and there's specific budgetary
3 requirements, develop time frames and (inaudible)
4 into one of the seven objectives.

5 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

6 MR. SHELLEY: And that's very specific.

7 MS. YOCHER: So are you seeing where
8 he's talking about?

9 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I was just looking
10 for the sentence.

11 MS. YOCHER: A shortened version. So
12 under 11 the second paragraph. The first
13 sentence, is there a way to make that shorter?

14 MS. LOVETT: I'll pull it over and --

15 MS. YOCHER: Heidi is such a pro with
16 this cutting and pasting stuff.

17 MS. LOVETT: Let's see.

18 MS. YOCHER: Copy and paste in this
19 case.

20 MS. LOVETT: (Inaudible). So okay. So
21 NOAA should review the recommendations in chapter
22 three of (inaudible) to identify which -- identify

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 budget needs --

2 MR. SHELLEY: They've got to do a budget
3 exercise. I mean, they've got to decide what's
4 important and when --

5 MS. YOCHER: And maybe, I don't know if
6 you want to leave out that last and tie each
7 recommendation --

8 MS. LOVETT: I think just say identify
9 specific budgetary requirements (inaudible) with
10 this.

11 MS. YOCHER: Right.

12 MS. LOVETT: Identify specific budgetary
13 requirements, develop time frames for
14 implementation I would say.

15 MS. YOCHER: Uh-huh. Do we need that
16 last part?

17 MS. LOVETT: Does it need the last part?
18 I'm not sure I understand it.

19 MR. SHELLEY: I don't know.

20 MS. YOCHER: Would you take that out?

21 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I think you can take
22 the tie out.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

2 MR. SHELLEY: I mean, I guess what I'm
3 saying is in this objectives section, the five --
4 page 5 through 9 where all these little bullets
5 are, you know, they all read the same in terms of
6 their budgetary impacts or their priorities or
7 their -- there's no -- so identifying the key
8 disease indicators to track and monitor herring is
9 one of the bullets.

10 MS. YOCHER: Well, but I mean, I think
11 that's why there was this idea of putting that --
12 your comment as an overarching thing.

13 MR. SHELLEY: Good, okay.

14 MS. YOCHER: No, it was at the very
15 beginning that we need to set some priorities --

16 MR. SHELLEY: That would make me very
17 happy.

18 MS. YOCHER: -- internally knowing we
19 can't. So she -- I think that exists already with
20 what Keith did and then, if you make that specific
21 --

22 MR. SHELLEY: Just add that to here?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Okay, yes. Okay. Follow what you're doing.
2 Yeah.

3 MS. LOVETT: So is that the kind of
4 thing you want?

5 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

6 MS. YOCHER: Review the recommendation,
7 identify specific --

8 MR. SHELLEY: Prioritize based on
9 different funding scenarios.

10 MS. LOVETT: And they do do that. So
11 there we go. So NOAA should review the
12 recommendations in chapter three of the draft
13 strategy, identify specific budgetary requirements
14 and time frames for implementation, then
15 prioritize based on different funding scenarios.

16 MS. YOCHER: Moving forward.

17 MR. SHELLEY: Perfect.

18 MS. YOCHER: And chapter three is the
19 moving forward chapter.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just a question.
22 Wouldn't you want to prioritize what the most

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 important objectives are and then --

2 MS. YOCHER: Yes.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Yes, that was my --
4 that's, I guess, I was reading into prioritize.

5 MR. OKONIEWSKI: That when you base it
6 on the different funding scenarios you might be
7 back to the least favorable or desirable
8 objective.

9 MS. YOCHER: Right. So I agree with
10 you. I would just say, and then prioritize as --

11 MR. SHELLEY: Prioritize period?

12 MS. YOCHER: Yeah or prioritize the
13 recommendations.

14 MR. SHELLEY: Okay.

15 MS. YOCHER: Or even not even and then
16 but and prioritize the recommendations. So we
17 want to know the review them, identify the budget
18 requirements and time frames and prioritize them.

19 MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

20 MS. YOCHER: So review the
21 recommendations, identify specific budget
22 requirements, does that read okay to everybody?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: And prioritize them?

2 MS. YOCHER: Sure.

3 MS. LOVETT: Hold on one moment. I'm
4 just going to make sure I save this as a new
5 version so if we ever -- sorry.

6 MS. YOCHER: Okay. I would say --
7 review the recommendations, chapter three. And
8 timeframes. Maybe you need and in front of time
9 -- well, no, okay. I see. And prioritize them.
10 Okay. Any other general comments like that or
11 should we just start walking through the -- any
12 other big things like -- because that's an example
13 to me of what Heidi had asked for and Keith had
14 asked for which was a big thing that was missing.

15 MS. LOVETT: So it might be good to, as
16 you walk through, to just say yea or nay to --
17 particularly since there -- we tried to organize
18 the topics, you know, discreetly. So do agree
19 with the -- that it, you know, it's risk, urgency
20 and risk, yes. Do -- move on to the next.

21 MR. BROWN: Right, yeah. One other
22 comment -- I did have a notation under capacity

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and limitations. That third paragraph,
2 unfortunately, in a climate change world --

3 MS. YOICHEM: Page 5 everybody number 11.

4 MR. BROWN: -- you know, historic data
5 becomes quickly outdated and I would say more or
6 less useful because and I would -- I think we need
7 to add something that says when you take advantage
8 of the efficiencies game of new technologies and
9 new needs because USDS just installed a new
10 collection point right around the corner from my
11 house on a little stream. And 15 years ago or 5
12 years ago, the amount of money to do what they're
13 doing now would have been phenomenal.

14 I mean, they're getting constant water
15 temperature, oxygen and a variety of other
16 readings and the stuff is being uplinked. It's
17 got solar cells to keep it running.

18 MS. YOICHEM: Well, let's -- we've got --
19 so we've got the first sentence unfortunately.
20 Then we have the second sentence, data needs to be
21 collected in a way. Are you suggesting adding
22 like a sentence right there?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: Right. And instead of
2 saying of becomes quickly outdated, it becomes
3 more or less useful.

4 MS. LOVETT: Useful or useless?

5 MR. BROWN: More or less useful because
6 sometimes it's becomes more useful because of
7 change and sometimes --

8 MS. LOVETT: Oh, I see what you're
9 saying.

10 MR. BROWN: You know, so it's not always
11 a negative.

12 MS. YOCHER: Oh, I see what you're
13 saying.

14 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, it become -- yeah.

15 MR. SHELLEY: Affect usability or?

16 MS. LOVETT: No.

17 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, I see what you're
18 saying.

19 MR. BROWN: It becomes more or less
20 useful.

21 MS. YOCHER: So basically this is saying
22 historic data are worthless.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: Are no longer any good, are
2 worthless and that's not true.

3 MS. YOCHER: Right. So what -- Heidi,
4 can you think of how to -- becomes more or less
5 useful. I don't know that that really says it.

6 MR. BROWN: Instead of quickly outdated.

7 MS. YOCHER: Historic data --

8 MR. SHELLEY: I think it is an important
9 question the use of historic and even traditional
10 knowledge.

11 MR. BROWN: Right.

12 MR. SHELLEY: In the climate change
13 world. I mean, in New England, people have
14 logbooks going back 150 years to the fish.

15 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. I think Keith was
16 thinking in the negative. I take your point.
17 This -- it could be a positive and data trend --

18 MS. YOCHER: Right.

19 MS. LOVETT: -- long trend data are
20 really important.

21 MS. YOCHER: Right.

22 MR. MCCARTY: Well, the example are the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 books or the scripts. They found DNA on some of
2 the blood splatters on old paper.

3 MR. BROWN: Right.

4 MR. MCCARTY: And so, it was deemed
5 useless until new technology came along and all of
6 sudden it was --

7 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

8 MS. YOCHER: Some historic data may be
9 --

10 MS. LOVETT: I don't think it's the
11 historic is the --

12 MS. YOCHER: Well, yeah, some --

13 MR. SHELLEY: It may not be as useful?

14 MS. YOCHER: As in the past.

15 MR. BROWN: I'd say more or less --

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Maybe less predictive
17 or something. It's less --

18 MR. BROWN: More or less useful.

19 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, but that's not --

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: As a predictor.

21 MR. BROWN: Yeah, right now, you think
22 -- right now is useless. I mean, we were -- I was

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 listening to this thing about some of the tribal
2 data and it, you know, the stuff that's being done
3 is not enough. Well, it's not that that data is
4 bad. It doesn't give you what you need.

5 MS. YOCHER: Right. So some historic
6 data may become more or less useful than in the
7 past.

8 MR. BROWN: Right.

9 MS. YOCHER: So why don't we just say
10 that? Useful than in the past to show that it's
11 -- something has changed.

12 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

13 MR. SHELLEY: Because value can vary.

14 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

15 MS. YOCHER: In a climate change world,
16 the value of historic data can vary, is that what
17 you're suggesting instead of this? Unfortunately,
18 in a climate changed world, the value of historic
19 data can vary?

20 MR. BROWN: Right.

21 MS. YOCHER: Or usefulness. Maybe the
22 usefulness of historic data because you don't want

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to say value but usefulness or the current
2 usefulness or something like that of historic data
3 can vary. While it still may be the best
4 available data, it may be inadequate.

5 MR. BROWN: It may still -- yeah.

6 MS. YOCHER: Unfortunately, in a climate
7 changed world the usefulness of historic data can
8 vary. While it may be the best available data, it
9 may be inadequate.

10 MR. BROWN: And I think in a positive
11 way you can say data need to be collected in a way
12 that takes advantage of efficiencies gained by new
13 technologies and --

14 MS. YOCHER: Okay, so stop. Data needs
15 to be collected in a way that takes advantage of
16 new technologies and is --

17 MR. BROWN: And efficiencies.

18 MS. YOCHER: -- and efficiencies and is
19 appropriate for the spatial and temporal extent of
20 the problem.

21 MR. SHELLEY: Oh, yeah, that ties it in.

22 MS. YOCHER: That makes sense.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Collected in a way that takes advantage of new
2 technologies and efficiencies and is appropriate
3 for the spatial and temporal extent of the
4 problem. Okay?

5 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

6 MS. YOCHER: Any other kind of major
7 changes like that where you think that --

8 MR. BROWN: Should it be and as
9 appropriate or as is appropriate?

10 MS. YOCHER: I'm sorry?

11 MR. BROWN: Should it be and as
12 appropriate or as is appropriate? As is
13 appropriate?

14 MR. MCCARTY: And as appropriate --

15 MS. YOCHER: Well, you need to collect
16 it in an appropriate way. Whether that involves
17 the use of new technologies or not.

18 MR. BROWN: Right.

19 MS. YOCHER: So collected in a way that
20 takes advantage of these things and in a way that
21 is appropriate for the extent of the problem.

22 MR. MCCARTY: So in a way or and is?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: I see those as two separate
2 things.

3 MR. MCCARTY: Do we want it in a way
4 instead and is appropriate? In a way that is?

5 MR. BROWN: Well, you have one and so
6 why don't you say as is appropriate.

7 MR. MCCARTY: As is.

8 MS. YOCHER: Well, you could say data
9 need to be collected in a way that takes advantage
10 of new technologies and efficiencies. I think
11 it's understood. You don't need to say and in a
12 way that is.

13 MR. MCCARTY: All right, as is
14 appropriate?

15 MS. YOCHER: I don't think you need to
16 say that again.

17 MS. LOVETT: No and is appropriate.
18 Data need to be appropriate for the spatial and
19 temporal extent of the problem.

20 MS. YOCHER: I think it's two completely
21 separate things.

22 MS. LOVETT: I think it's fine.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

2 MR. MCCARTY: Okay.

3 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

4 MR. MCCARTY: There is the one bullet
5 point we jumped away from.

6 MS. LOVETT: I'm going to suggest just
7 for efficiency of our time if we go the front part
8 and work our way through. And then, go back over
9 if there's any glare -- then it might help you see
10 if there's something you think is missing.

11 MR. BROWN: Right.

12 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

13 MS. LOVETT: And needs to be added. So
14 we can maybe have a parking lot of things so to
15 speak to go back to. Seriously.

16 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

17 MS. LOVETT: So and I will say that this
18 was a little bit of what was provided. I, you
19 know, merged a little bit into this front section
20 from the other parts.

21 MR. BROWN: Uh-huh.

22 MS. LOVETT: And the order of things

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 certainly can shift. It seemed to me that the
2 taskforce was really that urgency and risk was one
3 of the most important themes that came out so
4 that's why I put it first. Okay? So if there's
5 something else, I actually moved things around a
6 couple of times because I was trying to make sure
7 I was capturing what was the taskforce considered
8 to be their most important part.

9 So again, if you think things should --
10 I was also cognizant of the flow. So if there's
11 anything you think should be moved around, let us
12 know.

13 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So we're all going
14 to read urgency and risk. Does anybody see any --

15 MR. BROWN: I think we need to add
16 tribal in there.

17 MS. LOVETT: Where?

18 MR. BROWN: Under that second paragraph,
19 you know, whether federal, state or local.

20 MR. MCCARTY: Oh, yeah. Among the
21 family of governments that need to --

22 MS. LOVETT: Oh, in the very top part?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

2 MS. LOVETT: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

3 Where?

4 MR. BROWN: And I don't know which goes
5 first tribal or state but --

6 MR. MCCARTY: In my opinion, it's
7 tribes.

8 MR. BROWN: I mean, whatever the
9 protocol is there.

10 MR. MCCARTY: Well, for Washington State
11 --

12 MS. LOVETT: It's funny because that was
13 written by Gale.

14 MR. MCCARTY: -- state obtained through
15 treaties.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay.

17 MS. LOVETT: That part was actually
18 written by Gale and she was pretty -- let's see,
19 all of I would say federal, tribal, state or
20 local.

21 MR. BROWN: Okay.

22 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, Heidi?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

2 COURT REPORTER: We really need you guys
3 to please speak one at a time because we're not
4 going to have a clean transcript if I can't keep
5 up with crosstalk. Please?

6 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

7 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

8 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay.

10 MR. MCCARTY: Do we want to say and
11 local instead of or?

12 MS. LOVETT: Well, it's whether --

13 MR. MCCARTY: I see it -- I see whether.
14 Yeah, I see that. That's fine.

15 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. Okay, we've added
16 tribal.

17 MS. YOCHER: Okay, you've got a
18 suggestion?

19 MR. SHELLEY: One thing that I think --
20 I thought was in the discussion didn't show up in
21 A-1 which is the urgent -- I don't know if it
22 belongs in urgency and risk. Maybe this is a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 component of risk but there are opportunity costs
2 associated with not acting on some of these
3 things. That and they're not always to the lay,
4 you know, just when you listen to Cisco's
5 presentation how things are connected.

6 It may -- there would be -- it would be
7 nice if there was some ability to characterize the
8 opportunity costs of not acting in some of these
9 areas.

10 MS. YOCHER: Well, the last sentence, in
11 order to make a clear statement to this effect, a
12 preface is needed which highlights the urgency of
13 the issue and the risk of inaction. Do you want
14 to say such as opportunity?

15 MR. SHELLEY: I'd include it in the
16 opportunity costs.

17 MS. YOCHER: Such as opportunity costs?

18 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

19 MR. MCCARTY: You can't take back the
20 moment when you had a chance to act.

21 MR. SHELLEY: And risk could be a lot of
22 things so this is just one component of it. I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 think that we --

2 MS. YOICHEM: Right, right, exactly.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Communicate.

4 MR. BROWN: I'm not saying --

5 MR. SHELLEY: Exact science results.

6 MS. YOICHEM: Right, I agree. Okay. Any
7 other comments on A-1? How about A-2,
8 communicating science results? Climate science
9 results?

10 MR. SHELLEY: Agree.

11 MS. YOICHEM: Okay, we're good with that
12 one. Number three, socioeconomic dimensions?

13 MR. SHELLEY: This is a topic that's in
14 virtually every report written by the National
15 Fisheries Services and never executed particularly
16 well in any of them.

17 MS. YOICHEM: It does seem to --

18 MR. SHELLEY: I mean, it requires more
19 --

20 MS. YOICHEM: -- this comment is maybe
21 making that face.

22 MR. SHELLEY: -- than just a (inaudible)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 economist or sociologist thrown onto your staff.

2 I mean, there's --

3 MS. YOCHER: Well, and I think maybe
4 that's captured with the strategy offers less
5 information about how the objectives will be
6 reached.

7 MR. SHELLEY: All right, I mean, that's
8 fine. I just wanted -- I was reacting to it.

9 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, okay. Okay. How
10 about number four, linking objectives to
11 management questions and decisions? I agree with
12 this. This was one of the first questions I had
13 when I saw that document is the outside reader is
14 not going to have the advantage of the drafters to
15 explain everything. Okay.

16 MS. LOVETT: This is a nod to all the
17 members that were not very happy with the
18 structure of the document in part. And I would
19 say, would you agree?

20 MR. SHELLEY: Uh-huh.

21 MS. LOVETT: There's some people that
22 wanted to monkey around and really rearrange

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 things and --

2 MS. YOCHER: Right.

3 MS. LOVETT: -- Roger and staff are
4 trying to not necessarily encourage them to get
5 into the weeds either on that at this point in
6 time. And more focus on again, is there something
7 missing, something lacking? Is there an incorrect
8 emphasis?

9 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

10 MS. LOVETT: So --

11 MS. YOCHER: Well, now, we get to a
12 place where there's some disagreement. The
13 taskforce document says to provide greater
14 emphasis on habitat issues and the commenter
15 disagrees.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Who is RL?

17 MS. LOVETT: Robert Leaf.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So what was his
19 background?

20 MR. SHELLEY: Leaf, L-E-A-F.

21 MS. LOVETT: He's a professor at the
22 University of Southern Mississippi. A biologist

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 who does stock assessments and other things as
2 well.

3 MR. SHELLEY: I just think it's kind of
4 assumed. I don't know if it needs to be broken
5 out but I don't care. Based on the discussion, I
6 mean. Habitat issues are going to be a big part
7 of what they're doing in these different
8 objectives so.

9 MS. YOCHER: Well, is there a way to --
10 so number five says would benefit from clearer
11 focus and greater relevance of habitat or to
12 habitat programs. Maybe we just stop with the
13 first part of the sentence? In other words, is
14 what he's disagreeing with that they get
15 (inaudible) coverage?

16 MR. SHELLEY: Doesn't four say, okay,
17 you need to link these things with the programs
18 that, you know, like, okay, we need this type
19 section seven consultations.

20 MS. YOCHER: Well, I would -- I guess I
21 would defer to the people who were actually there
22 for the discussion because it seems to me that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 some people must have thought that --

2 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I don't remember it
3 jumping out at me. I have no memory --

4 MS. YOCHER: Do you remember how this
5 was decided, Heidi? Was this what you and Keith
6 did to make these two separate, four and five
7 separate or did they call that out?

8 MS. LOVETT: No, a few individuals had
9 called out habitat and I think if you -- I think
10 one way to, as a whole, it seemed there was some
11 thought that there's just not enough -- it didn't
12 talk to habitat a lot, the entire document.

13 I think Robert's point, though, is that
14 you don't want to -- I think that second part of
15 his sentence, you do not want to dilute the core
16 need of the documenter. He's rooting for not
17 diluting the need to focus on temporal issues.

18 So potentially, you could say -- you
19 could keep that the document would benefit from a
20 clearer focus and greater relevance or habitat
21 programs but not something like but not at a loss
22 or not to diffuse the importance of temp -- you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 know, the temporal climate change and variability.
2 Like, add that into the sentence.

3 MS. YOCHER: Right. Well, maybe greater
4 emphasis on habitat issues is where the problem
5 is. Maybe it's something like integration or
6 greater integration with habitat issues?

7 MS. LOVETT: Uh-huh.

8 MS. YOCHER: Something like provide
9 greater integration with habitat issues and would
10 benefit from --

11 MS. LOVETT: There's definitely other
12 places where people call out habitat issues so I
13 wouldn't -- I would say that it's not -- it would
14 be outside of the spirit of the group to take it
15 out altogether for sure.

16 MR. BROWN: Yeah, and also in light of,
17 you know, the fact that, you know, the CQ and just
18 announced the thing (inaudible) initiative to
19 prepare natural resources for climate change.

20 MS. LOVETT: So you said --

21 MR. BROWN: They've already ponied up
22 quite a bit of money.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

2 MS. LOVETT: So you're saying an
3 incorporation? Is that the word you used? From
4 clearer focus and incorporation of habitat
5 programs and assessment?

6 MS. YOCHER: Well, actually, I was
7 looking at the title of the whole section.

8 MS. LOVETT: Oh.

9 MS. YOCHER: Provide greater emphasis on
10 habitat issues because that's maybe where this
11 concern is that it would dilute it.

12 MS. LOVETT: Right.

13 MS. YOCHER: So I was thinking more of
14 if what they're worried about is that habitat
15 issues are not factored in or aren't called out to
16 be factored in as part of the considerations, if
17 that's what the taskforce saw in this document --

18 MR. MCCARTY: Or if greater emphasis
19 seems to prioritize --

20 MS. YOCHER: Habitat over temporal
21 issues.

22 MR. MCCARTY: (inaudible) merging holes

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and maybe we'd say be accountable to habitat
2 issues or inclusive.

3 MR. BROWN: Well, I think we should
4 leave it like it is because I think, you know, the
5 habitat issues are important and to some extent,
6 they are spatial and temporal. As you warm the
7 water and you increase the level of the ocean,
8 well, you're going to have more (inaudible) a
9 little further north and a little more inland from
10 where it is currently. And that is an important
11 habitat for a variety of species.

12 MS. YOCHER: Okay, so if we leave the
13 title as it is and then, do the benefit from
14 clearer focus and greater relevance to habitat
15 programs and assessments. And then, instead of
16 the editorializing that the habitat issues get
17 relatively little treatment, say something like
18 this should not diminish the importance of focus
19 on temporal, climate-drive patterns or something
20 like that.

21 MR. MCCARTY: Well, I -- just for
22 instance, I got an example I think that is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 relevant here where a lot of tribal programs that
2 do habitat and restoration programs don't have
3 enough money to go back and do the survival
4 studies. And so, you can plant a bunch of plants
5 along the riparian zone and then, with the
6 seasonal rain fluctuations and the scouring
7 events, that gets washed out.

8 But nobody goes back to monitor and see
9 what the survival statistics are of their
10 restoration projects. And so, habitats temporal,
11 the time/space of it, if you don't, you know,
12 consistently monitor what's going on with the
13 habitat and restoration projects, and you've just
14 closed a bunch of (inaudible), you haven't adapted
15 your methods to do a good work.

16 MS. YOCHER: Can folks look at the
17 language that Heidi's got up there now, the
18 suggested change in title of the section?

19 MS. LOVETT: That was just from before.

20 MR. MCCARTY: There's a caveat at the
21 end that address the comment.

22 MS. YOCHER: So instead of providing

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 greater emphasis, the comment is that we should
2 ensure that it provides a focus on spatial and
3 temporal habitat issues.

4 MR. MCCARTY: Yeah, change the title
5 altogether?

6 MR. SHELLEY: I mean, I think it's in
7 most of the document and I think there are a lot
8 of examples of habitat in the document. I don't
9 think they made it in specifically to the
10 recommendation section. I think that is what the
11 comment, I mean, if you look at the priority
12 actions, not many of the -- if you look at the
13 document, there is a lot of talk about habitat.
14 Coral reefs, blah, blah, blah, I mean, it's just
15 all over the place.

16 But how much of that actually, you know,
17 there's a couple of things, habitat recovery but
18 it's -- anyway. I mean, it's actually in here,
19 too, a lot.

20 MS. YOCHER? So you would disagree with
21 the comment that --

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So can I toss an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 observation on that? If you look at it from
2 NOAA's perspective, they don't have a lot of legal
3 or programmatic drive for habitat focus. They get
4 species focus; they get critter focus, right? And
5 what they're looking at from a science side going
6 back in the discussions we've been having is let's
7 get science that helps us with our management
8 decision-making. And what are they making
9 management decisions on? They're making
10 management decisions on stocks. They're making
11 management decisions on species.

12 Right? So what management decisions are
13 being made on habitat?

14 MR. BROWN: Well, what you have essent
15 --

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right, because
17 they're creating their science program to fuel
18 their management decisions and this document is
19 about how are we going to structure our science
20 decisions in the future? So I can understand why
21 habitat doesn't seem to be the priority focus
22 because they're looking at it through this lens of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 management decision-making.

2 MR. BROWN: But no habitat, no fish.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: It's not that I'm
4 disagreeing with your basic premise that habitat's
5 important. I'm just getting you to understand why
6 is it -- why does it look like it does?

7 MR. BROWN: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And then, if you're
9 going to change the model, okay, so help the
10 science center people who are now going to shape
11 their document realize, well, how is that going to
12 translate to management decisions? I get it. No
13 habitat, no fish.

14 MR. BROWN: Right. But essential fish
15 habitat is the key under the Magnuson that they
16 need to deal with. It's also critical habitat is
17 key under Endangered Species Act. So, you know,
18 habitat is --

19 MS. LOVETT: We have a whole habitat
20 science strategy. So it is not something that the
21 Agency shies away from.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I agree.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: And it's not strictly -- it
2 does link to the other management responsibilities
3 of the Agency when it comes to protected species
4 and particularly fish even though there's not a
5 mandate to do habitat restoration.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just saying I
7 like where Columbus went with this which is tie it
8 to critical habitat and essential fishery habitat
9 decision-making, right? You're talking about
10 habitat in general, you know, we all get it,
11 ecosystem management and habitat. But what
12 they're trying to figure out is how are they going
13 to prioritize their science models and their
14 science -- their decision- making tools and tie it
15 to those two concepts, that makes greater sense.

16 MS. YOCHER: Well, that's what we --
17 it's the essential fish habitat is the first
18 sentence. So what we're wondering now is if the
19 wording was changed to number five and the first
20 sentence stopped at the semicolon, do you think
21 that that would be adequate and would address
22 Robert Leaf's concerns that it would become a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 distraction?

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I guess when
3 you're saying section seven consultation, you're
4 talking about the clause about adversely modifying
5 critical habitat?

6 MS. YOCHER: Well, I mean, we could just
7 say essential fish habitat without tying it
8 strictly to --

9 MS. LOVETT: I don't think you need to
10 get that specific.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I agree.

12 MS. LOVETT: And we weren't -- they
13 weren't discussing taking that out. They were
14 just discussing balancing habitat with other
15 temporal needs.

16 MR. MCCARTY: If you weight it more than
17 other, yeah.

18 MS. LOVETT: Trying to maintain the
19 interest of both sides of the discussion from the
20 taskforce committee viewpoint, having an emphasis
21 on habitat but not losing focus on temporal
22 climate change. So they weren't trying to take it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 out but trying to incorporate Robert's comment.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah, there will
3 folks in the taskforce who get all excited about,
4 you know, getting comments back that say to focus
5 more on habitat and it'll generate all sorts of
6 discussion.

7 MS. YOCHER: Well, I mean, that's the
8 challenge is we're working through this document
9 kind of point-by-point and so we -- the parts that
10 where there was apparently consensus by the
11 taskforce, you know, we're going through those
12 fairly quickly and identifying maybe gaps that we
13 see. But when we get to something like this where
14 there's a difference of opinion --

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Uh-huh.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So is it relevance to
17 the habitat or the relevance to the change in the
18 effect on the habitat and how it interacts with
19 the species and stocks that they manage? Or is it
20 both?

21 MS. BONNEY: I guess my question is was
22 did every committee member have the opportunity to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 make comments like this? I mean, this is the only
2 person that basically --

3 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

4 MS. BONNEY: -- went in and so, of how
5 many, 15 participants only one guy stepped up and
6 made back changes or comments?

7 MS. YOCHER: Well, but then there were
8 --

9 MS. LOVETT: There was a response that
10 was and a few people agreed that they did not
11 agree with all the subject matter deletions that
12 Robert had recommended.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And understand that
14 the comments that you're looking at already
15 reflect a compilation of the effort by the working
16 group. So the folks who were there got together
17 into small groups. They conversed with each
18 other.

19 They generated documents. Those
20 documents got merged all together. So then one
21 guy after all those people had worked on all their
22 different pieces and then they'd all got merged,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 yes, one guy went back and he went back and made
2 more comments on all that.

3 MS. BONNEY: So I guess my question, and
4 I'm just -- this is just a process question.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Uh-huh.

6 MS. BONNEY: Are you giving too much
7 weight to one guy?

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes.

9 MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

10 MS. BONNEY: Compared to on that? So --

11 MR. BROWN: I think so.

12 MR. SHELLEY: I think so.

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes.

14 MS. BONNEY: That's what I was trying to
15 get to.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That's one smart
17 person's opinion.

18 MS. BONNEY: Right. And so, how do you
19 address that in terms of MAFAC recommendations and
20 do you try to be sensitive to the one guy that's
21 then --

22 MR. SHELLEY: Well, the Subcommittee

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 doesn't have to accept all the suggestions from
2 the taskforce.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And you don't have
4 to solve this thing today. I mean, you can kick
5 this back for more direction. I think one thing
6 that would be really helpful to send back to the
7 taskforce is to tell them anything on here that
8 you can't live with? If there's something on here
9 that's a real problem, then they should know that,
10 right? Give the red flags wherever there's red
11 flags.

12 If there are material omissions that
13 you've identified where you want more, I think
14 that's a great thing to tell them. Right? And if
15 it's a finesse thing then just tell them, please
16 go back and edit this further. Think about this a
17 little bit more. I mean, all those kinds of
18 comments are fine and I don't think this group
19 today needs to answer every little nuance like
20 that.

21 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, but I think if we, as
22 a group, or you all as a group, find what you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 might consider a compromise --

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Exactly.

3 MS. LOVETT: -- then and you're happy
4 with it, I don't think they would necessarily
5 dispute that.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah, I mean if you
7 can do the effort of giving them an underlying
8 strikethrough the reflects your consensus
9 modification to what they gave you, great. That's
10 the best scenario.

11 MS. LOVETT: Well, I'm just suggesting
12 this based on our conversation.

13 MS. BONNEY: This is just a lot of
14 things to try to get through.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: That's my point,
16 right. So what I'm saying is you can get by by
17 saying, you know, really like this, thumbs up.
18 Really don't like this, thumbs down. Please take
19 another crack as this piece over here. You know,
20 those kinds of directions. Even if that's the
21 direction that comes out of this Subcommittee
22 effort, that would be helpful.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. BONNEY: So in terms of the
2 taskforce, there's funding to bring them in to
3 continue the conversation for recommendations?

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah, and they are
5 getting better at using telephonic meetings and
6 email exchanges and, you know, we'll do what we
7 have to do through the taskforce.

8 MS. BONNEY: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: And these are good
10 people and smart people and I was just pleased to
11 be in the room with all those folks. I mean, they
12 were great.

13 MS. YOCHER: Okay, so we've come up with
14 some suggested maybe compromise language. So do
15 you need to delete that?

16 MS. LOVETT: I was going to.

17 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

18 MS. LOVETT: Everybody in this room now
19 is in agreement?

20 MR. BROWN: Correct.

21 MS. YOCHER: And then, Heidi is just now
22 doing track changes. So she'll -- we'll go back

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and figure out a way to do that for the rest of
2 them. Okay, so for resilience and risk, again,
3 this is one that from what you've said, Heidi,
4 this was a comment that came up quite a bit in the
5 taskforce and I saw that in some of the give and
6 take back and forth after the meetings, this issue
7 of redundancy.

8 But on the other hand, we also had a
9 situation here where we even added something that
10 was in one section and said it needed to be put in
11 the other section as well. So let's just take a
12 look at this and if we don't feel it's --

13 MR. BROWN: What page are you on?

14 MS. YOCHER: -- I'm on number six, page
15 2, resilience and risk. It seems to me that maybe
16 one of the major examples is if you look at page
17 3, there are very specific examples given. And
18 so, even if the section is okay, maybe they don't
19 need to be quite so specific in calling out these
20 examples.

21 So I'm looking at examples are provided
22 in section B, objective two of this document which

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Robert Leaf also agrees with. So if that's the
2 case, do we also need a couple of additional
3 examples include? Maybe, you can talk about how
4 these came up at the --

5 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, so the writers did
6 have these examples. And then, a third person, a
7 different person, Rick Garrity, I think I got his
8 name right, who is a recreational fisherman on the
9 taskforce from Hawaii had sent along email with a
10 few comments but hadn't commented specifically on
11 this. And he called people's attention to this
12 white paper that also looked at resiliency and
13 climate change.

14 And so, from that email comment, I'd
15 inserted it here because it linked to and talked
16 to marine protected areas specifically. So I made
17 that addition here.

18 MS. YOCHER: And actually, that brings
19 up a good point because Columbus mentioned that
20 document, referenced that document that he just
21 saw this morning and NOAA was one of the entities
22 that participated in it. So if we're giving

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 advice back to the taskforce, I don't know what
2 all materials they looked at prior to their
3 comments.

4 MS. LOVETT: They didn't look at all
5 that. There really wasn't, I mean, the task is to
6 review --

7 MR. SHELLEY: This document.

8 MS. LOVETT: -- this document.

9 MS. YOCHER: Right, okay. So this white
10 paper is just was a very specific thing on just
11 this one point?

12 MS. LOVETT: Right, yeah.

13 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

14 MS. LOVETT: And right.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So I didn't check
16 it, okay.

17 MS. LOVETT: And the strategy has
18 examples. So I don't think it's out of the realm
19 to make an offer of a different kind of an example
20 that they might include because there are
21 definitely clear examples in the strategy itself
22 which we have a couple of copies here of my

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 version. So that's up to you though.

2 MR. BROWN: Well, I think --

3 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, if people don't
4 object to additional examples being provided then
5 we can move on.

6 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I think it might be
7 useful to include that in --

8 MR. SHELLEY: The goal of this, I think,
9 was to call out particularly not that (inaudible)
10 the importance of the -- call out the notion that
11 there's some things we can do that would include
12 the resiliency of our systems to climate change.
13 And there's some science needs associated with
14 that.

15 And those are -- that's a different
16 category kind of than adaptive or other kinds of
17 responses to climate change and so I always
18 thought this number six section, the underlying
19 thing was that the underlying notion there was
20 that the science needs associated with system
21 resilience are under-emphasized maybe or
22 under-represented or not highlighted adequately or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 something along those lines. I thought that was
2 sort of what the taskforce discussion was.

3 MS. YOCHER: Okay, and you think that
4 the examples that were given represent that pretty
5 well?

6 MR. SHELLEY: I think they're fine. The
7 point -- just the point that makes a pretty narrow
8 point that there are science needs just associated
9 with what we need to do now to get the system
10 tuned up as well as it could be.

11 MS. LOVETT: So you just -- do you want
12 to add that thought if it's not quite here? The
13 science related to understanding --

14 MR. SHELLEY: It just needs to be --

15 MS. YOCHER: You think the in particular
16 on page 3 captures that?

17 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

18 MS. YOCHER: I think he thinks that in
19 particular copies or it captures that.

20 MS. LOVETT: Oh, it's already there.

21 Okay.

22 MR. SHELLEY: Just had to emphasize the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 science needs related to actions that (inaudible).
2 They've got the examples in there and a couple of
3 more examples are there.

4 MS. YOCHER: Right.

5 MR. BROWN: Yeah and another one would
6 be the one that the White House just announced on
7 (inaudible) waters initiative to prepare natural
8 resources for climate change. Did I send that to
9 you, Heidi?

10 MS. LOVETT: You sent me a couple of
11 different things. I haven't had a chance to look
12 at it all. But I was trying to understand why I
13 was getting those.

14 MR. BROWN: Well, because I was here and
15 it was -- I didn't have time to write emails.

16 MS. LOVETT: So I --

17 MS. YOCHER: Okay, so if we're -- go
18 ahead, Heidi.

19 MS. LOVETT: -- I would clarify. I know
20 what Keith said but if you all feel comfortable by
21 the time you're done with where you get, it would
22 be -- this Committee has been already provided

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 more time to provide comment on this document.

2 The public comment period closed.

3 I think it would confuse the taskforce
4 and they not clear -- I don't know if they would
5 benefit from getting it back again unless you just
6 asked them, as I said earlier, to clarify or clean
7 it up a little bit. But I don't think it needs to
8 go back and forth between us and them anymore to
9 be honest.

10 MS. YOCHER: Unless there's a really big
11 issue, okay.

12 MS. LOVETT: Right. So as I understand
13 it, we're going to take this comment out and
14 you're happy with how it currently reads?

15 MS. YOCHER: Yes. That's our suggested
16 compromise. And we've just agreed, I think, that
17 we can live with these specific examples in
18 section six?

19 MR. SHELLEY: That's as good as any. I
20 mean, the Agency is going to come up with their
21 own.

22 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Tools to prioritize

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 science needs is the next section and I wondered,
2 Heidi, why the one and two footnotes. Why is that
3 information in a footnote as opposed to like an
4 introductory sentence under tools to prioritize
5 science needs?

6 MS. LOVETT: I think they had it as a
7 box originally and it could go either way. It
8 could be -- I could just pull it up.

9 MS. YOCHER: Because there was the --
10 I'm trying to remember. We just talked about it.
11 The bit where there's the comment that the
12 document should explain more about how it was
13 developed.

14 MS. LOVETT: Uh-huh.

15 MS. YOCHER: Because the taskforce got
16 to hear that but nobody else did. In my mind,
17 this is the same sort of comment about the lay
18 reader not understanding the purpose of the
19 examples without additional text. So I just
20 wondered why it was handled as a footnote. I
21 mean, again, this is kind of like minor
22 wordsmithing but --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, but if you are
2 interested in having it just moved right up to the
3 very top or where would you insert it? That's
4 totally fine. I forget why it was done this way.

5 MS. YOCHER: So underneath tools to
6 prioritize science needs, I would just have those
7 two little paragraphs.

8 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

9 MR. BROWN: I agree.

10 MS. YOCHER: And then, maybe "the needs"
11 starts as a separate, yep. Okay. Anybody have
12 any other issues with this section? I sort of
13 ignored the third comment, you know, just that his
14 -- that was his opinion that the challenge would
15 be to keep the examples as such a high level but I
16 don't know that we need to change the text.

17 MR. SHELLEY: Well, another thought that
18 came in today and this is post taskforce so it's
19 probably not there is the value of exploring other
20 multidisciplinary kinds of decision-making
21 procedures like the, you know, the human genome.
22 I mean, there are -- it's important for NOAA to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 know what's out there in terms of what tools have
2 been tested and other lessons learned from these
3 different context things.

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So we have these
5 different forces at work here, climate stressors
6 or whatever and I would think that certain species
7 are going to adapt better. Some are going to
8 probably thrive better. Some are probably
9 possibly going to do extinct. There's quite a
10 wide range of what may happen. None of which is
11 very well understood. And so I guess wouldn't
12 there have to be some empirical data gathered as
13 to what's occurring as opposed to just making
14 assumptions about what's going to occur? And how
15 is that taking place? Through a sto -- I mean,
16 surveys or oceanographic infeed or --

17 MS. YOCHER: That's a good point because
18 this does say only modeling is addressed here.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

20 MS. YOCHER: So the way I took that was
21 that they -- the taskforce felt that the document
22 addressed the data needs well enough and that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 where they wanted more specific information was in
2 the modeling aspect.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I just don't think we
4 have the information to enter those other things
5 because we're narrowly driven and everything's
6 okay but I can, you know, that's my memory of the,
7 you know, we had some modeling experts in the
8 room. That's where the attention went.

9 MS. LOVETT: I think it was particularly
10 the circular that you always have feedback and you
11 need to constantly adjust and update your models
12 as you get new information. And we're unhappy
13 with a few of the diagrams that made it seem quite
14 linear such as figure three. And the one before
15 it, figure two, as I recall.

16 So they wanted these to be shown as
17 circular and obviously, there are observations and
18 data that go into the -- that are used to build
19 models or that are the inputs into models. Is
20 that what -- that's what you were talking about?

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, yes, but we're
22 assuming we need different models and then, do we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 need different method of data collection or more
2 of them or something that, I mean --

3 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- we're assuming that
5 tried and true doesn't work for the model.

6 MS. LOVETT: Right and that's what --
7 that's built into the earlier levels of this and
8 I'm not very good about this figure four diagram.
9 And some people -- when I first read it, I thought
10 it needed to be turned upside down but I think
11 that -- I agree with Pam. I think what they were
12 trying to talk about was both that this text was
13 addressing the modeling aspects.

14 MS. YOCHER: Which is what they were
15 most upset about and it sounds like -- or most
16 concerned about. And I -- your footnote, too,
17 addresses what you were just talking about with
18 the problems with the figures, right?

19 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

20 MS. YOCHER: This concept of avoiding
21 linear models of science delivery. Okay. So can
22 you suggest -- are you thinking there's a sentence

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 missing in here that like although only modeling
2 is addressed here something, something, something
3 about data?

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, maybe just a data
5 collection process in itself is -- maybe it's
6 covered somewhere else, I'm not sure but I guess
7 it's -- I think it's critically important the
8 model --

9 MS. YOCHER: So right under the top.

10 MR. SHELLEY: And it's multi-agency so
11 some of this data is going to be collected three
12 or four or five times by different agencies.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right, I think --

14 MS. YOCHER: So --

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- what Richard said
16 about getting information from one division. Then
17 there's the oceanographic demand on --

18 MS. YOCHER: So where it says only
19 modeling is addressed here, I was wondering if you
20 could change that and say although only modeling
21 is addressed here, a similar prioritization
22 process needs to occur for data needs or something

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 like that.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, I think
3 evaluation and prioritization.

4 MS. YOCHER: A similar evaluation and
5 prioritization.

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It might be more of
7 what we've got now or it might be something
8 different or satellite usage or drones or
9 something. I don't know.

10 MS. YOCHER: But for data needs and for
11 data needs and collection? For data needs should
12 be conducted?

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, I mean, it's a --
14 that sounds pretty static and I think what we're
15 looking for here is how the changes are
16 interacting with -- of climate are interacting
17 with the things we're managing. And what, be it
18 environment or be it habitat or be it the species,
19 and so, understanding -- watching the change
20 unfold in front of you as you go rather than, I
21 guess, getting a model that just makes assumptions
22 about. Because then you're using past data and if

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you don't have the newest best data, I guess --

2 MS. YOCHER: So although only modeling
3 is addressed here --

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm not helping much as
5 far as constructing the sentence but I was just --

6 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, it's important to
7 continue to advance data collection and
8 incorporate --

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Data collection and
10 technology to -- for measuring these --

11 MS. YOCHER: -- incorporate the most
12 recent information or something like that.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And to maintain full
14 funding or all necessary funding to -- I mean,
15 this is a --

16 MS. YOCHER: So in other words, you
17 don't want them to hire modelers and fire all the
18 data collectors?

19 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

20 MS. YOCHER: The people who are actually
21 collecting the inputs to the models?

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: When I see nothing but

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 modelers, I get real worried.

2 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

3 MS. YOCHER: So well, what about --
4 yeah, so although only modeling is addressed here
5 it's important to have a similar evaluation of the
6 continual need for updated information as inputs
7 to the model or something.

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. I think that
9 covers it. It doesn't have to be too lengthy but
10 just get it out there where it's got a comparative
11 weight.

12 MS. YOCHER: So you see what I'm trying
13 to get at, Heidi, with making sure that we talk
14 about the inputs to the models not just the
15 models?

16 MS. LOVETT: Right. Okay.

17 MS. YOCHER: That provide input to the
18 models. And I would trust you to polish that
19 later but I think -- does that address?

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, I think if she
21 polishes it up a little bit and, you know, I mean,
22 if I have a little time I could --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: You just want to make sure
2 that the data --

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I do but I also
4 think it's --

5 MS. YOCHER: -- garbage in garbage out
6 doesn't happen?

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- it's a contrast of
8 what has been the status quo of climate, I guess,
9 and then, what's going on with the individual
10 creatures that are being -- how are they being
11 impacted. Some are --

12 MS. LOVETT: Does that work for you? It
13 is important to continue to advance and prioritize
14 the data collection that is necessary to support
15 robust models or robust modeling?

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think that'll cover
17 it.

18 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, I like it.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Without getting too
20 technical, it's kind of inferring that that piece
21 has to go with the other things.

22 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Down to page 4.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: So we're eliminating this
2 comment?

3 MS. YOCHER: Right. Does any --

4 MR. BROWN: Which one?

5 MS. YOCHER: -- I don't think it really
6 says anything other than --

7 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I don't think it's
8 super important.

9 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, okay.

10 MS. LOVETT: Partnerships?

11 MS. YOCHER: And this is sort of what I
12 was getting at with the genome project is we need
13 to make sure that they continue to spend some of
14 the money hiring other smart people to do things
15 not necessarily just hiring. Recreating what's
16 available among their academic partners or other
17 partners.

18 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I would say that
19 partnership, the document should acknowledge
20 existing partnership efforts that are ongoing such
21 as with EPA, (inaudible) Corps of Engineers and
22 other (inaudible).

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: They do -- in the strategy,
2 I don't know how I turned right to right page but
3 on top of page 43, briefly this is strengthen core
4 science partnerships with formal mechanisms
5 especially with academic institutions, NASA, USGS,
6 National Science Foundation, the BAA, et cetera.
7 And I think that that is --

8 MR. BROWN: I think that's important but
9 I think they fail to acknowledge what's in
10 existence already. I think that's the problem. I
11 mean, NOAA's been an active player across the
12 board and there's a concerted effort by the White
13 House in this and you have multiple players at the
14 highest level and including states and tribes and
15 a whole bunch of folks.

16 MS. YOCHER: Well, I'm trying to figure
17 out where we can capture that. If you look at
18 this paragraph, you get down to these entities
19 should also be consulted in the development of
20 scientific priorities. Should we say like these
21 entities and their existing work products and then
22 you could say, for example, blah blah should also

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 be consulted?

2 MR. BROWN: Yes. Right, I think that's
3 a good idea.

4 MR. MCCARTY: I like the idea of having
5 some of integration and programming because just
6 one experience I had with the Blue Ribbon Panel on
7 ocean acidification with Christine Gregoire in
8 Washington State, we were part of the, I guess,
9 for lack of a better term, we were part of the
10 window dressing to justify federal appropriations
11 but all of the money went straight to University
12 of Washington. And jobs were used as a part of
13 the partnership to justify the funding but we
14 weren't integrating the program.

15 MR. BROWN: Right.

16 MR. MCCARTY: So it's not just
17 consultation. And the United States has a treaty
18 trust obligation under US versus Washington that
19 also should be fully integrated in program
20 development and partnership with our co-managers
21 under US versus Washington where the State of
22 Washington has to be legally accountable

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 co-manager with the tribes. And so, I mean, and
2 then, I also looked at another aspect. Federally
3 recognized tribes are, in fact, an extension of
4 the federal government through our federal
5 government employee ID number part of interior.

6 I could go through the Department of the
7 Interior with no security check but I couldn't do
8 the same thing at Commerce with my federal
9 government ID card.

10 MR. SHELLEY: The flavor of the
11 conversation of the taskforce that I don't think
12 this captured here is when you read this and you
13 see words like consult and you know, very soft
14 words in there. But certainly, I was involved
15 with some conversations. People were suggesting
16 that NOAA and other government entities need to
17 rethink, I mean, this isn't just an extension of
18 how they're doing business now and doing that a
19 little better.

20 This is a whole new set of
21 circumstances. It's going to tax data collection,
22 data analysis and this seems like okay, you've got

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to do what you're doing now a little bit better
2 and that would be enough. I just think they need
3 to rethink it. It's --

4 MR. BROWN: Well, I think some of this
5 stuff --

6 MR. SHELLEY: At a high level.

7 MR. BROWN: -- at a higher level of
8 (inaudible) on the power curve than has been
9 acknowledge. I mean, because looking at -- let's
10 put together whether environmental well --
11 Environmental Wildlife Federation. They basically
12 were the conduit that pulled everything together
13 for the various agencies.

14 MS. YOCHER: Well, see what Heidi's
15 written? Does that capture that? They should be
16 consulted for their ongoing scientific climate
17 enterprise?

18 MR. BROWN: Okay.

19 MS. YOCHER: Acknowledge that these
20 groups are -- and in the development of scientific
21 priorities so I think that addresses your concern
22 that we're not paying attention to what other

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 groups have done. But does that capture the
2 feeling about rethinking that you're saying about
3 --

4 MR. SHELLEY: Well, I'm just -- I mean,
5 consulting, you know, it's just --

6 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

7 MR. SHELLEY: -- I bet 60 or 70 percent
8 of the people in the NOAA today would say oh, we
9 already do that. We do that. I mean, you can
10 hear it in the room. We do that. But it's --
11 they're not doing it. I mean, they're not doing
12 it at the scale or the intensity that reflects the
13 challenge.

14 MS. YOCHER: So can you figure out a way
15 to say that that this may involve NOAA completely
16 rethinking the way it --

17 MR. SHELLEY: Yes. Not that the
18 partnership is, you know, rethinking its
19 strategies around partnerships in private, you
20 know, private/public partnerships.

21 MS. YOCHER: With regard to
22 partnerships? Yeah. The challenges may require a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 new way of doing business with regard to --

2 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, that's the sense.
3 If you could put that in fancy words.

4 MS. YOCHER: -- yeah, with regard to
5 incorporating partners.

6 MR. MCCARTY: I like the idea of
7 operational partners so we're actually hands on,
8 side by side not just consulted and then they go
9 off and do their thing.

10 MS. YOCHER: A new way of working with,
11 yeah.

12 MR. MCCARTY: Operational partners.

13 MS. YOCHER: To involve them more
14 directly?

15 MR. BROWN: And I think they sort of
16 addressed it earlier in the document. Bethesda
17 internal --

18 MR. SHELLEY: And doing business.

19 MR. BROWN: You know, they've got
20 working (inaudible) putting out that --

21 MS. LOVETT: Does that capture it a
22 little bit better? New challenges may require a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 new way of working with partners?

2 MR. SHELLEY: There we go.

3 MS. LOVETT: Or new partnerships?

4 MR. BROWN: Working with partners is
5 good.

6 MS. YOCHER: New challenges associated
7 with the climate strategy but that's probably
8 understood which challenges we're talking about.

9 MR. BROWN: Right.

10 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

11 MS. LOVETT: Climate challenge.

12 MS. YOCHER: Do we think it will or just
13 may?

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think it definitely
15 will.

16 MS. YOCHER: So let's just say will.

17 MR. MCCARTY: Shall.

18 MS. YOCHER: Because I agree with you.
19 It's not -- it can't be --

20 MR. SHELLEY: I mean the speed of these,
21 the speed with which some of these climate
22 changes, not all of them. They're coming down on

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 us.

2 MR. BROWN: Well, the whole notion of
3 developing our global database, oh man, that's
4 scary.

5 MR. SHELLEY: But it's not that hard
6 anymore, Columbus. I mean, that seems scary but
7 it's a matter of, if you've got, I mean, Google,
8 Google runs a global database.

9 MR. BROWN: But when you look at federal
10 agencies and how they have to protect themselves
11 from being attacked by the outsiders and all that.
12 I mean, I was in Fish and Wildlife and we were
13 totally shut down for a long period of time
14 because of stuff that happened with BIA. And they
15 had under court order, they had people attacking
16 the Web site, paying people to attack the Web site
17 to see its vulnerabilities, and we could not do
18 certain things before.

19 MS. YOCHER: Well we said, such as, and
20 then an inclusive approach to climate change and
21 information management.

22 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

2 MS. LOVETT: Okay. Are you done?

3 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. That way you don't
4 say --

5 MR. BROWN: Wait a minute, wait a
6 minute. How about enhanced data sharing, instead
7 of, in developing enhanced data sharing?

8 MS. LOVETT: Where?

9 MS. YOCHER: Rather than, a global
10 database?

11 MR. BROWN: Rather than a data -- rather
12 than a database.

13 MS. YOCHER: I don't know there's this
14 huge push for this, you know, these repositories,
15 these global repositories and information. The
16 train has left the station from what I can tell.

17 MR. BROWN: Well, it may be time but,
18 you know, each of these databases, somebody has
19 got the responsibility for taking care of them,
20 and to cap them and stuff like that and, you know,
21 then they can be plugged in, in a way that we can
22 these exchanges. I really liked what you said,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 about the assignment library, you said can walk in
2 there, and some people have the key to the
3 kingdom, and they can operate next to somebody who
4 has a less --

5 MS. YOCHER: More restrictions. Yeah.

6 MR. BROWN: -- more restrictions, and
7 then can do things another way.

8 MS. YOCHER: Well, it does say, all
9 these entities should pursue new ways of sharing
10 information, and --

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: We can do, maybe a
12 better -- I mean you can set up communal anyway
13 you want it.

14 MS. YOCHER: Such as -- by developing
15 shared databases?

16 MR. BROWN: Shared databases.

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Shared is fine.

18 MS. YOCHER: As opposed to global?

19 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah. Communally, you'll
21 probably get some political ears, plus with that
22 instrument.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: An inclusive approach to --
2 Okay. So, how does this read to everybody?

3 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

4 MS. YOCHER: Sharing and shared?

5 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

6 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

7 MS. LOVETT: How about, you've raised
8 the information exchange.

9 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

10 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

11 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

12 MS. LOVETT: Okay?

13 MS. YOCHER: To sharing and shared.

14 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. All right. So this
15 is a nod to your comments, I think, Columbus? As
16 well as Rowan's?

17 MR. BROWN: Yes.

18 MS. LOVETT: In this next section.

19 MS. YOCHER: Mm-hmm.

20 MS. LOVETT: And to, you know, Rowan,
21 because he was very active on the development of
22 the strategy, handling the strategy. I think we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 just leave it.

2 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

3 MR. BROWN: Okay.

4 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Number 10, making it
5 operational not just aspirational.

6 MS. LOVETT: I think we've already
7 looked at that.

8 MS. YOCHER: Covered that. And capacity
9 and limitations, did we do enough there?

10 MR. BROWN: Mm-hmm.

11 MS. YOCHER: By moving it into the, and
12 give them more or less useful?

13 MS. LOVETT: Where did I have --

14 MS. YOCHER: I can't remember -- I think
15 that was at the last paragraph, the unfortunately.
16 Yeah. That's the one.

17 MS. LOVETT: You did that to
18 (inaudible).

19 MS. YOCHER: So, can I highlight that
20 with the, unfortunately in a climate-changed world
21 the usefulness of historic data can vary. You
22 kind of highlight; that was a track -- or that was

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a change.

2 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

3 MS. YOCHER: And then there's other --
4 there were other changes in that paragraph as
5 well, the new technologies and efficiencies.

6 MS. LOVETT: Mm-hmm. I think that's now

7 --

8 MS. YOCHER: And you can go back and
9 match it up, if you can, yeah.

10 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

11 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Anything else that
12 you guys can think of, that is an overarching,
13 document-wide comment that we think needs to be
14 incorporated, that the taskforce didn't call out?

15 MR. BROWN: I kind of think they covered
16 it.

17 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

18 MS. LOVETT: It's just more difficult.

19 MS. YOCHER: Point by point now. Yeah.
20 Objective one, or --

21 MS. LOVETT: Well, yeah.

22 MS. YOCHER: Go ahead.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: No, in this particular case
2 there's obviously -- some miscommunication that
3 it's about -- and a difference of understanding
4 about balance of reference points. So, I think
5 Robert's point is accurate in certain cases,
6 species are not reference points, communities are
7 not reference points themselves, but I'm not sure
8 -- I'm not sure how -- I think it's just a
9 difference of understanding of what a reference
10 point is, and how it is used in this case.

11 MS. YOCHER: I did take his point
12 though, that you don't want to get too specific?

13 MS. LOVETT: Yes. I kind of agree with
14 that (inaudible).

15 MS. YOCHER: Because then you are
16 leaving out the whole --

17 MS. LOVETT: You could be, right.

18 MS. YOCHER: -- topic areas that maybe
19 aren't part of the taskforce.

20 MS. LOVETT: Mm-hmm.

21 MS. YOCHER: And I'm not sure how to --
22 So, for example, his comment 9, the anadromous

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species as a key reference point.

2 MS. LOVETT: Right.

3 MS. YOCHER: To focus on a single taxon
4 is going to confuse the scope of the document.

5 MS. LOVETT: Columbus and Peter, do you
6 have any particular comments on this?

7 SPEAKER: Oh, man.

8 MR. SHELLEY: I agreed basically with
9 all his comments, it kind of comes to this section
10 at least. It's coming back to the original
11 document.

12 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

13 MS. YOCHER: Well, like this, first
14 bullet point. Describe how the process of
15 determining biological reference points, I don't
16 see a problem with that.

17 MS. LOVETT: Mm-hmm. No.

18 MS. YOCHER: Because they are asking for
19 more -- for that to be sort of spelled out, but
20 then it seems to dictate, not only describing the
21 process for determining reference points, but
22 specifically which reference points you should

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 use.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Can you give me an
3 example of the biological reference point?

4 MS. LOVETT: Maximum sustainable yield,
5 that's an example in the document. And the
6 document says, development of biological reference
7 points is a primary objective of much of NOAA
8 Fisheries science work to meet demands. Be they
9 single species, measures of maximum sustainable
10 yield, thresholds for habitat designations,
11 potential biological removal of marine mammals,
12 multispecies fishing rates, thresholds for
13 ecosystem level indicators, criteria for protected
14 species recovery, those are reference points.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So they are referencing
16 the point where there's impacts of plus or minus,
17 or it has an impact on the biology of that animal,
18 or animals, or group of animals, or --

19 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

20 MR. SHELLEY: I think they are more
21 related to the regulatory point -- the regulatory
22 --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 SPEAKER: They are done?

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Figure?

3 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So that's a management

5 --

6 MR. SHELLEY: So, we should say that
7 that was the reference points should be flat,
8 adaptation and resilience.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. Sustainable
10 management, yeah. Okay.

11 MR. SHELLEY: And I think objective one
12 in the document itself, was that in the climate
13 you need to integrated climate considerations into
14 your reference point development.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And it would seem like

16 --

17 MS. YOCHER: And it seems like the
18 taskforce agrees with that, but to describe how
19 that's going to -- more about how that's going to
20 be done?

21 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

22 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: So how are we doing, we've
2 got a- half-an-hour left.

3 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

4 MS. YOCHER: Well, could you continue to
5 walk through.

6 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. I think this is --
7 Yeah. I think this was a major point, well we can
8 stay a little longer if needed, but we are kind of
9 closing in, there wasn't -- the next two pages
10 where there were most comments, and not too many
11 after that, at all.

12 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

13 MS. LOVETT: So it's just these two
14 pages really.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

16 MS. LOVETT: And this was a big one
17 because I wasn't quite sure how to deal with it.
18 I think it's --

19 MR. SHELLEY: I think it's your language
20 in here, then it's the most -- not yours, I'm
21 sorry, the language in here that's most troubling?

22 MS. LOVETT: Mm-hmm.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: Confusing species and
2 communities, and these different things that are
3 being referenced --

4 MS. LOVETT: Right.

5 MR. SHELLEY: -- with the reference
6 points for those things.

7 MS. LOVETT: Exactly.

8 MR. SHELLEY: And that's why I go
9 through all this sort of exclamation points and
10 flashes, and so then I think the first bullet
11 would be to -- you know, the way to describe the
12 process to determine how climate informed
13 considerations would be factored.

14 MS. YOCHER: That's a good idea.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And to reference point,
16 to that --

17 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Describe that as a --

19 MS. LOVETT: I think what they -- I
20 think it's just, potentially, like for subsistence
21 crews or any community, say, marine dependent
22 communities, as an example, you could say,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 identify appropriate reference points for
2 managing, for sustaining marine-dependent
3 communities, which could be maybe X-amount of
4 fishing activity to sustain a community, right.
5 To bring income into the community, I think it's
6 that how we are using it, usually define reference
7 points for proper management, good management.

8 MR. SHELLEY: Sure.

9 MS. LOVETT: And what the -- it's only
10 occasion to have, you know, objection one in the
11 action strategy, and what it says in the strategy
12 is, stock assessments, biological points and
13 fishing management plans, based on assessments may
14 not adequately capture, the future population of
15 dynamics in the changing ocean. The other
16 situations mandates, allow managers to shift their
17 reference points in response to shifts in the
18 environment.

19 Such as regime shifts, or shifts --
20 changes in the structural reflection and
21 ecosystem. So, what the document already is
22 saying is that reference points often do not

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 account for the fact that ecosystems and normal
2 (inaudible) in them will change with the
3 directional forcing of climate change. So the
4 reference points that we might be using now may
5 not be adequate in a changing environment. Do you
6 think that's right?

7 MR. SHELLEY: I think the document --
8 let's say that page, explicitly. So, I can't
9 remember this discussion being 00 --

10 MS. LOVETT: No. This came up after, so
11 it's not really -- I don't recall --

12 MR. SHELLEY: Well this document then,
13 like NOAA Fisheries, the first line.

14 MS. YOCEM: You explained it pretty
15 well. So all these specific examples, so the
16 first point, or some of the wording of that, I
17 don't have a problem with, but if you are going to
18 call out just these issues as something that NOAA
19 needs to focus on, what about all the other
20 management objectives that might require key
21 biological points?

22 MS. LOVETT: Right.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But just having seen --
2 been through two disasters on the West Coast, one
3 salmon and one groundfish, and seeing what
4 downstream impacts communities have, and also in
5 timbers, I've see that too, they are just the
6 downstream recipients, and then you can't manage
7 the community.

8 You can mitigate the effects, but only
9 to a limited degree, and if we've got fishery
10 dependents going on, harvest dependency, I mean,
11 that's kind of a tall order to -- I mean, you can
12 plan for it, but you can see that coming, and it's
13 going to be another disaster, just to get ahead of
14 it, but there's only so much you can do, and in
15 fact, because the impendency is an impendency.
16 Maybe you can shift gears and put out something
17 else, if you know in advance, but --

18 MS. LOVETT: Other sections of this do
19 talk to community shifts --

20 MR. SHELLEY: That's the economic
21 section.

22 MS. LOVETT: Yeah; allows us to do the

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 economic stuff.

2 MS. YOCHER: Well, you look at the very
3 last thing, to ensure current and any future
4 reference points take into account, there it's
5 talking about the different types of fisheries,
6 you could easily say that same thing. You know,
7 current and future reference points, take into
8 account the needs for international treaty
9 requirements, for communities that are dependent
10 on marine and anadromous species.

11 So, in other words, without saying,
12 specifically calling out, you need to have
13 reference points for these, you could say that you
14 want to ensure that any current and future
15 reference points take into account the needs of
16 all these different things, but again, then are
17 you saying that these are the only ones that
18 matter. I don't know what might not be listed
19 here.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Objective four, and
21 objective five -- objective four identifies future
22 states of marine coastal and fishery ecosystems

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 LMRs, and LMR dependent on the communities in a
2 changing climate. Five is identify the mechanism
3 whose climate effects on the ecosystems, LMRs, and
4 LMR dependent on the communities, and then six is
5 tracking the trends on the communities. I don't
6 know, I just think it's in there, and this maybe a
7 redundant in my category, to sort of identify the
8 subsistence communities. And there are a whole
9 bunch of communities you have to identify, in
10 terms of the affected --

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, if you had a good
12 measurement, depending on how much dependency they
13 had on the fishery going into this, that would be
14 --

15 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So it's some, I guess,
17 upstream measure, just where the dependency models
18 are at the present time, and what their
19 vulnerability is.

20 MR. SHELLEY: And that's in here?

21 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Mm-hmm.

22 MR. SHELLEY: And no other place, I mean

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 more specifically.

2 MS. YOCHER: So, do you remember this
3 discussion at the task force meeting? You don't
4 remember this?

5 MR. SHELLEY: I remember the general --
6 I remember the theme that I needed to get out in
7 front of some of these, to the extent you can, you
8 need to identify with the vulnerabilities of the
9 different communities, and you know, if we've got
10 a whole, we've got the man 70 percent dependent on
11 lobsters and (inaudible) in the case of the pots
12 that are going to crash in 20 years. It would be
13 good to know, it would be good to do some thinking
14 about that.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yes, when that's a
16 career to get into.

17 MR. SHELLEY: I remember that, need to
18 become a plumber again. So, then, I'm guess I'm
19 reacting to the test. I can't remember all this
20 detail coming out, and that objective or
21 objectives, in this section.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well it's another side

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- there is another side of that too, it's because
2 of your investment levels, and there's a change.

3 MS. YOCHER: You know, so if you all --
4 I mean, you -- as I've said, do you feel that what
5 they are saying is actually really isn't covered
6 in the document. I think once the comments got
7 sent around, the people kind of not do -- not
8 necessarily go back and look at the document
9 itself. Then I think maybe two or three bullets
10 here might be good to keep; and as you've said,
11 the first one, just to keep the first sentence.

12 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I mean I think there's
13 a -- you know, there is a point here, if it's good
14 in the first one that's saying, you know, that the
15 reference, I like this, you know, it's a
16 requirement of reference conditions, because we
17 can't do reference points --

18 MS. YOCHER: Right.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: To keep it in the
20 system, let alone to changing them.

21 MS. YOCHER: Right. So that -- so the
22 last two sentences, the biological reference

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 points are actually not points, but cross
2 reference. Leave that and then --

3 MR. SHELLEY: I think that's a long
4 statement.

5 MS. LOVETT: Okay. So, keep the first
6 sentence, and the last sentence?

7 MS. YOCHER: Well, and the biological
8 reference point sentence, also.

9 MS. LOVETT: Oh. This one?

10 MS. YOCHER: Mm-hmm.

11 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Can we go over the second
13 sentence, the general concept, are we --

14 MS. LOVETT: Are not pointed at rough
15 estimates of system capabilities, are we -- leave
16 that?

17 MS. YOCHER: Yes.

18 MS. LOVETT: Okay. And for that reason,
19 it might be better to call them.

20 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

21 MR. SHELLEY: What do you think of them?

22 MS. YOCHER: What's that?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: It would be better to
2 think of them, as quantitative reference
3 conditions.

4 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. Better to think of
5 them as.

6 MS. LOVETT: Oh, yeah.

7 MS. YOCHER: Well, I mean, what do you
8 think, Heidi? I mean did you key for these
9 specific points that you came up with are on
10 objective one?

11 MS. LOVETT: No. It was a different
12 group.

13 MS. YOCHER: It was a different group?

14 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

16 MS. LOVETT: I think that -- I
17 understand there wasn't discussion on the
18 international issues and treaties, that that
19 wasn't really addressed. I think that's separate,
20 because that's (inaudible) last two, are separate,
21 and the things that I added, when you --
22 communities if I capture this one about, identify

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 subsistence communities as key reference points.

2 They are not --

3 MS. YOCHER: Right.

4 MS. LOVETT: You know, so I wrote -- I
5 added in the kind of communities between the --
6 between all types of communities. So if you think
7 it needs to say subsistence as well, then it could
8 be added to the last one.

9 MS. YOCHER: Well, you have commercial
10 subsistence, and recreational fisheries.

11 MS. LOVETT: And marine dependent
12 communities.

13 MS. YOCHER: And marine dependent
14 communities.

15 MS. LOVETT: Because, and so --

16 MS. YOCHER: So we don't need also to
17 have the -- identify subsistence communities as a
18 key reference point.

19 MS. LOVETT: Right.

20 MR. McCARTY: There might be a value to
21 recognizing the longer observation of place-based
22 people who also happen to be subsistence

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 communities.

2 MS. LOVETT: That's in a different
3 section.

4 MR. McCARTY: Okay.

5 MS. LOVETT: That's all in different
6 sections, this -- right.

7 MR. McCARTY: That's right.

8 MS. YOCHER: Now, what about all these
9 other specifics, Heidi?

10 MS. LOVETT: Well?

11 MS. YOCHER: Anadromous species,
12 habitats; your views?

13 MS. LOVETT: I think it's pretty clear
14 that it talks about -- I will say this, the
15 strategy does seem to talk really about, delivery
16 in resources, because it says that identify
17 ecosystem -- It says, include climate change in
18 ecosystem inclusion from all living resource,
19 management plans and strategies. Make it one, to
20 include, and you could say, and their habitats, so
21 that would be more specific, include -- You know,
22 you could say, in the first bullet, include

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 habitats.

2 MR. BROWN: And habitats, habitats.

3 MS. LOVETT: Plural, yes.

4 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

5 MS. LOVETT: And you just type that in,
6 and potentially -- I, personally, do believe that
7 if there's too much specificity for a high-level,
8 but because you are asking, but it's up to you
9 all, if you agree with that.

10 MR. BROWN: I agree.

11 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

12 MR. BROWN: Do you agree with it?

13 MS. YOICHEM: Mm-hmm. Yeah. I mean I
14 think that -- if this was calling out things that
15 were definitely not in the document, you know, we
16 should identify them as gaps, but if you list --
17 if you get too specific then that makes it seem
18 as though these are the only things we needed.

19 MS. LOVETT: Right. But I think -- as I
20 said, potentially, because it's not listed in the
21 file, or rather, six bullets specifically, we
22 could suggest add "habitat" to the first bullet.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Mm-hmm. Yeah. So you
2 haven't done that yet?

3 MS. LOVETT: I'm going to do that right
4 now.

5 MR. SHELLEY: I thought -- I'm trying to
6 read people -- read the conversation, I thought
7 part of the discussion was that, in this -- in the
8 document strategy the reference -- there was one
9 point, I just associated with improving the
10 reference points and making them robust to climate
11 change by adding climate drivers to those
12 reference points. But I thought, whether the
13 taskforce was talking about the real strategy,
14 there is a real focus on whether it's on the
15 biological reference points or if it's on specific
16 regulatory uses of the Fishery Management Plan,
17 the fishery ecosystem plans, species recovery
18 plans, and that there might be -- there might be
19 reference points of things to be focused on,
20 independent of a particular species or independent
21 of particular Section 7 findings.

22 Or, you know, work programs that are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 still important to be aware of and track, in terms
2 of how the system is functioning and behavior --
3 it sounds like right now I hit that point of the
4 day when my brain is not working on even one
5 cylinder. You would think there was an effort
6 from the taskforce to say, sort of keep your mind
7 open about what your establishment reference
8 points, and they might not all be derived from
9 what's important for a polar bear.

10 You know, there might be other reference
11 points in the active -- you ought to be paying
12 attention to even though they are not, sort of,
13 directly related to the regulatory matter.

14 MS. LOVETT: Oh. Okay.

15 MR. SHELLEY: Do you know what I'm
16 saying?

17 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

18 MR. SHELLEY: Well, in the strategy a
19 lot of it is focused on how they are doing in this
20 objective. How the Agency is doing reference
21 points, and it describe reference points being
22 very specifically related to these regulatory

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 responsibilities they have. Biological opinions,
2 species recovery plans, environment impact
3 assessments, social impact assessments, ESA status
4 and --

5 MS. YOCHER: But that is their -- that
6 is their charge.

7 MR. SHELLEY: Well I know, that is their
8 charge and that is still the most important focal
9 point, and I think the taskforce was always trying
10 -- also trying to say, and that's where they
11 writing these specific things. You know, not just
12 -- lift your head up --

13 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

14 MR. SHELLEY: Well, I can't put that in
15 words. And clearly habitat is --

16 MS. YOCHER: So we've got habitats
17 added. Describe how the process actually works,
18 not points but rough estimates. Would you want to
19 add a sentence there, and some of the most useful
20 points may not be obviously tied to -- do you
21 understand --

22 MR. SHELLEY: May not be directly tied,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 or immediately tied to --

2 MS. YOCHER: Some of the most useful
3 reference points may not be immediately tiable to,
4 or?

5 MR. SHELLEY: Tied to a specific --

6 MS. YOCHER: Short-term management
7 objectives?

8 MR. SHELLEY: Yes. That's right.

9 MS. LOVETT: Tiable?

10 MR. SHELLEY: No. Linked, linked.

11 MS. YOCHER: Linked, yeah -- right -- to
12 short- term management objectives.

13 MR. SHELLEY: And don't ask for an
14 example.

15 MS. YOCHER: Right. Okay.

16 MS. LOVETT: So we are done. I think
17 there's suddenly others.

18 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

19 MS. LOVETT: All right, number two.

20 MS. YOCHER: Number two.

21 MS. LOVETT: Let's take this one a
22 little bit more.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: This is sort of, Mike,
2 what you were talking about as things happen at
3 different rates, your ups and downs, and it's sort
4 of difficult to come up with a robust strategy,
5 where things are headed, and a bunch of different
6 directions, that we don't know.

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, that's why I
8 think the measurement of that process is terribly
9 important. You know, which, I mean collection of
10 real data which -- and the contrasting to what
11 it's been. I guess, you can't call it status quo,
12 but I guess it's the norm.

13 MR. SHELLEY: Mm-hmm. And not all
14 regions in the country are facing identical --

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: No. Not at all. That
16 makes it that much more complex.

17 MR. BROWN: Well, I think that's a real
18 good point, his first point, is on target because,
19 you know, different stressors impact things
20 differently, and what may stress one thing, may
21 not stress another.

22 MS. YOCHER: But it does, and it seems

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to acknowledge that, the comments that the
2 taskforce made, it says that this alluded to at
3 least twice in the document, but would be
4 strengthened by incorporated follow-through on
5 these matters. So it seems -- it seemed to me
6 like that was really more the comment, than the --
7 acknowledging the fact that different things
8 happen at different rates.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay.

10 MS. YOCHER: Let's see.

11 MS. LOVETT: I would -- I think it could
12 be shortened to just say, the funded stressors --

13 SPEAKER: How would you write that in
14 there?

15 MS. LOVETT: You know, the rate of the
16 climate change, and it's --

17 MR. BROWN: So how do you write that in?

18 MS. YOCHER: It seems that this is
19 another attempt to get beyond just that linear
20 focus.

21 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

22 MR. BROWN: Yeah. You said, they are not

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 correlated; they are really not -- no direct
2 correlation between them.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It seems like some
4 mention of complexity that you -- and then
5 actually would be different, for different areas
6 and different species. Because what comes out of
7 this is going to be -- have multiple faces.

8 MR. BROWN: Right.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, it's really -- and
10 that's where I think the measurement process to be
11 so critical.

12 MR. BROWN: Right.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Because you may not
14 know what you've got and here it is you don't have
15 the requirement --

16 MS. YOCHER: And does that catch it,
17 with the incorporated follow through on these
18 matters.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: No. Where are we at
20 there? Kind of less --

21 MS. YOCHER: So we say then, are
22 happening at the same rate, and has tremendous

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 implications. I alluded to that in the document
2 but --

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, it's the same
4 rate, but it's also -- they don't have the same
5 impacts -- on different -- the ecosystem areas, or
6 different species.

7 MR. BROWN: Let's say -- so those kinds
8 of stressors of habitats and species, differently?

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. Some may be
10 positive stressor -- a stressor, I take has been
11 stressed, so maybe in some cases it's actually the
12 beneficial.

13 MR. BROWN: In some cases it might
14 increase the amount in some.

15 MS. YOCHER: Right. Part of the same
16 impact, yeah.

17 MS. LOVETT: Does that work? I don't
18 think it has be repeated to say same rate or --

19 MS. YOCHER: Right. Same rate -- well
20 --

21 MS. LOVETT: Or that same impact.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: That's one of the --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: How about, instead of
2 stressors, factors?

3 MS. LOVETT: Factors?

4 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

5 MS. YOICHEM: Well, but I think they --
6 well, yeah. I guess you are talking about
7 stressors to the system.

8 MR. BROWN: Yeah. Because what -- you
9 know --

10 MS. YOICHEM: Like acidification and
11 storm surge?

12 MR. BROWN: Yeah; because acidification
13 is bad for some species, but good for others.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just, I've got to dial
15 out for a minute.

16 MS. YOICHEM: Okay.

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But just one comment,
18 there's also the measurements, and I don't know if
19 we've got that encapsulated somewhere else, or
20 something, but these different factors,
21 measurements, the effects that's going on, these
22 things start to change and morph in a different

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 whatever. But then, I mean, maybe it's
2 encapsulated somewhere else, but just picking up
3 being able to observe that, and to gather the data
4 around it, I think that's regarded on how one
5 spot, and it's just -- it's a critical point.

6 MS. LOVETT: I'm sorry, anything point
7 -- to measuring change?

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. And in the
9 change -- not just in change but the impacts.

10 MS. YOCHER: So I think it's
11 incorporating follow through and maybe in
12 continual data collections, or in continual
13 measurement of these matters, or something?

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

15 MS. LOVETT: Monitoring?

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. Monitoring, but
17 not just monitoring but -- well, I guess
18 monitoring can do it, because it's just
19 understanding the downstream mentality, so that
20 enforces things. Does that make sense?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It's not sustained.

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: It's also (inaudible)
2 downstream such as --

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But then I think you
4 are trying to get into where you've been -- yeah,
5 it's going on, but we don't worry about what's
6 going on, but what the impacts are.

7 MS. LOVETT: Measuring impact.

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Because that's the way
9 it's kind of controlling the uncertainty to a
10 degree.

11 MS. LOVETT: Does that how it is, such
12 as measuring impacts, risks, assessments --

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

14 MS. LOVETT: Assessment versus --
15 (Inaudible) and response factors.

16 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Then the measurement of
17 the impact helps you better formulate the risk
18 assessment. Do you see what I'm saying?

19 MR. BROWN: Mm-hmm.

20 MS. YOCHER: So, risk assessment
21 prioritization and refinement.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Mm-hmm.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: So measuring of impacts,
2 risk assessment prioritization, and refinement?

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. I think you are
4 right.

5 MS. YOCHER: Indicator development and
6 response strategies. Okay.

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: You know, it's kind of
8 a step-by- step, here's what we do about it,
9 here's the emergency plan for it.

10 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Response time.

12 MS. LOVETT: So this comment is
13 supporting the management strategy violations,
14 which is on page 28. I will be inclined to
15 encourage you to maintain that.

16 MS. YOCHER: I agree. And the comment
17 agrees too.

18 MS. LOVETT: Well, I think he's -- I
19 think he's being a little facetious.

20 MS. YOCHER: Sure. Put this in your
21 inset box, as an example, but --

22 SPEAKER: Put it in the (inaudible)?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

2 MS. LOVETT: Well I think it's there is
3 a sense of a panacea, but I think we can -- that's
4 one person.

5 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

6 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

7 MS. YOCHER: I would leave that.

8 MS. LOVETT: Now, I get this point
9 completely. This is a science strategy, and I did
10 think that the writers were a little off-topic
11 about --

12 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

13 MS. LOVETT: This is all recovery, and
14 this is stuff that Agency in this case, does do.

15 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. I agree; outside of
16 the scope. Yeah.

17 MS. LOVETT: But I think it's out of the
18 scope in this particular case. So I agreed with
19 that, because that is stuff that is truly ongoing
20 when, you know, that is often the habitat for
21 them, does this to some lesser or bigger extent
22 depending on where you are in the country. And/or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it's outside of the scope, in some cases, in what
2 our Agency can do.

3 MS. YOICHEM: Yeah. Unless you want to
4 say something like continue efforts to identify
5 and protect the critical habitat, especially
6 strategies which may also mitigate risks from
7 climate change, and leave it at that without
8 giving all these examples.

9 MR. BROWN: Well, actually, one of the
10 things that we've done and the thing that -- this
11 thing of -- of the 21st is -- you know, they are
12 already looking at and adapted for our processes,
13 and that's in projects in poorer areas of the
14 country. That full range of -- say something on
15 that, so --

16 MS. YOICHEM: I mean, it seems to me that
17 basically what this is saying is making sure these
18 ongoing processes to identify and protect critical
19 habitat, considers strategies that can mitigate
20 risk. Among the other things they do, consider
21 strategies that may mitigate risks from climate
22 change. And then I don't think you need all these

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 specific examples.

2 MS. LOVETT: No.

3 MS. YOCHER: But that gives you -- that
4 gives you the habitat. So I don't know if there's
5 a -- so if we take out this specific examples,
6 look at that question now, Columbus, and Heidi and
7 everybody and see if that --

8 MR. BROWN: I can see --

9 MS. YOCHER: Does it need to say --
10 Yeah, does it need to say local communities.

11 MR. BROWN: Well I could -- you know,
12 you could use, for example, the (inaudible) in the
13 water centers, to prepare for natural for climate
14 change. Because if you are going to have shifts
15 in habitat, that you can't stop, and you want
16 those species to continue to exist, and you know
17 that that change couldn't lead a more suitable
18 habitat, and a different location then, you know,
19 anything that you could do to bridge that process
20 with an increased -- enhance the survivability of
21 that species by having that linkage.

22 MR. SHELLEY: This objective is to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 identify robust strategies.

2 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

3 MR. SHELLEY: Right? And so maybe the
4 point we make here is, evaluate the strategic
5 partnerships with state, a lot with tribal state
6 and local communities to protect or -- to identify
7 and protect critical habitat. So the strategy --
8 I mean the robust strategy is to have partners.

9 MR. BROWN: Right. And what I'm --
10 where I was coming from, you have four examples of
11 where they are already beginning to be selected
12 four projects to showcase climate resilience
13 approach, which essentially, effectively does
14 that.

15 MS. YOCHER: Well that's the point,
16 there was again, the climate comment in there
17 somewhere, so are you saying we just want to
18 reference the things that are already happening
19 elsewhere, or?

20 MR. SHELLEY: Well, I don't know
21 (inaudible).

22 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: So wait, does that mean --

2 MR. BROWN: Well, I mean, I say that
3 because --

4 MS. YOCHER: Well, okay. So let's say,
5 consider scientific strategies, and then you want
6 to say, such as.

7 MR. BROWN: I don't know if you are -- I
8 don't if it's out of scope, I was just trying to
9 get this back in scope.

10 MS. YOCHER: Right. Exactly.

11 MR. BROWN: I mean it's not -- this is
12 not, NOAA thinking toward the local -- I mean,
13 really this means, that's like NOAA is supposed to
14 spend some time figuring out for a local community
15 --

16 MS. YOCHER: Right. Right.

17 MR. BROWN: -- what they need to do to
18 protect, but I think the scope comment before
19 that.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Well, actually I note that
21 no --

22 MS. YOCHER: That's a way to count local

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 communities?

2 MR. BROWN: NOAA is doing those things
3 already through Seagram.

4 MS. YOCHER: But if you take out for
5 local communities.

6 MR. BROWN: But now they have some
7 underground projects, which engage the local
8 communities and the tribes that they are --

9 MR. SHELLEY: And I think we were trying
10 to encourage that.

11 MR. BROWN: Right. As I was saying,
12 these things have already started and then you
13 claimed it.

14 MR. SHELLEY: Right. So that's what
15 he's saying.

16 MS. LOVETT: Do you think that --

17 MS. YOCHER: So instead of, considered,
18 are you saying we should say encourage?

19 MR. BROWN: Yeah, encourage.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

21 MS. LOVETT: Also did it need to be
22 specific to respond in that area?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: No.

2 MS. LOVETT: No?

3 MS. YOCHER: That was going to be the
4 others.

5 MS. LOVETT: So encourage scientific
6 strategies to identify and protect marine coastal
7 estuary (inaudible) and critical habitat, with
8 special strategies which we may also negate risks
9 through climate change, has to remain visible.

10 MS. YOCHER: Yeah.

11 MR. SHELLEY: But you left out
12 completely the partnership mention.

13 MS. LOVETT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear
14 that.

15 MR. SHELLEY: And that was intentionally
16 the partnership. Yeah.

17 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. So the -- no that's
18 --

19 MR. SHELLEY: Did I say partnership?

20 MS. YOCHER: No. No. It's just that
21 what he was saying was, NOAA shouldn't be top-down
22 on local communities, and s that's why you would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- you would include the partnerships concept, but
2 if you take out for local communities --

3 MR. BROWN: For communities then you
4 don't. That's right.

5 MS. YOCHER: -- for local communities
6 then they are just encouraging all kinds of
7 strategies.

8 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah. Exactly, yeah.

9 MS. YOCHER: So as long as four local
10 communities is taking out?

11 MS. LOVETT: Okay. Are we all through
12 with that then?

13 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah.

14 MS. LOVETT: Well, use your commas.

15 MS. YOCHER: Everyone is getting
16 exhausted.

17 MS. LOVETT: Okay. We are almost done.

18 MR. BROWN: Which page are we on?

19 MS. YOCHER: We are on page -- the
20 bottom of page -- No, we've addressed all that, so
21 we are on page 7.

22 MR. BROWN: Okay.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: So the comment is, it's
2 staying a little too -- potentially a little too
3 specific, and information and confidence to
4 address what's being identified here may be really
5 out of scope, is what the comment was about.

6 MR. BROWN: Right.

7 MR. SHELLEY: Really, that first bullet
8 was -- is an aspect of the earlier thing about
9 resiliency. You know, it is, in these sorts of
10 issues --

11 MS. YOCHER: Well this is presupposing
12 that the best way to preserve the potential for
13 fish populations to adapt, is to distribute
14 fishing effort across these certain categories.

15 MR. SHELLEY: That's to protect
16 sub-stocks, genetically distinct populations and
17 --

18 MS. YOCHER: Right. That's one specific
19 thing.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Promote diversity, kind of
21 thing there, stock, structure?

22 MR. BROWN: I don't agree with this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comment, about confidence --

2 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I don't think the
3 confidence, I think is sort of sarcastic.

4 MR. BROWN: It's actually -- it's
5 actually been going on, and other sorts of things.

6 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

7 MS. LOVETT: So leave that bullet in?

8 MR. BROWN: I think.

9 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Was this --

10 MR. BROWN: And that's exactly what they
11 are doing in the other group in the Gulf.

12 MS. YOCHER: Do you guys remember this
13 discussion as being there.

14 MR. SHELLEY: Not that I know.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

16 MR. SHELLEY: I remember -- I just
17 categorized this as the sort of the resiliency
18 approach.

19 MR. BROWN: Now, Heidi, I do have one --

20 MS. LOVETT: Yeah?

21 MR. BROWN: The second one there, where
22 you put the acronym in front of the --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So if we -- if we
2 are okay with that one standing, are we okay with
3 the other two, the two bullet points that follow?
4 Developing capacity to evaluate cost and benefits?

5 MR. SHELLEY: Mm-hmm.

6 MS. YOCHER: And using model technology
7 that nobody seem to --

8 MR. SHELLEY: Realistically.

9 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. Okay.

10 MS. LOVETT: So I believe that what is
11 fleshed out wasn't deletion that was recommended
12 by Robert Leaf, on the first bullet under
13 objective three.

14 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So Robert Leaf did
15 that deletion?

16 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. So it's up to you
17 now if you, you know, think it has to come out or
18 if it should stay.

19 MR. SHELLEY: I think access to
20 information is pretty important, if that's what
21 this is promoting.

22 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. Getting timely and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 adequate information.

2 MR. BROWN: Yeah, but I think that there
3 were try make a very strong point about -- you
4 know, maybe they are obsessive about if any of
5 this is --

6 MS. YOCHER: Well, that's the second
7 point, but the first point I wouldn't -- I
8 wouldn't delete that, the first point, I don't
9 think, which you don't have on yours.

10 MR. BROWN: Right.

11 MS. YOCHER: This one. Do you identify
12 interim and long-term strategies?

13 MR. BROWN: Right.

14 MS. YOCHER: He suggested that be
15 deleted.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay.

17 MR. SHELLEY: But he didn't say why?

18 MS. YOCHER: Right.

19 MR. SHELLEY: Heidi?

20 MS. LOVETT: No.

21 MR. SHELLEY: I think you better go on.

22 MS. YOCHER: And I don't see a problem

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 with ensuring that sectors and communities give
2 timely and adequate information for making this
3 adapt to changes, our too, you make it adapt to
4 changes.

5 MR. BROWN: Right. I think that's on
6 point. And did I tell you we are doing and all
7 that stuff --

8 (Off the record discussion)

9 MS. YOCHER: All right.

10 MR. SHELLEY: So you are going to leave
11 that in there?

12 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. So we are going to
13 leave identify interim and long-term strategies.
14 What about this next one, it's another comment
15 about the interim member that is continual,
16 circular and evolving. And I think that's okay.
17 If you said it was a big topic of discussion, and
18 they really, really want to make a point, then, I
19 think that's fine.

20 MS. LOVETT: Where are we now?

21 MS. YOCHER: We are on the second -- the
22 accurately portray the adaptive management

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 process.

2 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

3 MS. YOCHER: I think we are okay with
4 leaving that as well.

5 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

6 MS. YOCHER: The next one is the
7 traditional knowledge.

8 MS. LOVETT: Mm-hmm.

9 MS. YOCHER: Anybody have a problem with
10 any of these -- any of the bullet points that are
11 not called out by Robert Leaf?

12 MR. BROWN: And I made a change, a
13 suggested change, put an acronym after that.

14 MS. YOCHER: Right.

15 MR. McCARTY: I'd like to see, instead
16 of create continuum dialogues, maintain; and some
17 way of archiving or, you know, building a database
18 with that.

19 MS. LUKENS: Where do you -- where is
20 this?

21 MR. SHELLEY: The second bullet under
22 the second point.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. McCARTY: And maintain, yeah, would
2 be a much better word.

3 MS. YOCHER: So maintain continual
4 dialogues.

5 MR. McCARTY: Or sustain.

6 MS. LOVETT: Maintain. Okay.

7 MS. YOCHER: What about his comment that
8 modern methods of data recording and transfer to
9 real-time information systems. These are in
10 place, I don't know --

11 MR. SHELLEY: I don't understand his
12 comment, if he was being sarcastic, or
13 questioning, or making a point.

14 MS. YOCHER: I mean that's part of cool
15 electronic monitoring is about, right? We are
16 starting to incorporate them, but they are not --
17 they are not incorporated now.

18 MR. BROWN: Well, do you mean, develop
19 new assets or --

20 MR. SHELLEY: I think it's really, maybe
21 just say, advanced methods of data recording and
22 transfer of real-time information systems.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: So, instead build it
2 modern, just say advanced.

3 MR. SHELLEY: I guess. I didn't even
4 know what his comment means, so.

5 MR. BROWN: Oh. Yeah. How about
6 advanced --

7 MS. YOCHER: Or support methods of --

8 MR. BROWN: You know, enhanced methods
9 of data recording and transfer to real-time
10 information.

11 MS. LOVETT: Advance or enhance?

12 MR. BROWN: I think enhance.

13 MS. YOCHER: Well that assumes that they
14 are -- sort of developed our enhanced methods of,
15 in case there are some places where we don't have
16 them?

17 MR. BROWN: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

18 MS. YOCHER: So develop and enhance --
19 or advance and enhance?

20 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

21 SPEAKER: Enhances.

22 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. I like enhance,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 better.

2 MR. BROWN: Yeah. It includes but
3 you've got -- and I think takes you further.

4 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

5 MS. LOVETT: Okay. Okay.

6 MR. SHELLEY: The only other comment I
7 have is you have a typo on page 9, the last bullet
8 of Section C, subsection -- the last bullet of
9 Section C, subsistence, research the use, not
10 "us".

11 MS. LOVETT: Oh. Thank you.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Mm-hmm.

13 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So that was the last
14 -- is the last bullet point where they were -- are
15 you --

16 MS. LOVETT: That was to -- Yeah, there
17 was some difference of opinion.

18 MS. YOCHER: What about -- so should we
19 just take a moment and read over these again. To
20 make sure we are -- I think on objective six,
21 track, trends and ecosystems, and so on, I think
22 there was -- I thought maybe some of these were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 too specific as well.

2 MR. BROWN: What page are you on.

3 MS. YOCHER: Page 8, objective six. So
4 it's calling out, you know, citizen, science,
5 monitoring, and all of a sudden you've got key
6 disease indicators, and identify key environmental
7 indicators, change in port and habitats. I mean,
8 that's kind of the whole, and then a model for
9 identifying major science of -- I don't know,
10 Heidi, does that seem -- in one sense it seems too
11 specific like with the disease picked as one
12 factor, but then too broad where it says,
13 identify, key environmental indicators of change.
14 You've got kind of like the all encompassing
15 statement like that and then drill down to this
16 very specific.

17 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. I don't know if it's
18 because disease as a whole is not addressed. I
19 don't know -- I don't know why that is --

20 MR. BROWN: Okay. Where is disease?

21 MS. YOCHER: Page 8.

22 MR. BROWN: Okay.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: This one, it just seems
2 like you are talking about citizen, science,
3 monitoring systems?

4 MR. BROWN: No. No.

5 MS. YOCHER: Monitoring systems?

6 MR. BROWN: Okay. I understand that.

7 MS. LOVETT: That's just, give some
8 examples, and I think that's okay.

9 MR. BROWN: It's to give an example,
10 right?

11 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

12 MR. BROWN: And there is a Fishing Life
13 (inaudible) Survey that they just -- that's a meta
14 data thing, where people put information on raw
15 fish, diseases, and that's one that's one that's
16 been tracked.

17 MS. YOCHER: Mm-hmm?

18 MR. BROWN: And it probably needs to be
19 enhanced, and a lot of the (inaudible) are
20 included in that fishing lines, so it's to keep
21 the data, but it's mostly within the top --

22 MS. YOCHER: But it's such a specific

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 thing. I mean can we --

2 MR. BROWN: Huh?

3 MS. YOCHER: It's such a specific --

4 MS. LOVETT: Well, the citizen is
5 monitoring that. I mean, I see the point, the
6 CoCoRaHS isn't a NOAA-related citizen monitoring,
7 but one, two -- if that is a disease- related
8 effort, do we include that in the citizen
9 monitoring, and let's --

10 MR. BROWN: No. But let's go --

11 MS. YOCHER: But it's like a sub-bullet,
12 that's the -- yeah, that's the idea. So if you
13 say, citizen science monitoring is one thing that
14 we want to promote, and then was want to promote
15 other indicators, and then give us an example,
16 maybe disease is an indicator, but there's others.
17 But there's others.

18 MR. BROWN: Yeah. And I think that one
19 of the opportunity to expand the Wild Fish --
20 Sorry.

21 MS. YOCHER: Is that something a
22 different agency would see, or that NOAA does?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: The fishing (inaudible) does
2 it. I think part of it is on contract with the
3 states, or something that expanding it would be
4 also helpful again, the offshore issues,
5 especially with aquaculture, and especially if you
6 are able to track wild diseases -- and while fish
7 that have issues and diseases --

8 MS. YOCHER: But we are looking for ways
9 to track trends to provide early warning and
10 change, and so I -- when I see something about
11 disease and climate change I'm thinking, you know,
12 temperature gets warmer, certain parasites are
13 preferred, and so if you see one of those
14 parasites in warm -- you know, then you think --

15 MR. BROWN: Right. And what's happened
16 in the case of the -- if they were honest,
17 inherent is that something that's cropped up most
18 recently that's now beginning to retract, and they
19 believe it's related to the whole --

20 MS. YOCHER: Right. Exactly. But
21 rather than just call that diseases the only
22 thing, there's other things too, you know, like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there are certain malformations, for example, that
2 are seen in fish that are associated with
3 temperature we think. And so why call out,
4 specifically, disease so you might want to -- so
5 identify key indicator of change, disease could be
6 one, or changes in prevalence of disease could be
7 one.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay.

9 MS. YOCHER: But just to call that out,
10 such a specific example.

11 MS. LOVETT: So, how would you -- would
12 you like to achieve indicators, and remove the
13 disease or --

14 MS. YOCHER: Identify key indicators to
15 track and monitor, and then you could say, as a
16 sub-bullet, you could see, for example,
17 temperature sensitive disease does not -- you say
18 as a sub-bullet for, instead of i.e., e.g. changes
19 in prevalence of diseases, such as.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay. I think that this
21 disease thing is a -- as an independent variable,
22 it would be a good thing to expand. Now there is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 an MOU between NOAA Fisheries and All Night
2 Service, in USDA, that could get at it, but it
3 could also be helpful for even in the absence, of
4 climate change it's important, because there have
5 been a number of cases, where the fish have been
6 destroyed in California, and to make sure that
7 they don't end up passing diseases capturing the
8 fish to Washington and Oregon. But also some --

9 MS. YOCHER: But sticking to the climate
10 change relevance of disease, if you are looking at
11 an indicator, so if you are looking at something
12 to trap, so you are -- what you are talking about
13 is an added benefit that would come from that?
14 But I think since this is a climate change
15 document, we should focus on this --

16 MR. BROWN: Well, it's an added benefit
17 from the climate change standpoint because if it
18 has issues that are moving further north, then
19 let's say some of the disease problems, in
20 California from pathogen might move me to further
21 North in the absence of what's being done to that.

22 MS. YOCHER: Right. But you can't --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that's why tracking those changes in the
2 prevalence of disease is so -- You'd say
3 occurrence and prevalence, I guess, because if we
4 see the disease is --

5 MR. BROWN: Well, yeah. It's a survey
6 that's being done and in the states, and in the
7 other agencies collects apples from Wild Fish,
8 they send them in and they could check for various
9 parasites, and other --

10 MS. YOCHER: So if you can -- Go ahead.

11 MS. LOVETT: No -- I was going to say, I
12 think I'm going to say it's okay, because we are
13 in the conversation and we are capturing the
14 changes.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay. For our Court
16 Reporter to go?

17 MS. LOVETT: And it will probably be
18 okay for our Court Reporter call it a day.

19 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were
21 adjourned.)

22 * * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

2 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

3 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary
4 public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia, do
5 hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was
6 duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under
7 my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell
8 the truth under penalty of perjury; that said
9 transcript is a true record of the testimony given
10 by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for,
11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
12 the action in which this proceeding was called;
13 and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or
14 employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
15 parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
16 interested in the outcome of this action.

17
18 (Signature and Seal on File)

19 Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of
20 Virginia

21 My Commission Expires: November 30, 2016

22 Notary Public Number 351998

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100